

Remarks* by
Mr. Raymond F. DuBois
Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Installations and Environment
to the
Craven County Committee of 100
New Bern, North Carolina
October 5, 2004

**“Infrastructure Transformation: Environmental and
Installation Realignment”**

* Actual Remarks may vary slightly from prepared text.

Thank you, Lieutenant Governor Perdue, for your remarks and for that kind introduction, and thanks to you all for a warm welcome. I am delighted to be here in New Bern and also to participate as the visiting lecturer for the New Bern High School advance placement course on BRAC.

The Lt. Governor and I had breakfast with Gov. Mike Easley this morning in Raleigh and I was very pleased to learn of their unequivocal support of the military communities in the Tar Heel State. And on behalf of the Secretary of Defense, Donald Rumsfeld, I thanked both of them for the provision that in-state tuition rates at state universities are available for soldiers, sailors, airmen and Marines and their family members while stationed in North Carolina.

I want to thank our host, the Craven County Committee of 100, and its executive director, Mr. Jim Davis, for inviting me down here to address the committee, and for the committee's continued support of the air station and the depot.

And I also want to recognize Senator Elizabeth Dole's military legislative aide, Ms. Christine Hill, a retired United States Air Force lieutenant colonel who was also the first female crewmember of a B-1 bomber.

Senator Dole's support for our military has been invaluable as a member of the Senate Armed Services Committee. As you can see, her encouragement to visit with you all did not fall on deaf ears.

And of course I want to thank U.S. Representative Walter Jones of Farmville, your Congressman and a staunch supporter of the military as a member of the House Armed Services Committee.

I would also like to recognize and welcome our military commanders with us today: Major General Bob C. Dickerson Jr., Commanding General, Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune. Brigadier General Steve Patton, Commanding General, Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point. Colonel John D. Gumbel, Commanding Officer, Naval Air Depot, Cherry Point. And Commander Don Rose, Commanding Officer, Coast Guard Group, Fort Macon.

Justice Sarah Parker, thank you for being here as well and for leading us in the pledge of allegiance. Mayor Tom Bayliss. County Commission Chairman George Brown. You both should know that I especially appreciate your support for Cherry Hill.

I'm somewhat of a mayor myself, so I have a personal appreciation for your job. Aside from overseeing installations and environment for the Defense Department, I have the additional role of Director of Administration and Management of the Office of the Secretary of Defense, which makes me the "Mayor" of the 280-acre military reservation known as the Pentagon. As far as I know, I am the only civilian installation commander in DoD, so I know what it means to care for and see to the needs of a community of 25,000 people on a daily basis. I am deeply attuned to the way our small city interacts

with and depends upon the community around us and the partnerships so necessary to successfully operate.

The working relationship between Marine Corps Air Station, Cherry Point; Naval Air Depot, Cherry Point; the City of New Bern, Craven County, and the State of North Carolina is a great example of exactly how the military community and the civilian community can form successful relationships, partnerships that benefit all parties and strengthen both communities.

In fact, North Carolina leads the nation in working with the Defense Department to address incompatible land use issues. At Fort Bragg, for instance, the success of an innovative partnership to preserve both the long leaf pine ecosystem and military readiness led to new federal legislation on DoD and stakeholder partnerships.

That new authority was enacted by Congress last year, and it provides greater flexibility to military departments to enter into agreements with private conservation organizations and state and local governments to cost-share the acquisition of easements – a way to preserve open space and high-value habitat or to limit incompatible development around our military installations.

And today Fort Bragg is actively participating in a cooperative agreement with North Carolina, the Fish and Wildlife Service and several nonprofit groups to cost-share the purchase of land or easements to reduce incompatible land use and promote ecosystem protection around the fort. It is also spearheading an effort called “Sustainable Sandhills” to strengthen regional planning in the area.

Camp Lejeune has also worked closely on surrounding regional land issues with nonprofit groups and other governmental partners since 2001 as part of the Onslow Bight Conservation Forum. In 2002, this group purchased 2,500 acres of open space (which was slated to become a housing development) adjacent to the Camp Lejeune tank and rifle ranges.

Initiatives like these and others in North Carolina are great examples of how military-community partnerships can protect and even restore the local environment while increasing military preparedness.

It’s a win-win-win situation. A win for the local communities: adding open green space and water areas for recreation, hunting and fishing. A win for the environment and the conservationists: protecting from urban encroachment more critical habitat and watersheds for larger recharge and natural filter systems. And it’s a win for the military: allowing a holistic approach to natural resource management on our adjacent lands, and integrated watershed and marine ecosystem management, so that we can have more flexibility on using these critical training areas for what Congress intended -- improved readiness for our sons and daughters in uniform who will go into harm’s way soon enough – after all, we owe them the best and most realistic live-fire training possible.

Land use controls and constructive engagement with local, state and federal environmental organizations constitute a win-win-win proposition.

In short, we are not an “accidental environmentalist.”

But I know many of you here today, if not most, want to know about my other area of responsibility – the installations piece, and how the BRAC process will transform the \$660 billion of real property assets in today’s military inventory.

So let me shift gears and give you some perspective on the last three and a half years at the Pentagon with Secretary Rumsfeld and how BRAC has become a key transformational tool for the Secretary. As an aside, as some of you may know, this is not my first time working for Don Rumsfeld. My first experience with him was 29 years ago when he was Secretary of Defense the first time and I was a young assistant in the Office of the Secretary of the Army. [He said early on in 2001, maybe we needed a second chance to do it right].

Deciding to return to work in the public sector after 24 years in the private sector was not a decision I would have made if I did not believe in President Bush’s commitment to protect the citizens of the United States and his vision for the future of the Department of Defense – and that of Secretary Rumsfeld.

It was a little over three-and-a-half years ago that President Bush gave DoD our marching orders on transformation. Within a month of his inauguration, the President acted to fulfill his campaign pledges to protect the United States against what he called “the dangers of a new era.”

He said, “At my request, Secretary of Defense Rumsfeld has begun a comprehensive review of the U.S. military, the state of our strategy, the structure of our forces, the priorities of our budget.”

There was an urgency to the President’s directive, even in early 2001. As he put it, “We must use this time well. We must seize this moment.”

Time was shorter than we realized, as we found out but seven months later on September 11, 2001.

In the wake of that terrible attack on our nation, some people said that transformation had to be put on the back burner. And some would say today, because of the global war on terrorism we ought to delay BRAC. Don Rumsfeld thought otherwise then, as he does now when he said, “The global war on terror has made transformation an even more urgent priority. Our experience on September 11th made clear that our adversaries are transforming the ways in which they will threaten our people. We cannot stand still.”

Less than two-weeks ago, Secretary Rumsfeld was testifying before the Senate Armed Services Committee, and he again put the situation in clear and easily discernable terms.

He said, “We are still situated in large part as if little has changed over last fifty years – as if, for example, Germany is still bracing for a Soviet tank invasion across its northern plain.”

We all know that the Soviet threat no longer exists. We all know that the Soviet Union no longer exists. So why does our infrastructure for dealing with it still exist? Old habits die hard, I suppose.

But as Secretary Rumsfeld told the Senate later in that same hearing, in order to better align our forces in the future, the Defense Department has developed a set of new concepts to break those old habits.

The first notion of that new concept, he said, was that our troops should be located in places where they are wanted, welcomed, and needed.

A second governing concept is that American troops should be located in physical and political environments that are hospitable to their movements.

Third, we need to be in places that allow our troops to be usable and flexible.

And finally, Secretary Rumsfeld said that the military should take advantage of advanced capabilities and technologies that allow us to do more with less.

No one would question the fact that the Abram’s tank of today is 10-20 times more lethal than the M-48 Patton tank I rode on in the Vietnam War.

No one would question the fact that the Virginia class submarines of today are 50-100, maybe 1,000 times more powerful than the GATO class pig boats that my father commanded in World War II.

No one would question the fact that the precision guided bombs of today combine accuracy and punch so that five are the equivalent of 50 or 100 dumb bombs of yesterday.

So if those old weapons systems are irrelevant in today’s equation of combat effectiveness, shouldn’t therefore the same analytic apply to our old Cold War infrastructure; more bases than we need in places where we don’t need them, or bases poorly sized for the modern weapons and troop formations of today?

In order for the defense department to achieve these goals and set the right infrastructure priorities we needed greater freedom to manage, modernize and maintain our real property assets. We translated that management objective three-and-a-half years ago into what became five major initiatives:

The first step was to accelerate housing and utility privatization which, with President Bush's \$400 million 2001 budget increase, we will have contracted to eliminate virtually all inadequate housing by 2007.

A second step was to formulate sustainment and recapitalization models which would drive an honest budget build and try and hold the services to their promises.

The third step was to deal with encroachment through narrowly constructed amendments to the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the Marine Mammal Protection Act and the Endangered Species Act and the "buffer zone" authority I mentioned earlier, all of which Congress has approved.

The fourth step was Secretary Rumsfeld's direction to the combatant commanders to plan a complete realignment of our overseas basing strategy and possibly close or realign up to half of our foreign installations and eventually bring home nearly 200,000 military personnel, DoD civilians and contractors, and their families.

And the last step was a BRAC authority in 2005.

Why?: Because we must reduce the total ownership cost of the military infrastructure while providing the nation with military installations that efficiently support the war fighter in achieving military dominance, ensure superior living and working conditions, and enhance the safety of the force and the quality of the environment.

Secretary Rumsfeld told the Senate Armed Services Committee that, for example, main operating bases in places like Germany, Italy, the U.K., Japan, and Korea, could be consolidated, and we could rely on forward operating sites and cooperative security locations, with rotational presence and pre-positioned equipment, and to gain access to a broader range of facilities with little or no permanent U.S. presence, but with periodic service or contractor support.

Furthermore, Secretary Rumsfeld said, and I'm sure all would agree, that such major muscle moves would significantly improve the lives of U.S. military families. Those 70,000 military personnel and their families who will return from overseas will experience fewer moves, and thus less disruption in their lives.

But many of you would ask – and many have – “Why should we close any installations with so many troops coming home?”

The answer is that the new global posture and BRAC are tightly linked. The overseas moves will inform the domestic BRAC decisions.

Any delay in BRAC delays the realization of a transformed, fully supported, defense enterprise. A delay would postpone the estimated \$8 billion in annual recurring savings the Department would realize from a robust round (if we achieve a 20% reduction in plant replacement value). Delaying realization from 2012 to 2014 amounts to losing \$16

billion that could be reallocated to higher priority requirements, buying a great deal of combat capability. That's a quantifiable example of how BRAC can directly help the war-fighter

So you shouldn't assume that our capability will diminish with BRAC. On the contrary, BRAC will be driven by a military value calculation as determined by the Joint Chiefs. As was the case with previous BRAC rounds, the U.S. will retain enough domestic infrastructure to provide for difficult-to-reconstitute assets, to respond to surge needs, and to accommodate significant plus-ups to end strength, including all forces (active, guard and reserve), based within or outside the United States.

For instance, we just successfully surged the number of soldiers in the Army from just under 500,000-strong to more than 640,000 in a matter of months to fight the global war on terror.

This transformation initiative is intended to improve our military's forward presence, to increase our ability to fulfill U.S. Security commitments and to work with allies and partners across the spectrum of military activities from combat to peace operations. During testimony earlier this year to the House Armed Services Committee, General Peter Schoomaker, the Army Chief of Staff, talked about the more than 640,000 people in the Army, mobilized Guard and Reserve and active duty troops, who are today fighting the war on terror.

He hailed their great achievements in protecting our country and said that the Army will add another 30,000 active duty troops through recruiting and retention and military to civilian conversion - "growing the Army as fast as we can grow the Army," he said. And, yes, overseas and domestic BRAC will contribute to moving military personnel from supporting and securing unneeded infrastructure to the pointy end of the spear.

While the public focus is usually on base closure, we have learned from earlier BRAC rounds that BRAC 05 can make an even more profound contribution to transforming the Department by realigning our infrastructure with defense strategy to maximize joint utilization. Doing so reduces overhead costs, improves efficiency and facilitates joint training and operations.

The Department of Defense views BRAC 05 as a singular opportunity, perhaps the best chance in a generation, to reshape our infrastructure to jointly optimize military readiness.

In the previous four BRAC rounds between 1988 and 1995 the Defense Department closed 97 major installations and realigned 55 major installations. By shutting down those 97 bases alone we saved \$17 billion, and since 2001, base operating costs have realized recurring annual saving of about \$7 billion.

Implementing the 2005 round of BRAC is in the best interest of our national security, the military services, the American taxpayer and the local community if we can harmonize property disposal and political desires in a timely fashion.

In the final analysis, and I am sure you would all agree, we have a responsibility to provide the people defending our country with the highest quality training, technology, weapons systems, information and resources available - to include well maintained infrastructure. By eliminating unnecessary capacity, we can free up funding to support our troops in areas where resources are needed.

Who needs those resources? Well, there are currently about 900 marines from Cherry Point who are deployed in the war on terror, and many more will eventually be deployed. They need it, and we certainly owe it to them.

In closing, let me emphasize that our armed forces are incredibly resolute, incredibly diligent, incredibly honorable young men and women, and some not so young. They work very hard at protecting us and our friends and allies around the world and defending the freedoms we hold so dear. I have been to Afghanistan and Iraq on several occasions and I wish you could see them in action, their names are Courage and their names are Bravery. They are putting their lives on the line every day so that those who will determine the future of Iraq and Afghanistan will be those with the most ballots – not the most bullets.

Before opening the floor to a few questions, I want to share an insightful comment. Late last year, after I came back from Iraq on a trip with the Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz, he was asked: “Sir, did you go to Iraq to buck up the morale of the troops?”

“No” Secretary Wolfowitz told the reporter. “I went to Iraq to buck up my morale!”

My sentiments exactly. You can be very proud of your Army, Navy, Air Force and Marine Corps.

Thank you ladies and gentlemen.