

**ALASKA STATE LEGISLATURE
JOINT ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE**

September 17, 2012

10:04 a.m.

MEMBERS PRESENT

Senator Bill Wielechowski, Co-Chair
Representative Dan Saddler, Co-Chair
Senator Bettye Davis
Senator Joe Paskvan
Senator Joe Thomas
Representative Eric Feige
Representative Bob Lynn
Representative Pete Petersen

MEMBERS ABSENT

Senator Charlie Huggins
Representative Craig Johnson

PUBLIC MEMBERS

Brigadier General George Cannelos - retired
Lieutenant General Tom Case - retired (via teleconference)
Colonel Tim Jones
Major General Jake Lestenkof - retired
Chick Wallace (via teleconference)

OTHER LEGISLATORS PRESENT

Senator John Coghill

COMMITTEE CALENDAR

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE ROUNDS AND DEVELOPING STRATEGIES
FOR RETENTION OF MILITARY INSTALLATIONS IN ALASKA

- HEARD

PREVIOUS COMMITTEE ACTION

No previous action to record

WITNESS REGISTER

STEVE HYJEK, Partner

Hyjek & Fix
Washington, D.C.

POSITION STATEMENT: Speaking as a consultant to the Department of Military & Veterans' Affairs, provided testimony regarding the upcoming base realignment and closure (BRAC) and a strategic plan.

MAJOR GENERAL THOMAS KATKUS, Adjutant General/Commissioner
Department of Military & Veterans' Affairs
Fort Richardson, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided testimony regarding the upcoming BRAC.

CHICK WALLACE
Fairbanks, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided testimony regarding the upcoming BRAC.

McHUGH PIERRE, Deputy Commissioner
Office of the Commissioner/Adjutant General
Department of Military and Veterans' Affairs
Anchorage, Alaska

POSITION STATEMENT: Provided response to testimony during the hearing on base realignment and closure rounds and developing strategies for retention of military installations in Alaska.

ACTION NARRATIVE

[10:04:21 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR BILL WIELECHOWSKI called the Joint Armed Services Committee meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. Representatives Feige, Lynn, Peterson, and Saddler and Senators Davis, Paskvan (via teleconference), Thomas (via teleconference), and Wielechowski were present at the call to order. Public members in attendance were Brigadier General Canelos - retired, Lieutenant General Case - retired (via teleconference), Colonel Tim Jones, Major General Lestenkof - retired, and Chick Wallace (via teleconference). Also in attendance was Senator Coghill.

Base Realignment and Closure Rounds and Developing Strategies for Retention of Military Installations in Alaska

[10:04:42 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR WIELECHOWSKI announced that the only order of business would be a presentation related to the base realignment and

closure (BRAC) rounds and developing strategies for retention of military installations in Alaska.

[10:07:22 AM](#)

STEVE HYJEK, Partner, Hyjek & Fix, reviewed his work history, including prior work with Alaska during the 1995 base realignment and closure (BRAC). He said an area of concern is the Budget Control Act, which includes sequestration, a mechanism that could be activated by January 2013 and would double the \$487 billion in reductions to military. He said the focus should be not only on BRAC but also on budget construction and implementation, personnel reductions, and movements of missions and equipment. He said the secretary of defense requested authority for the BRAC process to conduct two rounds: one in fiscal year 2013 (FY 13) and one in FY 15. Currently, the BRAC has not been approved and likely will not be approved by U.S. Congress this year; therefore, there will not be a round of BRAC in FY 13. He said the potential is reasonably strong that Congress may take favorable action toward approval for a BRAC round in calendar year 2013. He said the secretary of defense will push hard for the FY 15 BRAC; however, some political pundits predict it won't happen until 2017. He explained that if the BRAC does not take place until 2017, the bulk of the savings will not be seen until 2022, and since the Budget Control Act puts pressure on finding \$487 billion in savings between now and 2021, the BRAC would not do the secretary of defense much good if it does not occur until 2017.

MR. HYJEK said everyone is preparing for budget cuts and force structure adjustments. He said there was an air force misstep this year, when an attempt was made to move the 18th Aggressor Squadron from Eielson Air Force Base, but there is a strategic pause in place because of legislation, and the secretary of defense has committed not to move forward with any of those air craft or personnel movements while Congress is considering the FY 13 defense budget. He said the eventual force structure adjustment in the military will reduce personnel by over 100,000 people.

[10:12:49 AM](#)

MR. HYJEK turned to Alaska and his strategic plan. In response to Co-Chair Wielechowski, he agreed to stop periodically during his presentation to answer questions.

[10:13:55 AM](#)

MR. HYJEK said slide 2 of his briefing provides an outline of topics that will be discussed, including the strategic plan - what has been done to date and what is anticipated in the plan going forward - as well as other issues that are not the focus of the plan, but color the recommendations and are near-term issues that need addressing in order to include FY 13 legislative budgetary actions. He said slide 3 is entitled, "State Military Installation Strategic Plan."

MR. HYJEK said his team, including people in his firm and retired General Carrol H. "Howie" Chandler, visited each of the major installations in Alaska in June. The timing of the visits was unfortunate, he said, because it was during the heat of battle between the delegation and the state and the commander at that time of Pacific air forces, as well as the U.S. Air Force, regarding the 18th Aggressor Squadron proposed alignment to Joint Base Elmendorf-Richardson (JBER). He said, "The guidance that was provided to mend the installations was that -- it was a view that our visit could be linked to that issue, and so they were told to stick pretty much to a script of their mission brief, to respond to direct questions only that were with information the public domain, and then any other follow on questions would need to be run back through the major command for disposition and potential response." He said everyone was very professional and was following orders. He said the bulk of the information that has enabled the progress his team has made thus far has come from the Alaska Guard. He said his team submitted 62 questions to active duty installations and received a letter in late July from Pacific Air Forces (PACAF) indicating that any information the team might wish to have would be in either the Site Activation Task Force (SATAF) report provided by the Air Force, associated with the 18th Aggressor Squadron proposed movement, or would be subject to a Freedom of Information Act request.

MR. HYJEK said with the change of command in PACAF, his team plans to make another run at securing the information, now that the environment has changed. He said General Carlisle has committed to an open and congenial as possible relationship, and his team does not want to do anything to jeopardize that. He said the team is conducting back channel discussions with PACAF and the U.S. Army in Alaska. He said Major General Garrett was brand new when his team arrived, and General Katkus has also been discussing information requests with Alaskan Command (ALCOM). He said the team has reason to believe it will receive information in the near future; however, it has made a phased

plan. Phase one focuses on the Guard, while Phase 2 will be the omnibus state plan, which will include some details on active duty installations, with a projected completion date sometime in October.

MR. HYJEK said the team is not sitting on its hands waiting for information; it has reached out to other agencies, including the state department and the Office of the Undersecretary of Defense for Policy in the Pentagon, to get information and to conduct discussions on some potential initiatives, including potential options for realignment of more advanced F16s from either the Pacific or from Europe to one of the bases in Alaska. He said the team has also had conversations with "the air staff" and some other elements in the Pentagon regarding new mission opportunities with new air frames, including the joint strike fighter, the KC46 "future tanker," and air frames that fly without a pilot. Finally, he said, the team has been asking the U.S. Department of Defense, particularly the U.S. Army and Air Force, about personnel plans for FY 14 and beyond made as part of their reaction and adjustments to the force structure issues that came up this year. Mr. Hyjek said he would discuss the two-point plan, which would be shown in a PowerPoint presentation as phase 1 - the reserve component, and phase 2 - the active component, including JBER, Eielson Air Force Base, and Fort Wainwright.

[10:20:36 AM](#)

COLONEL JONES observed that there are a relatively small number of information requests made to the U.S. Army in Alaska, and he asked why.

MR. HYJEK answered that it was difficult to determine what needed to be requested. He said the team received a command brief comprised of 10-12 slides, and it was able to ascertain information, such as base operation support costs. He indicated that requests for other information regarding encroachment issues, future military construction, and the future defense plan, have not yet been answered, but when they are, that will allow the team to do a follow-up request.

[10:22:04 AM](#)

SENATOR THOMAS said he is disappointed with the disingenuous approach to releasing information, as well as the reluctance to release information, related to Eielson Air Force Base (Eielson). He said he thinks it is odd that questions regarding

cost resulted in so little information other than the conclusion given, and he expressed his hope that Mr. Hyjek is correct that there will be a better relationship through which the team can gather information in future.

MR. HYJEK said public and private statements have been made by General Carlyle indicating that he has a desire for a more transparent process when working with the state. He said the intent of the visit was about how Alaska could place itself in the most optimal situation in the future, and reiterated that he does not want this issue to become a point of contention with the commands.

[10:24:34 AM](#)

MR. HYJEK stated that slide 4 shows how the team develops a strategic plan by: using the BRAC 2005 criteria as the baseline against which all the installations are evaluated; using information from all of the service teams, as well as from the BRAC commission; reviewing all the data that was prepared by the U.S. Army in 2008 for the "grow the force" evaluation of army installations, as well as the limited amount of data regarding the force structure adjustments proposed by the U.S. Air Force; taking into account the revision of military strategy, highlighting the Asian and Pacific focus, for example, by providing a balance in the refueling capabilities in Hawaii versus Alaska; focusing on capability, cost, and power projection, particularly with Alaska as a strategic platform; not viewing the installation as a single entity within the perimeter of the base itself, but looking at areas where services can be shared with local communities; avoiding a narrow view of having just an Alaska set of installations; finding areas of collaboration; and considering tanker placement.

MR. HYJEK said having completed the analysis, the team will provide a matrix that pits the installations against the BRAC criteria and score installations: red for poor, yellow for fair, green for good, and blue for excellent. Then it will provide recommendations for courses of action. Further, the team will consider a holistic view in terms of what the state can do for the military industry and vice versa. One example, he said, is how collaborative efforts in terms of energy policy could benefit both parties.

[10:29:40 AM](#)

MR. HYJEK, in response to Co-Chair Wielechowski, said the top four out of eight criteria used in 2005 are called military value criteria, and they focus on: operational readiness and joint war fighting; diverse climate, terrain, and contribution to homeland defense; the ability to support surge operations, which he said is a fine balance; and the installation of man power cost, which includes how an installation ranks with others of its size and type and whether there have been spikes in costs. He said the last four criteria are called the tie breakers, and they are: cost of base realignment action (COBRA), which takes into consideration closing costs versus cost savings and generates a net present value cost to determine how soon there would be a pay back from closing an installation; economic impact, which is important to the communities but least important to the U.S. Department of Defense (DoD); the ability to absorb in a community, which is consideration of growth; and environmental issues. In response to a follow-up question, he confirmed that these criteria are in statute and will be used in the next BRAC round. He said the team hopes to have a draft plan ready in mid- to late-October.

[10:33:53 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR SADDLER said the issue of economic impact is important to Fairbanks, Alaska, and he asked Mr. Hyjek for his recommendation regarding whether or not to emphasize that concern to DoD.

MR. HYJEK responded that it is a reasonable issue, and clarified that he did not mean that DoD does not care about the issue; however, he emphasized that it is not a driver in DoD's analysis to determine which bases to expand, close, or realign. He said it is rare for a community to not want to keep its military base, so DoD expects economic impact to be discussed. He said the commission will want to see how significant the impact is, particularly if it affects education.

[10:34:58 AM](#)

BRIGADIER GENERAL CANNELOS, regarding strategic location, said those who live in Alaska like to believe that it is the center of the universe, which can reach out and touch Europe and Asia more quickly. He asked if that is self-evident to the decision-makers or should be highlighted for them with good maps and graphic illustrations.

MR. HYJEK responded that those who do the first cut in the analysis of the BRAC are number crunchers and don't focus on economic impact; later on consideration of operational trade-offs, such as location and capability will come into play. He said he does not believe everyone in DoD realizes the strategic position of Alaska. He related an example of his experience with Luke Air Force Base, in Phoenix, Arizona, and the educational process that was necessary to illustrate the compatibility of the installation with current and future operations. He said Alaska's process is an educational one and will not be a short-term victory.

[10:38:05 AM](#)

GENERAL CANNELOS complimented Mr. Hyjek for any involvement he might have had related to Luke Air Force Base.

[10:38:22 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR SADDLER asked Mr. Hyjek for his opinion regarding "the quality of the numbers that are being crunched about Alaska bases."

MR. HYJEK distinguished the difference between the 18th Aggressor Squadron force structure adjustment versus the BRAC, which are two separate groups with two different processes. He said the reason for the BRAC process and commission is because all too often there is flawed analysis and data. Nevertheless, the BRAC's oversight does not mean the process is flawless.

[10:40:11 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE FEIGE inquired as to the life expectancy of the KC-135R base tankers currently based at Eielson Air Force Base and the possibility that those tankers will be moved to Fairchild.

MR. HYJEK said there is no discussion of movement of tankers from Eielson to Fairchild, and it is highly unlikely. He said when the KC-46 basing goes forward, the odds on favorites for active duty installation is Fairchild Air Force Base and the odds on favorite for the Air Guard facility is Pease Air Force Base in New Hampshire. He said the view is that Washington State would likely get the KC-46. He noted that Boeing is in Washington. He said the KC-135R is going to be around for a long time, because of budget restraints. He said Phase 1, including the school house, the active duty operational base,

and the guard base, involves approximately 60 aircraft. Phase 2 won't be considered until 2020.

[10:43:11 AM](#)

SENATOR PASKVAN offered his understanding that earlier Mr. Hyjek had indicated that there are F-16s in Asia and Europe that "they" are trying to get to the bases in Alaska. Regarding readiness criteria, he asked if it is a consideration that Eielson Air Force Base is not subject to higher risks of earthquake or volcanic ash in the atmosphere.

MR. HYJEK clarified that neither the DoD nor the U.S. Air Force is looking at that; it is his team, as consultants to the State of Alaska, that is looking at the opportunity for the potential of having aircraft currently based overseas come to Alaska. He explained the reason the team is looking at those two capabilities is because of the capability of the aircraft that are located in Europe and Japan. He said Eielson Air Force Base would be a focus, but the objective is to first get the aircraft into the state. He said the team is looking for opportunities to generate or initiate action, but there are no DoD initiatives or plans underway to do anything in the F-16 or F-35 air frames at this time.

[10:45:13 AM](#)

SENATOR PASKVAN asked if the worldwide BRAC process considers earthquakes or volcanic ash as risk factors.

MR. HYJEK answered that it is probably in the mix, but said he is not sure how high in the profile it is considered. He recalled an installation in the BRAC 2005 where the potential for tornadoes was considered. He said environmental issues of that nature and their impact on operations are considered.

[10:46:09 AM](#)

SENATOR THOMAS expressed concern that the bean counters do the first review. He said he thinks that is short-sighted, because the first consideration should be strategic location. He offered his understanding that that was the top priority in the list previously stated by Mr. Hyjek. He said he thinks defense systems have been developed in the past to shorten the conflict. He stated his belief that location is extremely important and that an analysis of a war could prove that.

MR. HYJEK responded that the team intends to push strategic location as a critical issue. He reminded the committee that his responsibility is to give the most honest opinion about how the process goes forward. He said before the number crunching begins, the last list is pulled up. If an installation has survived in the past, that will be considered. The next factor examined is cost, including those costs that may not have been previously considered. He said from a pure cost standpoint, the Army War College in Pennsylvania would not be in that state, but because there are other things that have happened in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, and because every senior army leader has been through the college, that installation will not be moved. He said at the last, most senior level of review, the input of sponsorship and combatant commanders becomes of great value, because the four-star level has only so much time for review. He said, "If they really care and they have a concern or they're a real supporter, that's good for me to know; and if they don't care, then I probably have to go with the experts on my staff who put this recommendation in front of me."

[10:51:48 AM](#)

GENERAL CANNELOS, regarding the joint war fighting criteria, asked if the possible loss of Eielson Air Force Base would diminish the joint capability of Fairbanks and adversely affect Fort Wainwright.

MR. HYJEK said he does not think there would be a ripple effect, because the review would consider impacts of other installations. He said Fort Wainwright is an attribute for Eielson Air Force Base, and the Air Force would not be allowed to do something that would jeopardize the Army.

[10:52:48 AM](#)

GENERAL CASE noted that he has not heard mention of the training mechanism.

MR. HYJEK confirmed he had not yet discussed that. He remarked upon the unique environment of the Arctic and working in it. He said the problem is most wars have been fought in the desert or jungle, not the Arctic environment, and he stressed the importance of recognizing how that environment can affect a future conflict. He said the team is trying not only to push the strategic location, but also the unique training environment. He stated, "We have to work hard to make sure that

there's not a tradeoff of that training environment in Alaska versus a cost-savings measure someplace else."

[10:54:45 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR SADDLER asked if there is a difference in the process this time around.

MR. HYJEK explained that the BRAC was originally envisioned as a cost-savings ability to get rid of excess infrastructure, reduce operational costs, and realign forces to be the most efficient from an operational and cost perspective. The last BRAC was transformational: the U.S. Army used it as a vehicle to bring troops back from overseas and avoid a fight over which base was going to be the beneficiary; the U.S. Air Force used the last BRAC to realign assets that were in the Guard to move them to active duty and adjust the reserve component as it saw fit; the U.S. Navy Marine Corps used it to get rid of excess industrial capability that it could no longer afford to keep. This time around, he opined, the strategy by the U.S. Air Force was to use the force structure to do whatever it wanted to do in the Guard, by virtue of manning equipment and location and focusing the BRAC on active duty installations, because the next BRAC is all about saving money. He said Secretary of Defense Leon E. Panetta is focused on cutting costs while still delivering capability. He said the way to do that is by closing active duty installations. In terms of the U.S. Air Force, that means fewer fighters. He offered further details. In regard to the U.S. Army, Mr. Hyjek said until the actual mixed force design comes out, one can only surmise that heavy forces are going to take more hits than the light forces will. He offered an example. He said he thinks the U.S. Army is also going to consider industrial operations. He said force structure will be used to "tee up" what all the military services want to go after in a future BRAC. Budgeting for military construction (MILCON) combined with force structures will be leading signals to what will be considered.

[10:58:42 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR SADDLER asked if it is fair to look at this as three phases of one process.

MR. HYJEK answered yes. He said, "The BRAC will be the culmination of these other processes feeding into it."

[10:59:22 AM](#)

MR. HYJEK said slide 5 relates to the team engaging with the delegation and the state on issues that exist now and into the future. He said the 18th Aggressor Squadron's SATAF [report] affected the team's ability to get data, and he reminded everyone that there is a strategic hold related to that. He reiterated that there were C-130s that would be impacted, as well as the 176 at JBER. He said there is a change of command at PACAF and the team is working to build the relationship with PACAF. The team has also worked with General Carlyle, who understands the importance of good relationships. Regarding budget, he said Congress will not finish the 13 appropriations bills by September 30, so the government will operate in a six-month continuing resolution, which will fund DoD at the 2012 budget, minus 5 percent. As a result, defense appropriations bills will be kicked out until next year. He expressed his hope that next year Congress will look at issues with commercially directed spending, which then potentially would have an impact with regard to military construction projects in Alaska. Mr. Hyjek said sequestration would begin in January 2013 if nothing changes. He said both Congress and the Administration are concerned about the potential occurring and are looking for ways to negotiate an agreement; however, no significant action will take place until a lame duck session in the November-December time frame. In terms of the future, he reiterated that some say a BRAC will be authorized in 2013, while others say it will be 2017. He said Secretary of Defense Panetta is being asked to hold off on force structure adjustments, moving people, and saving money, but attain a \$487 billion cut, and he cannot do that without BRAC authority; therefore, he may allow a greater pause on force structure adjustments and roll those into the BRAC process. He said everyone should be concerned that if a 2015 BRAC is approved next year, the fiscal year from which the DoD uses data to make its decisions will already be half over. He concluded, "That's why, as we get our plan completed, we may urge for some quick action on some items that the state has control over, which could potentially create a beneficial impact for each of the installations."

[11:03:23 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR WIELECHOWSKI asked if there are other installations at risk in Alaska, other than Eielson Air Force Base.

MR. HYJEK said there are risks of either negative realignment or some reduction in force, but not risks of a significant negative action, such as taking away a major unit. He expressed concern

about Fort Wainwright's costs. He said in 2005, the Army Basic Study Group ranked 97 Army installations against a set of criteria, one of which was "cost of operating against the capability provided," and Fort Wainwright ranked 97 out of 97. Obviously negative action was not taken on Fort Wainwright in '05, but [the state] should be prepared to address that. Mr. Hyjek stated that his focus is greater on the northern tier of installations in Alaska, but clarified that does not mean the southern tier installations should not be prepared for the next BRAC. He said, across the board, joint basing has not delivered as many of the benefits that DoD thought it would. He said he thinks joint basing will be studied in the BRAC round to determine whether or not the process should be continued.

[11:06:27 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR WIELECHOWSKI asked how many bases across the U.S. might be at risk, and he asked for comparatives with previous BRAC years.

MR. HYJEK said it is difficult to provide a hard number. In the 2005 BRAC, there were roughly 80-100 proposed closures and 200-250 realignment actions. Next time there will be fewer alignments and fewer closures; however, the closures will be bigger. In terms of citing other installations, he expressed concern for Ellsworth Air Force Base [in South Dakota] and Red River Army Depot in Texas. He clarified that he is not saying those are the two that face the greatest threat, but said the Air Force cannot afford to continue to support the fighter bomber bases they have and the Army cannot continue to support its industrial operations when they can be done by the private sector.

[11:08:31 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR SADDLER, regarding joint basing, asked if Mr. Hyjek was talking about unwinding current joint basing decisions or not doing it more in the future.

MR. HYJEK answered that not doing it in the future is a clear possibility, whereas unwinding would have to be reviewed.

[11:09:19 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR SADDLER asked if there are any real simple actions that Alaska could take now.

MR. HYJEK said one item that would be in the team's report is related to low cost power for military installations, but he said he would not recommend it unless it would produce a savings to the state of at least 8 to 10 percent.

[11:11:04 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR WIELECHOWSKI said he looks forward to the conclusions in the report.

[11:11:31 AM](#)

MR. HYJEK, in response to a series of questions, reiterated his previous statements about the foreseen timing of future BRACs. He said the Air Force is doing its preparatory and due diligence work in the event that it can execute in 2014. He offered an example. He said hypothetically, if the 18th Aggressor Squadron were to leave, it would adversely affect the long-term viability of the 168th [Aggressor Squadron]. He said it is a Domino effect.

[11:17:15 AM](#)

MAJOR GENERAL THOMAS KATKUS, Adjutant General/Commissioner, Department of Military & Veterans' Affairs, confirmed that the Air Force plans for everything. For example, it considers having a wing on a commercial air field and whether there is "any component of Eielson that could remain in order to support it." He said, "We have a 24-hour-a-day mission, 7 days a week, 365 days out of the year; that wasn't part of the calculations, so they're having to deal with that." He said the Air Force is considering what it can do to make the 168th more relevant, which includes how much fuel it pushes. He said, "So, we're a very viable unit; it's just a matter that if they close the base they're still going to have to identify where we're going to be located."

[11:18:30 AM](#)

MR. HYJEK, in conclusion, emphasized that the plan the team will propose is not a reactive one; it recognizes that if a BRAC occurs or even if force structure adjustments are made, DoD will shrink. Notwithstanding that, he said there are areas with room for movement, and the team wants to be as proactive as possible to seek new mission opportunities. He said as the team completes its plan, it will identify both near-term and longer-term issues for consideration by the state and by the

legislature. He said there is good cause for optimism that there will be improved lines of communication with the command, which is sensitive to the issues in Alaska. He said the bottom line is that the BRAC is a three-element process, with near- and short-term issues pending, and the potential of a BRAC as early as 2015.

[11:20:28 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR SADDLER, regarding future missions, observed that unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) and drones seem to be the most cost-effective to deploy. He asked if they are being considered by other states or are "up for grabs."

MR. HYJEK responded that remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) and "cybers" are "the flavor of the day." He said the state should be careful to select a segment of the RPA or cyber areas where there is a need. He said the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) will not allow the RPA to be flown outside of restricted air space. He relayed that current RPA technology lacks de-icing capabilities, which is a limiting factor for Alaska. He stated that the Air Force looks towards the Air Guard for "reach-back" capabilities, where it can fly from the U.S. to air frames elsewhere in the world, track targets, gather intelligence, and execute against targets through various missions that the Air Guard can perform. Regarding the cyber areas, he recommended filling a niche where there is growth capability, which means focusing on aggressor squadrons rather than running a network operation center, for example. He said RPA and cybers are two areas on which the team will focus.

[11:22:55 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR SADDLER recollected that General Case had referenced the training capabilities of the joint Alaska Pacific Range complex. He asked if it would be beneficial for Alaska's suit if the state made additional commitments to the Northern Rail Extension to improve access to the Joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex (JPARC).

MR. HYJEK said he has no good answer yet and would need more review.

[11:23:33 AM](#)

REPRESENTATIVE PETERSEN read that some are advocating for improvement of the missile defense system. He asked if there

would be increased funding and spending in Alaska to upgrade Ft. Greely.

MR. HYJEK offered his understanding that the U.S. Army continues to plan to make investments in the infrastructure and capability of Fort Greely. Furthermore, he said the team received information last week that there likely would be expansion of the missile interceptor tracking and defeat capability in the Lower 48, particularly as more challenges are discovered related to the missile defense network in Europe.

11:25:02 AM

CO-CHAIR SADDLER inquired as to how Alaska's efforts stack up compared to that of other states.

MR. HYJEK said he thinks Alaska is doing just fine. He said Alaska has certainly demonstrated a clear and credible deterrent to the U.S. Air Force in terms of the way the state, the delegation, and the community came together in regard to the 18th Aggressor Squadron issue, which says a lot in terms of non-BRAC actions. He stated, "In terms of the ability ... of the state to PACAF, air mobility command, and the major commands on side, I think we're equal or ahead of other installations of other states in the country." He said he would give Alaska a B grade at this point, and he said his team is trying to help the state reach a higher grade. Some states have their heads in the sand, waiting, unprepared, for a BRAC to happen, but history shows those locations do not do well. In response to a follow-up question, he said he does not know which states have the gold standard, but suggested that Kansas may be a good example, because it has kept its governor's military council intact and come to Washington, D.C., twice a year to meet with DoD officials. He noted that Kansas was "the sixth largest gainer" in the BRAC 2005.

11:28:28 AM

GENERAL KATKUS offered praise to Mr. Hyjek for his presentation and expertise. Regarding the unfortunate timing mentioned previously by Mr. Hyjek, he said the [18th] Aggressor Squadron move set the stage for a confrontational environment. He said senior leadership has demonstrated that it realizes all of Alaska is being considered when determining how to make the state a better place in which the military operates. Regarding Colonel Jones' prior comment about the information from the U.S. Army in Alaska, he noted that tomorrow he would meet with Major

General Garrett to converse and generate more questions. He said last week he met with General Stephen Hoog and identified a way to get that information to [Mr. Hyjek], who is working hard on Phase 1, but needs information to move forward. He said General Carlyle has established that he wants a good working relationship with Alaska, and both General Hoog and Major General Garrett are in the position to make that happen.

GENERAL KATKUS clarified that while [Mr. Hyjek] has many contacts, he does not have insider information, but he is setting Alaska up to be in "the best position." Regarding the National Guard, he confirmed that cyber and RPA are the buzz words of the day. Alaska also has two factors in its favor: space and the Arctic. He stated that Alaska operates in mid-course range, which is the perfect spot in which to be working. He said a lot of money needs to go into the boost phase and the terminal phase. General Katkus stated that the U.S. Northern Command (NORTHCOM) has identified that the reconnaissance surveillance deficit exists in terms of the Arctic. He said the Arctic is going to be an area for military, DoD, and Coast Guard growth in Alaska.

[11:31:41 AM](#)

GENERAL CANNELOS stated that the 176th Wing is the biggest and most complicated wing in the Air Guard, and it includes strategic airlift, tactical airlift, and rescue. He said someone considering only costs could cut one of those missions but keep the wing.

MR. HYJEK agreed, but noted that almost every one of those missions currently is tied to an active duty fight. He offered examples. He said there are few "130s" out there, so he recommended highlighting the association with the 130s remains, which is protection that can be provided.

[11:33:21 AM](#)

CHICK WALLACE in Fairbanks, regarding the cost of towers, asked if there is any cost relationship between natural gas and coal, because Eielson Air Force Base and Fort Wainwright uses coal, which is a cheap source of power generation. He asked if Mr. Hyjek is suggesting that the state should build a gasline.

MR. HYJEK said he is not making that recommendation to the state, but is recommending that the state review the total net cost of current coal-fired operations both to the state and the

DoD, including consideration of environmental compliance, system improvements, and low-cost power payments made to Alaskans in the civilian community, and then consider the significant investment that would be required for natural gas and whether some of those other costs would go away as a result of using natural gas. He said he does not know the answer, but thinks it is something that needs to be considered.

[11:35:07 AM](#)

McHUGH PIERRE, Deputy Commissioner, Office of the Commissioner/Adjutant General, Department of Military & Veterans' Affairs, stated that the Alaska Energy Authority (AEA) is working closely with Mr. Hyjek and the legislature and plans to provide information to them so that the military can be part of the energy solution. He confirmed that his office is not advocating for one particular solution, but wants everyone to be aware that "DoD is affected just as much as maybe the private home owner in the area."

[11:35:49 AM](#)

CO-CHAIR WIELECHOWSKI expressed his thanks for the presentation and subsequent information provided.

[11:36:01 AM](#)

ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business before the committee, the Joint Armed Services Committee meeting was adjourned at 11:36 a.m.