

SB

255

Alaska State Legislature

Sen. Tim Kelly, Chairman
Anchorage
Sen. Loren Leman, Vice-Chair
Anchorage
Sen. Robin Taylor
Wrangell
Sen. John Torgerson
Kasilof
Sen. Jim Duncan
Juneau



Official Business

Senate Rules Committee

State Capitol
Juneau, AK 99801-1182
(907) 465-3822
Fax: (907) 465-3756
1-800-770-3822
(JANUARY - MAY)
INTERNET: //http://www.state.ak.us

716 West 4th, Suite 400
Anchorage, AK 99501
(907) 258-8180
Fax: (907) 258-4524

SPONSOR STATEMENT

SB 255 - Joint Committee On Military Bases In Alaska

Senate Bill 255 would establish a Joint House and Senate Committee On Military Bases in Alaska. We propose this joint committee have an existence longer than that called for in the Uniform Rules, Rules 21 (b) & (c), because of the reactivation of the federal Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC).

Creating this joint committee for longer than the duration of the current 20th Legislature requires a change in statute, and cannot be done by means of a concurrent resolution, hence this bill. The joint committee would expire on the date the 22nd Legislature convenes. This time frame corresponds with the activity period of BRAC, which will again be reviewing all military facilities in North America for justification of their continued existence.

The attention by BRAC given to Alaska bases in the past presents a considerable challenge, and necessitates vigilance, and a strong, unified response from the legislature. The military establishment in Alaska accounts for approximately \$2.7 billion throughout the Alaskan economy. In addition, the base closures experienced to date, Adak Naval Air Facility and Fort Greely, have shown that the process requires considerable attention on the part of state government to monitor the economic impact and the reuse potential of such base closures. This joint committee would provide that critical focus.

Section 1 of SB 255 sets out the legislative findings on the need for such a joint committee.

Section 2 of the bill establishes the joint committee within the legislature. This joint committee would have the status of an interim committee, able to meet at will, session or interim, but would not have authority to introduce legislation. It would exist similarly to the Legislative Budget & Audit Committee, the Select Committee On Legislative Ethics, and the Legislative Council. It would be an administrative unit of the Legislative Council.

This section also provides for the composition of the committee, the term of existence, travel and per diem policy, and reporting responsibilities.

Section 3 repeals the Act on the convening day of the 22nd Alaska Legislature.

Section 4 provides for an immediate effective date.

If there are questions on this legislation, please contact Tim Benintendi of my office at 3770.

only by the adoption of a simple resolution. The presiding officer of each house appoints the members of a special committee and designates a member to chair the special committee unless otherwise ordered by the house. The persons who chair like committees of each house may arrange for the committees to meet jointly to receive testimony and deal with other matters which may be expedited by joint committee action.

→ (b) A joint committee is a committee of both houses. A joint committee may be established only by the adoption of a concurrent resolution. The presiding officer of each house appoints one-half of the members of a joint committee. The persons who co-chair a joint committee shall be chosen in the manner provided by the presiding officers.

→ (c) A resolution establishing a special or joint committee shall specify the date or conditions of termination of the committee. A standing committee may meet between sessions. A special or joint committee may meet during the session or between sessions, or both, as authorized by the resolution which establishes the committee. A standing, special, or joint committee which acts between legislative sessions may consider any legislative matter which is consistent with the jurisdiction of the committee. A standing, special, or joint committee which acts between legislative sessions constitutes a subcommittee of the Legislative Council for administrative purposes. A special or joint committee may expend money only in accordance with an appropriation made for the work of the committee.

(d) A committee may not be established unless authorized by law or by the Uniform Rules.

OPEN AND EXECUTIVE SESSIONS

RULE 22. OPEN AND EXECUTIVE SESSIONS. (a) All meetings of a legislative body are open to all legislators, whether or not they are members of the particular legislative body that is meeting, and to the general public except as provided in (b) of this rule.

(b) A legislative body may call an executive session at which members of the general public may be excluded for the following reasons:

(1) discussion of matters, the immediate knowledge of which would adversely affect the finances of a government unit;

(2) discussion of subjects that tend to prejudice the reputation and character of a person;

(3) discussion of a matter that may, by law, be required to be

(SAMPLE ACTIVITY)

January 19, 1998

TO: Senate President Miller, Senate Majority Leader Taylor, Senate Rules Committee Chairman Kelly, Representative Mulder
FROM: Chris Nelson
SUBJECT: Trip Report

PURPOSE OF TRIP: Review Fort Greely reuse plans, inspect the facilities proposed for reuse, observe the community input process.

SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES: Visit Fort Greely, meet personally with Army officials and leaders of the Delta/Greely Community Coalition, attend the second of the Coalition's two public hearings on the proposal to convert the post into a privately operated prison.

DATES AND LOCATION: Fort Greely and Delta Junction, January 15-16, 1998.

SUMMARY: The proposal to convert a major portion of the closing Fort Greely military reservation into a privately operated medium security prison is feasible. After two years of exhaustive redevelopment study, it is the only plan currently available which will offset the adverse economic impact created by the loss of nearly 350 military positions and 200 civilian jobs when the post closes. Through a process which included two well attended public meetings and an advisory election, the plan has won community support by a decisive margin.

DISCUSSION:

1. Fort Greely and Naval Air Facility Adak were the only two military bases in Alaska selected for elimination by the 1995 Base Realignment and Closure Commission (BRAC). The Fort Greely action is a realignment: military and civilian positions will be shifted to Fort Wainwright in Fairbanks and the major portion of the base's cantonment area, including barracks, recreational facilities, and family housing, will be closed. Fort Greely's two major military activities, the Northern Warfare Training Center at Black Rapids and the Cold Regions Test Center at Bolio Lake, will be operated by a greatly reduced on-site staff augmented on a rotational basis with personnel from Fort Wainwright. The Army will retain the 670,000 acre range area. Realignment actions were originally scheduled to be completed by December, 1998, but the timetable was subsequently extended until the end of 2001.

2. The Delta/Greely Community Coalition, a broadly based group which includes representatives of the local city council, school district, federal employee union, and private citizens, was recognized

by the Department of Defense (DoD) as the Local Reuse Authority (LRA) empowered to develop and implement plans for civilian reuse of the closing facilities. Funded by a grant from DoD's Office of Economic Assistance (OEA), the Coalition and its consultants have spent the last two years attempting to interest both government agencies and civilian enterprises in using the vacated base. While several small enterprises expressed an interest in Fort Greely, the Coalition had been unsuccessful in finding an "anchor tenant" with a sufficient payroll to fill the void created by the Army's departure. That situation changed in December, however, when Allvest, Inc., proposed turning a major portion of the post into an 800 bed privately operated medium security correctional facility.

3. Allvest's original proposal envisioned a "fast track" transfer which would have enabled the prison to open in December, 1998. Army officials expressed concern over that timeline, however, noting that it would displace members of the Fort Greely civilian workforce who had made key career and retirement decisions based on the announced closure date of 2001. Recognizing the Army's concerns, Allvest modified its proposal to extend the transfer period to January, 2000. This new timeline won support from Fort Greely employees and many of them have now become advocates for the prison proposal.

4. To win community support for the plan, the Delta/Greely Community Coalition conducted a well publicized public participation process which included two heavily attended town meetings held in the high school gym followed by a community-wide vote. I attended the second of the public meetings which drew approximately 300 residents and lasted for over three hours. Everyone was given the opportunity to question or comment on the proposal and the discussion was spirited. On Saturday, January 17, a higher than predicted turnout of registered voters approved the prison proposal by an overwhelming 640 - 396 margin.

5. Following the vote, some opponents of the proposal expressed the criticism that the plan was moving forward "too fast." That objection, however, ignores the fact that the Delta/Greely Community Coalition has been working actively for over two years, through a well publicized process which continually invited and encouraged citizen participation, to develop reuse alternatives for the base. The prison proposal is actually the latest step in a very lengthy and deliberate public process.

6. Prompt action by the Legislature is the next step required to keep this process on track. A legislative package to relieve current prison overcrowding by authorizing and resourcing privately operated corrections facilities will enable Allvest, the Delta/Greely Community

Coalition, and the Army to move forward in the development of plans that will establish a seamless transition for Fort Greely from military to civilian use. The Fort Greely prison, which will be called the "Buffalo Flats Correctional Facility," could become the first privately operated correctional facility in Alaska. Our state currently pays an out of state vendor to house several hundred Alaska prisoners in a privately operated prison in Arizona. Legislation enacted during the Second Session of the Twentieth Alaska Legislature can redirect that money to be spent in Alaska, in a community which is facing a devastating economic impact as its military base closes and is now asking for the establishment of a prison as a result of a lengthy and open process.

RECOMMENDATIONS:

1. Meet with representatives of the Delta/Greely Community Coalition, the Army, and Allvest and review their proposals and timetables for the establishment of the Buffalo Flats Correctional Facility.
2. Draft and introduce appropriate legislation to authorize and resource this facility. Consider it a priority issue for action by the Twentieth Legislature.

February 6, 1998

TO: Senate President Miller, Senate Majority Leader Taylor, Senate Rules Committee Chairman Kelly
FROM: Chris Nelson
SUBJECT: Trip Report

PURPOSE OF TRIP: Coordination on issues affecting Alaska military bases focusing on preparation for possible Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) rounds in 2001 and 2004 as well as reuse activities at bases closed by BRAC 1995.

SCOPE OF ACTIVITIES: Held meetings with Alaska Congressional Delegation staff members working military base issues, the Washington members of Alaska's 1995 BRAC team, and key officials and staff members at the National Association of Installation Developers. Meetings focused on the Clinton Administration's new base closure initiatives, actions currently being taken by other communities across the nation to save their bases, and the challenges encountered by the groups developing reuse plans for Fort Greely and Adak, the two Alaska bases selected for closure by the 1995 BRAC.

DATES AND LOCATION: Washington, D.C., 2-4 February 1998.

SUMMARY: There is a growing consensus in Washington that more military bases will be closed. There is disagreement, however, on the methods and timetables to be used for new closure actions. The question is no longer **IF** there will be new rounds of base closures but rather **WHEN** and **HOW**. Several communities have already started programs to "BRAC-Proof" their bases. The transition from military to civilian reuse has been difficult for bases in Alaska and across the country.

DISCUSSION:

1. President Clinton's FY 1999 Budget specifically proposes two more rounds of base closures in 2001 and 2005. In a press release issued on February 2 outlining the Department of Defense (DoD) Budget, Defense Secretary Cohen asked Congress to approve two more BRAC rounds. The Administration is pushing to have these rounds approved by Congress this year.

2. The consensus among the people I visited is that Congress is reluctant to approve new BRAC rounds until the Administration resolves questions created by previous BRAC actions. These questions center around the "depot controversy" which followed the 1995 BRAC as well as the more fundamental issue of whether the base closures are actually producing the savings they were intended to achieve.

-2-

3. The depot controversy was created when the Clinton Administration directed lucrative contracts to two Air Force depots which had been selected for closure in the 1995 BRAC round. McClelland AFB in California and Kelly AFB in Texas are in high electoral vote states considered key to Clinton's re-election. The Administration contracts had the effect of over-riding the BRAC Commission's decision to close those bases and kept their workforces employed throughout the election year. Critics consequently charged that Clinton's contracts politicized the BRAC process.

4. Other Members of Congress have raised fundamental questions regarding the savings actually achieved by base closures. They point out that the adverse economic impact on local communities caused by closures has created a need for increased federal, state, and local government assistance and that environmental cleanup costs are proving to be much greater than originally anticipated. They have asked for detailed answers to justify any new BRAC rounds.

5. The military services are now working to provide answers to those questions and believe that they can ultimately persuade Congress to adopt new BRAC rounds. The biggest difference between the BRAC 2001 and 2005 proposals and previous closure rounds is that the services - the Army, Air Force, Navy and Marines - have now become the leading advocates for reducing base structure. Each service chief has indicated that force modernization is dependent on reducing base operations. Everyone I met with believes that this argument will ultimately prove persuasive to Congress -- if not this year, then next year.

6. Anticipating the inevitability of BRAC 2001, several communities have initiated actions to protect and 'BRAC-proof' their bases. Colorado Springs has already retained their 1995 Washington BRAC lobbyist, Tim Rupli at R. Duffy Wall, to prepare a strategy to save Fort Carson. That installation gained a significant advantage over other Army maneuver bases when it was selected as the test location for the Army's experiment in privatizing the management of base housing. Likewise, Fort Riley, Kansas, received a boost when it was named as the headquarters for one of the two new composite Active Army-National Guard heavy divisions. The State of New York, which for several years has budgeted funds to support and protect all of its military bases, has now increased that budget item to over \$7 million. A significant portion of that money can be expected to go to assist Fort Drum, a major rival to Alaska's Army bases.

-3-

7. Alaska's Army bases currently occupy an extremely vulnerable position. They have always been listed as having the highest operational costs of any of the Army maneuver bases. They have been losing rather than gaining forces since the 6th Infantry Division (Light) was deactivated in 1993. The latest loss is the aviation battalion at Fort Wainwright which is now programmed to be replaced by a National Guard unit. Most significantly, the Army has not requested military construction funds for its Alaska bases in the last three budgets.

8. Transition of closed bases to civilian reuse has not produced the "peace dividend" initially promised by closure advocates. In Alaska, the Fort Greely prison plan is facing political opposition from economic interests opposed to private correctional facilities. The Adak Reuse Corporation continues to search for an "anchor tenant" to underwrite the establishment of a viable civilian economy on the island. Communities across the country report difficulties in the reuse of closed bases.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. Begin preparations for BRAC 2001. While it would be premature to retain a full scale BRAC team along the lines of our efforts in BRAC 95, the Legislature during this Session should establish a Joint Committee on Military Bases to develop a BRAC strategy and identify the resources required to implement it.

2. That committee should additionally focus on the reuse process, not only to facilitate current transition efforts at Fort Greely and Adak but to prepare for a "worst case" scenario in case the state loses a major base in the next century.

encs:

1. FY 99 Defense Budget extract
2. OSD Press Release dated February 2, 1998

Reengineering DOD's Infrastructure: DOD must develop new, innovative approaches to manage and reduce infrastructure costs. Following the end of the Cold War, the United States began a major reduction of its military forces. DOD's cuts in infrastructure costs, however, have not kept pace. To make further cuts, DOD plans to adopt innovative management techniques and technological practices.

→ In addition, DOD will submit legislation to Congress proposing two more rounds of base closures and realignments in 2001 and 2005.

DOD has identified specific goals around which to focus the reform of business affairs.

By 1999, DOD will:

- Produce a Facility Strategic Plan to guide the acquisition, operation, maintenance, repair, renovation, and replacement of its physical plant.

By 2000, DOD will:

- Ensure that U.S. forces can achieve visibility of 90 percent of DOD materiel assets, while resupplying military peacekeepers and warfighters and reducing the 1997 average order-to-receipt time by half.
- Dispose of \$2.2 billion in excess National Defense Stockpile inventories and \$3 billion in unneeded Government personal property, while reducing supply inventory by \$12 billion.
- Simplify purchasing and payment by using purchase card transactions for 90 percent of all DOD micropurchases, while re-engineering the requisitioning, funding, and ordering processes.
- Create a world-class learning organization by offering 40 or more hours a year of continuing education and training to DOD's acquisition-related work force.
- Complete the disposal of half of the surplus real property, while privatizing 30,000 housing units.
- Cut paper acquisition transactions by half from 1997 levels through electronic commerce and electronic data interchange.
- Eliminate layers of management by streamlining processes, while cutting

DOD's acquisition-related work force by 15 percent.

**Department of Energy (DOE)
Performance**

DOE contributes to our national security mainly by reducing the global danger from nuclear weapons and other weapons of mass destruction. DOE is committed to maintaining confidence in the nuclear weapons stockpile without testing, as required under the Comprehensive Test Ban Treaty; to strengthen the nuclear nonproliferation regime; to work with states of the former Soviet Union to improve control of nuclear materials; to develop improved technologies to detect, identify, and respond to the proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and illicit materials trafficking; and to aggressively clean up the environmental legacy of nuclear weapons programs.

The budget proposes \$12.1 billion to meet DOE's national security objectives, of which \$6.1 billion is for ongoing national security missions to support DOD and other agencies.

DOE will achieve the following performance goals:

- Maintain and refurbish specific warheads in 1999, and certify that standards for safety, reliability, and performance of the nuclear weapons stockpile are met.
- Develop advanced simulation, modeling, and experimentation technologies to replace underground testing by 2004, including installing a computer system capable of three trillion operations per second in 1999.
- Dismantle about 500 nuclear weapons.
- Jointly, with Russia, test and demonstrate technologies to dispose of surplus weapons plutonium and begin to develop a pilot scale plutonium conversion system in Russia, design a full-scale pit disassembly and conversion facility, and procure mixed-oxide irradiation services in the United States.
- Complete 85 percent of the development of the next generation nuclear reactor plant for the Navy's new attack submarine.



NEWS RELEASE

OFFICE OF ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
(PUBLIC AFFAIRS)

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301

PLEASE NOTE DATE

FOR RELEASE AT
8:00 AM EST
February 2, 1998

No. 026-98
(703) 695-0192 (Media)
(703) 697-5737 (Public/Industry)

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BUDGET FOR FY 1999

Secretary of Defense William S. Cohen today released details of President Clinton's Fiscal Year (FY) 1999 defense budget. It requests \$257.3 billion in budget authority and \$252.6 billion in outlays for the Department of Defense (DoD). The President's proposed defense spending levels for FY 1999-2003 are generally consistent with last year's Bipartisan Budget Agreement.

Release of this budget is the culmination of intense scrutiny of the U.S. defense posture carried out during Secretary Cohen's first year in office. The new budget begins full implementation of the Department's comprehensive Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). The QDR examined the security threats and opportunities facing the U.S. and developed far-reaching recommendations for the post-Cold War era.

The budget includes \$48.7 billion for procurement of more modern weapons. Procurement is projected to reach \$61.3 billion in FY 2001, achieving the \$60 billion goal previously set by the Clinton Administration. DoD leaders consider this higher modernization spending to be essential to the future readiness and battlefield superiority of U.S. forces.

While highlighting the importance of weapons modernization, Secretary Cohen also is stressing that the long-term readiness of U.S. forces is threatened by the budgetary drain of excess infrastructure. The Department of Defense is burdened with facilities and bases that it neither needs nor can afford. To remedy this, Secretary Cohen today again urged Congress to approve two more base closure and realignment (BRAC) rounds.

For near-term force readiness, Congress's support also is needed for DoD's plans to streamline its business practices and organizational structure. Additionally, Secretary Cohen warns that readiness could suffer late in FY 1998 if Congress does not give timely approval to supplemental appropriations to cover unbudgeted operational costs. Such costs are related to the President's stated intention to extend Bosnia operations beyond June and to this year's increased intensity of operations in Southwest Asia.

INTERNET AVAILABILITY: This document is available on DefenseLINK, a World Wide Web Server on the Internet, at: <http://www.defenselink.mil/>

With its strong support for both immediate force readiness and cutting-edge technology, the new budget strikes a balance between current and future defense needs, as advocated in the QDR. It continues Secretary Cohen's commitment to enhancing the quality of life of the nation's military people and their families. And the budget reflects changes already underway as a result of last November's Defense Reform Initiative, through which Secretary Cohen and Deputy Secretary Hamre seek to substantially streamline and improve DoD support activities.

Transforming the U.S. Defense Posture

The FY 1999 budget begins implementation of the QDR's plan for transforming U.S. defense strategy and military forces.

Shorthand for the new defense strategy is: Shape, Respond, Prepare. It calls for the U.S. to work to shape the international security environment in ways favorable to American interests, be willing and able to respond to the full spectrum of crises as needed, and prepare now for an uncertain future. The FY 1999 budget supports this strategy primarily by ensuring continued American military superiority, high readiness, and extensive overseas deployment of U.S. forces. It also advances the transformation of U.S. forces and the organizations and activities supporting them so that together they can best guarantee America's long-term security.

The transformation of U.S. military forces seeks to maximize their effectiveness across the full spectrum of future crises and conflict scenarios. While we will transition to forces that are different in character, the hallmarks of America's military will continue to be top quality people, high readiness, and superior doctrine and technology. The FY 1999 budget includes strong funding for all these.

Transforming U.S. forces also requires implementation of *Joint Vision 2010*, the Department's new conceptual framework for how future U.S. forces will fight and achieve "full spectrum dominance." At the heart of *Joint Vision 2010* is the ability to collect, process, and disseminate essential information to U.S. forces, while denying the enemy the ability to gain and use battle-relevant intelligence. Support of *Joint Vision 2010* in the FY 1999 budget is primarily for funding relevant new technologies.

The QDR recommended end strengths and force levels that are only slightly below those already planned as a result of the Department's earlier post-Cold War adjustments. It called for additional cuts of about 60,000 active military personnel; 55,000 in Selected Reserves; and 80,000 DoD civilians. End strength trends and goals are shown below:

Department of Defense Personnel End Strengths (End of Fiscal Year in thousands)

	Cold War <u>FY 1987</u>	Current <u>FY 1998</u>	Budget <u>FY 1999</u>	QDR <u>Goals</u>
Active Military	2,174	1,419	1,396	1,360
Selected Reserves	1,151	886	877	835
DoD Civilians	1,127	770	747	640