

COMMISSION ON REVIEW OF OVERSEAS MILITARY
FACILITY STRUCTURE OF THE UNITED STATES

+ + + + +

HEARING

+ + + + +

THURSDAY,
SEPTEMBER 2, 2004

+ + + + +

The hearing convened in Room 138, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Washington, D.C., at 9:30 a.m., Al Cornella, Chairman, presiding.

PRESENT:

AL CORNELLA	Chairman
LEWIS CURTIS, Maj Gen U.S. Air Force (Retired)	Vice Chairman
KEITH MARTIN, BG, PA ARNG (Retired)	Commissioner
PETE TAYLOR, LTG U.S. Army (Retired)	Commissioner

WITNESSES:

GEORGE HARMEYER, MG U.S. Army (Retired)
MARY M. KELLER, Military Child Education Coalition
THE HONORABLE LAWRENCE KORB, Center for American Progress
MICHAEL E. O'HANLON, Brookings Institute
DONALD PILLING, ADM U.S. Navy (Retired)
JOYCE WESSEL RAEZER, The National Military Family Association
JACK SPENCER, Heritage Foundation
MIKE WILLIAMS, Gen U.S. Marine Corps (Retired)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

	<u>PAGE</u>
PANEL 1:	
General Harmeyer	7
Admiral Pilling	9
General Williams	11
 PANEL 2:	
Dr. Korb	67
Mr. Spencer	71
Mr. O'Hanlon	79
 PANEL 3:	
Ms. Raezer	134
Dr. Keller	144

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

P-R-O-C-E-E-D-I-N-G-S

(9:28 a.m.)

COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. This hearing constitutes the second public meeting of the Commission on the Review of Overseas Military Facility Structure of the United States, more commonly known, thankfully, as the Overseas Basing Commission, or OSBC.

My name is Al Cornella, and I'm serving as the Commission's Chairman. Other Commissioners present today are the Vice Chairman, Lewis Curtis, Major General U.S. Air Force (Retired); Pete Taylor, Lieutenant General, United States Army (Retired); and Keith Martin, Brigadier General, Pennsylvania Army National Guard (Retired).

Commissioner James Thomson is currently traveling overseas.

By way of introduction, let me explain the Commission. The Overseas Basing Commission was established by public law in FY2004. The Commission's task is to independently assess whether the current overseas basing structure is adequate to execute current missions and to assess the feasibility of closures, realignments, or establishment of new installations overseas to meet emerging defense

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 requirements.

2 The Commission's work is not intended to
3 preclude the Department of Defense's efforts towards
4 developing an integrated global presence and basing
5 strategy. Rather, the Commission report will serve as
6 another data point to assist Congressional committees
7 in performing their oversight responsibilities for
8 DoD's basing strategy, military construction
9 appropriations, and, in 2005, Base Realignment and
10 Closure Commission determinations.

11 This Commission has been active since May
12 2004. In addition to standing up the Commission,
13 Commissioners have engaged in briefings from the
14 Department of Defense, the Congressional Budget
15 Office, Congressional Research Service, and other
16 entities. The Commissioners have just returned from
17 our first trip abroad where we met with Commanders and
18 received extensive briefings on the transformation
19 plan for the European Command.

20 We visited military installations in
21 several countries, meeting with U.S. forces, Embassy
22 representatives, foreign military officers, and local
23 officials. We ended our trip by meeting with the
24 Supreme Allied Commander Europe and the European
25 Combatant Commander, General James Jones.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Additional trips are planned this fall to
2 three other regions of the world. The composition of
3 the Commission staff has been established. We have
4 hired lead research analysts, administrative staff,
5 and received two analysts detailed from the Department
6 of Defense with six more applied to -- or planned to
7 arrive within the next month.

8 Additionally, the Commission is in the
9 process of acquiring several additional professional
10 analysts and plans on being fully staffed by mid-
11 September.

12 At this point, I would like to describe
13 the procedure for today's hearing. We have three
14 panels, and we will introduce each panel as they
15 appear. Each panelist will receive up to 10 minutes
16 for an opening statement, if they so desire. At the
17 conclusion of all opening statements, each
18 Commissioner will have up to 10 minutes to ask
19 questions.

20 We will use lights only as a courtesy
21 reminder. When the yellow lights appear, you have two
22 minutes remaining. When the red appears, time has
23 expired. But I would ask all panelists to please take
24 the time necessary to complete your comments.

25 It is my privilege to introduce our first

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 panel. Joining us today are three distinguished
2 military experts whose combined military expertise
3 spans over 100 years of distinguished service.
4 Admiral Donald Pilling, U.S. Navy (Retired), is the
5 former Vice Chief of Naval Operations, and Admiral
6 Pilling also served as Commander of the 6th Fleet and
7 Naval Striking and Support Forces, Southern Europe.

8 General Michael Williams, U.S. Marine
9 Corps (Retired), is a former Assistant Commandant of
10 the Marine Corps. General Williams was also the
11 Commanding Officer of Marine Air Group 26, Commanding
12 General of 2nd Force Service Support Group, and
13 Commander, Joint Task Force 160.

14 And Major General George Harmeyer, U.S.
15 Army (Retired), served as Commander, Operations Group,
16 of the National Training Center, Fort Irwin,
17 California, Commanding General of the U.S. Army Armor
18 Center and Fort Knox, Kentucky. General Harmeyer also
19 commanded the 7th Army Training Command in
20 Grafenwoehr, Germany.

21 Gentlemen, welcome, and thank you for
22 appearing before us today. And a special note of
23 thanks to General Harmeyer for appearing on such short
24 notice after we learned that General Saint had a death
25 in the family and could not appear today as planned.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 We hope to hear from General Saint at a later date,
2 and we certainly extend condolences to him and his
3 family.

4 The Commission understands that General
5 Harmeyer has a previous commitment and will need to
6 leave a bit early. Therefore, I ask for the other
7 panelists' understanding, and we would like to begin
8 with your statement. Do you have a statement at this
9 time, General Harmeyer?

10 GENERAL HARMEYER: Yes, sir. First of
11 all, Mr. Commissioner, I am certainly honored to be
12 here today, and I am flattered to have been asked to
13 come replace one of my long-time mentors, General
14 Saint. Our condolences to General Saint also.

15 A couple of items in my career that may be
16 appropriate for -- hopefully will be appropriate for
17 the panel. I have deployed a number of times with
18 units into the European Theater and Southwest Asia.
19 I'm familiar with the deployment process from that
20 aspect, and also the family support issues that go
21 along with that.

22 Having deployed for Desert Storm/Desert
23 Shield, we really spawned the issues of family support
24 in the military from that exercise. So that's
25 significant, and now I believe the Army has a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 tremendous family support system to take care of
2 deploying organizations and taking care of their
3 families.

4 Since my retirement five years ago, I've
5 maintained currency with the Army working with future
6 combat systems training, Army training, to include
7 distance learning, courseware development. I have
8 also been involved with training the Stryker brigades.

9 We established the Mission Support Training Facility
10 at Fort Lewis and are still operating that facility
11 today.

12 So we've been involved in that network-
13 centric battle command training for them, plus their
14 deployment, and we track how they are doing in Iraq
15 today.

16 So Army transformation -- I have also
17 participated in a couple of the Chief of Staff's
18 panel's task force modularity and some of the
19 reorganization of the forces that will be in the
20 future deploying over to Europe. I understand the
21 basic premise of General Bell's plan for the
22 reorganization of United States Army Europe.

23 My concerns initially were maintaining a
24 presence in Europe, but his reorganization of the
25 headquarters seems to satisfy that. And the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 deployment for training exercises into the East
2 European countries, when the situation will allow that
3 with the global war on terror, will also provide
4 appropriate presence in the Theater.

5 So I look forward to your questions and
6 discussion. Appreciate your asking me on short notice
7 to come join you.

8 Thank you, sir.

9 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you,
10 General.

11 Admiral Pilling?

12 ADMIRAL PILLING: Good morning. I
13 appreciate the opportunity to appear before your
14 Commission. I believe that you have many difficult
15 problems to address with conflicting perspectives on
16 the various options that should be considered.

17 Although I retired from the U.S. Navy as a
18 Vice Chief of Naval Operations four years ago, I have
19 tried to remain current with DoD thinking through my
20 membership in the Defense Science Board and the
21 national security work that my firm is involved in.

22 I believe it makes sense to restructure
23 our permanently deployed forces to reflect the
24 dissolution of the Soviet Union and our increasing
25 involvement in troubled areas worldwide. However, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 devil is in the details. There are numerous issues
2 that need to be addressed, such as the conventional
3 forces in Europe, limits on equipment in Eastern
4 European countries, the upcoming BRAC, and our
5 relationships with our long-term allies.

6 The return of 70,000 members of our armed
7 forces currently stationed overseas to the United
8 States, along with what could be a temporary increase
9 in Army end strength of 30,000 people, argues that we
10 should factor this growth into the objectives of the
11 fiscal year '05 BRAC.

12 We should also consider the restructuring
13 impact on our allies. This is much more than an
14 economic issue. Some of our allies have provided
15 extraordinary support for our forces over the last
16 several decades. This is especially true in countries
17 like Italy, which made its facilities available to us
18 in the 1960s when France withdrew militarily from
19 NATO.

20 The final point I would like to emphasize
21 is that the restructuring of our forward deployed
22 forces argues even more strongly for the advantages
23 sea-basing offers. This concept of sea-basing is
24 primarily a Navy and Marine Corps initiative at
25 present, and we must ensure that it gets developed in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a way so that it will support joint forces, not just
2 the Navy and the Marine Corps, in the future.

3 I'm happy to answer any of your questions.

4 Thank you.

5 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you, sir.

6 General Williams?

7 GENERAL WILLIAMS: Good morning. I'd like
8 to read a similarly short statement for the record.
9 Thank you for the opportunity to appear.

10 This Commission is addressing a very
11 complex subject at a very difficult time. The
12 confluence of the President's basing initiative, the
13 upcoming BRAC, and the projected increase in the size
14 of the Army combine to make your task especially
15 difficult.

16 The Marine Corps' role in overseas basing
17 is limited but important. Over 20,000 Marines and
18 their families are deployed in Japan, most of them on
19 the island of Okinawa. The 3rd Marine Expeditionary
20 Force, headquartered in Okinawa, provides a strategic
21 strike force for the Regional Combat Commander in the
22 Pacific and the Commander of U.S. forces in Korea.

23 The relationship between the Marines on
24 Okinawa and the Japanese government is a cordial one.

25 But Marine presence on the island periodically causes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 political and social problems for the residents. The
2 Marine Corps is committed to reducing its footprint on
3 the island by 10 percent in the coming year by
4 rotating Okinawa-based forces to forward training
5 locations.

6 The Marine presence in Japan is part of
7 the delicate balance of power in the Pacific, and its
8 diplomatic, economic, and military consequences would
9 have to be carefully weighed before any substantial
10 change is made. The current Navy/Marine Corps sea-
11 basing initiative offers some long-term opportunity to
12 achieve desired forward presence without the burden of
13 overseas basing.

14 I'm happy to answer your questions.

15 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you, sir.

16 Today we would appreciate your frank and
17 professional views on the suggested focus for the
18 Commission to investigate in its review of overseas
19 basing, potential unintended consequences, returning
20 large numbers of troops stationed overseas to the
21 U.S., your thoughts on the issues surrounding DoD's
22 integrated global presence and basing strategy, and
23 other alternatives that the Commission should
24 consider. And I think that you'll find that our
25 questions will be directed at those subjects.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 And I'm going to open the questioning with
2 -- just direct it to the panel, and you can decide who
3 might want to lead off. But how would you envision
4 the global posture review changes increasing our
5 ability to carry out our defense commitments more
6 effectively?

7 ADMIRAL PILLING: I'll just take the first
8 shot at this. It just strikes me that the critical
9 dimension in all of these discussions about our
10 ability to project power in the future is a question
11 of time.

12 So as you bring forces back to the United
13 States, how do you offset this loss of time that you
14 have to deploy these forces? Which is why I think
15 ideas like sea-basing, which gives you the capability
16 to combine the logistics and operations required for
17 power projection overseas as a viable alternative in
18 the future to having more of our forces resident in
19 the United States.

20 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Any other
21 comments?

22 GENERAL HARMEYER: Yes, sir. I think
23 we've developed several concepts to reduce the amount
24 of time for deploying organizations. I think part of
25 the rebasing strategy is to have the reorganized units

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of action in the Army actually deployed almost on a
2 continuous basis into Eastern European countries for
3 training exercises, but be in a posture so that they
4 can move from there rapidly to points needed.

5 We still, I think, will entertain
6 prepositioned equipment stocks and even prepositioned
7 float stocks to be close to flash points or points
8 that we'd need to get to more rapidly. I still think
9 that the joint force must concentrate on strategic
10 lift. Even the Stryker brigade requires significant
11 strategic lift to meet its deployment timeframe. So
12 fast sealift and significant airlift is critical.

13 Thank you.

14 GENERAL WILLIAMS: And I would just add
15 that the focus of this is mostly in Europe. If you
16 look at the Pacific Theater, you have enormous
17 distance problems, which exacerbates any strategic
18 lift shortage. And, therefore, large-scale
19 redeployments out of the Pacific become even more
20 difficult, notwithstanding any problems you would have
21 back in the States for the redeployed Marines and
22 their families. Sort of the tyranny of distance that
23 you face in the Pacific really does add a dimension to
24 this problem.

25 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think General Williams just addressed
2 the Pacific issue on my next question. But one thing
3 that we always hear asked is: with such advantages as
4 long-range strike and strategic lift, other
5 technologies, why not just bring all of our troops
6 back to the United States?

7 ADMIRAL PILLING: Well, there is some
8 virtue in maintaining established relationships with
9 our allies overseas. I can tell you that when I was
10 stationed overseas in Italy I had the opportunity to
11 establish personal relationships with the leadership
12 of the Italian Armed Forces. We exercised with them
13 all the time. We understood each other. So there is
14 that virtue, which you don't get on a six-month
15 deployment if you're on a ship that's based in CONUS.

16 So there is an argument to be made. There
17 is value of being able to routinely exercise and work
18 with our allies overseas.

19 GENERAL HARMEYER: If I could follow on,
20 also I feel that we certainly need to maintain
21 presence on the senior staffs of our alliances,
22 particularly NATO. And the reorganization there in
23 Europe provides for having permanently stationed joint
24 task force capable headquarters, one large and two
25 small, and that will maintain the presence with our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 allies and be continuously planning for contingency
2 operations as well as the training operations that are
3 foreseen throughout the EUCOM AOR.

4 So I think we still must maintain a
5 presence for, you know, political as well as
6 operational strategic issues.

7 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Do any of you have
8 any concern about the number of troops being left
9 overseas or permanently assigned would diminish those
10 capabilities in regard to the alliances?

11 ADMIRAL PILLING: Sorry to go first on all
12 of these. But, I mean, I think if we can have the
13 senior commanders permanently stationed overseas, and
14 then the rotational forces can be CONUS-based, it's
15 the personal relationships that if you can call your
16 counterparts in other countries among our allies, I
17 would argue we shouldn't bring everybody back, keep
18 staffs and senior commanders deployed overseas.

19 GENERAL HARMEYER: If I could follow on,
20 also with rotational troops going into areas on a
21 temporary basis for training, that provides the
22 linkage with the allied forces, if you will, and one
23 of the objectives of those training exercises is to
24 raise the level of training and expertise of the newly
25 -- new NATO members. And also, it provides the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impetus to improve facilities and technology for
2 training support.

3 So I think the periodic or the -- well,
4 it's supposed to be continuous deployment for training
5 of these units is critical. But I agree with Admiral
6 Pilling that with the senior staffs there you have the
7 presence that can be felt by political and
8 governmental people in our allied countries.

9 GENERAL WILLIAMS: In the Pacific, the
10 Marine Corps has been a rotational force for quite a
11 few years. And the model we've used is to try to
12 stabilize the leadership -- the senior leadership and
13 the support personnel -- with three-year tours with
14 their families, and rotate the units on six-month --
15 the infantry battalions and the aircraft squadrons and
16 logistics units -- on six-month rotational tours
17 through Okinawa.

18 And we've found, in agreement with my
19 colleagues here, that having the commanders and senior
20 staff there to deal with the host governments, and
21 also the other governments in which we train, the
22 theaters in which we train -- a little bit in the
23 Philippines, a lot in Korea, some in Australia, some
24 in Guam. It's helpful to have the continuity and not
25 have everybody churning every six months, because you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really lose a lot when you do that.

2 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: During our recent
3 trip -- and I'd say almost to a country -- it seemed
4 that every nation was reducing their military, their
5 defense spending. Do you think that our changes are
6 what will promote changes in their thinking in regard
7 to their own national defense? I mean, do you have
8 any feel for how that will all play out?

9 GENERAL WILLIAMS: I'll go first on this
10 one. I think that having United States forces
11 deployed in Japan reduces a lot of tensions that would
12 otherwise result if there were no U.S. forces deployed
13 over there. The guarantees we made for Japanese
14 security and their constitution, the way that China
15 and Taiwan look at one another across the strait, the
16 relationships between China and Japan, would change in
17 ways that I don't completely understand if the
18 American military presence was removed.

19 And I think that may well be one of the
20 toughest parts of your assignment here is to try to
21 make an educated guess as to what those diplomatic
22 moves might be. If this presence that has endured
23 there for almost 60 years was plucked out, what would
24 happen to the vacuum?

25 ADMIRAL PILLING: I lived in Europe for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 six years while I was in uniform, and, with the
2 exception of Great Britain, I don't think what we do
3 really would make that much difference on the
4 Parliaments in our allies -- in the allies' countries.

5 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

6 GENERAL HARMEYER: One of the concerns I
7 have is the impact on the newer countries that we
8 would be taking our troops into. As we all know, any
9 concentration of U.S. forces or American citizens in
10 this day and age is a potential target of terrorists.

11 So the security impact on the new host nations is an
12 issue I think that must be examined. I'm sure it has
13 been or is being examined. But that's a thought that
14 has come across my mind -- the force protection that
15 the host nation will have to take on in conjunction
16 with forward deployed troops.

17 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you, sir.
18 Thank all of you.

19 And I will turn to General Taylor.

20 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you, Mr.
21 Chairman. And I'll add my thanks to the Chairman for
22 you being here today and providing us insights into
23 what is a difficult and short time fuse requirement
24 that we have. We deeply appreciate that.

25 And I believe, General Harmeyer, that you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have to depart early. So if you don't mind, I'll
2 start my questions with you. A lot of your background
3 is associated with training in various places all over
4 the world, but largely in Germany.

5 We just came back from, as the Chairman
6 has indicated, from a visit over there. And one of
7 the questions I would ask your opinion on is the
8 capability of the training areas and ranges in the
9 European Theater to accommodate the forces that are
10 remaining there and rotational forces that might come
11 back there.

12 GENERAL HARMEYER: Yes, sir. As you know,
13 Grafenwoehr and Hohenfels are quite well developed,
14 even though they are relatively small training areas.

15 And the advances in constructive simulation training
16 are increasing on a daily basis.

17 Now, when we went into Bosnia, I was
18 tasked to build a sustainment training base in
19 Hungary. And we found an old Soviet base that the
20 Hungarians were still training on, and in 1996 we
21 basically had to start from scratch and rebuild
22 everything. Their concept of range fans just didn't
23 exist. They shot right up to the boundary of the
24 training area, and, you know, stuff landed in the
25 village next door, didn't matter to them. And the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 facilities themselves had to be rebuilt.

2 We have the capability in the United
3 States military to build and construct superb
4 modernized training ranges. I'm sure in the last six
5 or eight years, since I left Europe, that there is --
6 a lot has been done. One of the criteria for being
7 accepted into NATO was to have their military meet
8 certain standards, NATO standards, and that involved a
9 lot of training.

10 So I would venture to say that many of the
11 training areas in the former Eastern European
12 countries have been upgraded. They do have large
13 training areas that can be utilized, and I know we've
14 been training in a huge training area in Poland for a
15 number of years now. USEUR does a huge joint combined
16 arms tactical exercise over there every year. So I
17 would say the land is, in fact, there.

18 Modernization has been taking place in the
19 Eastern European militaries. And having U.S. forces
20 planning to be stationed in those areas for training
21 purposes would be an impetus to modernize, and, of
22 course, we would assist in that modernization. I
23 think it would be very welcomed by those countries.

24 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: There is a new
25 exportable training system that they told us about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 when we were in Europe called the DYE system. It can
2 be used to export on an expeditionary basis fairly
3 cheaply and fairly easy on resources, and to other
4 countries or other areas in order to set up instrument
5 and training. Are you familiar with that? And would
6 you like to comment on your views of that being used
7 as a part of our engagement strategy with Eastern
8 European countries?

9 GENERAL HARMEYER: Yes, sir. That is an
10 instrumentation system, portable instrumentation
11 system, that has been worked for some time. I think
12 it is a very good system. It is the 80 percent
13 solution that is much less expensive and quicker to
14 establish than other folks who want to have a 100
15 percent solution.

16 Also, distributed constructive training,
17 simulation training, is increasing. I have worked
18 with several countries over there -- Uzbekistan, for
19 instance. We are installing a simulation training
20 system, establishing a simulation center, and training
21 their folks on how to use the more modern systems like
22 JANUS to do command and control training down to the
23 company team level. So they are making improvements
24 and great strides in their training capabilities in
25 the East.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Then, do I
2 understand from your statement that you feel that the
3 option is there for establishing temporary training
4 areas and facilities and without a huge investment of
5 resources in some of the Eastern European countries?

6 GENERAL HARMEYER: Yes, sir, I do.

7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. To change the
8 focus just a little bit, you mentioned -- the Chairman
9 mentioned the importance of maintaining presence
10 overseas in terms of our relationship with NATO and
11 other allies.

12 I guess the question I would have: what
13 is the break point? How much of a relationship, how
14 much of a presence do you have to have, in your
15 opinion, in order to sustain the capability, to feel
16 the key positions in the staff, like SACEUR and
17 others? And maybe that's not important, but I would
18 be interested in your opinions on that. Any of you?

19 ADMIRAL PILLING: I would support what
20 General Williams said about the model that the Marine
21 Corps follows in Japan as sort of being a model we
22 should think in terms of -- with rotational forces,
23 but the senior staff and the support personnel being
24 forward deployed permanently.

25 I think that model has worked well for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Marine Corps. The Navy follows a similar model in the
2 Mediterranean, where they have very few ships home
3 ported there, but the senior staffs are in Europe, and
4 establish those relationships.

5 So if you're looking for at least data
6 points on what's a reasonable size to maintain this, I
7 think the Marines in Japan and the Navy in Europe are
8 good models.

9 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Any other comments?

10 GENERAL HARMEYER: Sir, I really think
11 it's critical that we maintain our headquarters, of
12 course EUCOM, and our presence on the NATO staff. A
13 large amount of the resources committed to NATO are
14 U.S. resources, joint. So we -- it is my opinion that
15 we should maintain significant parts of the command
16 and control and planning process within NATO.

17 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, sir. I'm
18 sorry.

19 GENERAL WILLIAMS: I was just going to
20 comment that we -- in fairness, we need to talk to the
21 Regional Combatant Commanders as well, because at
22 least in the Pacific Theater the mission of the force
23 obviously is going to have some impact on how big it
24 is and how quickly the Regional Combatant Commander
25 expects it to show up.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In the case of U.S. Forces Korea, you
2 know, he wants a military viable strike force that he
3 can reach out and touch pretty quickly. It may not be
4 that way in Europe, but that would certainly impact on
5 the numbers and the question of how much is enough.

6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Yes, sir. And in
7 the case of Europe, we have -- we will again, and we
8 will be doing that with the commanders in the Pacific
9 as well.

10 Could one of you address -- we talked
11 about strategic lift and our -- obviously, with the
12 rotational concept, you have to have a robust
13 strategic lift. Would one or any of you comment on
14 our current capability as you see it to execute a plan
15 of only having principally higher level staffs forward
16 deployed and rotating all of the other forces?

17 ADMIRAL PILLING: I think if you look at
18 the numbers we can lift with strategic sealift, what's
19 necessary, the problem is the time. And so that
20 argues that you either have to go to fast sealift or
21 more prepositioned equipment afloat overseas in order
22 to reduce the timelines. I think that equation has
23 been that way for years. It just takes a long time
24 with standard sealift to move forces forward from the
25 United States.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. Other
2 comments?

3 GENERAL WILLIAMS: And as far as moving by
4 air, I mean, no commander in history has ever had
5 enough strategic airlift. We don't have enough now,
6 and we'll never have enough. And we've mitigated that
7 by -- at least in my service by forward deployments
8 and also forward deployments with the Navy. So we
9 have amphibious forces forward.

10 Fast sealift is certainly good, but then
11 you have to look at where we're going. In the case of
12 our most recent conflict, the number of airheads that
13 we had was limited, the number of ports we had was
14 limited. So even if we had had more sealift, there's
15 some question of what the throughput would have been.

16 We can move pretty quickly, and if we pull
17 our forces back to the extent that we move people in
18 Europe by train to ports and embark them to bring them
19 into the theater, we'd have to think through, how
20 would we get them there? And that -- the delta
21 between what we moved in Europe and what we would have
22 to move from the States, those will be the resources
23 that we're going to have to invest either in strategic
24 air or strategic sealift to make up the difference.

25 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I believe my time is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 up, Mr. Chairman.

2 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

3 Commissioner Curtis?

4 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: All of the services
5 over the past 10 years have developed significant new
6 capabilities, and all of the services have new
7 capabilities on the horizon. Clearly, the threat in
8 the evolving world situation is one of the factors
9 that influences overseas basing. Would you comment
10 on, in your respective services, the implications of
11 new capabilities, new technologies, on overseas
12 basing, both those that allow redeployment and maybe
13 those that would argue against some of the things that
14 are being proposed?

15 GENERAL WILLIAMS: For the sea services --
16 and I won't speak for the Navy, but we're in this
17 together, the Navy and the Marine Corps -- I think the
18 biggest, most exciting technology on the horizon are
19 those set of technologies that would allow us to sea
20 base. In other words, keep -- be able to receive
21 forces onto a sea base, process them, and then push
22 them forward from a sea base and have them return to
23 the sea base.

24 If you think of our amphibious forces
25 today, we have a very limited sea-basing capability.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 We can sustain forces from the sea for a period of
2 time, but always in the commander's plan we're going
3 to offload the ships and push everything ashore.

4 What we would like to do, and with the
5 help of the Navy, is to reduce the size of that
6 mountain ashore and be able to sustain forces from
7 offshore. To the extent we can do that, we reduce
8 some reliance on overseas bases, we reduce reliance on
9 prepositioned stocks ashore, and those things are all
10 good for the thought that we can have more of our
11 armed forces in the rear.

12 We can't do that yet, and it's going to
13 require substantial investments, new classes of ships.

14 The redesign of much of our materiel, command and
15 control systems, are going to have to be thought
16 through. It's a very complex subject, but both of our
17 services are embarked on it now. And probably the
18 first manifestation that we'll see will be the next
19 class of maritime prepositioned ships, whose design is
20 being argued and tugged about right now. And when
21 that emerges, it will be I think the first solid move
22 toward a sea-based force.

23 ADMIRAL PILLING: I would only add that
24 the Defense Science Board has conducted a study on
25 sea-basing to identify the strategic needs and the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 technological needs to make this happen. And it may
2 be worth your while to take that brief.

3 General Williams and I were on that study,
4 so if you would want at some future hearing to have us
5 actually talk about sea-basing we'd be happy to do
6 that.

7 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you.

8 GENERAL HARMEYER: Sir, I think the most
9 promising technology that I see is the tremendous
10 capability in communications and digital networking of
11 the force. Your force can be connected and in
12 communication en route to a crisis. They can plan en
13 route, rehearse en route, train to do what they need
14 to do when they hit the ground, and be in constant
15 communication in a distributed manner back to their
16 home base, so that they can receive logistics and
17 intelligence and simulation for rehearsal generated
18 right from their home base in CONUS.

19 I think we saw General Franks use a great
20 deal of that capability from his headquarters in Tampa
21 as they fought the wars in Afghanistan and Iraq. Of
22 course, he moved closer to the battlefield when his
23 presence on the battlefield was required, but that
24 shows you the capability of taking off in CONUS and
25 being in continuous communication, constantly updated

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 intelligence-wise, plan and rehearse and hit the
2 ground ready to fight rather than have to spend days
3 and weeks getting yourself organized when you get
4 there. So that's I think the most promising
5 technology that we're working.

6 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thanks.

7 You have given us your opinion on
8 strategic lift, clearly a key element, and sea-basing.

9 And I appreciate that; that's clearly something that
10 we need to look into in more detail. But beyond those
11 two elements of the logistics implications of this,
12 would you comment on what you see in a general way for
13 prepositioning or readiness reserves and the potential
14 for additional investments in those areas? Driven not
15 only by the return to the CONUS of some units but also
16 the shift in emphasis -- for example, the move south
17 and east in Europe, and equivalent moves forward in
18 the Pacific.

19 ADMIRAL PILLING: Although the company
20 that I run has the title "logistics" in its name, the
21 advantage of sea-basing is it combines operations and
22 logistics, and that's the virtue. And until we
23 eliminate this boundary between war fighting and
24 logistics, and view it as a whole entity unto itself,
25 we're going to have problems, and we'll keep going

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 back to this question of: how do we get the tanks
2 there?

3 How do we get -- sea-basing offers an
4 opportunity to have all of that predeployed, and so at
5 that point all you're talking about transporting are
6 the troops, to marry up with their equipment at sea
7 and to operate from the sea base.

8 And I know that the four service chiefs
9 have conducted war games among themselves and with
10 joint chiefs of staff to understand the advantages
11 that offers. And it really looks like it's a very
12 appealing concept, and you -- it does eliminate this
13 distinction between the logisticians and the war
14 fighters.

15 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you.

16 GENERAL WILLIAMS: At the present time,
17 both the Army and the Marine Corps have prepositioned
18 stocks. The Marine Corps' prepositioned equipment is
19 afloat, and we have three squadrons of ships -- one in
20 Diego Garcia, one in Guam, and the third one in the
21 Mediterranean somewhere. And each of them has
22 equipment and sustainment for a brigade, a Marine
23 brigade, which is a fairly robust 12- to 13,000-person
24 outfit.

25 The disadvantage of that prepositioned

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 equipment is it can only be used in a benign
2 environment. We can't -- we have to have somebody
3 allow us to come ashore with it. But it is in
4 excellent shape. It's offloaded every three years and
5 completely rebuilt. We are using it in Iraq. We used
6 it in the last Iraq war. So that's sort of the state
7 of the art of the technology of sea-basing.

8 Our problem is now we can take the
9 equipment ashore, but we can't throughput the troops.

10 The troops have to marry up with the equipment in a
11 benign environment somewhere, and so with sea-basing
12 what we're hoping to do is take the next step where we
13 can deploy the troops to the sea base.

14 GENERAL HARMEYER: The problem I see with
15 land-based prepositioned equipment is: how close to
16 the crisis area is it going to be prepositioned?
17 You're still going to have to have strategic lift in
18 most cases to go from the POMPKA site to the crisis.
19 Now that would be closer most of the time than coming
20 from the CONUS, but you still have to get the
21 strategic lift to the site, get it loaded, and move it
22 to the crisis area.

23 So there are advantages of prepositioned
24 equipment. It certainly lets us put equipment in
25 places where we're going to train often. That cuts

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 down expense, but being close to the crisis area, of
2 course, that's an intelligence process.

3 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Clearly,
4 implementation of the recommendations involve a number
5 of challenges. I'd be very interested in knowing what
6 each of you views as the most significant challenge
7 from your perspective in moving to the new global
8 posture.

9 GENERAL WILLIAMS: Speaking for a service
10 that's in that posture, if we bring troops home we're
11 going to see impact on all of the families, the
12 children, the schools, the infrastructure back here,
13 to support those additional 70,000 families. That's
14 going to mean impact aid to schools. I mean, there's
15 a long -- obviously, a very long laundry list.

16 And there's also -- there's likely to be a
17 problem with -- and I'll let the General address this.

18 The Marine Corps sort of gets away with being a
19 rotational force, because we're the youngest force.
20 At any given minute, two-thirds of the Marine Corps is
21 in their first enlistment. And that's purpose --
22 that's on purpose. We are a very young organization.

23 So I don't -- I think there would be a
24 different set of impacts, is what I'm trying to say,
25 on a force that's older, that chances to have probably

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more family members, aging parents, all of the issues
2 that grow as the professional force grows older.

3 And we haven't seen that in the Marine
4 Corps, because of the fact that we're such a young
5 force. But I think it could be a large issue for the
6 Army.

7 ADMIRAL PILLING: If I can just give a
8 Navy perspective, and this strictly is a Navy
9 perspective. Things like strategic lift and the
10 platforms for sea-basing are Navy bills. So I think
11 this boils down to, if you really want to do what we
12 have in mind, it's going to cost a lot more money for
13 lift and platforms than we presently have in our
14 program.

15 GENERAL HARMEYER: As I have thought about
16 this issue of families, my concern is, you know, we
17 have a superb military at this point. The Army, the
18 soldiers, from day one when they join the Army, are
19 educated on the warrior ethos and the soldiers creed,
20 and they have no problem deploying for the mission,
21 the combat mission. Go to Iraq for a year, morale is
22 high, they're working 24/7, no problem.

23 My concern is when we go to the peacetime
24 situation, and we're going to send an organization to
25 Eastern Europe for a year on a training peacetime

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 deployment for a year without dependents, I do not
2 believe the troops will be exercised 24/7 like they
3 are in a combat zone.

4 How will we control families from flying
5 to Romania to be with their troops on the weekend?
6 And what will the troops do, you know, being lonely
7 away from their family for a year in a peacetime
8 situation? That is a concern I think we really need
9 to work our way through.

10 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you very much.

11 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Commissioner
12 Martin?

13 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Thank you very much,
14 Mr. Chairman. I think we've opened a very interesting
15 line here that I'd like to explore just a little bit
16 farther if I might.

17 General Williams, your comment about the
18 youngest force and the unique demands, challenges, and
19 strengths of that as a member -- long-time member of
20 the oldest force, which is the RC side of things,
21 Reserve and National Guard, now very heavily deployed,
22 deployed, and heavily depended upon.

23 I'm interested in your opinions if you
24 would see all having experience with RC to a certain
25 extent, if you see the other side of that coin being

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 detrimental to the long-term repositioning plan,
2 especially on the rotational basis that General
3 Harmeyer was just talking about.

4 General Williams, your thoughts?

5 GENERAL WILLIAMS: If I understand you
6 correctly, you're talking about the reserve component.

7 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Yes, sir.

8 GENERAL WILLIAMS: My experience in
9 deploying with reserves -- half of my air group in the
10 first Gulf War were reservists called to active duty
11 to deploy for the conflict. The good news is they
12 were superb, young and eager, everybody did what they
13 were supposed to do. The bad news was many of them
14 had never prepared their families for this.

15 They didn't have ID cards. They didn't
16 understand commissary and PX privileges. They didn't
17 understand health care privileges. And so we had a
18 tremendous education problem in sorting through all of
19 the issues associated with that deployment.

20 I think we're better today. We learned a
21 very painful lesson in that deployment, and so when
22 this came around it was better. But we generally --
23 we, the Marine Corps, do not generally rotationally
24 deploy reserve component. They come on active duty
25 for training. Occasionally, a unit will come on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 active duty for an extended period for a humanitarian
2 crisis and that sort of thing.

3 But they are normally not part of our
4 rotational base, and so I think under extraordinary
5 circumstances when they become part of the rotational
6 base, as they are today, there is a set of unique
7 issues associated with the reserve component. And God
8 bless them, they do a great job. But there is always
9 going to be more friction there than there is with the
10 active component who are used to it.

11 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Admiral?

12 ADMIRAL PILLING: The Navy is very much
13 like the Marine Corps. We don't rotationally deploy
14 our reserve component forces. But on the active side,
15 the General talked about peacetime deployment of a
16 year. The Navy and the Marine Corps have been
17 routinely having six-month deployments overseas for
18 about the last 50 years.

19 And we make sure that the young people
20 that come into the force know up front that when
21 they're on sea duty they're going to be gone six
22 months to 12 months in every 30-month period. And we
23 still make our retention and reenlistment goals,
24 because they know and expect that. Now, a year in
25 peacetime to some Far Eastern country, that might be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 tough for a trooper.

2 General Harmeyer, I am particularly
3 interested in your comment on this, on the basis it's
4 been built.

5 GENERAL HARMEYER: Well, you know, that --
6 you know, I think that is the issue. A six-month
7 deployment is half as long as a one-year deployment.
8 One year gets very long when it's in a peacetime
9 situation and you're not working 24/7.

10 Now, you know, we have improved the family
11 support business. I know we had a disaster deploying
12 from Fort Hood, Texas, for Desert Shield. You know,
13 when I told my soldiers and their families that we
14 would probably be gone for a year, you could hear a
15 pin drop in the stadium with 3,000 people sitting
16 there. You know, it was a shock.

17 We've gotten over a lot of that, because
18 family support is worked on day in and day out. The
19 Guard that I'm familiar with had significant problems
20 when they started long-term deployments. When the
21 49th Division went from Texas to Bosnia for a year,
22 they only took several hundred troops, but they had a
23 significant family support structure to create and it
24 cost a lot of money.

25 Now all of that is in place, and I would

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hope that before we start these one-year peacetime
2 training deployments that a lot of the issues will be
3 discussed and talked about and thought through, and we
4 have good, solid plans to take care of our families.

5 I am encouraged by the Chief of Staff of
6 the Army's plan to have folks stabilized in their
7 first five to seven years at a base with rotational
8 deployments for training and for operations. I think
9 that will give families a tremendous advantage that we
10 haven't had in the past.

11 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: I think one of the
12 challenges that we would have is trying to have -- get
13 the best of the best news without having the worst
14 news. The best news is a great plan for forward
15 deployment changing our posture but having no force
16 left to deploy, because the rules, the regulations,
17 the procedures, the protocols, and the support package
18 in terms of families, soldiers, sailors, airmen, and
19 marines, leaves no one left to deploy. So that's one
20 of the things that I think we as a group have to sort
21 out.

22 The training issue, General Harmeyer, that
23 you raised about having use of other facilities in
24 other countries, and the other point that was made
25 about developing relationships with new countries and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 how much you can count on them, over what period of
2 time and during crunch time, how important is it to
3 have live fire, real maneuver ground training from
4 your perspective as an armor commander as we go
5 forward in looking where we're going to put our bases
6 and what we're going to do?

7 GENERAL HARMEYER: Well, I think live
8 training is absolutely essential. We can do a lot of
9 training prior to live training, and, in particular,
10 live fire training that raises the expertise of the
11 force to the point where we don't have to do
12 repetitive live training and live fire training, you
13 know, on a continuous basis.

14 So there is a balance to be created there,
15 and a simulation becomes more realistic, and we can
16 have the joint force participating in simulated
17 training. Then, the need for live fire and live
18 maneuver diminishes somewhat, but it's still -- you
19 have to get out in the mud and the dirt and do it for
20 real, because you just don't get those stresses
21 anywhere in a benign setting in a simulation.

22 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Admiral, let me cast
23 the question to you this way. The value of exercises
24 with partners and using ground forces in theater level
25 or at least area level exercises. Do you see any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 impact on what has been proposed at this point and the
2 value of continuing those exercises? Do we need to do
3 that and build that in?

4 ADMIRAL PILLING: I certainly believe we
5 need to continue those exercises, because you are
6 going to fight like you've trained. So, I mean, I
7 don't think there's any argument about that. The
8 question is: do you need all those forces there all
9 the time, or can they just be rotational forces?

10 There are certain things in the European
11 Theater that you can't do, that you can only do in the
12 United States, such as low levels. I mean, we even
13 have the German Air Force doing low levels in our
14 country, because they can't do it over Germany, and
15 live bombing ranges.

16 So it becomes, instead of a land force
17 issue, it becomes an aviation issue in Europe. And so
18 we have to think through how we're going to do all of
19 that, and those sort of training exercises for our air
20 forces, both Navy and Marine Corps and the Air Force.

21 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: General Williams?

22 GENERAL WILLIAMS: On Okinawa, training,
23 especially live fire training, is a very, very
24 sensitive subject. And over the years, we have
25 watched live fire training on Okinawa erode to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 point that there essentially isn't any live fire
2 training.

3 Fortunately, there are places we can go in
4 Korea, on the mainland Japan, on a small scale in the
5 Philippines, to Australia, to Guam, and Marines
6 routinely deploy from Okinawa to all of those places.

7 In fact, one of the things that we shouldn't forget
8 when we talk about rotational forces is youngsters
9 join -- the Marine Corps at least -- to go exciting
10 places, not necessarily to sit in Fort Polk for five
11 years.

12 So there is some good to be gained here by
13 having Marines go to Uzbekistan, Kazakstan, Romania.
14 I mean, these are exciting things, as long as there
15 are useful things for them to do there.

16 For the Marines, what we struggle is with
17 the worst possible scenario for deploying commanders
18 six months on Okinawa. I mean, he wants to get his
19 youngsters off, get them on a ship, get them to the
20 Philippines, take them somewhere where they can shoot,
21 move, and communicate, especially with the Japanese or
22 Koreans or whoever we might be training with. So it
23 is a very, very big deal in lots of ways.

24 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: I guess my final
25 question is a little bit rhetorical, Mr. Chairman, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that has to do -- if we asked soldiers, sailors,
2 airmen, and marines the question of how would they
3 want to be used, when we get back to our era of the
4 unaccompanied short tour being defined as the 12
5 months in South Vietnam and Cambodia or Korea, would
6 we get a mix of answers? Would there be a consensus
7 among soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines? Given
8 this is what the nation needs, how do you think you
9 want to be used? Or would we come to some
10 fractionalization there?

11 I just don't have a clear sense of that,
12 and I guess are we left -- I guess my question is:
13 are we left, in a sense, having to tell them, as we
14 always have, what we need and how we need them to
15 support that mission?

16 Admiral, that's kind of a 500-pound
17 question, but I wonder what your thoughts are.

18 ADMIRAL PILLING: Well, my experience with
19 young sailors in the Navy is they look forward to
20 rotational forward deployments, because, just as
21 General Williams said, they can be fun. You get port
22 visits. If this is peacetime, you get port visits,
23 you see a different part of the world, and these make
24 great stories for the year that you -- when you come
25 back after you've been forward deployed for six

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 months.

2 I think if you ask the typical sailor,
3 they would relish the opportunity to deploy. Now, I
4 can't speak for the land forces, so that's strictly a
5 Navy answer.

6 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: General Williams?

7 GENERAL WILLIAMS: Typically, the highest
8 reenlistment rates in Marine units are deployed units,
9 which I think answers the question of how the
10 youngsters feel about it. The two important things
11 are, first of all, that you need to deal honestly, so
12 that the expectation that a young man or woman has --
13 is what happens to them. I mean, this is what we're
14 going to do, this is why we're going to do it, this is
15 why it's important to your country.

16 And if we're honest and up front, I think
17 that they are very, very accepting, and, in fact,
18 eager to deploy. And so I think you will get a
19 consensus that, yes, as long as we're going to do
20 something useful, we want to do it.

21 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: General Harmeyer,
22 with the force mix that the Army faces constantly and
23 regularly now asking -- reaching into the Reserve and
24 the National Guard, what -- is your answer a little
25 bit different for the land base?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 GENERAL HARMEYER: Not really. I agree
2 with General Williams; our highest enlistment rates
3 are in the combat units that are deployed. Now, not
4 necessarily in the combat service support units, but I
5 have also experienced, you know, the National Guard
6 troops coming back. You know, the news media says,
7 well, they're all going to get out of the force. Not
8 so. Not so.

9 I was with the TAG (The Adjutant General)
10 of Kentucky a couple of weeks ago, and they've got the
11 highest enlistment and reenlistment in the State of
12 Kentucky they have ever had. And they've had guys
13 deployed all over the world for the last couple of
14 years like everybody has.

15 So the troops are more well informed, they
16 understand the needs of the nation, they are
17 absolutely dedicated to accomplishing the mission with
18 their buddies, and I don't think you'll have an
19 argument from the troops about deploying, as long as
20 they know about it and they've planned on it, and they
21 -- they see what they're doing is productive and
22 necessary for the country.

23 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Thank you.

24 Mr. Chairman, that's all I have.

25 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Gentlemen, if you would not mind, we'd
2 like to take another five-minute round with each
3 Commissioner and ask questions. We're way ahead of
4 time in regard -- I think due to the brevity of
5 opening statements and some other issues. So what I'd
6 like to do, again, is start out with the questioning.

7 I think everyone understands the
8 importance of Ramstein, and I think the troops have
9 been deployed out of Germany under both Operation
10 Iraqi Freedom and Enduring Freedom. So my question
11 would be: has the Cold War infrastructure served us
12 poorly?

13 ADMIRAL PILLING: That is really a 500-
14 pound question. We won, so it did serve us well while
15 we had a Cold War. The issue for us now is we're not
16 in that environment anymore, and so your Commission is
17 challenged with, how do you restructure that makes
18 sense.

19 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I guess my
20 question is in regard to OIF and OEF, did the Cold War
21 infrastructure serve us well or not? I mean, the fact
22 of where we had folks based.

23 ADMIRAL PILLING: I think that's a land
24 forces question, and I'll just let it pass.

25 GENERAL HARMEYER: Well, sir, I think we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 did very well. We deployed forces through Ramstein.
2 You know, Ramstein is a huge base. It's well located
3 next to the Landstuhl Hospital. We've been able to
4 save many troops' lives and limbs by being able to get
5 them to that major hospital relatively quickly from
6 the theaters that we've been fighting in --
7 Afghanistan and Iraq.

8 You know, Aviano Air Base, near the 173rd
9 Airborne, functioned to get them deployed into Mosul
10 very rapidly. And we moved a heavy task force by C-17
11 into Mosul shortly after the airborne guys went in and
12 secured the area -- secured the air strip. So I --
13 you know, those major facilities that we're still
14 operating out of have served us well, and I think will
15 serve us well into the future.

16 You know, deploying into Bosnia, I was
17 heavily involved in that. And, you know, equipments
18 flew from the United States into Ramstein, were taken
19 off the C-5s and the C-17s, put onto C-130s and flown
20 into Bosnia without skipping a beat, into the smaller
21 airfields. So they are fairly well positioned for
22 what we're doing today.

23 Now, establishing a base closer to
24 Afghanistan has been extremely critical. Uzbekistan
25 has been very critical to that piece.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: It has been said
2 that to achieve any savings out of the transformation
3 that some soldiers would have to be released, that the
4 size of the force would have to be reduced, rather
5 than just repositioning forces to the United States.
6 Do you have a feel for what is required for the size
7 of the force that -- will transformation result in a
8 reduction of military forces, or is it just strictly
9 repositioning?

10 GENERAL WILLIAMS: I'll take a shot at
11 that. I think the -- you know, the original goal of
12 transformation was to turn the Armed Forces into a
13 capabilities-based force rather than a threat-based
14 force. And to the extent that you can achieve
15 capabilities with technology, you might be able to
16 reduce force structure. And so there were -- and it
17 is reasonable to assume that in some cases you can
18 actually do that.

19 With 63 percent of the DoD budget spent on
20 manpower, it's going to be pretty difficult to save
21 money unless you do reduce people. And there are some
22 promising technologies that may allow us to do that,
23 but I don't think we went into transformation
24 necessarily to save money.

25 And it certainly isn't clear that bringing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 troops home rather than leaving them overseas, with
2 the attendant infrastructure issues that we'll have
3 back here in the States and the expectations of the
4 families that housing and schools and those kinds of
5 things will be made available, is going to result in
6 any savings of money. Certainly, I wouldn't -- I
7 would be very uncomfortable making a projection like
8 that.

9 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Any other
10 comments?

11 GENERAL HARMEYER: Well, certainly, as far
12 as the Army goes, there is tremendous debate right now
13 what the size of the force should be. With our
14 significant use of the reserve components -- National
15 Guard and Reserves -- and all of the commitments that
16 the Army is involved in at this point in time, I
17 believe temporarily we've added some 40,000 troops to
18 the end strength of the active force.

19 And that is necessary as we do the
20 reorganization into these units of action from the old
21 brigade and division structure, so I don't think we
22 can answer that question in the near term. I believe
23 it's going to take several years to determine what the
24 size of the force needs to be to have the effective
25 fighting force that the nation requires.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Effectiveness is what we have to have in a
2 military sense, not necessarily efficiency. There
3 must be some redundancy, because you never know -- you
4 know, the enemy always has a vote. You never know
5 what's going to happen. And if you do not have
6 redundancy, and you have single points of failure,
7 failure is not an option.

8 So I think it's going to take a couple
9 more years, several years, to sort out what the real
10 size of the force has to be, because this global war
11 on terrorism is going to continue for several more
12 years.

13 Now, as we work on transformation in the
14 future combat systems that the military are focusing
15 on, technology may, in fact, produce something that
16 will allow us to reduce the size of organizations and
17 still be as combat effective. There are some really
18 superb technologies being worked on, but, again, they
19 are several years over the horizon yet. So that
20 question is going to take a while to answer, sir.

21 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

22 Commissioner Taylor?

23 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: General Williams, I
24 was struck by your comments about capability-based
25 force versus threat-based force. And I know that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 "T word" is not in vogue at the moment. But I would
2 assume that as we position our forces, reposition them
3 around the world, that that's not going to be a short-
4 term thing. It'll be -- it'll last a while.

5 That there's some considerations about the
6 threat, so I'd be interested in your comments, and any
7 of the panel's comments about where these capabilities
8 should be positioned and why. Have we got what we
9 hear now, what we've read in the paper, and what we
10 know about the plan -- are we positioning them in the
11 right place for the next 20 years?

12 GENERAL WILLIAMS: This is a question I
13 find it difficult to answer, because I haven't seen
14 anything that speaks to repositioning of Marine forces
15 in the Pacific. And I think if you ask -- if you were
16 to ask the Regional Combat Commander in the Pacific or
17 the Commander, U.S. Forces in Korea, he would say that
18 Okinawa is a pretty good place, because it's close to
19 a lot of places that there's a reasonable chance of
20 forces being used.

21 So strictly from the parochial point of
22 view of a Marine looking at the Pacific Theater, I
23 think we're in pretty good shape where we are. And
24 it's pretty -- it would be pretty difficult to guess a
25 better place to put people that would give us a better

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 standing than we have currently.

2 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I know you've looked
3 at the world in a broader view, though. Any comments
4 about the remainder of the potential places where our
5 forces could be used?

6 GENERAL WILLIAMS: Well, I know that the
7 Combatant Commander in Europe, of course, is focused
8 on Eastern Europe, on the emerging nations in Eastern
9 Europe. Clearly, the last several years tell us that
10 the nations of Northern Africa and through the areas
11 of the Islamic nations of the world are where the
12 unrest is.

13 And so, consequently, moving people into
14 Eastern Europe seems like a reasonable -- a reasonable
15 counter to that. I suspect in the long run that we
16 would like to have some way to put at least rotational
17 forces in some of the friendly nations of Africa. The
18 Marine Corps routinely goes to Kenya for training.
19 Whether or not that might lead someday to a more
20 robust presence down there I don't know enough about
21 to answer. But I suspect that's another area where
22 we're looking to get a little closer.

23 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Comments from
24 others?

25 ADMIRAL PILLING: As you know, the Navy is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not going to do very much change in its forward
2 deployed structure, though I think they're talking
3 about putting a carrier in Hawaii, and that's about
4 the biggest move the Navy will make. So I think this
5 is really a question on land forces, and I'd defer to
6 my --

7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: But, sir, I'd be
8 interested in your comments about any of the forces.

9 ADMIRAL PILLING: We do have some legacies
10 from the Cold War that I think have to be included in
11 the calculations. And by that I mean the CFE limits,
12 the conventional forces in Europe limits, on equipment
13 in Eastern Europe is still there. And we're going to
14 have to figure out if you're going to station U.S.
15 forces in some of the Eastern Europe countries, how we
16 work around those limits that are already imposed,
17 because it was imposed 10 years ago.

18 That may be we'll end up being mal-
19 deployed because we have those limits, and I just
20 don't know whether you're going to address CFE in your
21 review.

22 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: General Harmeyer?

23 GENERAL HARMEYER: Sir, I really do not
24 know what General LaPorte's plans are for Korea. I
25 understand the U.S. forces are being repositioned, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some forces are going to be moved out of Korea. But I
2 do not know enough about that area to give an
3 intelligent comment.

4 I think in the European Theater moving
5 into the southeastern portion of Eastern Europe
6 certainly goes to what General Williams just said,
7 getting closer to the areas of unrest in the world. I
8 would assume that strategic lift from in and out of
9 those areas to move our forces to critical positions
10 will be there before we make a commitment to position
11 forces in those countries.

12 And as far as, you know, the Stryker
13 brigade, they can move relatively long distances
14 rapidly self-deployed. You know, they did that from
15 Kuwait all the way to Mosul in a very short period of
16 time and fought on their way up there and were in
17 combat immediately upon arrival.

18 So that's a capability that is new, and a
19 lot of folks still don't understand what they can do.

20 But I think they're doing quite well.

21 So I think repositioning the forces from
22 Central Europe into Eastern Europe, Southeastern
23 Europe, is a good thing.

24 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Commissioner
25 Curtis?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Following on
2 Commissioner Taylor's comment, the global posture
3 brings a military focus to some areas where we've had
4 very limited involvement in the past. Africa is one,
5 Central Asia is another.

6 From the top level, I'd be interested in
7 your views, the pros and the cons, the challenges of
8 our increased military involvement in these non-
9 traditional areas for us.

10 GENERAL WILLIAMS: Well, there is just a
11 long host of problems associated with starting
12 military-to-military contacts in places where we've
13 had very limited access. There are always going to be
14 political ramifications, because many governments
15 don't have the civil rights or human rights records
16 that we would want them to have.

17 The argument is: should we hold those
18 governments at arms-length, or does our involvement
19 there actually lead to a better human rights posture
20 in that government? That's a political argument, but
21 it ends up in the Combatant Commander's lap often.

22 Infrastructure, of course, the interaction
23 of the youngsters with the local population in areas
24 where you have -- where the AIDS pandemic is rampant.

25 I mean, there are just -- you can almost make a list

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 country by country of all of the challenges. But it's
2 fair to say that -- I think that having interaction
3 between the peoples of the world and the youngsters
4 who constitute our armed forces generally reflects
5 well on the United States.

6 And in areas where I've seen that happen,
7 the net result is a good result. And so whenever we
8 weigh all of those factors, I think where the United
9 States can influence, where we can send our young men
10 and women, and help countries either to build
11 democratic institutions, to have more professional
12 armed forces, NCO corps, understand how to build a
13 professional military, I think there are very, very
14 positive things that can come from that.

15 ADMIRAL PILLING: I would only echo what
16 General Williams says on the maritime side. Being
17 able to operate with the Navy's and the Coast Guard
18 organizations of these new countries to us is very,
19 very worthwhile, if we have to go and project power,
20 because you'll have the relationships and the
21 understanding of each other's capabilities. So I
22 think it's very, very meaningful that we do things
23 like that.

24 GENERAL HARMEYER: I would have to agree.
25 As we look at the successes of the Partnership for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Peace exercises that were started shortly after the
2 wall came down, you know, the impact that has had on
3 peoples of Eastern Europe and their militaries has
4 been significant. And I think stationing our troops,
5 as good as they are, in problem areas and put pressure
6 on these folks that would be terrorists is a good
7 thing. Initially, it may cause some security
8 difficulties, but eventually they will stabilize the
9 area.

10 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Commissioner
12 Martin?

13 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Mr. Chairman, just
14 one area that I think that I want to pin down a little
15 more specifically in the expert opinions of our panel
16 today. If we follow through on the global
17 repositioning of forces, does our existing log base --
18 you referred to Ramstein, Landstuhl, the K Town
19 complex, and some of the others around the world.

20 Are they able to support what you know of
21 global repositioning, or do we need to reposition and
22 rebuild the log base as well? And this is a hugely
23 financially significant question when you talk about.

24 Or are the facilities that you are aware of, given
25 what you know of the repositioning, adequate to the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 task, able to support our soldiers, sailors, airmen,
2 and marines in future conflict?

3 GENERAL WILLIAMS: Starting in the
4 Pacific, the network of bases starting in Hawaii and
5 reaching out to Anderson Air Force Base in Guam,
6 Kadena in Okinawa, Yokota in Japan, is a pretty robust
7 string of pearls there across the Pacific.

8 And if we make the assumption that
9 although we might rotate some forces, we wouldn't
10 close or lose access to those bases, and we'd be able
11 to keep that infrastructure warm. Then, I think we
12 could be reasonably comfortable that we have what we
13 need in that part of the world.

14 ADMIRAL PILLING: From a maritime
15 perspective, the infrastructure that we have in Europe
16 and in the Middle East I think is adequate for
17 maritime forces in the future. The land forces issue
18 is -- I'll defer to my --

19 GENERAL HARMEYER: Gee, thanks.

20 ADMIRAL PILLING: -- to General Harmeyer.

21 GENERAL HARMEYER: I'm starting to become
22 a little bit familiar with the current BRAC process.
23 And there is tremendous emphasis on analyzing the
24 entire logistics infrastructure within the CONUS to
25 determine the capabilities that exist at each

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 installation in the logistics arena, and to determine
2 what functions can be realigned to make the logistics
3 system more effective to support not only the United
4 States Army but, as you well know, the Army is
5 responsible for an awful lot of joint logistics.

6 So I know the BRAC process is focusing on
7 that issue, and I believe the answers that come out of
8 BRAC this time will make the logistics system much
9 more effective. As far as logistics, things in
10 Europe, as our units depart there, I'm sure the
11 realignment and movement of logistics facilities is
12 going to have to take place.

13 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Let me just try to
14 bring this to a joint level here, and you have all
15 served in various joint capacities or are familiar
16 with all aspects of the joint arena today. What about
17 when we get into the joint service operations?

18 CINCs in my era, now Combatant Commanders,
19 what is the impact at that level of thinking beyond
20 the individual service component?

21 General Harmeyer, if you would care to
22 start with that one. I'm a good guy. I really am,
23 General.

24 GENERAL HARMEYER: Well, being a tanker,
25 you know, the logisticians have always been in my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 gunsight, so I -- no, the responsibilities of joint
2 logistics weigh heavily on the Army. There is a
3 tremendous effort to improve the joint logistics
4 system, and I think you'll see, as we analyze what is
5 going on in Iraq and Afghanistan logistics-wise, we've
6 made tremendous strides in joint logistics vice 10
7 years ago when we did this in Southwest Asia before.

8 So I'm not a logistics expert, and
9 basically I -- that's about as far as I can go with
10 anything worthwhile.

11 Thank you, sir.

12 ADMIRAL PILLING: I agree with the General
13 that we are getting better at joint logistics, and it
14 is mostly an Army function. But I think we don't want
15 to lose sight of in the Pentagon it's a Title X
16 responsibility for the service chiefs to equip his
17 forces. So you do have -- we were talking about Cold
18 War legacies.

19 We have these problems that from 1947 on
20 -- that's a service prerogative, and so there are some
21 natural rivalries that just have to be overcome.

22 GENERAL WILLIAMS: The Regional Combatant
23 Commander in every case has component commanders from
24 each service who are responsible to provide organized
25 training and equip forces to him to meet any of his

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 contingency responsibilities.

2 If I were a Regional Combatant Commander,
3 my biggest concern would be if -- the longer it takes
4 me to reach out and touch those forces committed to me
5 for a particular contingency, the more friction in the
6 system to get them to where I need them to be. And
7 the longer the logistic pipeline, the more I'll worry.

8 I think that's a fact of life. And if we
9 withdraw forces that the Regional Combatant Commander
10 thinks he might need forward, it's going to bother
11 him. And, yes, we are getting better at logistics,
12 and we're getting better operationally at working with
13 one another, too. And both of those things are good,
14 but they're not going to overcome the fact that if
15 you're not there you're not there.

16 And when the Regional Combatant Commander
17 wants something quickly, having a forward deploy is a
18 certain comfort from his point of view. And so not
19 having it there, you're forcing him to accept a little
20 more risk than he probably would like.

21 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: So longer supply
22 lines with more nodes for interdiction become an issue
23 for all services, then, in the joint environment.

24 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I believe we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one final question from Commissioner Taylor.

2 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Our Commission is
3 certainly not charged to look at BRAC, and, in fact,
4 we are expressly prohibited from getting involved in
5 that. But one of the things we do have to be
6 concerned about, as if we bring back 70,000 military
7 and the accompanying dependents and family members
8 from overseas, do we have adequate places to bed them
9 down here in the CONUS, without an inordinate expense,
10 additional expense? Would anyone like to make a
11 comment about that? Just in the generic sense, not
12 necessarily specifics.

13 GENERAL HARMEYER: Well, sir, as you well
14 know, you know, the force is a heck of a lot smaller
15 than it was 10, 12 years ago, and we had lots of place
16 for them there. I'm sure the folks at Fort Hood would
17 absorb a few more troops. I think Fort Riley, Fort
18 Carson, are basically underutilized. Fort Lewis could
19 handle some more troops.

20 So I think the facilities that we have in
21 existence, they may need some modernization and some
22 facilities for the -- to take care of the troops a
23 little bit better, new construction. But I think the
24 bases that we have currently are going to be adequate.

25 GENERAL WILLIAMS: At this point at least,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 based on what I know, this is not a Marine issue. But
2 if it were, military construction would be needed, and
3 as well we would have to offset the fact that the
4 Japanese government pays a fairly substantial part of
5 the costs of maintaining Marine forces in Japan, as
6 I'm sure host governments do all over the world.

7 And those offsets are going to have to be
8 replaced, because the -- you know, the cost of
9 buildings and grounds maintenance, just the cost of
10 keeping people on a base, is extremely expensive. If
11 you add 15- or 20,000 people to a base, there is some
12 expectation that family housing will grow
13 commensurately, that schools will open commensurately,
14 impact aid will go up. Just the general costs of
15 doing business if any city were to grow by 20,000,
16 you'd have the same kind of an impact here, with the
17 additional fact that you wouldn't have a partner
18 helping to offset those costs, which we certainly do
19 now.

20 ADMIRAL PILLING: From a maritime
21 perspective, again, there are not many big moves
22 envisioned for the Navy. If the Navy were to bring
23 back all of its permanently deployed forward forces,
24 probably the biggest impact would be the carrier in
25 Japan, because that introduces a population of about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 5,000 people into some area of the United States.

2 And, again, like General Williams says,
3 we'd have to do some pier construction and some other
4 things. But if you leave them in Japan, I don't see
5 much of a maritime impact, just restructuring.

6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: What I think I'm
7 hearing from all of you, that you do want us to
8 understand there will be a substantial cost to this.
9 Okay.

10 GENERAL WILLIAMS: Yes, sir.

11 GENERAL HARMEYER: But I think that cost,
12 like the Admiral just said, if we -- or General
13 Williams said, if we close facilities overseas and
14 turn back facilities to the host nations, there should
15 be an offset there to help new construction or
16 refurbishment construction here in the United States.

17 We do own some property and own buildings and things
18 that --

19 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Has that been the
20 experience we've had, though, in getting an offset
21 from them when we turn the property back to them?

22 GENERAL HARMEYER: Yes, sir. As I closed
23 Erlangen and Nuremberg and Amburg, we had significant
24 monies back from the host nation to refurbish troop
25 billets and build family housing and do all kinds of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things in Europe.

2 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. Thank you.

3 That's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

4 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Gentlemen, I'd ask
5 each of you if you have any final thoughts you'd like
6 to share with the Commission.

7 ADMIRAL PILLING: Nothing from me, sir.
8 Thank you.

9 GENERAL WILLIAMS: No, sir.

10 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Well, I'd like to
11 thank you for taking time away from your busy
12 schedules to join us. Your insight will be invaluable
13 to this Commission as we move forward, and my fellow
14 Commissioners and I thank you for your military
15 service and the sacrifices you and your families have
16 made to this nation, as well as you continue to make.

17 Thank you very much.

18 We're going to take a short break and --
19 well, maybe a little more than a short break. I think
20 our next panel is scheduled for 11:30, or are we going
21 to -- okay. Well, we'll take at least a 15-minute
22 break.

23 Thank you.

24 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the
25 foregoing matter went off the record at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 10:58 a.m. and went back on the record at
2 11:37 a.m.)

3 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Well, we'd like to
4 continue. We're waiting on one panelist, and when he
5 comes in we'll introduce him.

6 I'd like to describe the procedure for
7 today's hearing. Each panelist will receive up to 10
8 minutes for an opening statement. At the conclusion
9 of all opening statements, each Commissioner will have
10 up to 10 minutes to ask a question. If we have a lot
11 of extra time, we may go an additional five minutes.

12 But we will use lights only as a courtesy
13 reminder. When the yellow light appears, you have two
14 minutes remaining. When the red light appears, time
15 has expired. I'd ask all panelists to please take the
16 time necessary to complete your responses.

17 On our second panel we will hear from
18 members of three leading authors of some of
19 Washington's most respected think-tanks. From the
20 Center for American Progress, The Honorable Lawrence
21 Korb, Senior Fellow and Senior Advisor to the Center
22 for Defense Information, as well as the former
23 Assistant Secretary of Defense for Manpower Reserve
24 Affairs, Installations, and Logistics. And from the
25 Heritage Foundation, Jack Spencer, who is a Senior

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Policy Analyst for Defense and National Security.

2 Mr. Korb, would you like to proceed with
3 an opening statement?

4 DR. KORB: Thank you very much. I
5 appreciate the opportunity to be here. Let me -- as I
6 pointed out in my statement, I'm coming at this from
7 two perspectives. One is having had to deal with a
8 lot of the issues that you're coping with when I was
9 privileged to work for President Reagan, and the other
10 is that I got involved quite a bit in the whole base
11 closure process.

12 I don't know if many of you know how that
13 came to be, but in the late '70s Congress had passed a
14 law that said you couldn't close any base in the
15 United States unless you gave Congress a year's notice
16 and you did all of these impact statements, which
17 basically meant we couldn't close any bases.

18 And when the late Senator Goldwater took
19 over Chairman of Armed Services Committee, he came to
20 me and said, "Why aren't you closing any bases?" I
21 said, "Well, we can't." So we sent up a list of bases
22 we would close if we could close, and I've got to tell
23 you that was one of the most interesting hearings I
24 was ever at.

25 And then, as a result of that -- and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 people like Dick Armev picked it up -- we do have this
2 process, and I think that that's terrific. And the
3 other is that when -- my last year on active duty with
4 the Navy, I was home ported in Okinawa, so I saw what
5 it was like to be stationed abroad permanently.

6 As I pointed out in my statement, as you
7 make your decisions, I'd just ask you to consider a
8 few things. First of all, whatever you recommend, it
9 should be part of an overall security strategy and
10 force structure review. It should not be taken apart
11 from it. You know the next Quadrennial Defense Review
12 comes in September -- in 2005, and, of course, I would
13 also urge you, as I pointed out, that we need a new
14 national security strategy, or at least the President
15 to say if the same one exists.

16 Interestingly enough, under the Goldwater-
17 Nichols Act, we're supposed to get one every year and
18 we haven't. And I think that that makes it difficult
19 to make both the resource and base closure decisions.

20 Secondly, obviously, to the extent that we
21 can, we ought to keep it out of politics. Politics
22 come and go. Officials come and go. But, you know,
23 our national security interest should remain constant.

24 Third, I know a lot of people think, well,
25 if you people do your job, we won't have to close any

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bases at home. I don't think that's true. Even if
2 you get rid of them all overseas, we're still going to
3 have to confront that. And I think it is unfortunate
4 that we did not have any rounds almost for a decade.
5 The last one was in '95.

6 Fourth -- and I used to confront this
7 during the Cold War -- our troops around the globe are
8 not there as a favor to these host countries. They're
9 there to protect our national interest. And they're
10 not there to prop up their -- the economies of these
11 countries, though it does have an economic effect, nor
12 to have them to spend less on defense.

13 And, in fact, as you know -- as you
14 already know, and I'm sure you'll find out, a lot of
15 our forces are in countries where the populous are not
16 very happy about it.

17 Fifth, when you take a look at cost,
18 remember that if the host nation building the
19 facilities, offsetting the cost, it may cost more
20 money to actually have the troops in the United
21 States.

22 And the only way that you can ever
23 specifically save money is you could bring the troops
24 home and demobilize them. And, obviously, that's not
25 going to occur, given how busy men and women in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 armed forces are today.

2 Seventh, the idea that somehow being
3 stationed abroad is a hardship -- you know, as I point
4 out, you know, men and women like myself, we did join
5 the Navy to see the world. And so this is not
6 something that is a hardship, particularly if you can
7 bring your family with you, as they do in Europe and
8 in Japan, and we have proposals -- and I know we
9 worked on them when I was in government, and I'm sure
10 they're even better now -- to help the spouses find
11 employment. And you've got a terrific school system
12 around the world. I was also privileged to have the
13 DoDDS (Department of Defense Dependents Schools)
14 system report to me.

15 Eighth, remember that these men and women
16 stationed around the world are one of our best
17 ambassadors for the values we're trying to promote.
18 And, obviously, in this war as people define it, the
19 global war against terrorism, it is, among many
20 things, a war of ideas.

21 And, finally, whatever you do, or whatever
22 you recommend, or whatever the government does, it
23 needs to be done in concert with our allies and host
24 nations. The worst thing we can do is send the wrong
25 signal to our friends and foes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 Thank you very much for having me. I
2 appreciate it, and I look forward to your questions.

3 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

4 Mr. Spencer?

5 MR. SPENCER: Thank you very much for
6 having me today. I really appreciate the opportunity
7 to speak with you all.

8 Let me first apologize for my voice. I
9 lost my voice yesterday. It's coming back a little
10 bit, so I might get a little raspy here as we move
11 forward.

12 Let me say, first, that I agree with most
13 of what Dr. Korb just said. I thought he made some
14 great points, and they're all very important. To me
15 there are a few issues facing the long-term health of
16 America's national security apparatus that are of
17 greater import than our international basing
18 infrastructure.

19 The fact is that the world is changing,
20 technology is changing, our national security
21 interests are changing, and our base infrastructure
22 needs to change to reflect that.

23 A few points that I'd like to point out,
24 and these are all in my statement that I handed in to
25 you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The current base structure was developed
2 to defend against a largely static and predictable
3 enemy -- the Soviet Union, which no longer exists.
4 It's true that we have these bases in Germany that are
5 great for families, that are high tech, are very
6 conducive to the military, but the fact is it still is
7 a reflection of the Cold War.

8 It still very much is indicative of an
9 adversary that we need to fight in Europe, and that
10 adversary just isn't there anymore. So I think that
11 changing your base infrastructure is part of that
12 overall transformation that we're undergoing right
13 now.

14 Secondly, today's threats, in stark
15 contrast to those during the Cold War, are dynamic and
16 unpredictable and demand flexibility that is currently
17 lacking. It's true that we can respond and react to
18 whatever we need. We've shown that with Afghanistan
19 where, after September 11th, we fought in a country
20 that was landlocked, that was surrounded by countries
21 that were former adversaries or current adversaries,
22 and we made that work.

23 And maybe we were lucky that time. Maybe
24 we were prepared. I don't know. But the fact is I
25 think that one thing is true historically. It's very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 difficult to predict where future threats are going to
2 emerge, and recognizing that, having a basing -- a
3 global basing infrastructure that is flexible, that we
4 don't need to worry about whether or not we'd be able
5 to respond, I think is very important.

6 A flexible basing structure will promote
7 adaptability in a world of diverse political,
8 strategic, and diplomatic interests. Again, this is
9 the same sort of theme -- that the world is changing
10 quickly. We didn't think a few years ago, even though
11 there were people who were warning about it, that this
12 emergence of Islamic fundamentalism was going to
13 provide the sort of comprehensive threat that is --
14 that it is right now.

15 The same thing with things like weapons of
16 mass destruction, ballistic missile proliferation, all
17 these sorts of things. Sure, there were warnings
18 about it. There were warnings about mass terrorism,
19 but no one really heeded them until September 11th.

20 This is all a function of the diversity
21 that's in the world today. You don't have two blocs
22 anymore. And a basing infrastructure that allows us
23 to respond and react to crises as they emerge is
24 incredibly important. And you add on to that the many
25 things that our military is asked to do every day,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 which I personally don't necessarily agree with, but
2 they are still a fact of life -- the peacekeeping, the
3 contraband interdiction, the anti-drug stuff, the drug
4 war stuff.

5 You know, there is any number of
6 operations other than warfare that our military is
7 asked to do. And if they're going to do it, we should
8 have a military that can do it efficiently, that can
9 do it the right way. Not that we can't do it now, but
10 it's all about efficiency and doing it in the best way
11 possible.

12 America's commitment to regional stability
13 can no longer be measured by manpower alone. This is
14 one of the things that as this debate has emerged over
15 the past few months that I think has been overlooked
16 politically, certainly internationally.

17 Just because the United States might be
18 changing around its -- where it puts troops in the
19 Pacific, for example, does not mean the United States
20 is no longer committed to the security of that country
21 or of a specific country or a specific region. The
22 same is true in Western Europe.

23 I would suggest that it is every bit as
24 important to the United States, every bit as vital to
25 the United States, that a dominant power not emerge in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Europe as it was 25 or 20 years ago. It just so
2 happens that the security environment right now
3 dictates that that's not a high priority or a high
4 risk. Therefore, we don't need to have troops and
5 infrastructure focused in on that potentiality.

6 A more efficient global basing
7 infrastructure will free manpower resources and help
8 alleviate personnel strains. Again, I think this is
9 one of the most important aspects, both of domestic
10 BRAC and global BRAC. If we create a defense -- a
11 basing infrastructure that promotes the adaptability,
12 the maneuverability, the flexibility of a lighter,
13 more lethal force, then what that creates is the
14 ability to put your resources, so they can respond to
15 crises as they emerge, rather than building an
16 infrastructure that's geared towards a specific
17 threat.

18 Korea in the Pacific is a good example.
19 Right now the idea is that we were preparing to
20 dissuade and deter aggression on the Korean Peninsula.

21 And, of course, we've been successful in doing that.

22 But technology will allow the United States and its
23 friends and allies to continue to deter and dissuade
24 on the Korean Peninsula without necessarily having the
25 same amount of manpower stationed there over the long

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 term.

2 The reason for -- and by pulling back a
3 little bit you can -- by pulling back and maintaining
4 a more Spartan sort of basing infrastructure, what we
5 can then do is if a crisis were to emerge here you can
6 surge resources to that area. By the same token, you
7 can surge resources to another area in the Pacific,
8 which I think underscores and promotes stability there
9 and increases our commitment to the overall stability
10 of that region, rather than focusing our scarce
11 resources on one specific place.

12 Evolving military technology allows the
13 United States to apply greater amounts of military
14 force over greater distances in shorter periods of
15 time. Now this is becoming more and more true every
16 day. I don't think that it's as true today as what
17 some would have us believe, because if you look at
18 where our investments continue to go it's still
19 largely -- our investments are still largely a
20 function of a Cold War military.

21 We still are investing billions of dollars
22 on tactical aircraft, platforms that are still heavy.

23 We talk transformation, but we're not really acting
24 transformation. But that's not to say that we're not
25 evolving towards that transformational force over

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 time.

2 And as we do that, we're going to be able
3 to not just out of -- not just will we be able to
4 project that force over greater distances, it will
5 become imperative that we're able to, especially
6 whenever you look at places like the Pacific where you
7 have these huge sloughs of water, you have potential
8 adversaries that are technologically just a step
9 behind us, you have potential adversaries who have had
10 all the time in the world to focus their resources on
11 those capabilities that are directed specifically at
12 the United States. So if we can -- we will have to be
13 able to reach from far way.

14 And then, finally, diversifying basing
15 infrastructure throughout vital regions will allow the
16 United States surge capability to crisis areas. And
17 this is -- I guess I had gone over that quickly
18 before.

19 I'd like to just follow up with a few
20 principles that I think are important as we move
21 forward with this important global base realignment
22 and closure process. And I think, as Dr. Korb pointed
23 out, this cannot be looked at in a vacuum. This has
24 to be looked at comprehensively.

25 Domestic BRAC and global BRAC are one in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the same process. I understand that's not the focus
2 of your Commission necessarily, but as we move forward
3 that has to be taken into consideration. You can't
4 just take away a base abroad and put one at home or
5 vice versa. It has to be part of the same overall --
6 the same overall process.

7 Strategically, a base must advance
8 America's overall objectives. Obviously, that would
9 seem to be the case, but there are a lot of political
10 considerations and other considerations that come into
11 the process. Operationally, a base must improve
12 America's ability to respond to current threats as
13 well as facilitate and enhance America's ongoing
14 military operation.

15 I went into some detail about that
16 earlier, but I think that's important to take into
17 account when you're talking about having to go over
18 long distances. We can't become too dependent, I
19 don't think, on bases that are geographically -- in
20 close geographic proximity.

21 Politically, the decision to maintain an
22 existing base or open a new one must not be driven by
23 political differences, yet it must take into
24 consideration evolving political realities for the
25 21st century. We know all the stories about Turkey

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 not letting us use their country as a basing point
2 during the Iraq War.

3 We all know about the problems with
4 Germany that we had. There was -- everything worked
5 out with Germany, thankfully, but there was a movement
6 within the German government to not allow the United
7 States and the Coalition to have flyover rights.

8 So that's not to say that we should punish
9 any country, but we need to take into consideration
10 their realities.

11 And finally, economically, base structure
12 decisions must not be driven by cost concerns but
13 should embrace economic prudence. The driving overall
14 concern has to be military value. We should not do
15 this -- not do this because of economic reasons.

16 Thank you very much. I look forward to
17 your questions.

18 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: I'd like to
19 welcome and introduce our third panelist -- from the
20 Brookings Institute, Michael O'Hanlon, Senior Fellow,
21 Foreign Policy Studies. Welcome.

22 MR. O'HANLON: Thank you, sir, and I'm
23 sorry I couldn't be here earlier. It's an honor to
24 appear today and be on this distinguished panel. I
25 very much admire the testimonies that were just given.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I may have a little more voice than Jack, because I
2 probably spent less time whooping and hollering during
3 the Senator Miller and Vice President Cheney speeches
4 last night --

5 (Laughter.)

6 -- than he may have --

7 MR. SPENCER: He's right. That's what
8 it's all about.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MR. O'HANLON: But I also know you are
11 pressed for time, so I won't abuse what's left of my
12 voice and take a lot of your time.

13 Let me just say, in terms of the Germany
14 and Korea issues, I generally support what President
15 Bush outlined a couple of weeks ago. I'm happy to
16 explain more in our discussion period about why, but I
17 generally support that.

18 So let me make four quick points about
19 four other issues that were not at the centerpiece of
20 Mr. Bush's remarks, but I think very much are on your
21 agenda still, and then I'll be done. Because my
22 colleagues have done such a great job of framing the
23 broader issue, I don't need to go over that material
24 again.

25 One, in terms of these new bases that are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 proposed for Eastern Europe, the so-called lily pads
2 as General Jones has often described them, the
3 temporary bases, the smaller bases, good ideas in
4 principle, dangerous ideas for the U.S. Army right
5 now, because as you know as well as anybody our Army
6 is so badly overdeployed the last thing we need right
7 now is more temporary deployments away from home base.

8 Larry mentioned, I think very eloquently
9 and correctly, that Germany is not a hardship post in
10 that sense, but a new temporary deployment in Romania
11 or Hungary would be. Nothing against those new
12 members. I'm sure if we built up our infrastructure
13 there we could probably have our troops very happy in
14 those places, but what's being proposed is temporary,
15 unescorted deployments. We don't need more of those
16 now. That should be handled over time. Any new
17 deployments should be very minimal I think in scope
18 and scale in the near future.

19 The Army doesn't need more missions; it
20 needs less and/or more people to share in the burden.

21 And, therefore, that part of the plan, as I can
22 understand it, worries me a little bit. That's my
23 only critique, really, of what's being done in regard
24 to the German and Korea basing arrangements we have
25 today.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Second point. Okinawa, Japan -- that
2 Larry mentioned where he had been several decades ago.
3 Hard to believe, he's such a young man still today,
4 that he could have been there when it -- when we still
5 had a Navy aircraft carrier or a number of ships home
6 ported there. But in any event -- of course, as you
7 know today, the primary capabilities in Okinawa are
8 about 20,000 Marines and about 7,000 Air Force that
9 use the Kadena Air Force Base.

10 My own view on Okinawa -- and I've done
11 some work on this topic with a Japanese security
12 expert named Mike Mojazuki, George Washington
13 University. It's a deployment that I think we should
14 reconsider, especially the Marine Corps fraction of
15 that deployment. The Kadena Air Base is critical.
16 It's a critical hub to our Pacific operations.

17 We have to protect that against the fact
18 that the Okinawan population is concerned about what
19 it sees as too many Americans on a fairly small island
20 that has become more and more densely populated over
21 the years. Now, admittedly, the Okinawans are
22 conflicted, because they don't have a very strong
23 economy, and if we were to pull forces away they would
24 suffer, at least in the short term, economically.

25 And some of their aspirations for what

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could replace a large Marine Corps presence in my
2 judgment are not realistic. I don't think Okinawa is
3 going to become the kind of hub of commerce in the
4 Pacific that, you know, Shanghai and Hong Kong and
5 other places have become. And sometimes you get the
6 flavor the Okinawans think they have easy ways to
7 replace the bases.

8 So it's a complicated issue, and there
9 would be an economic net detriment to the Okinawans
10 from losing these facilities. On the other hand, they
11 are fairly adamant that they want change. The
12 airfield right now that's in Ginowan City that we
13 cannot find a substitute for, and it's going very
14 slowly, could be a major problem if there's an
15 accident there.

16 I met with the Mayor of Ginowan City this
17 year. I met with both recent Governors of Okinawa.
18 They are very worried about this problem. And I think
19 we have to think about not only the Okinawan politics
20 but our own U.S. Marine Corps. I don't believe the
21 Marine Corps benefits that much from being on Okinawa.
22 Training space is not that extensive.

23 It's true, it's nice to have a hub of
24 operations for the 31st Marine Expeditionary Unit. I
25 want to keep a hub of Marines there, and the ability

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to reinforce in the event of a crisis. But I think
2 you can do that with 5- to 7,000 Marines in normal
3 conditions, as opposed to the nearly 20,000 we have
4 today.

5 And if you made that change, I believe you
6 could also then have more flexibility in what you do
7 with Marine Corps deployments around the world. As
8 you know, right now we take our Marines usually from
9 California or North Carolina, and we send them to
10 Okinawa on temporary deployment.

11 So they're essentially being deployed once
12 just to get to Okinawa, which by itself is not a
13 conflict zone, not a crisis zone. And then if they're
14 deployed again, there is sort of a lost efficiency.
15 And it's not the most efficient way, in my judgment,
16 for the Marine Corps to deploy its forces.

17 So when we have crises in Afghanistan or
18 Iraq, we cut down the number in Okinawa, because we
19 realize we really don't need them there all the time
20 in these numbers anyhow. And I think we should make
21 that sort of a change permanent, or at least consider
22 alternatives, maybe having more Marines based in
23 Australia.

24 Right now, the Australians aren't crazy
25 about the idea of permanent basing, but we could

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 probably do more training in Australia at a minimum.
2 We may be able to bring some of these forces to other
3 parts of the Asia-Pacific, if we are creative and
4 flexible. And I think we could bring some of those
5 home as well without any harm to our Asia-Pacific
6 presence, as long as we compensate with more pre-
7 deployed equipment, more ability to reinforce fast if
8 we need to in the event of a crisis.

9 So I would propose, in summary, that the
10 Marine Corps presence on Okinawa might want to be cut
11 by more than half. Still keeping the key elements of
12 the hub, the access to airfields, the access to ports,
13 at least for crisis or emergency circumstances. The
14 31st MEU I think should still operate out of Okinawa,
15 but the fact that we have almost 20,000 Marines there
16 I think is an old idea that should be reconsidered.

17 And the Marines don't all have to stay in
18 Japan. They can go to other parts of the region or
19 even, in part, come home, and I think with no harm to
20 our security position. I think Mr. Rumsfeld has been
21 looking at this question from what I understand. They
22 haven't managed to make much progress.

23 As you know, the President didn't talk
24 much about this in his speech two weeks ago. I hope
25 you can investigate this and look at some options,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because I think there really is an opportunity, as
2 well as potential danger, to the U.S.-Japan alliance
3 if we don't reconsider some of that.

4 A third point -- let me take my hat off to
5 what the military has been doing on Guam, and I think
6 this backs up a point that Jack made. This helps us
7 compensate, to some extent, for some of the reductions
8 in Korea. We are now showing we're adaptable. We can
9 put more attack submarines on Guam and have fewer Army
10 forces in Korea. On balance, I think that enhances
11 our regional flexibility, and I think we can do more
12 of that on Guam.

13 And I'm very curious to see what you can
14 discover about the possibility of putting more attack
15 submarines on Guam, possibly even considering putting
16 an aircraft carrier -- an additional aircraft carrier
17 in home port in the Asia-Pacific region. Whether it's
18 Guam, Hawaii, or somewhere else, it's an idea already
19 being considered. I think it makes good sense for a
20 number of reasons.

21 So Guam is already providing us more and
22 more in the way of assets and help, and I think we
23 might be able to pursue that logic further.

24 Last point and I'll stop: the idea of sea
25 swapping, as you know, is now an idea the Navy is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 intrigued by. What it's trying to do is instead of
2 sending a ship overseas for a few months and then
3 bringing that ship home because the crew needs to go
4 back to its home port, and we don't want to deploy our
5 crews for more than six months at a time, now we're
6 trying to keep the ships deployed overseas for a
7 longer period of time and rotate the crews by
8 airplane, so the crews can come home but the ship
9 stays overseas.

10 That way you don't waste all the time in
11 transit, but this requires a certain kind of facility
12 overseas where you can fly people in, where you can do
13 some exercises so the crews have a smooth handover.
14 We need to consider facilities that will allow us to
15 do more and more of this sort of thing in the future.

16 It doesn't require a permanent home port for ships
17 necessarily, but it does require some repair
18 facilities, some barracks, a certain kind of working
19 relationship with a number of countries.

20 I don't think we want to do all of that in
21 one place. I think we want to do some in -- maybe
22 some in Thailand, some in Singapore, some in the
23 Philippines. It doesn't require the same level of
24 close home porting relationship that we've had in the
25 past, but it does require a certain degree of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 flexibility and receptivity on the part of those
2 countries. And I think we can look into that more.

3 For the Navy, I think it's a very
4 promising idea for the future to do more and more of
5 this sea swapping concept. It's a way to get maximum
6 benefit for whatever size fleet we have. And if the
7 defense budget stops growing at \$20 billion a year the
8 way it has been of late, and we start having some more
9 pressure on the defense budget because of the federal
10 deficit problem, which I think will happen sometime
11 this decade, then we're going to have to figure out
12 ways to make do -- do more with less.

13 And one of the ways is to do this crew
14 swapping idea, which allows you to, again, get more
15 forward presence out of a given size fleet. So we
16 have to consider ways to maximize the use of
17 facilities to help with that process.

18 Thank you very much for your time, and I
19 look forward to the discussion.

20 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

21 I know that some of the questions may
22 address items that some of you have addressed in your
23 statements as well, but I don't believe you're all on
24 the same page, so we're going to ask a lot of those
25 questions.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In what's proposed in regard to a lighter,
2 more mobile force, do you feel it will be geared more
3 to the global war on terrorism and brush fires, or
4 will it also be able to deal with the major regional
5 conflict?

6 Dr. Korb?

7 DR. KORB: Thank you for talking about the
8 lighter -- yes, we're talking about the so-called
9 transformation and making it lighter, more agile. I
10 think one of the things that we discovered in Iraq and
11 Afghanistan is you also still need boots on the
12 ground. You need forces.

13 So I don't think you can get too carried
14 away with just making everything lighter, more mobile,
15 more flexible. We've seen that in Iraq. The
16 Bradleys, which a lot of the transformationists wanted
17 to do away with, have done a heck of a job. In fact,
18 the Marines were asking for Bradleys and Abrams when
19 they were going into Najaf.

20 So, yes, I think you want to keep making
21 us lighter, more flexible. And as you know, the Army
22 and -- I mean, the Navy and the Air Force are actually
23 cutting people, whereas I do think you need more Army
24 troops and Marine troops.

25 MR. SPENCER: Not if you don't want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 find yourself in a world of hurt at some future point,
2 I would argue. We should not be transforming our
3 military, in my estimation, to fight the war on
4 terrorism. The war on terrorism is here today now.

5 Hopefully we will not be fighting the war
6 on terrorism a decade from now, which is when you
7 begin to achieve some of those transformational
8 capabilities that people would like to see happen.
9 When we talk about from a transformation perspective
10 -- agility, maneuverability, flexibility -- those
11 things are important, but so is capability.

12 It's not about building a lighter tank
13 that operates like a lighter tank. It's about
14 building a lighter platform that gives you the same
15 capability, if not more, the same survivability, if
16 not more, as a tank that we have today. So that's
17 what transformation is about. Too often people
18 confuse transformation with just normal military
19 modernization.

20 MR. O'HANLON: Just to add a word, Mr.
21 Chairman, about Korea. And one of the reasons I
22 support the change here is, in my judgment, the forces
23 we've had in Korea over the years have really been
24 just for Korea. We haven't had much flexibility with
25 them, and so I think we shouldn't see what capability

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we had there as serving a larger regional purpose. It
2 had to be evaluated in terms of its contribution in
3 Korea.

4 With the South Koreans so much stronger
5 than they used to be, I believe we can afford to
6 downsize. And, in fact, in a book that I did last
7 year on Korea, the last chapter was on future force
8 planning for Korea beyond the North Korean crisis and
9 conflict, if we ever get to that happy stage. And how
10 would you want to reposition your forces?

11 And, frankly, it's in the general thrust
12 of what Mr. Rumsfeld is now proposing. You want to
13 have somewhat fewer forces, but you want to have more
14 regional mobility, have the forces perhaps somewhat
15 more southerly on the peninsula, so you're closer to
16 regional hot spots.

17 A lot of what he's doing, it may be
18 designed more for the here and now, but it also is
19 consistent with what I think our long-term structure
20 might want to be in Korea for the regional scenarios
21 that you mention, whether they're small or big. And,
22 therefore, that's one of the reasons why I think this
23 Korea repositioning and redeployment is moving in the
24 right direction and why I support it.

25 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 How does -- and I think Mr. O'Hanlon
2 touched on it, but how does Iraq affect the ability to
3 implement the global plan as it's being considered?

4 MR. O'HANLON: I will just follow up and
5 say, again, thank you for -- I agree that I did touch
6 on it, because I said that we can't really afford more
7 deployments in the short term in Eastern Europe. It's
8 also one more reason why I support the Korea change.
9 We need that second brigade or the 2nd Infantry
10 Division to help out in Iraq.

11 We need a lot more help in Iraq, too, from
12 allies, from the 40,000 more troops Mr. Kerry wants to
13 add to the force structure, from the 6,000 individual
14 ready reserve that Mr. Rumsfeld has called up. I
15 think we need all of these things in Iraq. And if we
16 can afford to make a reduction somewhere else, we
17 should, because the Iraq mission I think is on the
18 verge of breaking the U.S. Army and Marine Corps, and
19 we'd better act before that happens, not afterwards.

20 DR. KORB: One of the considerations, if
21 you're talking about going to Eastern Europe, that you
22 should not overlook is the fact that you've got
23 horrible environmental problems at those bases. And
24 if we go in there, we're going to have to clean them
25 up.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The Warsaw Pact and the Soviet Union
2 didn't really have an EPA going around making sure
3 that things were clean, and so we're going to have to
4 do that. Those countries are not in a position to
5 provide any of the support that a country like Germany
6 or Italy or Japan has been able to do, so it will be
7 more expensive.

8 You'll also have the problem that Mike
9 talked about, and that is that if the troops are over
10 there they're away from home. And then, if you have
11 to send them someplace else, they're going to be away
12 from home even longer. The brigade we're taking out
13 of Korea, a lot of those people are being taken out of
14 Korea, being sent to Iraq, a lot of those people have
15 already been away from home close to a year, no
16 dependents. Now they're getting another tour, and
17 that causes you more problems.

18 And then, finally, if you deploy the
19 troops to these so-called lily pads without their
20 equipment, the question is: how do you get their
21 equipment where it needs to go? In Western Europe,
22 you have much better rail facilities to get it to the
23 ports if, in fact, that's what you needed to do.

24 MR. SPENCER: I would suggest that Iraq
25 demonstrates exactly why these things need to happen.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Right now we have about 2.3 million military
2 personnel available for operations when you combine
3 everything together. We have something under 200,000
4 of those personnel involved in some way, shape, or
5 form, in Central Command in Iraq and Afghanistan.

6 Yet the Army is about to break, yet the
7 Marine Corps is about to break. That should not be
8 the case. And these are structural problems, I would
9 argue. I think that we need to change the system
10 comprehensively.

11 Yes, if you take today's system, the
12 capabilities we have, the platforms we have, the force
13 structure that we have, the basing infrastructure we
14 have, and do the war on terrorism like we're doing,
15 and then you add on top of that the lily pads -- I
16 mean, add on top of that more rotational bases, yes,
17 then you're going to have problems. You're going to
18 create more tension. You're going to create more
19 retention problems and make less -- fewer families
20 happy.

21 But it's not about adding on top of it.
22 It's about evolving into something else, having a
23 basing infrastructure that can do the Iraq and have
24 the flexibility in place, so that we can take full
25 advantage of our -- all of our military resources.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And that's why you keep coming back to words like
2 efficiency. Efficiency is what allows you to use your
3 resources comprehensively, without breaking it.

4 And let's also not forget that we are
5 involved in the global war on terrorism, and we
6 haven't gotten rid of other commitments that we have,
7 so you're going to have stress on the force. I would
8 argue that we don't want a force so big that we can
9 fight a global war on terrorism and not feel stress on
10 it. And we need to have a force and a capability that
11 you're able to surge to do that over some period of
12 time, but, you know, there's going to be stress given
13 what this country is being asked or being forced to do
14 right now.

15 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you. If we
16 have a little time later, I'll ask a follow-up
17 question on that. But for right now I want to get one
18 more question out. And that's in Europe, one of the
19 concerns is that we have enough of a presence
20 remaining there that we continue to have a seat at the
21 table in regard to NATO, and with the emergence of the
22 EU, and so I'd like the panel to address that concern.

23 Dr. Korb?

24 DR. KORB: Well, I think if you want to
25 have the United States -- first of all, if you want to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 keep NATO -- and I think you should -- you want to
2 have an American commander, the so-called SACEUR,
3 you're going to have to have a significant presence
4 there. And you do want to have a seat at the table,
5 because you want to ensure, as people say, that Europe
6 stays whole and free.

7 The United States wants to have influence,
8 and if you have influence in one sphere it carries
9 over into other spheres. So I think you have to take
10 a look at what that number is. Does it have to be
11 70,000? Could it be 35,000? And as I understand the
12 President's plan, the only -- we are taking the two --
13 two heavy divisions out of Europe, the 1st Armored and
14 1st Infantry Divisions.

15 We're not clear on what we're going to --
16 you know, what we're going to -- going to leave there.

17 But I think that is a terrific point, and that's why
18 I said in my last point whatever you're going to do,
19 you need to do it in concert with you allies. If the
20 President was going to make the announcement that he
21 did two weeks ago, I think it would have been much
22 better if he had made it at Istanbul in concert with
23 the rest of the NATO nations, so it would look like
24 this is something the alliance had decided all
25 together, and then it becomes a win-win proposition.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. O'HANLON: I'm glad you asked that
2 question, because it does raise one of the concerns I
3 have, and it's also something I had read as a concern
4 of General Monty Meigs, who I know many of you are
5 aware of and in contact with.

6 The question of how you maintain strong
7 interoperability and joint exercises with the
8 alliance. When you're taking all four heavy combat
9 brigades out of Europe and replacing them with one
10 single Stryker brigade, which as we all know is
11 performing reasonably well in Iraq, and people that
12 I've spoken with are fairly happy with it, but it is
13 still a new, innovative sort of platform.

14 I think, from what I've discerned from
15 General Meigs' comments, and others, there's an
16 argument for keeping one of the heavy brigades at
17 least in Germany, one of the four that we're planning
18 to take home. And this is in the level of detail. I
19 support the overall thrust of the President's plan,
20 but I think we might want to ask if in addition to the
21 Stryker brigade we plan to deploy we should perhaps
22 keep one additional heavy brigade, because, of course,
23 that is, as Jack and Larry have mentioned, it's still
24 an important kind of combat capability in our
25 military. It will be in the future. It's important

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in our allies' militaries.

2 If we want to continue to do rigorous
3 joint exercises and training with them, we may want to
4 rethink that one before we fully commit to the entire
5 drawdown of all four heavy brigades. So I think
6 there's a case to keep one of them while we also bring
7 the other three home, and then add the Stryker brigade
8 to Germany.

9 And I'm not sure which option I would
10 prefer between what the President has now proposed and
11 this alternative still in the spirit of the
12 President's plan, but that would keep one heavy
13 brigade in Germany as well as the new Stryker brigade.

14 MR. SPENCER: I would just add that I
15 think we are in no -- there is no threat of us losing
16 our seat at the European table. As of right now,
17 Europe spends very little on defense. They are very
18 dependent on us, on defense. I hope that will change.

19 At some future point, if some chain of
20 events were to lead to a fissure in U.S.-European
21 relations, then maybe we lose our seat at the table.
22 But I don't think that's a concern right now.

23 The second point is that we need to really
24 concentrate I think on capabilities rather than
25 numbers. You know, the President said 70,000 troops

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is what -- who could be affected here. But we need to
2 keep our eye on the capability that we're able to
3 bring to bear in Europe. That capability might be
4 housed in Kansas, but it can be brought to bear in
5 Europe. So that's incredibly important in this
6 overall process as it moves forward over the next 10
7 years.

8 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you,
9 gentlemen.

10 Commissioner Curtis?

11 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you, Mr.
12 Chairman.

13 I'd like to turn the question to strategic
14 lift a little bit. During the Cold War, we constantly
15 lived with war plans, and we had a hard time finding
16 the strategic lift and support. In an error of
17 increased deployment, strategic lift becomes a key
18 factor. I'd like -- I appreciate you gentlemen's
19 comments on strategic lift and particularly where you
20 believe we should go on the entire issue of strategic
21 lift.

22 MR. SPENCER: Well, strategic lift is
23 always important. It's going to continue to be
24 important. It's how you get things from point A to
25 point B. But there is -- when you look into the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 future, one of the things we need to keep our eye on
2 is the vulnerability of moving our assets into place.
3 That's one of the main driving forces behind the
4 whole idea of transformation.

5 It's not about whether we can or can't
6 change our basing infrastructure, our ability to fight
7 from long distances. It's that we might find
8 ourselves confronted with an adversary in 25 years who
9 will not allow us to move things into theater without
10 being blown up. So we have to increase our capability
11 to fight from longer distances, which I guess is not
12 the same sort of strategic lift you would normally
13 associate with that, but it's how you get a bomb on a
14 target.

15 But to answer your question more
16 specifically more in the near term, again, that's part
17 of the whole evolution we see happening right now. A
18 lot of the problems with future combat system is with
19 weight. A lot of the problems with -- one of the
20 problems with Stryker is with weight.

21 The problems with these systems is that
22 they are too heavy to move over long distances. The
23 problem always is with our European allies. Yes, they
24 have three million troops, only one percent of which
25 can move outside of the European Theater. So they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 need to invest in that.

2 The entire burden of strategic lift I
3 don't think can continue to fall on our shoulders.
4 That's one of the things that we need to impress upon
5 our friends and allies that they need to make
6 investments in. So it's a problem, it has been a
7 problem, and it will be a problem. But it's one that
8 we need to recognize, and that's why we need to be
9 lighter. That's why we need to gain these
10 efficiencies.

11 DR. KORB: Mike was kind enough to mention
12 I've been doing this a long time, and I have never
13 seen a time where we didn't say we were short of lift.

14 That is -- it used to drive me up the wall when I was
15 in the building and saying, "Okay. We're short. What
16 are we going to do about it?" And so I think that all
17 other things being equal, if you don't have as many
18 bases around the globe, you're going to need more
19 lift. I think it's -- you know, just as you're not --
20 I think Jack is right. We don't know where we're
21 going to go.

22 But the fact of the matter is if you're
23 more in the United States than you used to be, you're
24 going to need more lift. And I think it's something
25 that should be part of your analysis, and then

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 national strategy and the national military strategy,
2 and the Quadrennial Defense Review to see how this all
3 fits together, because if you can't get where you want
4 to go, you're not going to be able to put the power
5 that you need.

6 So I think that we should be doing more,
7 and if we withdraw from overseas you're going to have
8 to do even more in lift.

9 MR. O'HANLON: A couple of quick thoughts,
10 sir. One is that I think we need to worry about
11 replacing any Marine Corps capabilities on Okinawa
12 with more prepositioned equipment. It's been a very
13 good news story, as I'm sure you're aware.

14 The last 25 years, the American military
15 doctrine, ever since the rapid deployment force was
16 created in the late '70s/early '80s, we've really
17 increased our lift a lot, including prepositioning,
18 fast sealift and airlift. And so to take each of
19 those three, I think that we need more prepositioning,
20 especially if we're going to replace the Marines on
21 Okinawa with a smaller number and a smaller footprint.

22 I think we need perhaps still more fast
23 sealift, but what has concerned me looking at the
24 issue is, as you know, our current fast sealift is the
25 SL-7s and the LMSRs. These are huge ships. They may

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 find themselves unable to get into some of the ports.

2 We may have to fight it in the future.

3 I know back in the Mogadishu experience,
4 for example, in the early '90s, we could only fit one
5 of those ships into the harbor at a time. Of course,
6 we didn't need more than one at a time. But what if
7 that harbor had somehow been bottled up by some kind
8 of a ship sinking just before we needed to get there?

9 I think we want more flexibility in our fast sealift
10 to go with somewhat smaller roll-on/roll-off capable
11 ships. That's my one observation on fast sealift.

12 And then, on airlift what I would simply
13 say is that I think the general direction of adding
14 more is the right way to go. Airlift is the part of
15 the Air Force that is still working awfully hard from
16 what I can tell.

17 I know there are other aspects to Air
18 Force capabilities that are being stressed right now
19 in general, but if you look at the Air Force and the
20 Navy, the end of the Saddam Hussein threat has
21 actually made their lives, to some extent, a little
22 bit easier, while the Army and Marine Corps are
23 working harder because of the occupation and then
24 subsequent stabilization mission.

25 But the Air Force is still working very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 hard, as I'm sure you're aware, on refueling and
2 airlift into the Central Asian Theater. And we have
3 to assume that kind of thing may continue. So I think
4 more airlift capacity, especially with airplanes that
5 are capable, as the C-17 is, of operating from austere
6 runways, continues to be a priority. And I would put
7 somewhat more resources into that part of the defense
8 budget.

9 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you. A
10 related -- none of the panel mentioned sea-basing.
11 Would you touch on sea-basing if you have thoughts on
12 the subject?

13 MR. SPENCER: Tell me what sea-basing is.
14 And that is the serious question, because a lot of
15 people talk about sea-basing, and sea-basing could be
16 any number of 100 different things. I was at a panel
17 discussion the other day where this was the specific
18 topic. And at the end of the day, the conclusion was,
19 well, it seems like a good idea, but, really, what is
20 it?

21 But let's just work from the concept of
22 basing something from the sea. I think it's an
23 important element, an important capability to pursue
24 until we find that it doesn't work or that it's not
25 really the way to go. Again, my fear is that today

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 fighting terrorists, fighting rogue leaders, yes, if
2 you can come up with a means by which to project power
3 from the sea, that might work, especially with an
4 Afghanistan-type situation where you don't have any
5 prepositioned friends and allies.

6 My fear is the future adversary that's
7 throwing things other than old Soviet weapons and, you
8 know, a more capable future adversary. And in that
9 case, although when you hear Navy people and Army
10 people speak of it, they are relatively sure that they
11 can defend it adequately. My fear is that they can't.

12 And when you hear people talk about whatever the
13 platform is, they can always defend it adequately.

14 Again, my fear is that perhaps they can't,
15 and that is why I think that sea-basing is a good
16 idea. It can help perhaps, if it all works the way
17 they think it will. I mean, it gives us more of that
18 added flexibility. That's what it's all about. But
19 the idea has not been examined enough, the
20 technologies have not been developed enough to know
21 whether or not this is something that can be pursued
22 beyond the theoretical at this point.

23 DR. KORB: Well, I noticed on the panel we
24 have Air Force and Army people, no Navy people, so I'm
25 sure that they might have a different answer. And as

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I say, I did spend some time in the Navy.

2 I think it's a good thing to the extent
3 that you can defend it, because you can't always be
4 sure that you're going to get the basis in the area.
5 We were fortunate, at least eventually in Afghanistan,
6 that we were able to get some of those -- the
7 countries there to allow us to put forces in, and, in
8 fact, we still have people there.

9 But you've got to remember that we've made
10 a lot of what I would call compromises with unsavory
11 governments to get that. So there is a loss for it.
12 So I think if you can defend it, you really ought to
13 emphasize it, because it gives you more flexibility
14 and it keeps you from having to make sometimes these
15 horrible compromises.

16 I cringe when I see leaders from our
17 country going around in these countries, you know,
18 standing next to some of these characters that are
19 running some of these places, and, you know, the
20 message that it's sending.

21 MR. O'HANLON: I think these two summed it
22 up very well. I wouldn't mind the idea. I'm
23 skeptical that we have the technology to do it very
24 effectively, but there may be a case for a two-mile
25 long runway that's survivable and we can use for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 airlift and refueling, and what have you, let's say,
2 in the Arabian Sea.

3 But I need to -- I'm skeptical because
4 people tend to be so vague about what they are
5 proposing that it makes you wonder if they are almost
6 asking too much of a concept that really isn't as far
7 along as I think it may be at this moment.

8 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you.

9 I have one final question. Part of the
10 global posture proposal increases our military
11 engagement in areas that are non-traditional for our
12 military -- Africa, Central Asia. We have had very
13 limited military involvement there, and the movement
14 south and east gives us -- out of Europe gives us a
15 lot more engagement.

16 I'd appreciate your comments on what you
17 see are both the risks and the benefits of increased
18 engagement in these areas.

19 MR. O'HANLON: I'll start and go quickly.

20 I think that, in summary, I'll go in broad brush. In
21 Central Asia, we're not really looking to work with
22 allies. As Larry points out, these are not countries
23 that share our values. We don't really think of them
24 as security partners. The bases are because we need
25 places to put our stuff down and refuel and stage, not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 for any other reason. And so they are very functional
2 bases. They're not engagement-oriented bases, and we
3 should be clear-eyed about that.

4 That's true in most of the Persian Gulf as
5 well. There we're a little more optimistic about
6 seeing some political progress in some countries like
7 Kuwait in recent years, but for the most part we run
8 into a lot of dangers with our troops being in that
9 region, and I want to minimize our footprint. I'm
10 delighted we managed to pull a lot of forces out of
11 Saudi Arabia in recent times.

12 In Africa, I don't think we're likely to
13 put a big military footprint ourselves, but this is
14 actually a place where I think we need to help the
15 Africans get a lot better themselves. And the
16 training and equipping programs that we've been
17 initiating in the last few years should be expanded
18 quite a bit in my judgment, so they can handle more of
19 the Darfur, Rwanda, Congo-style scenarios that keep
20 coming up.

21 That doesn't require a big military
22 footprint on our part, however, so I'm not sure it has
23 to be a major concern of the Commission.

24 DR. KORB: I read an astounding figure
25 recently. I'd like to get more details on it. It

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 said the Army is deployed to 130 countries. That's
2 practically every country in the world. You'd like to
3 know, what are they doing there, what are the
4 facilities, what are the arrangements? And I think
5 this is something we need to be, you know, very
6 careful about. Do we really need to be there? Are we
7 stretching the forces? What kind of deals have been
8 made?

9 So I go back to the point I made before.
10 I think to the extent that you can, you have to be
11 careful because sending the American forces sends a
12 lot of other signals and many times get you to do
13 things that underline some of your other goals, like
14 if you're trying to spread democracy in the Persian
15 Gulf and the Middle East region, but then you are
16 making deals someplace else. This is going to send
17 mixed messages to the world.

18 MR. SPENCER: Let me start by saying that
19 I think that I'm very skeptical of using military
20 force for anything that's not a very important
21 interest to this country. So I'm not for sending U.S.
22 troops to Africa, for example, for humanitarian
23 operations, things of that nature.

24 That said, when I look at Africa, I think
25 this country is missing a very significant opportunity

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to create a lot of friends and a lot of allies. You
2 have a lot of countries in Africa that aren't anti-
3 American. They very much look to the United States as
4 a friend, as a potential friend. We have a lot of
5 cultural and historical relations with the people of
6 that continent, some not good, granted, but there is
7 still those links there.

8 And there's a lot of problems in Africa
9 that could very quickly become our problems. And
10 while I don't support setting up bases in Africa in
11 order to get rid of AIDS or to do anything like that,
12 I think that it is important to increase our relations
13 with those countries, primarily from a military
14 perspective, to do what Mike was talking about,
15 because these are problems that if they're not taken
16 care of that they will flood beyond the borders of
17 Africa and become our problems quickly.

18 So we need to help the Africans be able to
19 help themselves, and I think that the Liberia model
20 serves to show us what we can do by taking a
21 leadership position. We didn't invest a lot of
22 resources in doing that, and we helped the Africans
23 come up with a solution to an African problem. And if
24 we do that over time, I think we're going to find a
25 lot of friends and a lot of allies in a resource-rich

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 continent. And if we don't, we're missing a great
2 opportunity.

3 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you very much.

4 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

5 Commissioner Martin?

6 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Thank you very much,
7 Mr. Chairman. I don't think there's anyone who would
8 disagree there's a lot of shifting sand out there, and
9 not all of it is in Afghanistan and Iraq, meaning the
10 geopolitical situation at the present time.

11 My question to you all is: how do we
12 strike the balance of building something that is
13 definitive in terms of meeting our base structure
14 needs to serve the interests of this nation, and yet
15 be flexible enough that we don't paint ourselves into
16 a corner fighting the last war again? Your thoughts?

17 MR. SPENCER: Well, I think that's why --
18 I think it's important to build a number of smaller,
19 more spartan bases, that you're able to use as surge
20 capacity, to surge capability into the region when
21 needed. And that's why I think it also needs to be
22 based on capability. You can have a small base that,
23 if you can then surge, you can bring an immense amount
24 of military power to bear, if need be, without having
25 that investment of a large sprawling base that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 includes families and everything else.

2 That's not to say that there's necessarily
3 anything wrong with those large bases. But the fact
4 of the matter remains that if you have the -- if you
5 have that basing infrastructure, like what we have in
6 Germany, it becomes very difficult to move beyond that
7 basing infrastructure as the rest of the world
8 changes.

9 And that's why we're here right now doing
10 what we're doing. The rest of the world is changing,
11 but we have these old bases. They're fine bases.
12 It's not tough -- or, you know, I don't want to say
13 it's not tough on the people to be there. They're
14 good bases, they're technologically advanced bases,
15 it's easy to get things in and out of there. That's
16 all true.

17 But it's also true the rest of the world
18 is changing, and that -- I think that we can
19 demonstrate our commitment by having a small presence
20 in these countries, by demonstrating -- by evolving
21 our military capability in a way that allows us to
22 bring large amounts of military force to bear on short
23 order through these smaller bases that are set up
24 around the world.

25 And they don't all need to be the same.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 You know, that's one thing that I think that is a
2 problem in this debate. People act like they all need
3 to be the same kind of bases. I mean, there are a
4 couple of good models. You have the Bosnia model
5 that's out there right now where you have -- we're
6 maintaining about 3,000 troops, and they rotate in and
7 out every six months. Their equipment stays.

8 You have the South Korean model, where
9 they come in and out on year rotations. Then you have
10 the larger base model. And another quick point --
11 people say, "Well, the families -- it's tough on the
12 families when they're rotating in and out for six
13 months or for a year," and that kind of thing. Yes,
14 it is tough on families. The same thing with Reserves
15 and National Guard troops. It's tough whenever
16 they're deployed all the time.

17 That's all true, but that's because the
18 system was set up this way, and we're trying to use
19 the system to do something it was never set up to do.

20 If you change the system, and everyone knows that's
21 what it is coming in, then you don't have those same
22 detrimental effects ripple out as time goes forward.

23 DR. KORB: I think if we were starting
24 with a blank slate, we might do things differently,
25 but you never do. We are where we are, and I think we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 ought to step back and talk about a lot of the changes
2 that have been made.

3 You might get the impression from
4 listening to the President or other people that we
5 hadn't done a darn thing since the end of the Cold
6 War, for example, in Europe. But the fact of the
7 matter is when the Cold War ended, we had over 300,000
8 troops in Europe, and we're now down well below
9 100,000. We had a lot more troops in Asia. We've
10 taken them home.

11 And if you were to take, for example, the
12 situation in Germany with the two large divisions
13 there, the fact of the matter is both of them have
14 gone to Iraq and have done quite well. So you have
15 adapted I think already -- the whole military idea is,
16 you know, you hope for the best but you plan for the
17 worst.

18 So I think when you talk about any of
19 these things, I think it's -- or to make your
20 decisions, it's important to keep in mind that you're
21 not quite sure what things are going to be. Let's
22 hedge your bets. And if you said to me, "You've got a
23 terrific base in Germany," the burden of proof would
24 be on you to tell me why you want to leave there and
25 go someplace else, because having that there does give

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 you flexibility to do a lot of other things.

2 And that's why I think we need to -- the
3 point I made in the beginning. We need to go back and
4 say, "Well, what is the national security strategy?"
5 I mean, Jack is right, we don't know. But this is why
6 we elect people to office, and they're supposed to
7 tell us, they're supposed to make decisions, and then
8 once you do that then, of course, a lot of these
9 things will fall.

10 And then, finally, the idea -- you know,
11 you also get the impression from listening to a lot of
12 the debate that the U.S. military has been hide bound
13 for a number of years, and you had a great group of
14 people, the military transformation, the revolution of
15 military affairs. The question has always not been:
16 do you transform the military? The question is: at
17 what pace? And I think that's really the issue.

18 MR. O'HANLON: Not a lot to add, sir, but
19 a couple of points. Even though, again, I generally
20 support where Mr. Rumsfeld and Mr. Bush want to go, I
21 do think Larry's point is very valid -- that before
22 you give up something, you've got to have a good
23 reason to give it up, if it's a very effective
24 functioning base.

25 And on balance, the facilities in Germany

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are quite good. And for the most part, they're not a
2 bad place to be. On the other hand, there are also
3 places in the United States that aren't bad to be, and
4 so I'm glad you're doing this in the context of
5 getting ready for a BRAC and doing this all in one
6 broader strategic review. In one period of time we're
7 focused on both these questions.

8 But I think we should be reluctant to give
9 up good infrastructure overseas unless we're really
10 sure we have a better alternative and are prepared to
11 pay for it. Another point is -- and, again, I agree
12 with most of what Jack has been saying, but I think we
13 can overestimate the value of spartan bases.

14 You know, they're good for joint
15 exercises, they're good for a place to touch down your
16 airplane if you need to refuel and you can have some
17 fuel prepositioned there, but if it's really spartan
18 you're not going to have very much fuel there. And if
19 it's really spartan, you're not going to have a lot of
20 spare parts and a lot of repair technicians.

21 And you're not going to necessarily be
22 able to build up quickly. And so it may serve some
23 political benefit to have already done the
24 consultation you need to then ramp up in wartime or in
25 a major crisis. But while I do agree with Jack, these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 things are more useful for smaller, quicker
2 operations, and they shouldn't be viewed as anything
3 close to the big major hubs that we've had.

4 So I really value facilities like the
5 Kadena Airfield in Okinawa. These sorts of things are
6 huge national assets, very important allied assets.
7 And we've got to be very careful about protecting them
8 as we rethink the overall force structure and base
9 structure.

10 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Thank you.

11 My second question has -- strikes to the
12 contract that we have with the men and women who
13 serve, the contract of implication that we will
14 support them through whatever it takes, with whatever
15 they need to discharge their duty to the country, and,
16 secondly, by implication to their families and loved
17 ones.

18 Are we taking enough of a look at the
19 questions of our families and dependents as we look at
20 the broader -- if you include global posturing and
21 BRAC at the same time? Should we be taking more of a
22 look at it, or should we be taking less of a look at
23 it as we do our due diligence here?

24 DR. KORB: The late General Maxwell Taylor
25 had a saying. He said, "We sent the Army to Vietnam

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to save Vietnam. We took it out to save the Army."

2 We are in I think a very precarious
3 position right now with the all-volunteer Army, and I
4 emphasize Army as opposed to the other services,
5 because the other services I think are doing pretty
6 well with recruiting and retention.

7 And one of the things you need to
8 recognize -- that if you have a volunteer military,
9 you're going to have a higher percentage of people who
10 have families than you did in a mixed military. And
11 to the extent that you don't pay attention to those
12 things, you risk undermining the quality of the people
13 that you get and keep in the military.

14 And so I think you've got to pay attention
15 to that. That has to be as important as anything,
16 because if you don't take care of that and you don't
17 get the good people, it doesn't matter how much you
18 spend on equipment, or where you base them or anything
19 else like that, I mean, that has got to be front and
20 center.

21 MR. O'HANLON: Let me just say one thing
22 about Germany in this context. And it's sort of a
23 nuanced argument because I very much agree with the
24 point Larry made earlier that our troops, as best I
25 can tell, and you probably have greater insight into

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 this, sir, than I do. But our troops really don't
2 mind being in Germany. It's not an unpleasant place
3 to be.

4 On the other hand, at the margin I still
5 support the idea of bringing the people home, to the
6 extent we can, because, as we all know, many spouses
7 are now working in the military. It's easier I think
8 -- I think -- for most of them to get jobs back here
9 than to get jobs in Germany. It's also easier if,
10 like the Marines, the Army can begin to have
11 concentrations of bases in one part of the country.

12 You can hope to spend a good part of your
13 career in that general area. I think the Marines
14 benefit in terms of their morale, in terms of their
15 families, from knowing that they are often going to
16 wind up either around Camp Lejeune or Camp Pendleton,
17 or somewhere in those vicinities of North Carolina and
18 Southern California.

19 The Army obviously can never be quite that
20 consolidated, but I still think that model is not bad.

21 And as we all know, the Army is moving in this
22 direction already, hoping to give people the ability
23 to stay in one general base vicinity for six or seven
24 years. I think that's a good idea, and I think
25 bringing some forces home from Germany may contribute

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to that effort at the margin. But only at the margin,
2 because, again, people in Germany are really not
3 unhappy to be there.

4 And so it has less to do with the troops
5 being happy and less to do with the troops being with
6 their families. They are already doing just fine in
7 Germany on those scores, but the spouses may have an
8 easier time getting jobs back home, and it may be
9 easier to keep people in one part of the country for
10 six, seven, eight years at a stretch, which I think is
11 a good part of General Schoomaker's current quality of
12 life initiative in the Army that your plan has to
13 somehow try to support if possible.

14 MR. SPENCER: I would just add that it's
15 obviously very important that you -- the families come
16 with the soldiers, and airmen, marines, and sailors.
17 That said, I think it -- because it's politically
18 popular, because it's the right thing to do, generally
19 speaking these initiatives can go far.

20 Now, it's important that we keep talking
21 about it, because if we quit talking about it they can
22 recede. But I think the balance is pretty good right
23 now that the politicians and the policymakers tend to
24 put quality of life issues, especially because of some
25 of the readiness problems from the '90s, these quality

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of life issues remain -- continue to be a rather high
2 priority.

3 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Thank you, Mr.
4 Chairman.

5 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

6 Commissioner Taylor?

7 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. O'Hanlon, you --
8 and we have talked a good deal about the problems with
9 rotational forces and the impact it might have on
10 families and other aspects, and especially -- and I'm
11 speaking primarily about Europe right now.

12 And let's turn to the military value of
13 the forces in Europe. Could you and others talk about
14 the plan, as you understand it right now, and the
15 forces that -- and we'll use what you outlined there a
16 few moments ago -- the Stryker brigade there, and the
17 two divisions coming home, and an Airborne brigade in
18 Italy, and possibly a rotation of forces in Eastern
19 Europe. Is that adequate to deal with regional
20 threats in that area or where they might deploy to?

21 MR. O'HANLON: Thank you, sir. I would
22 say the following. In terms of the new bases in
23 Eastern Europe, I see them primarily for two reasons.

24 One is as airfield staging bases to get to Central
25 Asia or perhaps other regions, and then, secondly, to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bring in the new NATO members into a more full
2 membership, higher NATO standards of interoperability,
3 to let them work with our military and bring them up.

4 And we all know Poland is contributing a
5 great deal now in Iraq, and other new members have
6 really tried to help out. And we should try to
7 encourage that, not as punishment for the old members,
8 but as encouragement to the new members, and I think
9 we have an opportunity.

10 So I don't think bases in these parts of
11 the world are going to be all that useful for most
12 purposes. But as staging airfields and as joint
13 exercise training grounds, I think they can help.

14 In terms of Central and -- Germany, in
15 particular, but also Britain and Italy and Spain, I
16 tend to think that we're right to leave most of the
17 airfields alone. I don't think we have so much
18 excessive airfield capacity in Europe that we want to
19 bring a lot of it home. There might be an argument
20 for bringing a squadron or two of TAC fighters; I'm
21 not sure. Because the main argument for having that
22 capability is really not to defend against the threat
23 to Europe, I think it's really to do, again, joint
24 exercises and training with our major allies.

25 So I would evaluate the proposals mostly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in those terms, but then the big airfields in Germany
2 of course are useful ways to get supplies to the
3 Middle East region. And we should definitely want to
4 protect those assets, so that I feel strongly about
5 keeping.

6 In terms of the Army ground forces, I
7 think I agree with General Meigs' point that I --
8 again, I saw it quoted in the paper. I didn't see him
9 write a longer essay, so I'd be curious to know
10 exactly what his more detailed argument is. But the
11 basic point being, again, joint exercises and joint
12 training require people, and they require people in
13 the vicinity all the time, because to bring people
14 from the States is a huge effort.

15 You can do it here and then, now and
16 again, but if you want to do a lot of joint exercises
17 with these very important allies, you do need to have
18 some capability permanently in Europe I think. And so
19 General Meigs did make me think perhaps there's an
20 argument to keep one heavy brigade still in Germany,
21 not because of any threat to Germany, but because of
22 this interoperability transformation, joint exercise,
23 joint training issue.

24 And the Stryker brigade -- I like that
25 idea, because it gives our European allies the message

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we've got to keep getting more expeditionary as an
2 alliance. As Jack pointed out, they haven't done
3 enough of this themselves. They've got a huge
4 standing set of armies and very little ability to
5 deploy. Part of the reason is lack of strategic lift.

6 Part of the reason is the wrong mind-set. Part of
7 the reason may be somewhat wrong forces.

8 And I think the Stryker brigade can help
9 push them a little bit, at the margin at least, to a
10 more expeditionary philosophy. But that's the way I
11 would evaluate each of these things, somewhat
12 different philosophies for the air bases in Eastern
13 Europe, for the air bases in Central Europe, for the
14 TAC air in Central Europe, for the Army forces.

15 For every one I think you need a separate
16 set of arguments, but the overlapping point is it's
17 not the threat to Europe itself that really motivates
18 any of this. It's issues like staging, joint
19 exercises, interoperability, and keeping the alliance
20 a cohesive fighting force for operations outside of
21 Europe.

22 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Right. And that's
23 what I was referring to. Other comments from you, Mr.
24 Korb? Dr. Korb?

25 DR. KORB: I can see no strategic,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 economic reason for bringing home the two divisions in
2 Europe. I'm on record of saying that, in fact, in the
3 summer of 2003. I wrote an editorial in The New York
4 Times exactly about that. In fact, I know it must
5 have gotten General Jones' attention, because his
6 public affairs guy called me as I was checking out at
7 the Giant. And I'm trying to, you know, see my bill
8 there, and the guy is calling all the way from Europe.
9 I said, "Oh, no, no, we're not going to do anything
10 like that." Well, I think we did.

11 I have not seen -- and the point I'd like
12 to make is the burden of proof is on those who want to
13 change what seems to be working well, and I would also
14 point out some of the writings of Professor Kagan at
15 West Point -- and I urge you to take a look at that --
16 has made a lot of these similar arguments that I have
17 made.

18 In fact, I've -- I mean, I haven't been
19 influenced by a General, but just, you know, somebody
20 at the Social Science Department at West Point,
21 because I really think in terms of the threats to our
22 security, where you want to go, the overall good of
23 our relations with Europe as well as cost
24 considerations, it doesn't make any sense.

25 Now, if you want to put a Stryker brigade

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and, you know, change that or change the composition
2 of one of those divisions, that's another issue. But
3 I really don't -- and one of the things that I think
4 to me is very concerned -- when I went to Iraq in
5 November as part of one of these trips that Secretary
6 Rumsfeld had -- I think Mike went on one as well --
7 when I was eating with the troops from the 1st Armored
8 Division, their main concern is, "Where are we going?
9 Are we going back to Europe? We're reading all of
10 this stuff."

11 I wonder what in the heck is happening to
12 the 1st ID now when they're over there and they read
13 this type of thing, because in the fine print of 2006
14 is when I understand this starts. So I think that
15 that's just sort of something somebody should have
16 considered before making this announcement.

17 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Mr. Spencer?

18 MR. SPENCER: There's one thing to keep in
19 mind I think is that in Western Europe you have a lot
20 of the same growing environmental regulation problems,
21 a lot of the same growing population problems. That's
22 putting limits on the ability to train. You can't do
23 -- there's a lot of limits on live fire training,
24 nighttime helicopter flying, tracked vehicle training,
25 and what is happening is that European countries are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 now going to Eastern Europe.

2 The Western European countries are also
3 going to Eastern Europe to train. So you have a lot
4 more training opportunities in Eastern Europe, and you
5 have the seas, the mountains. You have a lot of
6 different terrain. You have more flexibility in
7 training, joint training because the -- like I said,
8 the Western countries are coming over there.

9 So I think that, operationally, military
10 value-wise, it does make sense to create an
11 infrastructure in place for that training. And why
12 not just stay there in some capacity if it's in
13 everyone's interest to do so.

14 I also would suggest that if we see these
15 trends around the world, different kinds of threats,
16 we're talking about the need for flexibility. It's
17 true that we've not run into a situation that we've
18 not been able to respond to yet. So it seems like
19 it's working well.

20 I would argue that you don't wait until
21 it's not working well to make the change, that as you
22 see these trends emerging if we think we're going to
23 need more spartan bases, if we think we're going to
24 have to have an infrastructure that supports a long-
25 range force, why don't we start implementing some of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 those things now rather than wait until maybe it's too
2 late.

3 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay. As a follow-
4 on to a comment you made earlier about a capabilities-
5 based force located in Kansas that could maybe be as
6 effective in projecting power as it would be forward
7 station, as long as it possibly wasn't in the right
8 place, I didn't quite understand your strategy for
9 getting it there.

10 When you were asked about strategic lift,
11 I didn't hear you talking about a drastic increase in
12 that. How do you get that capability? How do you get
13 the capabilities in the right place to do the job
14 that's expected?

15 MR. SPENCER: Sure. Well, first, let me
16 preface what I'm saying with, it's not a matter of
17 just having the ability to project power globally
18 because you can. It's a matter of you might be faced
19 with the instance that you have to, that you're not
20 able to use your TAC air, you're not able to put in
21 your aircraft carriers. So you have to have some
22 alternative to that.

23 How do you get it there? Well, that
24 depends on what you're getting there. Bombers are --
25 we are not investing any money in bombers in this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 country right now, yet it's bombers that put the vast
2 majority of bombs on targets in any of the wars that
3 we fight. We're going to invest something on the
4 order of \$300 billion in tactical air over the next 30
5 years to buy 4,000 tactical fighters.

6 During that same timeframe, we're going to
7 be flying the same B-52 bombers that Slim Pickens got
8 down on in Dr. Strangelove. So I think that's a
9 problem, whenever you look at evolving technologies,
10 when you look at what we're using.

11 Another point is that technology allows us
12 to project far greater power with far less mass. So
13 it's a whole lot easier to apply that larger amount of
14 military power. At least hopefully it will be at that
15 future point than it is today. So you need less
16 strategic lift to get that same number of -- that same
17 amount of power into a theater somewhere.

18 Now, specifically, how do you do that? I
19 don't know all the answers on how to do that. I think
20 that we need to invest greater amounts of money in
21 bombers. I think we need to invest greater amounts of
22 money in space-based sensing, things like space-based
23 radar, these sorts of things, which will allow us to
24 hit targets from far away.

25 I think that we need to look into the sea-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 basing issue. That's another way to do this. These
2 rotational -- these bases that we're here talking
3 about today that are more spartan and more spread out
4 in nature is a way to do that that -- you move your
5 forces into there, then surge them and move forward
6 from that point.

7 So it's any combination of these things.
8 I don't have the answer. I'm not saying we need 100
9 of this certain plane to carry this many brigades to
10 that point. It's got to be different than that.
11 That's what transformation is about. It's about
12 bringing in new capabilities using information
13 technology to allow you to apply that military
14 technology over long distances.

15 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Dr. Korb, did you
16 have another comment?

17 DR. KORB: Well, I think if you're taking
18 a look at where we spend our money in defense, one of
19 the things that I am concerned about is this rush to
20 deploy a national missile defense system and spend
21 over \$10 billion a year on it. We were spending more
22 on that than the entire Coast Guard, and I'm more
23 worried about something coming in in a container than
24 I am somebody shooting a missile with a return
25 address.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And I do think -- and Michael and I have
2 said already -- you need more ground troops if you're
3 going to continue what you're doing in Iraq and
4 Afghanistan. We haven't gotten to it yet, but you've
5 got to change the active/reserve mix in the Army.
6 You've got far too many capabilities in the Guard and
7 the Reserve that you use an awful lot.

8 And as General Helmly, though, as the head
9 of the Army Reserves says, "You should not call up
10 somebody for more than one year out of every four or
11 five if you want to keep that man or woman in the
12 Guard and Reserves." So I think that that's a
13 critical thing that you've got to take a look at,
14 because you've got things like military police, civil
15 affairs, engineers. The majority of these are in the
16 Guard and Reserve, and you can't keep calling them up
17 and keep them on for long periods of time.

18 So, I mean, those are the things I think
19 that you need to take a look at. I think with the --
20 if you're looking at building aircraft, the F-22 is a
21 terrific plane, but I don't think you're going to need
22 that many of them, given the fact that we already have
23 got a very good air superiority as it is. And I think
24 the Joint Strike Fighter, which you can get at a more
25 reasonable cost, will enable us to maintain that air

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 superiority.

2 Now, to go back to the point I made
3 before, I think you need to keep transforming, and,
4 yes, make it lighter, more flexible, particularly with
5 your projection forces. But don't forget that at some
6 point you're going to need boots on the ground,
7 because it's not just Iraq and Afghanistan, if you
8 don't want to have failed states in other parts of the
9 world that could become a haven for terrorists, at
10 some point you may have to put forces in the ground on
11 there to prevent that from happening.

12 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Go ahead.

13 MR. O'HANLON: My colleagues have covered
14 it pretty well. I was going to talk specifically
15 about the nuance differences between Kansas and
16 Germany for ground troops. But you're very familiar
17 with that. I think that they are actually both pretty
18 good places from which to deploy. We can spend a lot
19 of time talking about the slight advantages of one
20 over the other, but bottom line we have a nice
21 position to be in.

22 Those are both good places to be if you're
23 trying to deploy ground forces, especially if you have
24 the infrastructure that both Kansas and Germany have
25 to get to the ports, and if you have the fast sealift

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that we have in increasing amounts today.

2 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Gentlemen, I thank
4 you. I want to say that I think -- and I know I speak
5 for all the Commissioners when I say that your
6 contributions are invaluable to this Commission. I
7 think we're about halfway through our questions. What
8 we'd like to do is have you back again, if you'd
9 consider that. We'd love to have this panel back
10 again at a future hearing, and I think at that time
11 we'll have more questions in addition to some that
12 we've already prepared.

13 So I know Dr. Korb has got a commitment,
14 so I -- I really appreciate your participation on this
15 Commission.

16 We're going to adjourn now until about
17 1:30, and I thank you all very much.

18 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the
19 foregoing matter went off the record at
20 12:46 p.m. and went back on the record at
21 1:35 p.m.)

22 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Good afternoon.

23 Before I introduce you, I would just -- I
24 keep putting my book over my button here, turning my
25 microphone off, so excuse me.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I'd like to describe the procedure for
2 today's hearing, and each panelist will receive up to
3 10 minutes for an opening statement. And at the
4 conclusion of those statements, then the Commissioners
5 will each have up to 10 minutes to ask questions.

6 We'll use the lights only as a courtesy
7 reminder. So when the yellow light comes on, you have
8 two minutes remaining. And when the red light
9 appears, time has expired, but please finish any
10 thoughts or statements that you are making.

11 Our third panel will focus on family
12 issues. From the National Military Family
13 Association, we will hear from Joyce Wessel Raezer,
14 Director of Government Relations. And from the
15 Military Child Education Coalition, Dr. Mary Keller,
16 Executive Director.

17 So if one of you would want to start with
18 an opening statement, please.

19 MS. RAEZER: It looks like I'm elected.

20 Mr. Chairman and members of the
21 Commission, National Military Family Association
22 thanks you for this opportunity to provide some input
23 concerning potential changes in the basing of U.S.
24 forces overseas and their effect on the quality of
25 life of military service members and families.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 I do have to state that NMFA does not have
2 a position on whether or not downsizing should occur,
3 or how or where troops should be based. Our interest
4 in this discussion is in raising awareness of the
5 imperative that military family and quality of life
6 issues must be considered by policymakers early in the
7 decision-making process and the implementation of any
8 rebasing or transformation plans.

9 Our written statement, which we have
10 submitted for the record, highlights some of those
11 concerns. It is based on our Association's long-time
12 close observation of military quality of life issues
13 and on put we receive from military family members,
14 family support providers, and from our worldwide
15 network of volunteer NMFA representatives, most of
16 whom are military spouses.

17 Today I'm going to highlight a few key
18 points based on our observations, and also based on
19 some of this morning's discussion about how best to
20 ease the disruptions to families during any rebasing
21 initiative.

22 The first point is quality of life issues
23 that affect service members and families must be
24 brought to the table early in the planning process and
25 considered on an equal basis with other mission-

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 related tasks. And I thank you for allowing this
2 opportunity to discuss this issue so early in your
3 process.

4 The quality of life infrastructure needed
5 to support families includes housing, quality schools,
6 child and youth programs, morale welfare, recreation
7 facilities and programs, family centers, chaplains
8 programs, and medical care. Policymakers must
9 understand that sustaining this infrastructure, which
10 includes people, programs, and facilities, cannot be
11 done as an afterthought.

12 Point number two -- look both ways.
13 Planning must include the preservation of quality of
14 life programs, services, and facilities at closing
15 installations, as long as families remain, and the
16 development of a robust quality of life infrastructure
17 at the receiving installation. And this
18 infrastructure must be in place before the new
19 families and service members arrive.

20 Number three, don't expect you can take
21 care of families on the cheap. Ensuring availability
22 of quality of life programs, services, and facilities
23 at both closing and receiving installations, and
24 easing families' transition from one to another, will
25 take additional funding, personnel, and facilities.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 DoD must program in the costs of family
2 support and quality of life as part of its
3 calculations from the beginning, ask for the resources
4 it needs, and then allocate them. Don't just program
5 in the cost of a new runway or tank maintenance
6 facility. Also add the cost of a new child
7 development center or possibly new schools.

8 Number four, planning must be coordinated.

9 Many offices, commands, activities, and agencies have
10 a piece of the quality of life puzzle. No one owns
11 the whole thing. They must work together to ensure
12 there are no gaps in the provision of essential
13 services. The need for coordination and partnerships
14 was a key lesson learned from earlier downsizing
15 efforts in Europe.

16 NMFA's written statement discusses the
17 problems that emerged when key military medical and
18 mental health personnel were removed from European
19 communities, leaving school nurses as the first option
20 for medical care and high school guidance counselors
21 as the only counseling resource in many small
22 communities.

23 Number five, information is key. Families
24 must be assured that the quality of life programs and
25 facilities will remain in place and be adequately

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 staffed and resourced for as long as families remain
2 at installations to be closed. They also need to know
3 the timeline for closure, and any other changes.

4 European communities have been dealing
5 with rumors about base closure for several years --
6 rumors that installations would be closing fast or
7 that families of deployed service members would be
8 moved back to CONUS installations while the service
9 members were still deployed.

10 NMFA is now concerned by reports from
11 families that several communities in Europe are
12 experiencing decline in the participation in community
13 activities, because family members and family support
14 providers seem so resigned to the eventual closing of
15 the installation that they say, "What's the use?"

16 Says one spouse that talked to us, "The
17 one thing I would like to see is the leadership
18 telling us what is going on and keep things in place.

19 Just because we're leaving in two to four years does
20 not mean we are leaving tomorrow, so programs
21 shouldn't stop. If something is to go away, please
22 have a plan on what is leaving and how you're going to
23 phase it out. Work up to that date. Just don't stop
24 because we're leaving."

25 Number six, in the eyes of today's family

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 force, school issues could make or break the success
2 of rebasing initiatives. Our military force today is
3 an educated force that cares deeply about the
4 education of its children. Military members will be
5 angry if they think their children's education is
6 being short-changed in any effort to modernize the
7 force structure.

8 As Dr. Keller of MCEC will note, there are
9 many issues affecting whether or not a child and
10 family has a successful transition from one school to
11 another. NMFA's written statement contains a
12 discussion of many of those issues as well, including
13 school staffing, coordination between sending and
14 receiving schools, parent information, maintaining
15 strong partnerships between commanders, schools, and
16 parents, identifying the financial impact on receiving
17 schools, and ensuring that DoD does its part to
18 mitigate that financial impact.

19 Relations between the DoD schools and
20 their military communities hit a low after the last
21 major downsizing in Europe. It took some stateside
22 districts several years after the last overseas
23 downsizing to complete necessary construction projects
24 to eliminate the rows and rows of portable classrooms.

25 General Williams this morning referenced

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 school funding and capacity issues. That solving
2 these issues can be difficult, costly, and
3 contentious, is borne out by recent experiences at
4 installations undergoing housing privatization and
5 some of the early movements associated with Army
6 transformation.

7 DoD must be prepared to supplement local
8 resources if civilian schools cannot adequately
9 prepare for the influx of new military children. It
10 must work with the districts and with Congress to
11 develop a comprehensive funding plan to ensure that
12 all schools receiving additional students -- and that
13 includes DoD schools -- have the resources they need
14 to provide a quality education for both their current
15 students and the new arrivals. The resources must be
16 in place before the children arrive.

17 For the good of the families, we must
18 ensure that the effective partnerships now existing in
19 many military communities between commanders, school
20 officials, and parents, and the spirit that created
21 them, are nurtured during the downsizing, so that
22 schools do not become a source of frustration for
23 military families.

24 Number seven, overseas basing changes will
25 not occur in a vacuum. While lessons learned in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 previous overseas initiatives can guide many
2 activities to support families this time around, we
3 must remember that the world in which the American
4 overseas downsizing occurred a decade ago no longer
5 exists.

6 Troop movements and installation closings
7 and realignments today occur against a backdrop of the
8 ongoing war on terror and a heavy deployment schedule.

9 Deployment and force protection issues have had a
10 significant impact on the quality of life for families
11 in Europe. Look for even more issues when folks --
12 when forces based in Korea deploy to Iraq soon.

13 Yes, living overseas can be enjoyable for
14 families. But families tell us -- and most recently
15 they told us as we prepared this document, the report
16 on military family support since 9/11 -- families told
17 us that having the service member deployed from
18 overseas is more problematic than if they were
19 stateside.

20 The management of permanent change of
21 station moves into and out of overseas locations from
22 -- and from one installation to another within those
23 locations must be watched carefully as installations
24 begin to close. Watching an installation empty out
25 and shut down can be demoralizing, more so if their

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 experience is repeated at another location.

2 The experience is even more disheartening
3 if it is coupled with a deployment or the threat of
4 deployment. Supporting families during a deployment
5 and easing the transitions that occur when an
6 installation has to absorb families from elsewhere
7 requires a great deal of focus. It is unfair to
8 communities to have them to endure these challenges
9 simultaneously without extra support.

10 Changes in military health care delivery
11 and the construction and operation of military family
12 housing will also have an impact on the ability of a
13 CONUS installation to absorb large numbers of service
14 members and families returning from overseas.
15 Increasing visibility of issues such as the smooth
16 transition of military children, and a military
17 spouse's ability to pursue a career, mean that more
18 family members will expect their leadership to provide
19 additional support in these areas.

20 Army transformation is already having an
21 impact at some CONUS installations. That impact on
22 schools, housing, and health care could be devastating
23 to the quality of life of the entire community if DoD
24 sends families from overseas without first ensuring
25 capacity still exists to absorb them.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 For example, services must reevaluate
2 their local housing surveys to determine if community
3 can support service members' and families' housing
4 needs. Their solution to an installation housing
5 shortage should not be just to extend the acceptable
6 drive time radius to the installation.

7 The services must ensure the medical
8 infrastructure is in place at receiving installations
9 to support the influx of service members and families
10 and provide timely access to care for all
11 beneficiaries, including retirees and their family
12 members. That sufficient health care resources are
13 available must be -- in a community must be confirmed
14 before any decision is made to send more service
15 members and families to that location.

16 Any move is disruptive to the family.
17 Watch -- oh, I already did that. I'm sorry. Okay.

18 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Please take the
19 time you need. Don't be distracted by the red light.

20 MS. RAEZER: As the discussion happened
21 this morning, I added some things, and that's why I
22 have to get my story straight.

23 Okay. That was just -- that was the point
24 I wanted to make. It's just there are a lot of things
25 going on in the environment, and we have to be careful

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 about how all of this plays together.

2 The last point is remember that every
3 proposal on how to change the basing of forces
4 overseas will have advantages and disadvantages, and,
5 if implemented, unintended consequences. No good deed
6 goes unpunished.

7 Keeping all of the affected parties
8 informed, eliminating service and program stovepipes
9 to create partnerships, identifying and allocating
10 resources early, and accepting responsibility at the
11 highest level for ensuring the quality of life of
12 military personnel and their families, will pay off.

13 Whatever proposal is adopted, even if the
14 decision is made to change nothing in the basing
15 structure, there will be family support needs that
16 will exist. And these family support needs will
17 continue to change over time. Families are asking
18 questions about the overseas basing and the idea of
19 putting more bases in Eastern Europe. They are very
20 concerned about this, and we can talk about that in
21 the questions if you'd like.

22 The challenge with all of these proposals
23 will be in understanding how different responses are
24 needed to meet those family needs.

25 Thank you.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Dr. Keller?

2 DR. KELLER: Mr. Chairman, Commissioners,
3 I'm so glad to be here today to talk about children on
4 behalf of the Military Child Education Coalition. We
5 are a private, nonprofit organization that serve as
6 advocates for the educational needs of military
7 children whose parents are devoting their talent,
8 skills, and lives to our nation.

9 The MCEC's goal is to level the
10 educational playing field for the military child
11 wherever they are located around the world, and as an
12 outgrowth develop effective models addressing the
13 educational needs of other mobile students.

14 On behalf of the leadership and the entire
15 community, thank you so much for the opportunity to
16 talk about military children and the serious discourse
17 that is surrounding your decisions. Though the
18 Military Child Education Coalition should not, and
19 does not, take a position on the efficacy of the
20 current overseas basing initiative, we recognize and
21 appreciate that there are many complexities that
22 require serious attention and deliberation.

23 The Military Child Education Coalition
24 does appreciate this opportunity to contribute,
25 especially to talk about how this impacts and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 potentially impacts children and their educational
2 experiences. Our views on the implication and
3 potential consequences that might be forecast for
4 school-age children as a result of the reorganization
5 and repositioning of troops from overseas to CONUS are
6 based on solid research, professional experience, and
7 first-hand knowledge.

8 At MCEC, we start and end with a focus on
9 the child. This truly is a tough time for the
10 military parent. As Joyce said in her testimony, and
11 we absolutely agree, that we need to take a look at
12 the amplified issues that their very mobile children
13 face because of the parents' career.

14 Precisely because their parents are
15 serving our nation, the military child has a life of
16 transition. It is punctuated by separation. Moving
17 and changing schools every two to three years is a
18 challenge at any grade, but especially for the
19 students in high school.

20 A student from a military family is
21 destined to face school transitions regardless of our
22 current or future basing strategies. The question is
23 how to prepare the systems and respond in a way that
24 lessens the expected collateral effects of increased
25 turbulence as a result of the force restructuring.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 By the time the school bell rings this
2 coming Tuesday, across our nation and across the
3 world, military children, like their civilian
4 classmates, will participate in a great gift in our
5 American heritage, and this is the privilege of an
6 education.

7 Seventy percent of school-age children
8 from full-time active duty military families are
9 attending public schools in the United States. This
10 translates to a student population of about 600
11 children in classrooms that are located in over 600
12 public school districts here in the United States.

13 There are also other military children in
14 areas that are isolated from installations, which
15 brings the estimated school district numbers up to
16 about 800. Of course, with the mobilization of the
17 Guard and Reserve forces, the number rises
18 exponentially. But their challenges, while very real,
19 are somewhat different and not the subject of this
20 discourse.

21 Less than 15 percent, or 100,000 students,
22 attend the Department of Defense schools. The
23 stateside DoDEA schools, or DoDDS, have a total K-12
24 population of about 30,000, where overseas there is
25 about 70,000 students. The remaining 15 percent, or

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 100,000 students, are in private schools, parochial
2 schools, host nation schools, and about six to nine
3 percent -- it's actually a very hard number to get
4 hold of -- are home-schooled.

5 Faced with a potential for significant
6 changes for families, as well as the impact these
7 changes will have on the child, the Military Child
8 Education Coalition believes that decision-makers at
9 the national, state, installation, and school levels
10 should consider these fundamentals for the sake of
11 each child.

12 Number one, communication is the key.
13 Plan ahead and give notice as soon as possible to
14 families and installations at both the sending and
15 receiving school systems. Fast growth school systems
16 are able to respond effectively to student needs when
17 they have the time possible to assess and plan
18 appropriately.

19 Partnerships become even more important.
20 Military and school communities at the local level, at
21 both sending and receiving locations, must establish
22 effective and collaborative systems and set up working
23 groups to address this, to organize actions and deal
24 with challenges as they arise.

25 Changing student populations affect the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 quality of life for everyone at both the sending and
2 receiving side. So clear information is essential.
3 Advanced notification and planning must include
4 military youth and family programs and other
5 installation youth and child services as well as
6 community services, such as Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts,
7 youth clubs, YMCAs, that respond to the needs of
8 families and take care of children.

9 Given that this rebasing initiative will
10 be disruptive for families, it is vital that they
11 receive as much advance information as possible,
12 resources as well as support. The message is that the
13 vast majority of military parents, like all other
14 parents, want to see their children do well.

15 Given the tools and the opportunity, a
16 military parent can be the best partner throughout
17 either the exit or the entry phase of the transition
18 experience. In order to bridge this transition and
19 transform it eventually into the promise of a more
20 stable school experience for children, it must be a
21 shared responsibility that includes parents, schools,
22 and communities.

23 I can speak to this beyond a hypothetical.
24 So let me share some personal and professional
25 experience.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Both in my career as a public school
2 educator and my service as the Executive Director of
3 MCEC, I spent 21 years as a public school educator, 16
4 years as an Assistant Superintendent, the last eight
5 years in the Killeen Independent School District in
6 Texas that served the children of the Fort Hood area.

7 In 1992, we helped Fort Hood move a 13,000
8 strong division from Fort Polk. This meant that the
9 Killeen schools brought thousands of additional
10 students in in one year. In a strong partnership with
11 Fort Hood and the community, we planned months in
12 advance of the move. We connected frequently with
13 Leesville, Louisiana schools and made personal visits
14 to Fort Polk. We planned in a very large scale for
15 classrooms, for school resources, and instructional
16 materials.

17 We hired teachers and administrators. We
18 shared information and planned for children with
19 special needs. We answered family questions and
20 concerns. We did everything that we possibly could
21 do, as did Fort Hood, as did the sending school, and
22 it was still not perfect. And 500 miles separate Fort
23 Polk and Fort Hood, and it was not easy.

24 What happens when students come is that
25 the plan gets the reality test. The real school

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 examples are that classrooms have to be shifted,
2 teachers reassigned because one grade level is over
3 projection and one under. Facilities have to be
4 reevaluated. This requires precision and patience as
5 well as creative problem-solving and compassion.

6 What I learned from my years as an
7 Assistant Superintendent and an Area Superintendent,
8 in a large fast growth school district, has now only
9 been seasoned and reinforced on the global scale in my
10 position as Executive Director of MCEC. In the past
11 four years, I have been in these schools. I have
12 worked with dedicated teachers and military commanders
13 in communities all over this country.

14 Their professionalism and the sense of
15 purpose are inspiring. In every situation, schools
16 and military communities are working together to take
17 care of children, given the natural challenges of the
18 school year, and the amplified challenges and
19 heartbreak of wartime.

20 Given the complexities and the stressors
21 to people and systems, no matter what, all is possible
22 if we never lose sight that this is about the kids.
23 We know that this reorganization is unprecedented in
24 scope, and it's a huge undertaking for the
25 institutions. Yet it's personal for a family. "It's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 my baby," says a mom.

2 What are some of the methods and means to
3 ameliorate the challenges for the potential transition
4 of the estimated over 35,000 to 45,000 K-12 students?

5 In order to make this easier, it is important to
6 identify as much as possible those receiving schools,
7 those receiving areas. The use of technology can play
8 a critical role. We talk more about this in the
9 written statement.

10 With interactive technology, schools and
11 families can immediately connect. Not only is it
12 important for a child to get records, it is important
13 for a family to know someone.

14 Secondly, there are proven tested programs
15 that already exist that train school and military
16 professionals to help military students with
17 transitions. To give you one recent example is the
18 Student-2-Student Program that the Army, in
19 partnership with MCEC, has just launched.

20 Why is this important? Because if you're
21 in high school and you're moving, you care who you're
22 going to eat lunch with. You care if you're going to
23 have friends. A student enters and leaves a high
24 school and wants to know, does someone care about me?

25 They also want to be successful academically.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In addition to planning for teachers'
2 textbooks and resources, it's necessary to set up an
3 environment that also takes care of the high stakes
4 accountability systems that are in place. Even more
5 than before, the No Child Left Behind requirements --
6 most states have served military children, have had
7 high stakes testing.

8 What this means is that a student must
9 pass an exam or a series of exams to get course credit
10 or to promote or to graduate from high school. The
11 DoDEA system has a well-articulated academic standards
12 and accountability system, but like those of each
13 state it is unique to that system. Students must
14 learn how to move, understanding what the academic
15 requirements are.

16 This will help it be less frustrating and
17 confusing and the transition less overwhelming.
18 Preparedness is our main message to you. This is a
19 complex thing where you're moving from a single school
20 system to a broad, diverse dispersion of U.S. public
21 schools, and it will require a multi-phased and
22 practical plan.

23 Given sufficient notice, states can also
24 do their part. So what we're asking is for everyone
25 to pay attention, that this is going to require

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 planning and planning together in a very large scale.

2 Thank you.

3 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

4 Just a couple of comments before we start
5 our questioning. The first would be that I understand
6 your sensitivity to forming an opinion on
7 transformation and what might happen and might not
8 happen. But I guess I would ask frankness in your
9 answers in regard to how those changes will affect,
10 you know, not just generally but little -- maybe a
11 little more specifically.

12 The other thing I would add is that I
13 don't think you'll speak to a group that probably is
14 more supportive of what you're doing than this group.

15 I mean, I believe everyone up here understands the
16 importance of the family to the military.

17 And I'm sure that, you know, all of us
18 have a history in regard to supporting military
19 families and understand the importance of a soldier,
20 sailor, or airmen being out there and not having to be
21 concerned about how their family is being cared for.
22 So we're here to help you in that regard.

23 The first question I would ask, and you
24 both sort of touched on it in regard to education, but
25 I would like to ask possibly other issues that might

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have been learned from previous downsizing and
2 restructuring that would affect families. I mean, was
3 it lodging? There has to be other things that --
4 housing, other issues that you might want to address
5 other than just education, not that education is not
6 important, but I'm wondering what other issues are out
7 there.

8 MS. RAEZER: Well, I'll start. I think
9 that -- I referenced a couple of the big ones, housing
10 and medical care, along with a whole family --
11 maintaining the whole family support structure as long
12 as families are in a location and making sure that
13 that structure is at capacity to handle the influx
14 when they come to another installation.

15 In earlier downsizings, and BRAC as well,
16 there was often a lag time between the provision of
17 services -- between the arrival of families and the
18 full provision of services. And reference two areas
19 where I think this time around that's even more
20 critical that we begin planning earlier because of the
21 changes in the way the military now does housing and
22 the way the military now does health care.

23 We didn't have TRICARE during the first
24 big downsizing. We now have TRICARE. We have a
25 military medical system that is stretched very, very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 thin to take of all the deployment-related needs --
2 the deployment-related needs, and that's the
3 deployment of military medical personnel overseas with
4 the troops as well as mobilizing all of those Guard
5 and Reserve members.

6 So we have a system that depends on the
7 military health -- the direct care system, the
8 military hospitals, for the first line of care,
9 supplemented with civilian providers out in the
10 neighborhood. But that provider mix for a family
11 audience -- a family beneficiary pool is very
12 different from, say, a retiree beneficiary pool. You
13 need more OB/GYNs, you need more pediatricians, you
14 need more family practice folks.

15 It may take some time to get those either
16 at the military hospitals or in the civilian networks.

17 So the lesson learned is we've got to have those in
18 place first.

19 The other issue was housing. We had some
20 folks coming to some installations, being on very,
21 very long waiting lists, either told don't bring your
22 family, send your family to grandma until we can find
23 housing for you here at your new installation, or your
24 only option is to live very far away from the
25 installation and to commute. And then that makes it a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lot more difficult for the family to access support
2 services, like commissaries, family centers. So it
3 puts a lot of difficulty.

4 The housing pool on installations in a lot
5 of places is even smaller than it was then, because
6 what the military has done to its credit in the last
7 few years is tear down a lot of the old housing. They
8 are replacing it in a lot of places with newer, bigger
9 housing, but not always on a one-to-one basis.

10 So we are watching this very closely. We
11 see some problems already emerging with some of the
12 areas where the Army is changing its brigade
13 structure. We've been told by family support folks at
14 Fort Drum, New York, for example, that they're
15 expecting families and they're telling them they may
16 have to live in Syracuse, which is about 70 miles away
17 from New York, and not a real quality of life trip in
18 the cold in New York.

19 So I think the lesson was have these
20 services in place, and we need to make sure we learn
21 -- we've learned that lesson.

22 DR. KELLER: Fifty percent of the kids are
23 below age 7, and so what that means is there is a huge
24 issue about child care, quality child care. That is
25 absolutely essentially important for families.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So that, you know, really ripples out into
2 the community, and I'm talking about between infant
3 care and also child care after school. The bases do
4 not have enough spaces in their youth centers to
5 handle the child care or the after school care. So
6 that is a huge issue of itself. That does also affect
7 spouse employment and many of the things that I know
8 NMFA is very, very concerned about, and we're very,
9 very concerned about the quality of child care.

10 What we know about the experiences that
11 young children have in pre-kindergarten program, and
12 really even before that in day care programs and child
13 care programs, is that it does have a positive effect
14 on their experiences when they start school, if that
15 child care program is quality. So I'd say that number
16 one is quality child care.

17 The second thing that is very important is
18 quality community services, respite care, and medical
19 care for students that are the most handicapped
20 students, that families really need extra support.
21 And that is sometimes not available in some
22 communities, and I can tell you a story from an
23 installation where they did bring in a lot of people
24 the last time and there was a family that had a very,
25 very needy child.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And the school district was not able to
2 handle that child's very, very involved handicapping
3 conditions, and they also had to then look at
4 transporting the child an hour each way on a bus to a
5 school system that could handle it. But it isn't even
6 just during the day. I mean, some of these families
7 need respite care. So that is a huge issue, sir, that
8 really does affect the whole family.

9 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: What about -- and
10 I know in some cases there may be extended families
11 that would help with this situation. But what about
12 instances where either both members are deployed, or
13 they are single-parent families, what kind of
14 experiences have you had with that in regard to
15 rotations and mobilizations?

16 MS. RAEZER: The single-parent issue
17 complicates the family dynamic. Every dual military
18 couple and single parents have to have a family care
19 plan approved by their commander that, you know, is
20 supposed to be workable, that outlines where -- who is
21 going to take care of the child.

22 There are various ways to handle that, and
23 I know Mary has dealt with some of these cases where
24 that maybe hasn't worked as well or just has been
25 rough for the child, because sometimes the family care

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plan is that the child leaves that safe nest of the
2 installation and the school where they're used to --
3 where they have that comfort zone, and they have to
4 move with -- far away to live with grandma or Aunt
5 Susie or whoever.

6 So, but a lot of the issues facing that
7 dual military and the single parent are the same as
8 any families. Where I think we're going to see some
9 concerns as I look at some of the proposals would be
10 the proposal to have that extra deployment to those --
11 what people have called lily pad bases today.

12 Adding that extra deployment, that's just
13 one more time of family separation, which in the case
14 of single parents and dual military may be one more
15 time a child is pulled away from home to go stay with
16 someone else.

17 DR. KELLER: Just to get the scope, there
18 is 6.4 percent of the activity duty that are single
19 parents, and 2.5 percent of active duty are dual
20 military family members. Now, what we see are the
21 issues of when the child is with someone else, with a
22 family care plan, that that child also experiences
23 some extra challenges in getting that person who is
24 the caregiver involved in the school as appropriately
25 as their parent would have been involved in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 school.

2 And also, the whole issue of making sure
3 that -- again, that you're taking care of special
4 needs children, we have found that to be the most
5 amplified challenge when you have a single parent or
6 dual military parents deployed, because who
7 understands the individualized education plan if that
8 child has to go live with a grandmother or an aunt or
9 something -- someone else out of town.

10 That also sometimes means the child has to
11 move to a location that is not close to a base, and
12 that means that whoever is taking that child in
13 doesn't have the support of the family support groups
14 and other things that would help. So it is absolutely
15 a challenge for both dual military families and single
16 parents.

17 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Thank you.

18 Commissioner Martin?

19 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Thanks very much,
20 Mr. Chairman, and I certainly want to thank you both
21 for being here to give us a perspective on things that
22 we're concerned about but may not necessarily know all
23 we need to know about.

24 My first question is kind of general, and
25 it's in the current tempo, high op tempo, intensity

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 uncertainty world, let me first ask you on the active
2 component side, what are you seeing in general about
3 the pressure of deployment that has surprised you?
4 Even given your career's work that is -- something
5 that has surprised you or things that have not been
6 obvious about the pressure on the military family due
7 to the current op tempo.

8 MS. RAEZER: I think the first thing that
9 surprised me is we talk a lot about how resilient
10 families are. It has surprised me that they really
11 are as resilient as we've always said. They are doing
12 phenomenal things under very difficult circumstances.

13 So, but they are being stretched very,
14 very thin. And that doesn't surprise me. I read the
15 papers. I look at where the units are going. And, you
16 know, it's -- they are very -- they are wearing down.

17 I think the families in overseas areas dealing with
18 the deployment are wearing down faster than the
19 families at stateside installations.

20 The other thing that surprised a lot of
21 folks in the deployment-related arena is the need by
22 the non-ID car holder or family members, the parents
23 of service members, the grandparents of the military
24 children, for information and for a connection with
25 the unit and the family support structure. That has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 overwhelmed some family readiness group folks.

2 It has overwhelmed some commands, because
3 they have been getting these very, very tough
4 questions from grandparents who now have children,
5 from parents of single service members who are
6 managing the finances, taking care of the house or the
7 car or whatever, or just as long as -- just basic
8 questions about information. And that has been an
9 issue -- I think on the active side, those are some of
10 the surprises.

11 DR. KELLER: I think some of the surprises
12 that I've seen is I was actually in Washington State
13 when they turned one of the aircraft carriers around
14 and the families were waiting for the aircraft carrier
15 to come in. And the students were very excited about
16 their parents coming home, and then they went back out
17 again.

18 And I say that to highlight the
19 redeployments have been pretty tough on kids and
20 families. That has been a surprise. I think it's
21 because it's hard for them to see -- you know, kids
22 have a now and not now sense of time. When that seat
23 is empty at the dinner table every single night, you
24 know, it's really hard if you're six or you're eight
25 or you're 16, to see that this is going to get better

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 over time. And that's -- the parent that's left
2 behind is having kind of a tough time keeping that up.

3 Parents have told us that when they're by
4 themselves during deployment and a school issue arises
5 -- and I can think of, as a parent myself, you know,
6 is it good for parents to be able to double-team those
7 school issues? They don't have a backup. You know,
8 they don't have somebody to talk to to say, you know,
9 the 13-year-old is going through some things, and, you
10 know, I need a break from that, so can you take it for
11 a while and deal with it?

12 The other thing that I've been surprised
13 with is we deal with educators and train educators
14 around the world on working with military families.
15 Most educators have not had experience in the
16 military. Actually, very few, compared to the overall
17 population. They're really struggling with trying to
18 learn how to do the right things and help in a
19 meaningful way, I mean, beyond putting red, white, and
20 blue dixie cups in the -- you know, the chain link
21 fence. They want to do something meaningful.

22 So I've been surprised that as we've
23 worked with them and given them more information on
24 how to take care of the kids that they've gone even
25 beyond and done some fabulous things.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The next surprise has been when they get a
2 deployment and a move connected, so you've got a
3 school transition and a move, I've talked to a lot of
4 parents that, you know, said, "You know, I could
5 handle one or the other, but these have come at the
6 very same time. So we moved to this installation at
7 the very same time my spouse left. Matter of fact,
8 the boxes weren't even unpacked. Matter of fact, we
9 hadn't even enrolled in school yet." And sometimes
10 that's been extremely difficult for families.

11 But bottom line, I am so impressed with
12 the courage of children and the way that people are
13 encouraging the courage of children, from moms and
14 dads around the world that are hanging together, from
15 dads and moms that are deployed that are e-mailing
16 back, that are staying involved, that are working
17 hard, to those that are home.

18 But I'm also impressed with the way that
19 kids are encouraging each other. So those have been
20 my surprises.

21 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Let me just add now
22 the dimension of the reserve component for you. And
23 not exactly knowing your -- where your boundary line
24 is drawn, I'd just add the dimension of reserve
25 component deployments and potential use on rotational

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 basis, just some brief thoughts on specifically what
2 we might -- should be concerned about or worried
3 about.

4 MS. RAEZER: Well, I think for both of us
5 -- I know it happened with us, and I imagine it
6 happened with MCEC as well -- because we have military
7 family or military child in our names, when those
8 Guard or Reserve members become activated, and their
9 family members have questions, they go on the website
10 and look for military family, military child, so both
11 of us are dealing with Guard and Reserve issues, and
12 treat that they are military families.

13 And so we do a lot of work with them. Our
14 association has had to kind of -- we have had to add
15 some extra staff just to handle Guard and Reserve
16 family issues. And so they do have special
17 challenges, and a lot of the challenges come from what
18 Mary said. A lot of those educators, a lot of the
19 people in the community, have no concept about what
20 being in the military means.

21 A lot of the families don't have the
22 concept what our -- our team of volunteers who
23 researched our project noted when they talked to Guard
24 and Reserve families is that the service member may
25 think of themselves as active duty now, because they

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have been mobilized. The family still thinks of
2 themselves as Guard or Reserve. That's something you
3 kind of handle on the weekend and you don't really
4 think about, but now we have to. And they don't know
5 how to.

6 DR. KELLER: We also take care of the
7 Guard and Reserve families. There is 500,000 school-
8 age children that are the children in the Guard and
9 Reserve that are involved in all of the challenges
10 that Joyce mentioned. We call them the suddenly
11 military child, because they -- all of a sudden they
12 have to think of themselves as that.

13 The demographic is slightly older with
14 this population of students, so you have many more
15 middle school students and high school students. So
16 what we found is that you add the team transitions or
17 middle school transitions along with now you're coping
18 because a parent is deployed.

19 Joyce is exactly right. Communities are
20 struggling, schools are struggling, and we have been
21 training -- a specific type of training for
22 communities that are taking care of the Guard and
23 Reserve. Interestingly enough, sir, many teachers,
24 principals, coaches, have also been called up because
25 they are members of the Guard and Reserve.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 In that sense, we help whole schools who
2 suddenly are also affected by a key leader in their
3 community being called up. And maybe none of the
4 children in the school are military children, but the
5 favorite coach has been called up, brothers and
6 sisters as well. So siblings have been an interesting
7 and new aspect as we take care of children in the
8 Guard and Reserve.

9 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: You've led me to my
10 last question, which is the distinction, for the
11 benefit of us on the Commission, between child care
12 and child development, and what that difference means
13 on the demands on school systems, families, and the
14 entire family support, and should DoD consider
15 legislation to adapt and adopt child development
16 requirements.

17 DR. KELLER: When I speak about -- talk
18 here, I'm talking about usually, you know, a day care
19 center, a child care center, a program or a place that
20 parents can go to, or homes that parents know have
21 been certified that, you know, it's safe to take your
22 child there, so that they have a support system or
23 someone that can take care of their child after school
24 or maybe even all-day programs.

25 The child development is absolutely

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 critical, so that -- the child development is the
2 scaffolding that good child care centers are built on,
3 so that you know that they understand about taking
4 care of kids and they're not warehousing children,
5 that they -- I mean, that is why DoD standards about
6 what is appropriate child care is absolutely
7 essential. And I so appreciate you saying that.

8 And sometimes it's the transportation that
9 kids also need. So here you have a family -- you
10 know, a single parent, now she or he has to work and
11 you've got all these children, you have to go to work,
12 they also need to go to the child care center, and
13 people are overtaxed. So it can be, how do I even get
14 my child there and get them home again in an
15 appropriate time?

16 So how I interpret it is child care is a
17 program or a place, and then child development is the
18 fundamentals.

19 MS. RAEZER: One the biggest disparities
20 that exists today between the military family benefits
21 enjoyed by that active duty family who lives on the
22 installation and the active duty family who lives away
23 from the installation, or the Guard or Reserve family
24 who is now active duty family who lives away from
25 installation, is there access to high quality,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 subsidized child care?

2 If you're lucky enough to live near the
3 installation, and it has room in its child development
4 center for your child, you have access to nationally
5 accredited care at a subsidized price based on your
6 family income. If you don't, you're out on your own
7 trying to do the best you can, and you're going to
8 pick up the full tab for it.

9 Now, recent appropriations have added
10 funding for the services to help -- to start to meet
11 the needs -- the child care needs of those Guard and
12 Reserve families. It's not enough. We hear from
13 Guard and Reserve family spouses who have tremendous
14 difficulty in finding quality child care to fit around
15 their work schedules or, you know, maybe they were
16 both students and the service member and the spouse
17 traded off on child care duties. Now the spouse has
18 to take up the whole burden, spouse has to change
19 shiftwork and hope that their employer goes along with
20 it, because there is no USARA protection for military
21 spouses.

22 So this is a real -- this is I think the
23 biggest disparity. I think in a lot of ways the child
24 care access and funding issue is a bigger disparity
25 than health care, because at least those Guard and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Reserve members have TRICARE. Sometimes it's hard to
2 find that civilian provider, but they -- you know,
3 there are people who will take TRICARE, and we work
4 that. The child care issue is a lot tougher, I think.

5 COMMISSIONER MARTIN: Thank you very much
6 to both of you.

7 Mr. Chairman?

8 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Commissioner
9 Taylor?

10 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I think while the
11 overseas basing initiative -- or rebasing -- and the
12 stabilization initiative that the Army started are not
13 necessarily directly connected, the stabilization
14 initiative cannot work unless -- probably cannot work
15 unless there is some rebasing. Just the numbers don't
16 work out.

17 But that is a major institutional change.

18 Five, seven years, and at the same place. What's the
19 feedback that -- and impact on families that you're
20 hearing on both -- from a general sense and then from
21 an educational sense?

22 MS. RAEZER: The general sense first. I'm
23 hearing a lot of excitement about -- a lot of
24 questions. I think most families have picked up on
25 the same piece you have, General Taylor, that this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stabilization proposal cannot work unless we bring
2 families back from overseas, and service members back
3 from overseas.

4 And then you have the questions, well,
5 this would be -- five to seven years in one place
6 would be wonderful for -- in terms of the stability,
7 especially if you have a high school senior, but, you
8 know, they're not sure how it's going to work at the
9 level -- the level of the service member who has high
10 school students, because they're talking about -- the
11 first tour is the guarantee, so -- but it would allow
12 a military spouse to stay in one place long enough to
13 get a college degree without having to move in the
14 middle of that college career, which would be
15 wonderful, have a spouse get established in career,
16 for example.

17 Families do say, "Well, it's wonderful if
18 we could have five to seven years in a place that has
19 nice weather and good schools and lots of job
20 opportunities for spouses. It would not be so
21 wonderful if we had to spend five to seven years at an
22 installation that's in a rural area, no job
23 opportunities for spouses, and the schools have a
24 questionable reputation." So a lot of it is where
25 you're going to spend it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The other piece along with that is the
2 families still understand that the service member will
3 continue to be deployed. While the family will be
4 able to stay, put down some roots, and have a little
5 better support structure because they have those roots
6 in the community, the service member is still going to
7 be gone.

8 And families are looking at those
9 deployment schedules and they're saying, "We don't
10 want any more time. We don't want any more family
11 separation time. We -- if it's the choice between
12 stabilizing and going overseas for a couple years,
13 even if you have to move more often, we'd rather move
14 overseas with the service member a couple years and be
15 together than have a family separation."

16 The other issue that comes up in terms of
17 the stabilization is, yes, you stay at one place for
18 five, six, seven years, establish roots, build
19 connections in the community. It may be more
20 difficult to move, because you've established those
21 roots. So we will still need a family support -- we
22 will still need family support. It will just be a
23 different kind of family support.

24 DR. KELLER: The educational impact --
25 what we know from very, very good research studies,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and just really great things that have been done on
2 mobile students in general, and also the work that I
3 am submitting -- a secondary education transition
4 study -- is that mobility does impact the continuity
5 of the educational process.

6 And that can be just, for example, in
7 mathematics, because math is sequential, you can move
8 and miss multiplication. I mean, you can move and
9 miss an essential skill along the way. And then the
10 other school district doesn't -- you know, it's out of
11 sequence a little bit, and it's very hard for kids to
12 catch up.

13 It actually is in mathematics where kids
14 have had the problems. We've done pretty careful
15 analysis of which classes. So the plus on the
16 academic side is the promise of stabilization could
17 minimize the adverse impact of mobility on academic
18 achievement and continuity.

19 However, the research also shows with
20 strong parents that mitigates some of the problems
21 with mobility, which also I think is a benefit of the
22 stabilization. If parents stay in one place, they
23 begin to get a relationship with the school. It makes
24 them more confident as an involved parent. So if they
25 get good at being an involved parent in one location,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 they are much more likely to be involved in PTAs, in
2 school volunteering at the next location.

3 Because of the time, if they move after
4 the first seven years, and just doing some assumptions
5 -- and we know most of the kids are very young kids --
6 we've also done some research on how old you have to
7 be to go to kindergarten. And you would think that
8 would be pretty consistent.

9 And what we've discovered -- and I'm
10 submitting this as part of the research -- is looking
11 at 31 states and the Department of Defense schools
12 that there is very little consistency on how old you
13 have to be to go to kindergarten. So it can mean that
14 you stay in one place, you make some assumptions, so
15 you have a young child -- a baby that maybe gets to be
16 a young child.

17 This is also an effect of them coming back
18 from Europe, because DoDEA has more -- you can be
19 actually younger and start kindergarten in DoDEA than
20 you can in a few of the states. And so you plan for
21 your child to go to kindergarten, and then it doesn't
22 happen.

23 So there are some challenges there, but
24 all in all I think the positives really, really
25 outweigh the challenges for the family as they get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 some roots in one place. And then they have to make
2 those roots portable when they go to the next
3 location.

4 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you.

5 You obviously know about the -- part of
6 the overseas basing plan would be an extensive
7 rotational plan that would take forces unaccompanied
8 to rotate into possible bases in Eastern Europe,
9 possibly in Korea, possibly elsewhere.

10 What is the -- and I'm sure the families
11 have heard about this, too. What is the reaction
12 you're hearing from the families?

13 And, Dr. Keller, then if you want to
14 comment on any of the educational impacts.

15 MS. RAEZER: Families are still learning
16 about this and are kind of all over the map on this
17 one. But some of the things that have been referenced
18 -- that were alluded to in some of the discussions
19 this morning. Family concerns that we're going to
20 have Eastern Europe just become another Korea. We've
21 dealt with those unaccompanied tours to Korea for
22 years. We haven't liked them, but we've dealt with
23 them.

24 And now we're going to add another
25 unaccompanied tour type option. And do we really need

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Eastern Europe to become another Korea?

2 Concern that it's one thing to say the
3 service member is being deployed to a war zone, I
4 can't go, we're going to gut it out and accept this as
5 time away, because the service member has that war-
6 related mission. It's another thing to say we're
7 going to be happy about the family separation when the
8 service member is just going over somewhere to wait
9 and train and sit, because I think you will have some
10 families who will want to do that, fly -- let's fly
11 over to Romania for spring break.

12 Or I'm hoping we won't have the folks in
13 the numbers that we do in Korea who want to go as, you
14 know, non-command sponsored, to find a place out, you
15 know, in the countryside, wherever, just to be with
16 the service member. But I think we're going to have
17 to watch it, because people do it in Korea. I think
18 they're going to try to do it in some of these Eastern
19 European locations.

20 So families are very wary of that
21 additional separation. They are still evaluating
22 whether additional family separations is a fair price
23 to pay for not having to move.

24 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Okay.

25 DR. KELLER: Sir, on the educational side,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we have also been concerned about the unaccompanied
2 assignments, where they would go over there and the
3 family just lives on the economy, because what we know
4 is when kids go sometimes to these schools in host
5 nations, it's iffy as to whether or not they get an
6 education in a school that is translatable back into
7 the American school system.

8 And we know that from experience from the
9 non-DoDDS program as well as other programs, that
10 sometimes that's a rough transition.

11 Overall, the separation from a parent is
12 hard on the student. So I think if that happens that
13 we're going to just have to figure out a lot of other
14 ways that schools can help support the families during
15 that deployment and keep that parent involved during
16 the deployment, which means that it could be another
17 great way to use technology, because technology would
18 keep that parent immediately connected.

19 By having those remote locations fixed
20 locations, there could be ways that parents can come
21 in, you know, as we're doing in a lot of other
22 locations, where parents can come in and still
23 conference back to the school and talk to other
24 things.

25 I think it's going to require some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 creative problem-solving. But I also have confidence,
2 again, if everyone stays focused on the kids that we
3 can do the right thing.

4 MS. RAEZER: The other question that does
5 come up is, if you're having these new installations
6 in Eastern Europe, are you going to have any permanent
7 party at all? And if you're going to have -- we do --
8 we have some two-year accompanied tours in Korea. Are
9 you going to have any permanent party? Are there
10 going to be any accompanied tours for anyone? And if
11 there are going to be accompanied tours for some, how
12 are you going to deal with the family issues that will
13 arise with those folks?

14 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: Thank you very much.
15 Mr. Chairman?

16 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Commissioner
17 Curtis?

18 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: I'd like to add my
19 thanks for the two of you taking your time to be here
20 with us today. It's a critically important subject.

21 Dr. Raezer -- I'm sorry, Ms. Raezer, early
22 on you said that having members deployed from overseas
23 locations was more problematic than having the same
24 deployment requirements from a stateside base. Will
25 you amplify on that and give us a better feel for the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 kind of issues involved from your perspective, and the
2 challenges?

3 And, Dr. Keller, would you then comment
4 upon the child development issues associated with
5 that?

6 MS. RAEZER: What families have told us is
7 that there are not the range of support options
8 available for them when they're overseas that you
9 would find in the States. A lot of military
10 communities back here in the States have done -- have
11 had -- made wonderful partnerships with community
12 organizations, community service entities, schools.

13 There's a much bigger support network
14 available for families in the States in many
15 communities than there is overseas where almost
16 everything has to be supplied by the American
17 military. So you have a very small group of family
18 support providers, rear detachment command, child
19 youth programs, schools, you know, trying to deal with
20 the day-to-day operation and provide that extra
21 support for the deployment.

22 So you have an entire community that is
23 stressed out, and no one -- you know, no VFW, no
24 American Legion, no Lions Club, to kind of say, "You
25 guys are doing a great job." You know, it's Families

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Eat Free Night at Wendy's. You know, that -- so they
2 miss that bigger community support.

3 The other piece that has been very
4 problematic in some European communities is the whole
5 security and force protection issue. These are --
6 yes, Europe is wonderful when you can tour and travel
7 and experience it all. But if it's just Mom and the
8 kids, it's a little -- and you're constantly getting
9 force protection issues about keeping a low profile,
10 and a lot more of our spouses don't feel comfortable
11 driving in Europe, you get isolated on the
12 installation. And so that takes an emotional toll.

13 DR. KELLER: Commissioner Curtis, if I
14 could, I'd like to tell you a story. We deal with --
15 specifically with children and families about the
16 educational issues. And I have a really compelling
17 story to tell you.

18 In Germany, the Mom -- a single mom was
19 deployed to Iraq, and her five-year-old daughter, a
20 bright, wonderful little girl, just really fabulous
21 little girl, was doing wonderfully well in school.
22 Unfortunately, she got meningitis, and it was a very
23 bad case of meningitis. And what happened is because
24 the hospitals and other things were really under
25 stress, they had to reach out into the German

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 community to help.

2 Unfortunately, this little baby got brain
3 damaged and became an exceptional family member.
4 Suddenly, a mom is in Iraq, the child caregiver, the
5 family care plan was working, everything was great
6 until she got meningitis.

7 What happened, then, when Mom came back --
8 and I know this because I actually talked to the
9 mother about it -- her mother and sisters that are her
10 support system are back home, so now she's dealing
11 with something that is devastating to any parent, and
12 doesn't have -- and not that the German hospital
13 wasn't good. I'm not saying that. What I'm saying is
14 she didn't have the kinds of support that we would all
15 want for our daughters to have if they were going
16 through that kind of situation.

17 At the same time, now this child is in the
18 exceptional family member program. Now, if she were
19 in the States, what would have happened is she would
20 have been picked up by what's called Child Find, and
21 the school system would have also been there with
22 other kinds of community support agencies like MHMR
23 and other kinds of things that do help families.

24 And, sir, I can just tell you that that
25 story is in my heart as the most compelling example of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the question that you raised.

2 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you, Dr.
3 Keller.

4 Clearly, as we attempt to move to a more
5 deployment, expeditionary-oriented portions of the
6 military that have not had that focus before with the
7 long-term, you know, six-month deployments, there are
8 going to be a number of family issues.

9 Do either one of you -- do your
10 organizations, and do either one of you know of
11 anybody who has tried to capture the lessons learned,
12 the kind of things that you're talking about, Dr.
13 Keller, or the initiatives that we should all consider
14 is to support the families and the children as we
15 evolve to this different approach?

16 MS. RAEZER: Well, we are -- both of us --
17 our organizations are, because -- and our organization
18 has been watching these issues throughout our history.

19 We're a little older than MCEC, so we are -- what
20 I've provided to you is based on -- you know, I went
21 back in our files and looked at what happened in some
22 of those earlier basing moves.

23 I'm pleased to say that folks within the
24 Department of Defense are also capturing this kind of
25 information and sharing issues as they arise, so that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 other providers can be aware of them. There is what's
2 called a joint family readiness working group that's
3 made up of folks in the family program arena in the
4 Office of Secretary of Defense as well as the
5 services, to include the National Guard Bureau and the
6 Reserve commands, and also invite some associations to
7 participate.

8 And we and a couple other associations --
9 NMFA and a couple of other associations participate in
10 that, and we meet quarterly, and we just -- we share,
11 what are the surprises, what are we doing that's
12 working well, what are other issues that we need to
13 address, how are folks doing, what is the deployment
14 cycle that we're experiencing and some of the issues.

15 So I think as we get into some of these
16 other troop movement issues, we will be talking --
17 they will be talking about that as well. But there
18 are a lot of associations and others who are out there
19 collecting this information. A lot of it starts as
20 anecdotal, but you can pick up trends very quickly in
21 some cases, and we are -- we just keep our ear to the
22 ground.

23 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: And I understand
24 there are really two aspects of it it seems to me.
25 One is the base closure and the realignment of forces,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 which is the permanent move and movement into
2 communities where you're not prepared that you
3 addressed very articulately earlier.

4 But the second is the entire change in
5 mind-set to become expeditionary and to move regularly
6 and to have a set of families -- well, there will
7 always be sets of families where the service members
8 are gone a substantial portion of the time, more along
9 the traditional Navy model.

10 That's really -- because that's the long-
11 term situation we're going to be in, and I was
12 wondering whether those -- those are important lessons
13 to pick up. And is there anybody working a
14 congressional agenda, a legislative agenda, in those
15 areas?

16 MS. RAEZER: A lot of these issues don't
17 require legislation. A lot of them just require
18 people to work together, and some of those issues are
19 starting to come up in the discussions with that joint
20 working group, for example, where you have the Army
21 folks learning from the Marine Corps model and the
22 Navy model.

23 You know, the Navy folks are having to
24 change some of their family support practices and
25 ideas because the Navy is -- used to have a fairly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 predictable deployment pattern, but that example that
2 Dr. Keller told you about with the ship turning
3 around, the CNO has said maybe we've been too
4 predictable. The families know when we're going out
5 and coming back, and so do the bad guys. So we may
6 need to adjust how we deploy.

7 The Navy's family support system is going
8 to have to change to meet that change, and so we are
9 seeing more discussion now between the service folks
10 who have to deal with these issues.

11 DR. KELLER: We capture a lot of research.
12 We are a very serious research-based organization.
13 And it just happens that we're doing some research for
14 Admiral Fargo on the transitions in and out of Hawaii,
15 and part of that research is looking at the effects of
16 deployment. So it's looking at the school-based in
17 and out, and Hawaii is a microcosm of precisely what
18 you said.

19 That research will be published in about
20 six weeks. It is very, very serious. We worked with
21 Carnegie, we worked with several other groups to make
22 sure that it gives some solid lessons learned. What's
23 fascinating is how individuals have figured out to
24 work around things, individual families or educators,
25 schools, and, you know, people think everyone does

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 what they are doing.

2 I mean, they don't know that other people
3 aren't doing this, so it's a great way to capture
4 these ideas and the goodness that's happening at the
5 local levels, and these tremendous partnerships that
6 are happening between units in individual schools and
7 other places. So, yes, we are capturing that.

8 Plus, we have a system in our
9 organization, and we call it Ask Aunt Peggy. And we
10 really have a person called Aunt Peggy, and families
11 e-mail or call in for school transition issues, but
12 then they tell her the whole range of stories. And
13 it's kind of, you know, the Ann Landers/Hints from
14 Heloise about schools, except she's a testing
15 specialist or researcher. And we also capture that,
16 put it into a solid research model, and we do work
17 really hard, as has NMFA.

18 We do a great job referring people back
19 and forth to each other, so that's also very helpful.

20 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Well, thank you very
21 much.

22 MS. RAEZER: May I add one point?

23 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Yes, please.

24 MS. RAEZER: Dr. Keller talked about the
25 local initiatives and the state efforts, and that's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 really critical when you come to family support. The
2 Department of Defense, the Federal Government, cannot
3 do everything for families, because our families are
4 out all over the place. They're out in the civilian
5 communities. Their spouses are employed by civilians.
6 The kids go to civilian schools.

7 What has been very, very helpful is the
8 increased visibility of how states and local
9 communities can support military families. It has
10 come a lot from the mobilizations of the Guard and
11 Reserve. There are members of Congress who are
12 focusing on this issue. There was a hearing recently
13 in the Senate that focused on some initiatives coming
14 out of the National Governors Conference to address
15 some of these support issues.

16 What we need most from Congress at the DoD
17 level I think is more resources to help families
18 address these challenges.

19 COMMISSIONER CURTIS: Thank you very much.
20 Keep up the good work.

21 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Do the
22 Commissioners have any other questions?

23 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: I have just one.
24 You've talked a lot about things that are going on to
25 ease the challenges of transition as our families move

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 back and forth. Planning has been a key factor in
2 getting the word out to both the families and
3 installations, the schools, so they can plan ahead and
4 prepare for the numbers of people who will be
5 arriving. And you talked a little bit about
6 technology and those types of things.

7 What are some other things? In a perfect
8 world -- both of you, in a perfect world, and you knew
9 that the President's plan that he announced, 70,000
10 military personnel and the accompanying families
11 coming back, what are the things you would do to, if
12 you could make them happen, to ameliorate that impact
13 on military families?

14 I know it's a broad question, but I want
15 to be sure that we've -- we know about all these
16 things we could do to make it easier. Something is
17 going to happen. There is going to be a movement of
18 some type, and we just don't know how many yet and
19 where. But what could we do? What do you recommend?

20 MS. RAEZER: Don't move anybody until you
21 have resources in place at the home installations. We
22 are very, very concerned about health care in many
23 communities. The military medical system is stretched
24 thin.

25 We have -- the Department of Defense has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to do a better job of persuading civilian providers to
2 take TRICARE, to get them in the networks, to get them
3 to take military patients. We have -- the military
4 has access standards for its beneficiaries in TRICARE
5 Prime, which include active duty members. Many places
6 are not meeting them, because they don't have the
7 capacity.

8 They can't -- once in a while those
9 stories get in the press. We've seen a couple in --
10 over the last year or so from places. So we need to
11 have -- we need to make sure before anybody is moved
12 there is health care, there is housing, and there's
13 housing at a reasonable location from the installation
14 where folks can take advantage of it. And we need to
15 be -- and the education resources need to be available
16 -- identified and available, which means a lot of
17 folks have to be talking together and planning
18 together and identifying resources now.

19 DR. KELLER: I think that planning is
20 absolutely the key, and I'm not going to restate what
21 Joyce said. But I guess if you could say a perfect
22 world, that the students and the parents would know
23 which school district or school area that they would
24 be attending at the receiving end.

25 But also in the perfect world what we find

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 consistently in our research that the hand off is
2 where the weak point is. From the parents and the
3 educators at the sending school, things unravel at the
4 exit. And it's because it's hard for people to think
5 about the exit, because you're going from the known to
6 the unknown.

7 So if we could wave a magic wand, in this
8 perfect world I would want that the sending school was
9 working with the receiving school, that the parents
10 were preparing that child to leave both academically
11 and emotionally, and that everyone realized that their
12 job wasn't complete until the child was smoothly
13 handed off, enrolled in the next location.

14 Then, once they're at the next location,
15 that they got feedback from the receiving school to
16 the sending school, letting them know what worked and
17 what didn't work, because that helps the next child
18 that's coming through the pipeline with that exit
19 process.

20 So I think it's that time, that specific
21 information about where the students are going, but
22 really in all transitions is that exit is the very,
23 very tough point. And that is that everyone is
24 attending to the needs of the child as they go to the
25 next place, as they come from someplace and go to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 someplace.

2 MS. RAEZER: And the big thing that would
3 fix -- make that exit piece easier is not to have it
4 too closely associated with a deployment, either going
5 or coming, watching the timing.

6 COMMISSIONER TAYLOR: My deepest
7 appreciation to both of you for this very insightful
8 view of the impact of what we're thinking about on
9 families.

10 Thank you.

11 COMMISSIONER CORNELLA: Commissioners?
12 Anything else?

13 Well, I thank the two of you for the
14 remarkable work that you do on behalf of our military
15 families. I've lived next door to an Air Force Base
16 for the last 36 years, and I'm always amazed at the
17 quality of military families. I've come to know
18 literally hundreds of families and their children, and
19 I am always amazed at the quality of the kids and
20 their interest in school and discipline.

21 And I think your organizations and the two
22 of you have a lot to do with that, and I think it's
23 important, important to our country, important to our
24 national defense. Be assured that your comments are
25 going to be taken to heart as we move through this

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealgross.com

1 process.

2 So thank you for appearing here today.

3 I just want to add that -- I want to thank
4 Ms. Walker, and I want to thank Ms. Walker and our
5 staff for the tremendous job that they have done in
6 preparing for this hearing.

7 I'd again like to thank our witnesses, and
8 there will be future hearings. There will be notices
9 thereof in the Federal Register, and as they happen
10 there will be future trips for the Commissioners as
11 well. So this Commission is going to move forward,
12 and it will provide a report to Congress as planned.

13 Thank you.

14 (Whereupon, at 2:50 p.m., the proceedings
15 in the foregoing matter were concluded.)

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701