

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
JOINT ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE**

Anchorage, Alaska
November 15, 2001
8:20 a.m.

SENATE MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Randy Phillips
Senator Loren Leman
Senator Ben Stevens

HOUSE MEMBERS PRESENT

Representative Eldon Mulder, Co-Chair
Representative John Harris
Representative Jeannette James

PUBLIC MEMBERS PRESENT

Frank Love
John Hoyt
Jake Lestenkof
Dean Owen
George Vakalis
Charles Wallace

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Gary Wilken, Co-Chair
Senator Bettye Davis
Senator Alan Austerman
Representative Lisa Murkowski
Representative Reggie Joule

OTHERS PRESENT

Amy Erickson, Staff to Representative Murkowski
Cliff Stone, Staff to Senator Austerman (via teleconference)
Sue Wright, Staff to Representative Chenault (via teleconference)
Representative Sharon Cissna

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

Citizen Advisory Board member recognition and certificate presentation

Presentation by Charlie Smith - proposed legislation for selective service registration

Update on Mobility Hub project by Larry Crawford

Report on National Association of Independent Developers (NAID) conference by George Vakalis

Update on National Missile Defense (NMD) by Chris Nelson

PREVIOUS ACTION

No previous action to record

WITNESS REGISTER

Charlie Smith
Alaska Selective Service Representative
POSITION STATEMENT: Selective Service presentation

Amy Erickson
Staff to Representative Murkowski
POSITION STATEMENT: Answered questions on draft legislation concerning selective service registration

Chris Nelson
Alaska Army National Guard Missile Defense Coordinator
POSITION STATEMENT: Update on National Missile Defense

Lt. Gen. Norton Schwartz
ALCOM Commander
POSITION STATEMENT: State of military readiness

Larry Crawford
President & CEO Anchorage Economic Development Corporation
POSITION STATEMENT: Update on Mobility Hub project

AFTERNOON SESSION:
Invited participants:

Anchorage Mayor George Wuerch
POSITION STATEMENT: City and State working with military on economic development business

Governor Bill Sheffield
Anchorage Port Director
POSITION STATEMENT: Port issues and the military

General Patrick Gamble, Retired
President Alaska Railroad

POSITION STATEMENT: What Alaska might do to keep and attract more military units

Mano Frey
Co-chairman Arctic Power, AFL-CIO representative

POSITION STATEMENT: Possibility of umbrella organization for military matters

Duane Heyman
Executive Director Commonwealth North

POSITION STATEMENT: Importance of the military to Alaska.

Dave Hudspeth
Representative of Anchorage Chamber of Commerce

POSITION STATEMENT: Importance of the military.

Janice Nielsen
Representative, United States Air Reserve Pacific, Hawaii (USARPAC)

POSITION STATEMENT: Commented on military activity in Hawaii

Tom Morgan
Executive Officer, Armed Services Young Men Christian Association (ASYMCA)

POSITION STATEMENT: Commented on the importance of the military

ACTION NARRATIVE

TAPE 01-04, SIDE A

Number 001

CO-CHAIR ELDON MULDER called the Joint Armed Services Committee meeting to order at 8:20 a.m. Committee members present were Senators Phillips and Leman and Representatives Harris and Mulder. Staff to Representative Lisa Murkowski, Amy Erickson, was also present. Cliff Stone, staff to Senator Austerman, Sue Wright, staff to Representative Chenault participated via teleconference. Public members present were Frank Love, John Hoyt, Jake Lestenkof, Dean Owen, George Vakalis and Chick Wallace. Janice Nielson and Chris Nelson were also in attendance. Barbara Mee was introduced as the new Armed Services Committee staff member.

CO-CHAIR MULDER recognized and thanked newly appointed Senator

Ben Stevens for being present.

CO-CHAIR MULDER introduced Frank Love as the new public member to the committee. He pointed out his biographical sketch in the committee packets. Frank is the representative for the Coast Guard, and is given high praise by Admiral Barrett. Frank replaces Alan Walker who had obligations, which took him out of state.

FRANK LOVE: Expressed his appreciation in being appointed to the committee and looked forward to serving.

CO-CHAIR MULDER explained CO-CHAIR Wilken's absence due to unexpected death in the family and that Co-Chairman Wilken sent his regards. Welcomed Janice Nielsen from USARPAC Hawaii. Mulder mentioned that General Ed Smith was still in command in Hawaii but would be retiring in a couple of months and that hopefully his successor, General Campbell would visit Alaska soon and perhaps pay a visit on the committee.

CO-CHAIR MULDER also welcomed former JASC Staff Director, Chris Nelson, who has moved on to new responsibilities with National Missile Defense. Mulder then introduced new staff person, Barb Andrews-Mee, who many of the committee would know having worked with her when she was with Senator Ted Stevens' office.

CO-CHAIR MULDER then said he would deviate from the agenda in handing out the Citizens Board certificates as they were still enroute. Mulder said this morning's session would deal with activities happening in and around the State; this afternoon's less formal session would be an outgrowth of meetings the committee had with Senator Ted Stevens and General Schwartz where recommendations came back to us that we have so many things going on trying to help advocate the military position in Alaska but not much coordination. This afternoon we have invited a number of individuals to participate in a discussion on how we can better serve the military and more greatly maximum the utilization of the resources we have.

CO-CHAIR MULDER pointed out that copies of the September 2000, and January, February and April 2001 minutes were in packet and would welcome a motion for approval of these minutes.

SENATOR LEMAN MOVED to approve all the minutes, and there being no objection, the minutes were approved.

CO-CHAIR MULDER welcomed General Hoyt back to the committee after a prolonged absence. Not only is he a valued member of the

committee but a very good friend - General Hoyt we welcome you back, it is really good to see you up and around and have you back.

MR. JOHN HOYT: Well, I want you to know that I am delighted to be here! (much laughter) ... considering the alternative.

CO CHAIR MULDER: Well you were certainly in our thoughts and prayers.

CO CHAIR MULDER: Gave a synopsis of informal meetings of August 16, 2001 when committee members met with Senator Stevens and August 21, 2001 with General Schwartz.

We talked with Stevens about the BRAC (Base Realignment and Closure) process and what we could do as a committee and as a state to make us more BRAC proof and more attractive to the military. Mulder stated in his opinion, and asked for feed back that other members have, Senator Stevens encouraged the committee to be supportive, positive and as proactive toward the military as possible; that in Stevens' judgment there would be plenty of time to consider the hiring of a consultant if necessary to represent us with any BRAC process. Stevens had been asked how imminent was BRAC and if we should go out and try and procure representation as we did the last go-around or should we keep our powder dry! Mulder says the latter reflected Senator Stevens' opinion that BRAC wasn't on the front burner just yet; keep our power dry but be mindful and aware and ready to move if we had to. The other point Stevens raised was that we should try to correlate the actions of those traveling to Washington DC; to meet the movers and shakers in the military and Congress; and to help educate decision makers about Alaska and the importance of Alaska to the military. Hence the meeting this afternoon where we have invited Anchorage and Fairbanks officials and citizens for a brainstorming session on how we might correlate the efforts of local government, Chambers, civic groups and individuals in our goal to not only retain our military but to get the word out to decision makers in DC of Alaska's strategic location and assets.

On August 21, 2001, we had an informal, off the record meeting with General Norman Schwartz (ALCOM) and received a briefing on Alcom's (Alaska Command) perspective on the Efficient Facilities Initiative (formerly BRAC) giving reasons for military to reduce its infra-structure. General Schwartz explained the Department of Defense logic and why there would be the need. He made suggestions for Alaskans to speak with a consistent voice and emphasize its strategic value. He also briefed us on the Alaskan

Air Space and Range Modernization Plan- describing what the air space has been, where they're going and ongoing needs to maintain air space and improve Army training ranges.

CO CHAIR MULDER asked committee members if there was any other feedback they had from either of these meetings.

GEORGE VAKALIS said Stevens also made the point that he was concerned that if we got out in the forefront talking about BRAC that it would be almost like a self-fulfilling prophecy and he strongly recommended we not mention the BRAC word yet until something was imminent but that we go along the course of action that you just outlined.

SENATOR LOREN LEMAN said Senator Stevens also talked about the importance of Alaskans not only going to Washington to meet key people but inviting them to our state to get to know us and our Alaskan communities, and the importance of us to proactively speak out for the military.

SENATOR RANDY PHILLIPS mentioned meeting of Anchorage Caucus recently and the importance of Fort Richardson, Elmendorf, Eielson and Fort Wainwright was top priority.

CO CHAIR MULDER mentioned we had tried to schedule a meeting in Kodiak to coordinate with a rocket launch, but it was difficult to arrange and then the attack of 911 really put that on the back burner.

CHICK WALLACE mentioned with regard to General Schwartz briefing on Air Space, he'd heard a rumbling from some in the Fairbanks civil aviation side about how much air space the Air Force is using and that is something we have to be aware of and constantly on guard about. That is probably just local to Fairbanks, I'm not sure it happens here in Anchorage.

CO CHAIR MULDER agreed that it's probably not heard so much here in Anchorage but that it is something we should talk about this afternoon. How can we help the military with issues like the ever-present encroachment concerns at Fort Richardson and also air space issues in the Interior. These things pose real threat to the security and long-term stability of the military in Alaska. We have to be proactive to try and help stave some of that off - we can really help the military do their job.

CO CHAIR MULDER - Introduced Charlie Smith, State Director of Selective Service, a federal non-paid position, who'd like to address our group about possible legislation for selective

service registration.

8:35 a.m.

MR. CHARLIE SMITH handed out brochures talking about Selective Service. The Selective Service System, is the old draft system. We haven't had a draft since 1973. In 1980 Congress and the President decided that we needed to have the availability of a standby force and came up with what they called Selective Service Registration. Since then we've been registering young men when they turn 18. We now have about 12 million young men registered. The Selective Service System has been known as kind of the third branch of the military. If we get into a national or international emergency and need more manpower than is available we would call on Selective Service. Alaska is at about 84% registration. I believe we are about 10th or 11th state in the nation, so we're doing well. Recently the Governor signed the proclamation for Selective Service for November. The biggest problem we have in Alaska is awareness. We do advertise. Every high school in Alaska has a registrar- I think we have something like 270 of them. If a school happens to have two or three students - if one of them happens to be a senior- that's a high school by Selective Service standards. The registrars are certified by the Selective Service and register young men when they turn 18. Last year the law was changed whereby a young man can sign up when they are 17 and when they reach 18 they will automatically be registered with Selective Service. I've been working with various legislators in trying to get legislation to assist registration. There's some driver's license legislation going through whereby young people would not be able to get a driver's license unless they were registered. I want to preface that by saying registration is a federal law. It's a felony not to register. It's punishable by 5 years in prison and a \$250,000 fine. The federal government about 3 or 4 years ago passed legislation whereby if a person has not registered by the time they are age 26 they can never work for the federal government, including the Postal Service, they cannot get any federal grants, loans and if they're aliens, they can never become a citizen. We find the main reason people don't register- obviously there are some people who don't want to - but most of them don't register because they don't know they have to. In the old days, those of us under the old draft system knew at age 18 what we were going to be doing. There are many ways to register: at the Post Office; on-line; or by telephone. In addition to legislation tying registration to drivers' licenses, we're hoping to do something with Permanent Fund Dividend. That would get everybody in the state whereas a lot of folks in the state that don't get drivers licenses. Under the PFD system if a person is under 18,

someone signs the PFD application for them. Once they reach 18, they sign on their own and that's the age we're after. I don't know of the legal dynamics involved but ideally that would work very well. There is also some legislation in the works right now where the person would have had to meet the requirements in order to obtain state jobs, state loans, state student loans and things like that. I know that Representative Murkowski has been working on quite a few of these things. I've been working with the Municipality of Anchorage and City of Juneau so that employees of the municipalities would also have to be registered in order to get these jobs. I should explain that in the State of Alaska although there is no draft, we still have six draft boards in the State.

SENATOR PHILLIPS said he assumed automatic registration when filing for the Permanent Fund Dividend would be preferred.

MR. SMITH agreed

MR. LESTENKOF asked how many states impose penalties for non-compliance, how long you would be subject to call once registered and the size of the Selective Service budget.

MR. SMITH replied that 21 states impose penalties, young men are subject to call until age 26 and the budget is \$34 million per year but it could rise during times of active conflict.

MR. HOYT asked whether registered young men are required to report when they move.

MR. SMITH said they are.

CO-CHAIR MULDER asked whether women are required to register.

MR. SMITH said the federal law does not require women to register.

CO CHAIR MULDER if state did put in place that when you apply for the Permanent Fund Dividend when you are 18 and that automatically registers you with Selective Service, might it be contested even though you are complying with a federal mandate that supercedes even our constitution.

Mr. Smith - Permanent Fund Office they didn't see it as a problem. States who have these laws now don't have a permanent fund but their drivers' licenses laws have been tested and so far everything's gone through ok.

MR. HOYT asked what Mr. Smith would like the committee to do to help him.

8:50 p.m.

MR. SMITH said he would like support from the committee for Representative Murkowski's legislation on the subject. If this legislation comes up he would like the committee to help

MR. HOYT proposed Charlie Smith provide copies of suggested legislation to the members of the committee and let the people who are sympathetic with what you're trying to do help you.

SENATOR LEMAN said withholding the dividend is effective in shaping desired behavior.

MR. SMITH responded that his staff is working with Representative Wilson (Wrangell) on legislation that requires Selective Service registration to be eligible for a driver's license.

AMY ERICKSON, staff to Representative Murkowski, said the legislation under discussion is in work draft form and will pertain to the Permanent Fund. She and Mr. Smith agreed to meet following the meeting.

CO-CHAIR MULDER thought a companion Senate bill would speed the process.

SENATOR PHILLIPS asked whether federal law prohibited female registration.

MR. SMITH said federal law does not prohibit female registration it just requires male registration. The reasoning at this point is that enough women are signing for service without having to resort to mandatory registration for them. Federal law would have to be changed before women could be required to register and there is no such legislation before Congress at this time.

CHICK WALLACE asked how young men are notified that they are required to register.

MR. SMITH said notices are posted in the high schools, school counselors have information. He also said Selective Service gets information comes from the Permanent Fund database. The Selective Service computer center matches the names of men that are not registered and sends them reminders.

CO-CHAIR MULDER commented the effort is to keep these young men from becoming felons. He thought that in addition to tying receipt of the Permanent Fund to registration there should be similar requirements for receipt of federal loans, jobs and benefits.

SENATOR PHILLIPS moved the joint committee request legislation be put forward requiring receipt of state benefits including the Permanent Fund be tied to Selective Service registration.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS asked whether this request for legislation would interfere with work Representative Murkowski has already done.

MS. ERICKSON said she could not speak for Representative Murkowski.

CO-CHAIR MULDER said Representative Murkowski or Senator Phillips could carry the legislation but deference should be shown to Representative Murkowski since she has a draft bill.

There being no further discussion or objection, the motion carried.

TAPE 01-04, SIDE B

CO-CHAIR MULDER asked George Vakalis to report on NAID (National Association of Installation Developers).

GEORGE VAKALIS reported that NAID has been in existence for many years and now includes more individuals in the development and finance fields. Their first mission began about 25 years ago when bases started to close around the country. They determined there was a niche to redevelop former military bases. Over the years they determined they can not only redevelop old bases and turn them over to the civilian community but they can also give assistance to active bases to become more economically viable and business oriented.

The last conference he attended with Barbara Mee and Chris Nelson broke into the following workstations to discuss cost cutting measures to determine how developers and financiers can help bases to be more cost effective.

- Housing privatization: Base housing is very expensive. Private developers are currently building 260 new houses at Elmendorf. Three developers have merged for the project and gotten

financing from Alaska. There is a 50-year lease under which the developer owns, manages and maintains the housing and leases it to the government leases the space for 50 years. At the end of that 50-year lease the military can take the housing over fee simple or they can ask the developer to raze the development.

- Utilities privatization: Utilities are very expensive on bases in Alaska because of old methods of generation. In a privatization move, Fort Richardson has contracted with Honeywell to provide independent gas fired heating systems in each building on the base. Once this is finished, the old power plant will no longer be used and Chugach Electric and ML&P will compete to provide power generation for the base.
- Tax credits: Discussion centered on ways the various developers could work together to receive tax credits if they were to take over other base operations such as range operation and administrative work.
- Leasing BRAC properties back to the military: There are examples of this in the Lower 48.
- Senator Stevens' legislative work to return to the original BRAC process: This is much better for Alaska than the process preferred by the Administration that weighs base efficiency heavily. Geographic factors make Alaska operations more expensive. The focus on BRAC changed after the September 11, 2001 attack.
- Alternate options to prepare for a closure.
- Establishing foreign trade zones in and around military installations: Anchorage is a foreign trade zone, which gives leverage and tax incentives to local businesses.
- Creative financing: There are different ways to obtain financing if a private entrepreneur wants to go on base and assist in privatization. For example, the housing project at Elmendorf had three different financial institutions that worked together.

MR. DEAN OWEN asked whether the base or adjoining community would initiate the action of increased base efficiency.

MR. VAKALIS replied it was a combination of three entities. First, the Department of Defense (DOD) is conducting A76 studies to determine which functions the military may divest itself of so it can be more focused on combat support functions. Second, individual installations may conduct their own examination to divest themselves of operations that could be done more efficiently by a private contractor. Third, a private developer could approach an installation or DOD with a plan to privatize and streamline operations. This doesn't happen often because the military cannot let contracts to a private developer without putting the project out to bid first.

MR. OWEN asked what was going on regarding efficiency.

MR. VAKALIS said the Army and Air Force were currently undergoing A76 studies for utilities, public works, housing, range operations and community relations (MWR activities).

MR. OWEN reported the DOD has directed that all military installations must have a request for proposals (RFP) by 2003 for privatization of utilities.

MR. VAKALIS added that Fort Wainwright has asked for an extension because they are undergoing an extensive renovation of their utilities. Eielson Air Force Base received an exemption because of their military mission and Elmendorf will not be privatizing its power plant. They decided it is not cost effective to change. However, it is cost effective at Fort Richardson. Generation in Fairbanks is all coal fired and has dual generation so change won't occur until natural gas is available in the area.

MR. CHRIS NELSON said he had been attending NAID conferences for about five years and it's an excellent opportunity to speak with other military communities and exchange ideas. He encouraged all public members to attend the next conference in January 2002 in Tempe, Arizona.

CO-CHAIR MULDER asked whether other communities typically send resource development council (RDC) members or similar entities.

MR. VAKALIS said attendees are developers, finance companies, legislators, military personnel and interested community members. In the past, most attendees were those who had been affected by BRAC, but now many are interested in working to keep posts viable

so they won't get on the BRAC list.

MR. OWEN said he plans to go to the next conference.

CO-CHAIR MULDER thought it would be advantageous to have both armed services members and counterparts within the civilian sector attend the conference.

MR. NELSON agreed that encouraging municipalities and other entities to participate in the conferences would be advantageous.

CO-CHAIR MULDER asked whether the January conference would conflict with the upcoming session.

MS. MEE reported the conference dates were January 27-29.

MR. VAKALIS said Larry Crawford was planning to send a representative to the conference.

CO-CHAIR MULDER reminded members the meeting was being teleconferenced.

CLIFF STONE, staff to Senator Austerman, said he was listening to the meeting from Juneau because Senator Austerman was unavailable.

CO-CHAIRMAN MULDER asked that the record reflect that Representative Cissna arrived at the meeting and Senator Phillips had to leave.

He called for a 20-minute break.

11:05 a.m.

CO-CHAIR MULDER called the meeting back to order and acknowledged the following Citizens Advisory Board members and presented those present with certificates.

Karen Washburn	Dave Dean
Gerald Myers	Gordy Lewis
Mike Olson	Howard "Buzz" Otis
Mike Ferguson	Mead Treadwell
Lance Herrington*	Chris Gates
Craig Johnson*	Dave Lewis*
John Nicely	Tom Morgan*
Dennis Metrokin	Roger Schnell
Mitch Abood	

*Indicates a member present to receive a certificate.

He then asked Chris Nelson to give an update on National Missile Defense Program (NMD).

MR. CHRIS NELSON used slides to enhance his presentation. He said he would point out significant changes in NMD that will have important and positive effects in Alaska. The Bush Administration made changes by announcing the new Pacific Region Test Bed and a more comprehensive approach to missile defense. He also wanted to touch on the changes expected within the next 72 hours in our relationship with Russia and the Anti Ballistic Missile (ABM) Treaty. Finally, he would discuss the environmental lawsuit that has been filed.

DoD wants to set up a series of ground base mid-course phase missile interceptors. A missile launched anywhere in the world would be detected by early warning satellite space sensors. In the 2006-2010 time frame, the current defense support program (DSP) satellites will be replaced by a more modern, infrared sensor system that will break the radar horizon on advanced early warning radars. The trajectory of incoming missiles will be plotted, an intercept area will be designated and a ground-based interceptor will be launched. The interceptor will acquire the target once it reaches outer space and within that interceptor location it will perform a hit to kill, kinetic energy kill.

Due primarily to its geographic location, the Clinton Administration designated Alaska as the site for the ground base interceptors. It is the only North American location from which ground based interceptors can be launched to defend all 50 states.

When the missile defense program was first announced, they were constrained by the 1972 Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty with the Soviet Union that required each country to have just one missile site. The United States designated North Dakota as the site to defend the Minute Man Missile Fields when the treaty was signed. The Clinton Administration wanted to maintain the treaty but move the site to Alaska. The Russians weren't in favor of changing the treaty to make this possible. However, since the September 11 attack, Russian President Putin has indicated a willingness to discuss the change.

As of one year ago, the missile defense plan for location in Alaska was designed for the deployment of 100 ground-based interceptors and an X-Band radar site at Shemya Island. Getting the X-Band system up and running on the island presents logistic difficulties and then President Clinton decided to defer the

decision to deploy to his successor.

In March, President Bush announced he would move forward with a more robust system than planned during the previous administration. They are advocating for a multi-layered approach that would consist of a mid-course defense system, a boost phase intercept and a terminal defense system such as the Patriot Advance Capability III (PAC III), thus providing three opportunities to intercept an incoming missile rather than one.

TAPE 01-05, SIDE A

At this point, the X-Band Radar system is under evaluation. They are considering using the existing missile facility at Barking Sands on the island of Kauai or putting systems on ships so they can be deployed from locations around the world. The urgency felt a year ago to get the system up and running on Shemya has dissipated with the change in administration but software upgrades to the Cobra Dane are going forward.

Upgrades to the early warning radar at Clear, Alaska and Beale Air Force Base, California are on track. Reducing the size of the missile field at Fort Greeley to just five missile silos instead of the 100 is planned. However, the battle management command and control facilities and the in-flight data transmission facilities that steer missiles into the intercept area will go in and Fort Greeley could be easily upgraded to 100 silos. They expect the entire Test Bed to be up and operational by 2004, which means construction will begin much sooner than previously anticipated.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER asked about the silos at Narrow Cape.

MR. NELSON said no decision has been made on installing silos at Narrow Cape on Kodiak Island but if that happens, the military will be a tenant in that private facility. The possibility that test silos will be installed has triggered some concern on whether that will require National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) compliance activities.

In response to questions from speakers that did not identify themselves, Mr. Nelson explained that Russia does not view the clearing done at Fort Greeley as a treaty violation. If they agree to a ground based mid range interceptor test proposal, Alaska is in good position to move forward. Reaching an understanding on sea-based interceptors will probably take longer.

MR. NELSON went on to explain that after the flag came down at Fort Greeley, the commanding general of the Ballistic Missile Defense Organization requested that it be withdrawn from the BRAC list and turned over to the army. This was done and authorization to move forward with construction of the test facility was received recently. President Bush will have to come to an understanding with the Russians before they can move beyond the construction phase and install the system.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER asked about power generation at Fort Greeley.

MR. NELSON explained the military wouldn't be in the power generation business. They will have back up generators for the tactical installation, but intend to buy their electricity from Golden Valley Electric for operations. When they are remediating lead-based paint and asbestos hazards, there will be opportunity to address installation of efficient heating units and other infrastructure concerns. The rehab will be necessary to comply with current standards.

CO-CHAIR MULDER asked how large a deployment is expected when the number of silos has been reduced from 100 to five.

MR. NELSON responded that a parallel activity is to build a unit and structure within the Army National Guard that will run the ground based mid-course phase interceptors. They expected to get an Alaska National Guard unit with support from battalions and force structures in other states that are currently doing missile work. This probably won't happen until a decision is made to build the other 95 silos and deploy the system. With just five silos, the contractors will probably conduct the tests with a military presence from the Joint Program Office.

The responsible players in Alaska include Major General Nance from the Joint Program Office, Army National Guard Lieutenant General Jay Smith who is working with civilian contractors and has overall site responsibility for the Fort Richardson project, which will eventually be turned over to the U.S. Army Space and Missile Defense Command. Boeing is now the prime contractor with overall responsibility and is designing the system architecture and design integration. The U.S. Army Corp of Engineers in the Alaska district is doing site design at Fort Greeley and Shemya and will help the Alaska Aerospace Development Corporation at Kodiak.

There are several things that are influencing the action here in Alaska. First, we need to reach an agreement with the Russians on

the ABM Treaty. Second, a coalition of environmental groups has filed a lawsuit demanding a full environmental impact report for the entire Pacific Region Test Bed. The environmental offices at Space and Missile Defense Command are working on behalf of the Joint Program Office on a National Environmental Protection Act (NEPA) compliance strategy. A thorough environmental impact study for the Fort Greeley deployment was published in December 2000 and it identified all the activity planned for Shemya and Eielson Air Force Base. Kodiak had a rigorous environmental assessment done when the launch facility was constructed but adding the two missile silos may require additional environmental study. An option being discussed includes moving forward with the existing EIS for the Fort Greeley, Clear and Shemya portions and tier environmental assessments from that to handle the new reduced construction at Fort Greeley and do an environmental impact statement for Kodiak. If a full EIS is required, it won't slow progress because the environmental studies have been done and a new series of scoping meetings would fulfill NEPA requirements.

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER asked who the plaintiffs were.

MR. NELSON listed the National Resources Defense Council, Physicians for Social Responsibility, Greenpeace, Alaska Action Center, Alaska Community Action on Toxics, Alaska Public Interest Research Group, Kodiak Rocket Launch Information Group, No Nukes North and the Alaskan and Circumpolar Coalition Against Missile Defense.

He commented some of the statements made in the suit have factual errors.

CO-CHAIR MULDER called for a short at ease.

TAPE 01-05, SIDE B

CO-CHAIR MULDER called the meeting back to order at 11:00 a.m. and introduced Lieutenant General Norton Schwartz, Commander, Alaskan Command, Alaskan North American Aerospace Defense Command Region, and 11th Air Force.

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ gave a slide presentation and discussed Homeland Security and Defense and gave information on activities in the last several months and what the near-term future holds. September 11 was a significant emotional event that has underwritten significant changes into the perspective as to what armed forces missions are in Alaska and internationally. He talked about Homeland Security and wanted to emphasize the amount of interagency cooperation occurring nation wide and particularly

within Alaska. He said his first phone call on 9/11 was to Pat Poe (Administrator of the Anchorage Federal Aviation Administration) to make sure they were working in concert.

Al Qaeda proved itself to be a formidable adversary but that does not mean they won't be soundly beaten. What occurred was a paradigm breaker because, as a nation, we have traditionally felt quite secure. It was quite a shock to suddenly realize we too are vulnerable. He said there is a two front war here because we're fighting our adversaries and those who sponsor terrorism and we're also battling for homeland defense. Terrorist acts place everyone on the front line. Teamwork, particularly as it is represented in Alaska, will work to our benefit and play a large role in our success. Defending our homeland is mission one.

He said he would discuss two missions. Operation Enduring Freedom is the part of the military mission that is outside the United States. It focuses primarily on Afghanistan, which is a long-term mission. The early unraveling of the Taliban is the result of purchased and coerced soldiers capitulating. The core has not yet been confronted and it will be a significant undertaking.

The second mission is in the United States and is a many dimensioned inter-agency undertaking. The Alaskan North American Air Space Defense Command Region continues to defend Alaskan air sovereignty. The difference after 9/11 is they are focusing on threats from domestic aircraft as well as external threats. The Alaskan Command is ready to support civil authority if the need arises. It's important to acknowledge the National Guard has a substantial role in Alaska because it is military and able to handle a role in either a state or federal context. For instance, they are currently handling security at airports throughout the state.

The governor recently announced plans to create an analog homeland security office in state government and the Alaska Command's role is to provide support. Because keeping the military separated from law enforcement is fundamental to sustaining freedom, there must be very special circumstances under which the military can become involved in law enforcement. This is not a local decision; rather it typically involves a determination by the President and the Attorney General.

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ said under most circumstances he cannot act unilaterally to provide federal assets to support a civil emergency. Prior to 9/11, he had to receive presidential approval for such an action, but now there are singular events under which he has the authority to act to mitigate the consequences of a

disaster. The Stafford Act allows him to act on his own authority.

Subsequent to 9/11, there are 27 bases in the Lower 48 where airplanes are on alert in addition to constant air patrols over New York, Washington D.C., Detroit, Chicago and wherever the President is outside those areas. The ten-mile no fly zone around nuclear power plants is another example of stricter air space controls being enforced by the combat air patrol. In Alaska, there are fighter aircraft, airborne radar aircraft and a National Guard tanker on alert. Because the Valdez Marine Terminal is a potential target, there is a multi-disciplinary plan for its defense that involves key individuals from all the key agencies. The lack of aerial radar for the Valdez area is a deficiency that is currently being addressed.

Under the old paradigm, each of the peripheral radar sites in Alaska looked out to the polar basin where the Russians routinely operated. Because there are just a few interior sites coupled with the shift of concern from exterior to interior, it is apparent that interior coverage is not as robust as it might be. This situation is being evaluated at this time.

He made reference to the well-publicized fact that, under certain circumstances, he has the authority to act unilaterally. He pointed out that everyone makes decisions upon data that is presented. Because everyone in his organization knows that it is a profound decision to act upon a hostile threat, he is provided with the best and most current data so he is able to make careful and diligent decisions.

His personal opinion on homeland defense is that although our government is able to bring both military and economic powers to bear, the American people are fundamentally safe and secure because of missile defense. It is a necessary part of homeland defense because it provides Americans the security that they must have in order to have the freedom to act as a great nation. Ballistic missile defense might not be priority number one, but "it's part of the package in its proper place."

Last April, Alaska DoD agreed to pursue the enhancement of the Alaska Land Mobile Radio capabilities. By 2008 there will be a transition from wide band frequency use to that of narrow band. The cost is high, but the benefits would be substantial if the federal government, state government and municipalities were able to operate and communicate on the same frequencies. There would be substantial cost savings if all agencies built their systems using the same framework rather than building separate units. He

identified this as a classic case of good government.

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ concluded his slide presentation with the thought that this is not a war of choice; we are now fighting a war of necessity. Believes Americans and Alaskans are fundamentally safe and secure. It is a fight for our national survival...and we will not lose.

CO-CHAIR MULDER commented there was \$3 million in last year's budget for Mobile Radio. [Balance of comment was indiscernible.]

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ responded his point of contact has been Lt. Governor Ulmer. She has been an advocate on the executive side and it's clear that there is a vision there that is consistent with their view. There is good federal, state and municipal cooperation. It is not a cheap thing but it is something that will last us fifty years or more.

CO CHAIR MULDER asked if there were any military plans for Adak navigational aids.

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ said Adak was a base closure location but the VHF navigational aid and instrument landing system are under contract maintenance agreements. It's unlikely DOD will reassume a base ownership role at that location. Said that Elmendorf, Ft. Rich and the bases north of the range have infra-structure shortfalls that would only be worsened by taking on bases we don't need.

CO-CHAIR MULDER didn't disagree with that assessment but replied that Adak is an important place from the Coast Guard's standpoint - not necessarily the installation itself, but the support apparatus that can be operated out of there.

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ advised there might be a win-win solution in which a government entity maintains the runway and navigational aids while the corporation provides base operations, fire department and similar activities.

REPRESENTATIVE HARRIS asked if there was a plan for additional Coast Guard defense for Valdez.

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ said Tom Barrett has increased his presence in Valdez and there is a plan to bring in active duty military if the threat level rises.

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ discussed the upgrading of the Emergency Operations Center as a result of 9/11, there is now a hot line

that exists between NORAD, ALCOM Crises Support Room, the OAC out at Fort Richardson with 24 hour capability and the Municipality EOC counterpart. That gives you a sense of the interaction we have and the reason that came about is because of the discussion that Harry Kieling had with me. The bottom line is that the communications is now good.

CO CHAIR MULDER said with respect to our afternoon meeting, it would be interesting for the committee to hear General Schwartz' perspective on what we can we do to better coordinate our efforts with regard to retaining and attracting addition military to our state.

LT. GEN. SCHWARTZ said in a general sense, my take is that Alaska is not at risk. It has more to do with the strategic situation than more tactical considerations. My long view is that in ten or fifteen years, there is going to be a reconciliation of some sort between the North and the South Koreans. What that means is that in the Western Pacific the fifty-year rationale for basing U.S. Forces will lose one of its fundamental imperatives and that is the defense of South Korea. When that occurs, if you are the Commander in Chief of the Pacific Command, you're going to ask yourself, ok, if I've got basing problems in WesPAC and I do not want those assets to go back to the Lower 48, I'd rather have them somewhere in Theatre, where do they go. I'd say there are two bastions in the Pacific, one is Guam and the other is Alaska. And so, my sense is that since the criteria for the new base closures legislation proposed by DoD, specifically contains a criterion for consideration of long-term basing prospects, (that wasn't always the case. It was capacity driven). There are encroachment considerations, things of that nature, but nowadays there is this strategic component, which I think is very powerfully in Alaska's favor. I'm sure that those throughout the Pacific Community see it that way too. The same reason UPS and FedEX are here is the same reason you want the Armed Forces here.

To talk more specifically about what to do, let me speak candidly. Knik Arm Crossing and things that have the potential of affecting the clear zones approaching Elmendorf's Runway Five are not the way for long term stability of the base structure. There's a way to work all this out but it might not be the way to have the approach, which I've heard proposed is to bring it to the North side of the Anchorage Port. There are reasons for that. I appreciate them, but my role is to defend the DoD equity. If you're going to keep Elmendorf viable and as a result Rich, you need to be concerned about clear zones and obstructions and things of that nature to the west of the Elmendorf runway.

How do you reach out to people? I think we'll connect with them when they're here in town. I have made a commitment previously to coordinate with Barb (Mee) to make sure that she knows when people of substance are in town so that appropriate people can make a pass if you want to do that. We want to keep it discrete obviously. You have to protect my equities in this, too. I can't allow "campaigning" to occur on the installation, but doing business with federal officials as they pass through, that's a good opportunity and other things that might occur of that nature so that you can make your case in a way that we (the military) ought not to do.

CO-CHAIR MULDER recessed the meeting until 1:30 p.m.

CO-CHAIR MULDER called the meeting back to order at 1:30 p.m. He noted the arrival of Citizen Advisory Board members, Roger Schnell and Chris Gates and presented them with their certificates.

He stated purpose for this afternoon's meeting - to correlate and coordinate the efforts of city and state agencies to inform citizens of how important the military is to Alaska and how Alaskans can carry the message of Alaska's resources and location to both Military and Hill decision makers in Washington. In all probability Congress may not deal with any BRAC action this session. Senator Stevens' staff indicated yesterday to us that in all likelihood there's less than a 40% chance that the Conference Committee would pass the BRAC legislation. We hope to establish dialogue today how this type of information would be useful now and when and if we ever do face another BRAC action. We have invited a number of guests today who have a wide range of experience and talent. Serving on this committee has impressed me of the vast resources in our state and yet we don't fully utilize them in a coordinated effort to maximize the return to the State. We have our committee doing one thing, the Anchorage and Fairbanks Chambers doing another thing and so on. If we could work in a coordinated effort we could maximize the time, the commitment and the impact that we could have. Therefore, several individuals have been invited to come here speak to us today concerning the strategies they are looking at - opportunities that they are seizing and points they might have as to how we might better coordinate all the efforts.

With that, I'd like to invite Anchorage Mayor George Wuerch to

speaking.

MAYOR GEORGE WUERCH: I'd like to set the stage to outline the multiple contacts and avenues of communication available to municipalities. I'll speak of the operating government side, not the School District. You have a member of your Committee (George Vakalis) who can better represent the School District's activities. Wuerch pointed out that utilities maintain offices and lobbyists in Washington and municipal officials frequently travel there to press their particular viewpoint. The importance of that to the issue of our defense position in Alaska and value of it to future developments - whether on the downside of a BRAC action - or the upside of evolution of national military defense or increased logistics presence of the newly designated interim brigade combat team for U.S. Army Alaska is that we have intelligence avenues. We can with very little effort and money exercise this. I'm reminded of the international business community in the 50s and 60s when an American executive doing business or traveling overseas, would return and voluntarily do a debrief with our intelligence community. Times have changed of course and that ended but that was so effective after WWII. I think if we could create that mutual willingness in our various organizations. What we'd need here in Alaska is a politically knowledgeable Alaskan that could absorb information and share it with interested parties.

I would encourage us to think in terms of who we have who might sign on to take that job instead of trying to reach out to some external "professional". There are in Washington, D.C. a myriad of "beltway bandits" who would be willing to take your \$100,000 and represent us but I don't think we need to do that. I think what we have is the ability with our own resources to bring back or to carry messages as long as we have some central hub in Alaska.

Having said that, unless you want to go into the particular names of individuals we have representing us in D.C., I'm happy to respond to any questions. I think your chairman's comments about any possible BRAC legislation soon with the events of 9/11 are probably more remote than they were before 9/11. I think we're all focused on security. Now's the time for us to be organizing and stay proactive in this effort.

MR. LESTENKOF asked if he had anyone in Washington to track legislation that is of interest to municipalities.

MAYOR WUERCH said they did have several people, but most of their contracts are specific to a function. For example, Governor

Sheffield, who came out of retirement to help with the port development plan, has two lobbyists in Washington that are involved with funding the port project. He said some of their lobbyists are already connected with the defense industry and it wouldn't take much to have them keep their eyes and ears open. He thought perhaps they could be of assistance.

CO-CHAIR MULDER mentioned committee member George Vakalis attendance at NAID (National Association of Installation Developers). Some of the discussions at NAID have transformed from cities that have been impacted by base closure to those now trying to be proactive about how they can reduce costs. Mulder asked the Mayor if he and Vakalis have talked about city opportunities - how you might interact. I know AEDC is part of that as well.

MAYOR WUERCH said he isn't familiar with that organization (NAID) and we haven't talked about it this go-around - but they were very much active in the last (BRAC) go-around.

CO CHAIR MULDER said when they talked with Senator Stevens - one of the issues that came up was trying to host some of the dignitaries that came up - both civilian and military and government - to better acquaint them with Alaska. Does the muni have any type of informal committee or are you alerted at all?

MAYOR WUERCH said they haven't focused on that issue yet.

CO-CHAIR MULDER agreed with Mayor Wuerch's suggestion that we need a central post to collect and disseminate information and perhaps a home host location; someone willing at short notice to host visitors in a personal setting.

MAYOR WUERCH asked if Mulder meant a home host as opposed to VIP quarters at the base.

GEORGE VAKALIS reflected that back in the 94 time frame and a lot of visitors coming here, not only the Chamber but some legislators and certainly the military were very involved with them but so was the local government to some extent as far as some hosting and I think that was what Senator Stevens was talking about. But to be more proactive this time because we have an awful lot of business community contacts with their corporate headquarters and/or contacts in Washington DC on legislative matters where these folks could also be of great service to us in communicating how great Alaska is for all the military. And certainly some of those folks come HERE. And if someone high up in the corporate structure does have influence in

the Washington area we really don't know it - mainly only by circumstance. We have the venue where we can get the information if there is a military or DoD official coming. But Stevens' focus was not only the DoD decision-makers, both civilian and military, but also the corporate structure of big business to help advocate for Alaska.

MAYOR WUERCH thought that was an excellent point. Recalled from his industry days we have a lot of companies in Alaska that have a Washington office - whether oil company or contractors as well as the professional associations who have offices and full time staffs in DC. It wouldn't take long to compile a list of those with fully staffed offices in Washington. I'm also thinking about the Alaskans across the state who are serving on federal boards and commissions. Former Mayor Tom Fink for instance serves on a federal commission and still goes to DC once a year plus several meetings throughout the year across the country. It's amazing the kind of network you can put together when you start to chart out who all the players might be.

MR. HOYT said he didn't have to explain to Mayor Wuerch the importance of the military to the economies of Anchorage and Fairbanks and all Alaska and questioned if it would be worthwhile to select some of these lobbyists to kind of keep an eye on military issues that affect Alaska?

MAYOR WUERCH said yes they could do that. First step would be to communicate with each one of them; to have them give him a statement of their qualifications and expectations and see who might be the best - but quite honestly, I think tasking all of them to keep their eyes and ears open - just walking down the halls of a House Office Building you can sometimes pick up information and just having our folks who are on the Hill keep their ears open but more importantly for them to remember to go back to their offices and send us an email or whoever our HUB here is and have them say here's what I just heard or observed.

GEORGE VAKALIS pointed out to Mayor Wuerch Alaskan bases have great potential for expansion capabilities. Several things we need to be looking at. If we could look into the stationing of the F22 Raptors and the C17s that would enhance our ground and air forces capabilities worldwide. Opportunity of the Interim Brigade Combat Team which eventually will be the new Brigade Combat Team format but that's going to need a Division Headquarters. And wouldn't it be great - we have the capacity of a Division Headquarters already here - nothing went away - advocating for something like that as well as maybe another Interim Brigade Combat Team because we have expansion capability.

From a proactive standpoint all of us should come up with a strategic plan to enhance Alaska's position - because these decisions will be made.

MAYOR WUERCH commented he represents Anchorage but recognizes the importance of keeping a statewide perspective. Anything that benefits the state will enhance Anchorage. Wanted to be on the record that he is favor of anything that will benefit the entire state.

CO CHAIR MULDER mentioned that we did invite Fairbanks government and chamber officials who could not attend, but left their representation in the capable hands of Dean Owen, Chick Wallace and Representative James; and agreed we are working for the benefit of the entire state, not just one area.

GEORGE VAKALIS said that another point to what makes Alaska's military such a steadfast organization is that we have the Elmendorf/Fort Richardson and Fort Wainwright/Eielson links as well as Fairbanks and Anchorage's Ted Stevens' airports as well as the great Port capacity. If we strip away any one leg we weaken it but with training areas, geographical location it's a strong force.

BARBARA MEE asked whether the chambers and others' efforts to attract units such as the Raptors, the C17s from other places were being coordinated with the Alaska delegation so we wouldn't be getting out ahead of them.

GEORGE VAKALIS said that no, that the Chamber has about four major projects the military committee is working on. Both Alaskan Command and U.S.Army Alaska have members on Anchorage Chamber so it's a statewide approach. They're working on a strawman pamphlet much like was done in 94- but one which not only captures Alaska military capabilities, but capabilities of Anchorage and Fairbanks resources that enhance the military capabilities. Also working on a series of briefing slides that individuals or corporate leaders could use highlighting the military in Alaska and what Alaska has to offer the military.

REPRESENTATIVE JEANNETTE JAMES said she thought that was the key point - what we can do for the military to keep what we have and expand. Necessity to show our interest in supporting the military - making available for them what makes their life easier.

MR. LESTENKOF asked Vakalis if State Chamber could come into play

with Anchorage Chamber is doing.

GEORGE VAKALIS said that other than the Anchorage Chamber having members on the State Chamber it's not an issue they've taken up. But once the Anchorage Chamber signs off on it's strawman pamphlets it is something they would go out to find a mechanism for funding.

REPRESENTATIVE JEANETTE JAMES offered as to who's the best sales person for military's importance, she feels the State Chamber's main focus is tourism and might conflict with promoting the military.

CO-CHAIR MULDER stated air space, Alpen Glow ski area and the Knik Arm Bridge are all areas of interest for the military and they want assurances they will be protected against encroachment in the future. Asked the Mayor if they'd had conversations about any of these.

MAYOR WUERCH said, with respect to the Knik Arm Bridge, Governor Sheffield is negotiating an additional road easement at the base of the bluff behind the port. They delivered to our delegation a mark up version of the 1983 study. The key issues are the removal of some obstacles that existed in 1983 that no longer exist. Number one is the removal of the old Native Hospital at the junction of the Old Glenn Highway and Seward Highway. It's removal makes it possible to take a road from that junction across Ship Creek on a new viaduct nearly parallel to what's there now. The second big player is the removal of the Defense Fuels Farm behind the Port, which now allows the construction of a road behind the Port that would go up to where the Knik Arm crossing abutment may be. This provides access to the port without cutting through either Elmendorf or Fort Richardson. General Schwartz' team has been very responsive in coming back with an initiative that opens that door to establish an easement at the base of the Bluff. Mayor Wuerch has written State House and Senate asking that \$75,000 be appropriated early to update the '83 Concept Study. DOT has received some money for beginning EIS for the crossing. Things are possible within the next 24 months. Timing's important because the Transportation Efficiency Act of 21st Century is up for reauthorization in 2003 and we need to give our Delegation the tools with which to lobby to get that bridge started.

MR. LESTENKOF asked the Mayor to clarify if they are looking at the 1983 Study as the plan for the Knik Arm Crossing.

MAYOR WUERCH said the 1983 study looked at a series of approaches

on the East side to get to it and a series of road networks on the West side. The end result was a recommendation that pretty much brought it across close to the Port (Carin Point) but had to drop it because of the obstacles previously mentioned.

MR. LESTENKOF said the reason he brought it up was because of General Schwartz comments of concern this morning.

GOVERNOR SHEFFIELD said he met with Lt. Gen. Schwartz and Brig. Gen. Fraser. As far as what the Port wants and needs to protect in the future if there's going to be a bridge are two different things. One's a lot more highway and one's just a road and rail behind the Port to do our business. The military's concerned about security can be overcome because a fence would be installed; they're concerned about quality of life issues (noise factors - emissions etc.) for Cherry Hill housing. We're working all those issues out. It wouldn't be fair if I only went for a road and a rail, which may be all that we need right now, but must look to future needs for the area. Mayor's Planning Department says Muni will be out of residential land by 2020. Port grows 2 to 3% a year.

As to what we can do for the military -stay friendly. We're noted for that. The Railroad gives away a million dollars worth of tickets each year for military use. Lots we can do. Shouldn't take them for granted which we probably do.

CO CHAIR MULDER - perfect opportunity to introduce Alaska Railroad's President, recently retired General Pat Gamble.

MR. PAT GAMBLE said his perspective is slightly different than some of what he's heard. In talking of your value to the military, I will talk to you from previous experience what the military views when dealing with BRAC action; how it weighs the different things that communities came forth with in their energetic efforts. So while what I have to say may sound a bit funny I'm just telling you the way it was at the time and that I don't think a lot has changed.

Base values and reputations are built long before BRAC occurs. It isn't what you do right before BRAC it's in terms of your history and how you've related to the military over an extended period of time. History and consistency count heavily because, before the BRAC process begins, military services meet and evaluate all sites; there are no sacred cows. One of the first questions asked is how difficult it is to do business in a particular area. Next, it is important to realize there are linkages between bases in terms of force structure and the

ability to consolidate or move force structure quickly to an area of interest depending on what that force structure's mission is . In other words if you want to put tankers on the coast - you put bombers inland because they have longer range- you tend to put fighters toward the coast line where they can meet up with the tankers and get to the Pacific and Europe faster. If the Air Force had its way that's the way they would organize and as we got smaller we would consolidate because it's more efficient.

You have two opportunities here. You have an opportunity to gain and you have an opportunity not to lose. If you play your strategy right I think you can take advantage of both of those. You cannot lose and when they look around to consolidate you can also gain. If that's what you want to do.

It's important to understand the missions of military units that are in the state. Understand their mission because that is what they're concerned about and where they place the most weighted value. If they're unable to train and exercise to that mission, that location becomes of little value to them. Strategic value will be relinquished to maintain training and mission value. When BRAC occurs, they will view a base or unit according to encumbrances. If they are encumbered and training is not possible, value decreases. Mobility potential then the ability to enhance, refine and do their mission are predominate.

In working to keep a base or post open, you're working for or against preconceived notions relating to mission training and structure so you need to work that to your advantage when you build a strategy. Pick those things the military already likes and enhance them as much as possible. (For states who do not already have a history of being pro-military - it is not going to work for them to all of a sudden become proactive and hire lobbyists to enhance their ability to retain bases).

The military is looking ahead a long way - they know this is probably going to be the last one (BRAC) for a very long time and they want to get it right. So in going with the flow, if you know what their mission is, you won't be going in and telling DoD what you think is good for them about Alaska, they already know. You want to enhance and protect what you have that the military needs. Not Alaska, but other communities have gone in and tried to present its case based on how they looked at what they had to offer - not through the military's eyes. The DoD will state it's value. If it needs training space, a state saying it has good communities, schools, etc. won't mean anything. Those issues might be important but they're only frosting on the cake, they don't tip the scales.

Cited a story from Inside the Air Force, a military publication, that said Secretary of the Air Force will allow World (?) Fighting Commanders in Chiefs to guide his basing decisions, according to this source. In particular Pacific and Central Command Chiefs, such as CINCPAC would be able to provide Secretary of the Air Force information regarding what he thinks his priority bases ought to be. So, our strategy ought to be when we see things like this, is not to run to a staffer on the Hill, but we need to get with the CINC and find out what his program is and decide what we can offer to his program. I can tell you the CINCPAC has a very large program and basing is key. And part of his concern is what happens if we have bases close in Korea because of a reconciliation of North and South. Where do those forces go; how do they continue to support his over all strategy for guarding against growth and resurgence of militarism in China or other unforeseen things that may go on in the Pacific. In figuring out how Alaska fits in that then is what we want to tell the CINC. Not tell him what his job is, but tell him what we're willing to offer so he can do his job better. And that brings you to the fact that if you're going to get around, you have to have airlift and Alaska has the room to expand if that's what we want to say. Let him know that offer's on the table and all they have to do is come and talk to us; tell us what they need; and let us tell them what we can do for them. If we have to bring fighter units back, Alaska is a forward position, but it is a route over the horizon position at the same time. If we're going to swap the fighters out in Okinawa, which are principally air to air fighters, for the Raptor, for example, which needs this expanded broader air space, there is no broader, better air space anywhere left in the United States than there is here in Alaska.

But, offering that, going forward and saying we know you're going to need more training opportunity, we know you're going to need more air space- if we decide we can do that then being proactive and saying we're here to work with you on these things - we can hang the shingle out and say we're open for business.

Some dos and don'ts to go along with these thoughts:

Don't concentrate on saying how important the military is to a city for jobs.

Don't say how important the commissary is to retired military.
Don't tell DOD how much money they will save by closing certain bases and keeping others open.

Don't stifle a commanders attempt to improve internal quality of life opportunities on bases. Base may need to build more housing on base, commissaries, etc. that may look like its

taking away from local community.
Don't be afraid to deal with local commanders; you don't have to go to Washington to make your point.
Don't believe schools and housing are predominant issues.
Don't compete the Air Force with either commercial or private aviation.
Don't interfere with communication capabilities.
Don't encroach on bases.
Don't assume the Washington delegation can fix everything.
Do capitalize on new missions. Sec Def Rumsfeld is seeking creation of three new assistant secretaries of Defense between the new under secretary of defense for counter terrorism for security. One each for counter terrorism, support for civil authority and international and humanitarian support. There are new missions being created right now that will have worldwide application wherever there are American bases, American people and businesses in ways I don't even know yet. Our ability to stay in tune to understand what's happening in these areas and then raise our hands and say we can offer some resources for you to be able to do that mission. We're a hop and a step away from Asia and there's a lot going on over there and maybe there's going to be a need for some headquarters or communications or quick transportation. There are tests going on - there's a lot of new equipment coming out. It's tough to find test areas. There's some pilot-less machinery that's starting to fly - they need space to do operational testing. I'm not talking about the original testing that goes on like in New Mexico or one of the ranges at Eglin (Florida) - but once they get them going they need operational testing. They need to get with military units, become parts of exercises and get an operational check out. Once again, we've got this wonderful air space up here and these kinds of things might prove fruitful. We flew one of these Drones (unmanned reconnaissance aircraft) from West Coast to Australia in one hop; exercised with it down there and then flew it back. It was all pre-programmed and flew by itself. There's some tremendous technology coming and tapping into that and opening our arms and saying we've got opportunity to test some of that out here - what can we do to help. When you test you bring in communications, people, temporary facilities and structure and then sometimes if they like it, those temporary things turn into permanent things. Our test areas would be more up to the North and there's development for Fairbanks. Jointness and experimentation. Experimentation is a bad word in the military right now. Jointness and Experimentation that I'm talking about are on the larger scale and there are almost no places left in the

Lower 48 where you can get the Army, Navy, Marines and the Air Force all together doing their thing at Brigade level or above. You can do tactical stuff on a small level but to find a coast line so you can bring the battle group up and then join in at a Brigade-sized, throughout all those services, exercise is virtually impossible. You can't fly over California with military aircraft to get to the Eastern part of California or into Nevada; the maneuvering space on the ground in some of those ranges is such that once you've been there and done it once or twice you've maneuvered the only way you can because it's so limited. Depending on time of the year you can come up to Alaska five times and never see the same country and that's very valuable for training. So the idea of capitalizing on new missions and meeting the needs that pressing the military right now is important.

Do be proactive with regard to homeland defense- a brand new mission. When I was aware of that job in joint forces command about a year and half ago that was about a 30 man office. That office today is up to about 90 people and growing. They have no idea where they're going to go and in fact the CINC who owns that particular staff may very well become the military Commander in Chief of Homeland Defense. We don't know what his plan will be for homeland defense but it may be that more organizational or communication components and I wouldn't think that Alaska would be left out of that - so what could we offer to be proactive and say come on up - we need homeland defense, too and here's what we can offer you by way of support

Two ways to look at dealing with the military on issues - one is compromise -

ok, you've got a problem we have an issue but we want to help you solve your problem so lets sit down and make this thing work. OR, delimiting the impact and that is ok, I know what you want to do but I can't let you do that but I can let you do a little part of that. There's a whole different approach to one verses the other. Delimiting means how can I reduce the impact of what they want to do to the very minimum so no one even sees it or is impacted by it. The other one is how can I offer as much as I can so they can get their mission done and I can get advantage out of it at the same time. One's proactive - one's defensive It's amazing between communities - one will take one approach and the other a different one. I remember as a Wing Commander in Phoenix at our Air Force's largest fighter training base- more fighters and trainers sitting on the ramp than we have in all of PACAF

or Europe. Understanding that mission of course means if you've got all those trainers you have to be training some place. I was on the Governor's Air Port Commission for a short time. They wanted to put the airport right in the middle of area between the base and the training area. I tried to make the point to them they could have their cake and eat it too. They could be an aviation state- build a big international airport for NAFTA North South Cargo Hauling and all those things they wanted - but why would they want to cut their other foot off while they are growing one at the same time. Why don't you do both because it's the training space that counts. The base doesn't count. That base is on the table like every other base. You've got a vine - and that's the ability to train and the air space that goes with it. You've got a grape - and that's the base. You cut that vine and the grape shrivels up and BRAC will take it. What the base and the community did was encroachment and that's a big killer for bases. Land was being encroached and the farmers were being offered prices to sell off their land and build their houses up close to the base. With 225 fighters or so- that flight pattern is full and it's noisy 24 hours a day. We knew as soon as those people built houses up next to the base they would start complaining and try to stop the flying- so the community stepped in and bought the land and said they weren't going to develop on that land and basically saved it in my view. It was a very bold step but they understood the value of what the mission was and preserved the mission and then preserve the base.

Don't be afraid to deal with the local commanders. They talk to their bosses and when those bosses to the bosses in Washington what they say is "General Fraser said this". They put a lot of stock in the local commander. You don't have to run to Washington to make a point. You can make it with the local Post and Base Commanders and local general officers

The issue of affordable, available housing , schools, living in a safe community - all those are very important quality of life issues to military people, but I'll tell you we've put up for many years not having those things around our bases - wishing that we'd had them - but we're there anyway. So they're not the predominating issues . They can be great attractors and pluses but if you cut the mission and have the worlds greatest housing it's not going to save the base. The other way, you can have the world's greatest mission and have lousy housing and we're still going to move people to the base and they sort of fend for themselves. They find housing where they can until it can be made available. I think the idea of people across Knik Arm once that gets

built and the fact that suburbia could be growing up there - that's another place that could be feeding Elmendorf with commuters if someday that happens.

Do speak with one voice. Whether you're a Chamber of Commerce - the Governor - the Mayor. There's nothing wrong with saying we can't do this - as long as you can back it up and everybody says it with the same voice. Try to avoid mixed signals

A couple of never-nevers are you don't want to compete the Air Force with the airport because the Air Force will lose and when they do they'll leave. Don't compete the Air Force with commercial or private aviation. Sit down and work those issues out in a positive way like Alaska has a history of doing and in fact it's a model for other states because you've been so successful. That's a great Kudo - and it was done years ago and it's still remembered very well in the office of the Secretary of the Air Force and the halls of the Pentagon. They know we can make things happen other states can't. But the minute we start competing those things instead of cooperating than you're on your way to being a BRAC candidate in my view.

Never interfere with communications capability. For the Army on the ground for hand held radios for aircraft radio frequency - when we start reallocating frequencies or eliminating the ability to communicate over as vast an area as we have in Alaska - communications is fundamental to the mission. When you start to erode the primary mission, you start to erode the viability of the whole apparatus.

Never encroach and never assume that your Washington delegation can fix it because they're realists too and understand the mission of the military and sometimes somebody's got to give someplace. I think our legislators in Washington by and large have given a lot in the past. They are very responsible when it comes to these things and are ready to anti up if the time is right, or go to the complete opposite extreme if they don't have any seniority at all and it's sacrificial time and they spin the dial and it comes up "state 'x'" and that state doesn't have the power to overcome it and that can happen too. So the idea that we've reached an impasse, I can't live with this, I'm going to go to Washington and Washington will fix it- that can be dangerous as a strategy.

(Talked of futility of communities hanging on to bases who have no mission and are only kept going through political efforts. Only a matter of time till these bases are closed).

MR. LESTENKOF asked what Alaska's strongest point is as far as

air operations are concerned.

MR. GAMBLE said quick access (you can be in Europe or in the Pacific) and expansion capabilities are extremely important points. And to be sure that Alaskans understand expansion. There's more demand - air space - communications. Have to WANT to expand. If answer is yes - play it for all it's worth. Taking a proactive position sends a powerful signal. Sit down with (General) Norty Schwartz and say we're interested in playing on this- how should we go forward - can you give us some ideas. Let Norty be the go-between because he's got to go to his boss at PACAF, the component who would talk to CINCPAC. Use that military channel. And then at a point in time, when it's right, depending on how CINCPAC reacts - his initial reaction may be well - that's really great, we've got a lot of planning to do, we'll get back to you. At some point he's going to come back and say exactly what are they willing to offer- would they be willing to do this.. or that.. And then it gets down to Norty and he comes back and says would we be willing to bed down a squadron of C17s and a squadron of F22s. Would we have that much expansion capacity? Then the community's got to get involved - now it's back to us. And we say is this really what we mean or is that biting off a little bit too much. It's like negotiating but I see the dialogue working up and down that military channel. I don't see getting a group together at the very beginning and going to visit Admiral Blair , the current CINCPAC. I think he would be cordial and find it interesting but it's a bullet I'd save until later on in the game. Later on when he comes here for a visit to bring him in and specifically talk about what offers you have made and to seal that deal between the civilian side and him directly. But I would see that in the later stages.

MR. HOYT asked Gamble in his opinion, is the air space Alaska has sufficient to support additional training for Air Force.

MR. GAMBLE... In the abstract, absolutely. It's the largest single piece of air space we've got anywhere. It's bigger than the Goldwater air space (Arizona) it's bigger than the Nellis Air space (Nevada) by a factor of like five, I think. It's huge. Now when you say is it adequate. We have commercial operations.. private operations.. airport operations.. We have to consider and interface those to determine what the reality of adequate is. But if you just take it in the abstract and look at the MOA that we've got - assuming you could use the whole thing, it's wonderful.

MR. HOYT - so it would be advantageous for the State of Alaska to continue to support the MOAs.

MR. GAMBLE - Yes sir, in fact it is one of the best things Alaska offers on the air side, no doubt about it. In my last job the XO of the Air Force (head of operations for the Air Force). we had this Air Expeditionary Force - an organization the AF undertook - where you take a group of airplanes and on short notice you move them into a crisis area. You can't just take 100 airplanes and move them into a crisis area for practice in New York - or Florida or Texas, anymore. You could in the old days but not anymore. And about the only place you can go is Nevada and half that range is owned by the Atomic Energy Commission and the minute they want to use it, they pick up the phone and it shuts down just like that. All airplanes stop flying and you don't fly.

And you never know when that's going to happen. And so when you look at the places you have available there aren't very many. So when the XO called he asked is that air space up in Alaska really that good because we need a place to rehearse to train this unit force. That was probably a little over a year ago and today on the books they're coming up to train in Alaska. So, absolutely.

TAPE 01-07, SIDE A

CO-CHAIR MULDER recessed the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

CO-CHAIR MULDER called the meeting back to order at 3:20 p.m. He noted the arrival of Citizen Advisory Board member, Mead Treadwell and presented him with his certificate.

MANO FREY, Arctic Power co-chair, opened by saying maintaining the military is important, and the prospects of nurturing military growth throughout the state are truly exciting.

In thinking about what I might say this afternoon I thought back to 1989. It hasn't been reflected much in the media recently but in 1989 we almost had the coastal plain of ANWR (Arctic National Wildlife Refuge) open. Our delegation was pushing forward and at the time George H.W. was president. Then on March 24th, Joseph Hazelwood became the laborer of the year (when the Exxon Valdez spill occurred) and the opportunity to open ANWR dissolved for years. If that incident hadn't occurred we'd be 12 years down the road of oil probably coming into the line the last couple of years. So one of the things that happened as we started to resaddle the horse - there were a lot of great support groups working to support opening ANWR. Resource Development Council, the Alliance, the Chambers - and all the different groups - none of them doing anything that was negative or bad - just that they

were all doing their own separate issues. That's how Arctic Power was born - as an effort to try and coordinate the message. Hopefully, the burden's going to be lifted from my shoulders soon as far as being co-chair, but one of the things we accomplished is coordinating the effort. It provides the material, it provides the arguments, it responds and every person that's involved has the same information. I know many of you have traveled to DC and helped us in our efforts lobbying both the House and the Senate and each of you have the same information so no missed messages are sent and no false statements made.

I would suggest that is one approach as far as the military I this State do - is to have a single focal point. You will still have the same groups supporting the efforts but they'll be singing from the same sheet of music as far as the mission.

The other entity I'll mention is the Denali Commission. It was established by Senator Stevens, who was frustrated by federal agency work done in rural Alaska because there was no coordination. The Denali Commission is a perfect model for coordinating federal and state efforts- whether they be training, construction or maintenance. The Commission provides the focal point and an opportunity for all those groups to coordinate.

I think both Arctic Power and the Denali Commission are excellent models that could be utilized by this group in trying to for the same kind of thing. I don't have any answers as to what the right mechanism is but I would encourage those of you who are involved in these things to move ahead with that kind of approach.

REPRESENTATIVE JEANETTE JAMES thanked Mano Frey for his efforts with Arctic Power.

CO CHAIR MULDER mentioned that lack of coordination appears to be our problem. We just aren't proceeding with full potential that we could.

MANO FREY agreed and that the committee could expand the opportunities out there on a statewide basis by having a single focal point.

DUANE HEYMAN, Executive Director for Commonwealth North, said his comments build upon those made previously to focus on ways to use civic, business and public policy organizations to help further what we've been talking about. It's an opportunity to build a long term track record in communication, personal relationships and help formulate strategy, learn from and influence key people, involve local commanders and educate the community.

If there were some kind of a clearing house for information you could take advantage of the range of activities these different organizations have by way of offering speaking opportunities; having dinners with various Boards of Directors; more intimate dinners in people's homes; there was some talk of a need to find places and people who could entertain and there's a very strong network among these Boards and executive committees of various organizations who have access to those kinds of things. If a coordinating group or person were aware of the different missions and interests of different groups, they could pick what would be most appropriate - i.e. if it were something that affected a local community you'd go to the Anchorage or Fairbanks Chamber. If it was a statewide policy issue you might go to Commonwealth North. By utilizing these groups and networks that already exist - that would fit in with their missions.

CO CHAIR MULDER said dovetailing on the concept of Arctic Power, but recognizing that Arctic Power has some vested interest to help fund Arctic Power, that even though we do fund it publicly, it's really more or less private enterprise. He asked Heyman how he saw an entity like this happening - did he see it as an outgrowth of this committee or something separate. Who could pay for it.

DUANE HEYMAN said someone could hire an individual, an employee to track that. Or through an organization like The Group - that the Anchorage Chamber pulled together - which includes executive directors and elected heads of various organizations - to meet and talk about common interests. Maybe we could add a military component to that organization, or this group could have another meeting to talk about those things.

CO CHAIR MULDER mentioned in past conversations with General Ralston as to what Alaska could do to help familiarize the military, he'd said to utilize groups like Commonwealth North to give speaking opportunities to key military. Mulder asked Heyman if they'd focused on that and how is it determined whom they ask.

MR. HEYMAN said its part of their mission to ask key people to Alaska for this interchange and their program committee is always looking for speakers and assumes the Chamber is also.

MR. VAKALIS says Chamber is also and trying to find out what's on the horizon to keep membership informed.

MR. HEYMAN said there are many connections and resources people have here to bring up speakers and most all are very supportive

because the sustainability of the economy is important matter and military's a major part of that.

MR. LESTENKOF asked if Commonwealth North had weekly speakers and how many military speakers in past year.

MR. HEYMAN said they have at least one meeting a month as well as different formats. He didn't have exact number of military leaders in past year - but past speakers have included General Ralston, Secretary of Defense Cohen; head of the Space Command.

CO CHAIR MULDER then introduced Larry Crawford, Anchorage Economic Development Corporation who had asked to be moved from the morning agenda.

LARRY CRAWFORD reviewed the committee of the Price Waterhouse study recommendations, the conclusions the committee reached and the work AEDC has done with various military organizations.

The Price Waterhouse study identified Anchorage as a beneficial location for certain high cost, high demand items in the North Pacific and Europe. They also found that Anchorage is strategically located to provide services such as maintenance and product support. They recommended meeting with third party logistics providers and the DOD vendors to promote the Anchorage advantage. They should consider incentives to defray startup costs, pursue DOD to commission a study to identify specific vendor items to be stocked in Anchorage and continue to pursue support functions based on Anchorage's strategic location. When he says Anchorage he means the system because they have been working with Fairbanks.

All the findings and recommendations represent opportunities that exist but an essential finding is that the military wants to piggyback on the commercial system. They want a good commercial infrastructure to which they can add their logistics.

The scope and objective of the current project, and this is the second appropriation the Legislature made for this project, is to focus on global companies with military and commercial customers. We've contracted with a firm to help us with this and are also working with D Logistics from Germany, who has a high interest in and is in process of negotiating a lease for a major hub at the Anchorage Airport. We've pre-qualified 10 to 15 companies and the criteria we've used are: what are their markets; who are their customers, where are the factories and where are their distribution hubs.

Some of the companies we're looking at: 3M, Lockheed Martin,

Boeing, General Dynamics, Motorola, InTel.

We believe opportunities do exist both on military and commercial side and if they can establish this infrastructure that interests the military, I think we'll see some real opportunities open up. We still have the military logistic steering committee in existence and Fairbanks is a member. We believe the current project will result in some new business and in identifying some new opportunities. There's need to continue to follow up on the current project. We need to continue to renew our contacts with military leaders; follow up with the companies we identify as opportunities and working with DoD Logistics in establishing a major hub here in Anchorage.

CO-CHAIR MULDER asked how Fire Island figured into the picture and whether air space is an issue there.

MR. CRAWFORD said Fire Island is one of the alternatives in the airport master plan. He considers Fire Island an excellent industrial site. It's within the city limits so anything that happens there will add to the tax base. It's 3,000 acres of undeveloped land and wouldn't interfere with City traffic. There may be some access issues and we wouldn't want to do anything locally that would interfere with military air space.

MR. LESTENKOF asked whether Anchorage is ready to accept expansion.

MR. CRAWFORD said the broader community is ready, but there are neighborhood issues that are difficult to fight through. Some public meetings don't really give an accurate representation because those present at meetings are frequently those most immediately affected. He is sure the total community believes the Anchorage Airport is a major economic generator. Crawford said that one in ten jobs in Anchorage is tied to the Airport.

MR. LESTENKOF then asked whether there was any information about repositioning military equipment in Alaska in the Price Waterhouse study.

MR. CRAWFORD said it did and it is an opportunity, but to be able to serve Europe they must also be able to serve Asia. That is where the savings come from.

CO CHAIR MULDER then introduced Dave Hudspeth, member of the military committee of the Anchorage Chamber of Commerce.

DAVE HUDSPETH explained their mission is to foster and encourage

relationships among the business and military communities. He is involved in the committee due to his strong belief in the importance of the military to the Anchorage and Alaskan economy.

Areas of concern for the committee have been base closures, national missile defense, attracting military units and government privatization. Hudspeth deferred to George Vakalis, who's the most knowledgeable Chamber member on Base Closure and military related matters.

Both Anchorage and Fairbanks Chamber members voiced methods they are involved with to show appreciation for it's military neighbors by yearly event.

GEORGE VAKALIS reiterated General Gamble's and Mano Frey's earlier assessments of the need to speak with one voice. The Anchorage Chamber is preparing briefing slides that look at military from holistic point of view from Alaska. No matter the color of the suit or where it's stationed - it's being looked at as one organization. The slides will take into account our jointness and training capabilities and the military air space; our geographical location which allows the military to get to any place faster than from anywhere else.

REPRESENTATIVE CISSNA said there are people that don't want anyone interfering with their personal activities. As a legislator, she hears those types of complaints and realizes this is very sensitive matter.

CHICK WALLACE spoke of civilian pockets in the Fairbanks area that have expressed frustration with military activity and the cost benefit ratio of military presence.

DAVE OWEN said that Fairbanks has counterpart to Anchorage's Chamber's military committee and the Borough Mayo appointed a BRAC committee as an organization that would, when the time came, have a structure to do whatever needs to be done. And, I think this committee (JASC) might be the forum to address who and how do we get that central message.

CO CHAIR MULDER then introduced Mead Treadwell.

MEAD TREADWELL represents three organizations. He is the managing director of the Institute of the North; he works with Governor Hickel who is secretary general of the Northern Forum; and he is a member of the Arctic Research Commission.

The Northern Forum has been brought into humanitarian aid issues

four or five times in the last several years and they have always had military assistance in their relief efforts. This coming spring, the Northern Forum will host a conference to bring representatives from regions throughout the Arctic to plan for cold region disaster assistance. Coinciding with the conference is a meeting of a cooperative group of eight Arctic nations that work in disaster assistance.

He pointed out that large portions of the kind of research done in the Arctic, such as biodiversity and global change, have been sponsored by and budgeted through the military.

The Northern Forum and the eight Arctic nations have been working with the Institute of the North as the Secretariat for the Circumpolar Infrastructure Task Force to discuss air routes and logistics in the north. The next chairman of the Arctic Council will be Iceland, which is a country with many of the same air support and U.S. base characteristics and issues. Governor Knowles recently invited the President of Iceland to visit Alaska to encourage a cordial working relationship.

The Institute of the North is planning another national policy conference on national missile defense and other issues that give Alaska visibility. They realize the importance of speaking with one voice and will stay in touch with the committee.

CO-CHAIR MULDER said the state needs to speak with one voice and formulate a strategic plan of action to coordinate the civilian and military people back east and acquaint them with Alaska. He challenged the committee to become active and commit their time and efforts. We need a coordinated message that will assure we are all saying the same things. When General Campbell, General Smith's replacement comes on board, he's interested in coming to Alaska. That would be an opportunity, if there are to be expanded missions, for Alaskans to discuss with him what we have to offer. There are missions that Hawaiians are opposing the Army on and that might be a mission Alaska could offer to do. We need to include in that strategic plan how we're going to court the civilian and military folks from back East to acquaint them with Alaska.

What I'm throwing out to my committee members here is: do we want to be an active committee and take this? It's going to take a commitment on your part.

As stated earlier, when some committee members, Barb Mee and I discussed these matters with Senator Stevens, we talked about the possibility of a retreat. I'm curious to get feedback from the

committee if they're interested and willing to make that kind of commitment.

MR. WALLACE agreed with the chairman's ideas and added it would be a good idea to put together a resource bank to show what could be offered. The super computer at the University of Fairbanks and the Center for Global Change were resources that came to mind.

MR. LESTENKOF offered that because he lives in Hawaii part time, although the army is having difficulties with training areas there, they're good neighbors and the senators work together closely. If anything is put on the table about replacing Hawaii, it's important to be very strategic and state the concerns about the COPAC in the Pacific - if anything is moved back to CONUS from the Pacific we are concerned about that and we'd want to keep it in the Pacific - and we're available!

JANICE NIELSEN addressed the problem Hawaii's facing regarding the training area the Army's had prior to WWII. It had been shut down for training since 1998 because of fires and other issues. Training area is used not only by active Army but also the Guard, Reserve and Marines stationed there. Recently they settled out of court a two-year litigation with a group of environmentalists and the Army's now back training on a limited basis for the next three years. During that time an EIS will be done. Problems include endangered species and cultural resources. Whatever comes out in that EIS will determine what kind of training can go on three years from now. At that point it will be determined if the Army can use it. Of course during the next three years the Army is considering putting an Interim Combat Brigade Team in Hawaii, just as in Alaska, so Hawaii will be going through an EIS process for the entire state to see the possibility of putting an ICBT there. Other areas in Hawaii will be looking at expanding their training ranges - mostly at Scofield Barracks. There's always been the rumblings that maybe the Army would leave Hawaii but that doesn't look viable at this time. We do look, as was mentioned earlier, when the reunification of North and South Korea occurs, where will those troops go. Alaska is very much in the top of consideration for both army and air force, as well as Guam, who's put out a tremendous White Paper on why those troops should be assigned there. I'm get a copy of that to Chairman Mulder to see what your competition might be.

LARRY CRAWFORD added some military leaders believe Alaska should be doing benchmark studies to compare Anchorage to Guam and some other locations to determine strengths and weaknesses.

CO-CHAIR MULDER asked Crawford how we'd undertake such a study.

MR. CRAWFORD thought it could be part of the strategic planning process. Do an analysis of Alaska itself, and then do a benchmark with these other strategic locations to see how we stack up. If there's something we can correct in a relatively short period of time we can do it.

CO CHAIR MULDER discussed difficulty in coming up with dates to meet or for a retreat to further discuss these issues. Stressed importance of coming up with a strategic plan to enhance our position regardless of any BRAC action. We'll look at early next Spring, January or February. Also as General Campbell's interested in visiting the state, perhaps we'll have a meeting in Juneau, acquaint ourselves with him so when the opportunity to discuss missions is right we'll have made initial contact with him. Asked Barb Mee for any ideas.

BARB MEE indicated she had not yet been brought into the loop on General Campbell's schedule. But wanted to remind that in these times since 9/11 when the patriotism is high we should strike while the iron's hot to come up with a plan. She lamented the loss of Bob Atwood, former Anchorage Times editor and publisher, adding she now gets more military news from the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner than the local Anchorage paper. Since they can't count on the news, they need to find some way to get out the word on the importance of the military. We need more than to just be talking to each other in small groups. Additionally, Anchorage's Pat Gamble, and Fairbanks' Mark Hamilton and the super computer are tremendous resources that shouldn't be overlooked. January and February shouldn't come and go without conducting a study regarding available resources.

CO-CHAIR agreed there should be no delay.

MR. OWEN asked if it wouldn't be a good idea to break the project into two phases. A good days session will be needed to figure exactly what they want to do and then the retreat might be in order.

CO CHAIR MULDER asked Janice Nielsen if she knew when General Campbell might be in Alaska.

MS. NIELSEN said that was unknown yet - it might be as late as February.

REPRESENTATIVE JAMES thought that we ought to check to see if some of the information we need hasn't already been gathered.

MR. NELSON said General Willie Nance is spearheading a project that will be promoted into a full time position and his replacement is interested in coming to Alaska. As soon as more is known, they will inform the committee.

MS. MEE said it would be helpful if those in attendance today wrote their ideas down and sent them in so they can be compiled.

CO-CHAIR MULDER advised public and advisory members that they were selected for participation because of their specific areas of expertise and their ideas were most welcome.

MR. TOM MORGAN, Executive Director of the Armed Services Young Men Christian Association, (ASYMCA) suggested incorporating monthly military programs in any organization members belong to currently. He said he would be happy to find speakers. Said people in military are put in harms way every day (not just since 911) and all of us should be trying to get regular military programs included in our local social organizations.

MS. NIELSON announced Admiral Blair will be changing command in February and his successor has not been named yet.

MR. OWEN asked whether Fairbanks or Anchorage JASC members could host advisory members to a luncheon to discuss and solicit ideas, and be reimbursed for that cost.

CO-CHAIR MULDER said he thought that was possible.

MR. WALLACE reiterated the importance of interacting and hosting young military members at luncheons.

MR. VAKALIS wanted to set the record straight that the Chamber luncheon has bigger groups than 25 for lunch - closer to 80. Also pointed out that the war we're undertaking now is different than any in the past. When bombings done, we're going to have to send troops in and the war will be long and prolonged. Patriotism will start to wane. It's up to every one of us to do everything we can to foster and encourage the support for our military. Encourage people to keep the flags up and decorate around them for the Christmas holiday!

CO CHAIR MULDER thanked everyone for his or her participation and the meeting was adjourned at 4:55 p.m.