



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 108<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 150

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, MAY 18, 2004

No. 70

## Senate

### Statement of Senator Dianne Feinstein

*“On the Lott-Dorgan-Snowe-Feinstein BRAC Amendment to the Fiscal Year 2005 Defense Authorization”*

Mrs. FEINSTEIN. Mr. President, I thank the Senator. I had the privilege of listening to the Senator from Maine. I feel very privileged to join in this effort along with the Senator from Mississippi and the Senator from North Dakota. The Senator from Maine made an excellent case, and I concur wholeheartedly.

Specifically, what we are trying to do with this amendment are two simple things: modify the 2005 base closure round to make it apply solely to military installations outside the United States. As Senator Snowe said, we need to begin to look at the 700 operations and installations we have around the globe and make some decisions with respect to them in this

new asymmetrical war on terror we face.

Secondly, provide for expedited consideration of a request for a domestic base closure round in 2007.

I thought the Senator made the excellent point that Congress authorized the 2005 base closure round in 2001. Our military and our Nation have been confronted by several new challenges since that time: 9/11, the war on terror, the overthrow of the Taliban and the Hussein regime, and the reconstruction of Afghanistan and Iraq. We now know our enemy may well be rogue states, may well be non-state entities who seek to find weapons of mass destruction. They may well be international groups which have replaced the Soviet Union

as the greatest threat to American interests and security.

These challenges, we believe, mandate us to reexamine the role and composition of our military in this new era: What kind of force structure will be needed? How many troops will be sufficient? And, yes, what sort of infrastructure and basing needs will be required to meet these new threats?

It seems very shortsighted to me to proceed with a new round of domestic base closures that was approved before 9/11 took place and before any of these questions were raised. In fact, the criteria for the 2005 base closure round are almost identical to the criteria for the past four rounds. How can we

be sure this process will be fair and balanced and in the best interest of our military and our national security interests if it is based on criteria appropriate for 1995?

For example, as Senator Snowe pointed out, there was no Department of Homeland Security in 1995. We are only beginning to understand how our domestic military infrastructure can play a role in providing for the actual defense of our homeland. That is a very important point. I do not think there is anyone who would say our homeland is beyond attack. As a matter of fact, I think a majority of us, certainly on the Intelligence Committee, would say there are very good chances that there will be another attack; therefore, domestic military has a new and different role to play in our country.

I do not think now is the time to rush forward. We still have 112,000 troops based in Europe, 37,000 in Korea, 45,000 in Japan in bases designated, devised, and intended for cold-war-

era threats. Those threats have changed.

We see on the Military Construction Subcommittee how the thinking is now changing with respect to force structure, the location of force structure in Korea, as well as in Europe, moving more of the European components south of the Alps so that we may be able to move them more rapidly into the Middle East and into Africa.

Suppose after the 2005 round is completed it is determined several overseas bases need to be closed and the troops relocated to the United States. Where will they go? Will closed bases have to be reopened?

Let us also remember there is an economic impact on a community that must be taken into consideration. When a base is closed, jobs are lost, economic growth is stunted. Even the threat of a base closure is enough to scare away investment.

Should we not take a look at our overseas basing

structure first before we ask our communities to make additional sacrifices?

Senator Hutchison, who is the chairman of the Military Construction Subcommittee, and I, as ranking member, introduced legislation last year to create a congressional commission to take an objective and thorough look at our overseas bases. We met with that commission last week and gave them their charge to look at the mission and then make some recommendations to us with respect to the placement of bases needed by that mission.

It seems to me the way one approaches this issue is to build on that legislation and first look at overseas basing needs in 2005, since they are, in fact, changing, and then turn to domestic bases, if necessary, in 2 years' time.

I also want very briefly to mention the impact of base closures on my home State of California. California has had 29 military bases closed. It has cost the State

more than 93,000 jobs, of which 40,000 were civilian positions.

According to the executive director of the California Institute for Federal Policy Research, California lost more jobs than all of the other States combined in the last four rounds. While at the time we had only 15 percent of the Nation's military personnel, we shouldered 60 percent of the net personnel cuts. I believe we have sacrificed enough.

If California is called on to make additional sacrifices and additional bases are closed in a future domestic BRAC round, we should know that our Government did a complete and thorough examination of the threats our country will face in the future and the military capabilities we will need to face those threats.

While we are mentioning this, I also want to raise another real problem and that is the gross underfunding of cleanup and remediation of the bases. This has been short funded by literally billions of dollars. Let me make a couple of points.

It is estimated it will cost \$1.3 billion to clean up the former McClellan Air Force Base in Sacramento. That process will not be finished until 2033. The cleanup of Fort Ord will not be finished until 2031. Castle Air Force Base will not be completed until 2038, and the list goes on.

What is the rush to close more bases that cannot be rapidly transitioned into civilian use because of the inability to fund remediation and cleanup of environmental hazards?

So I think Senator Snowe made an excellent argument with respect to the need to take a good look at the overseas bases first -- 700 of them -- and make some decisions with respect to where we are going in this new asymmetric war on terror and to leave intact America's bases for the next 2 years and then, in 2007, to consider an expedited round.

I am very proud to join with Senators Dorgan, Lott, and Snowe in this amendment.

I yield the floor.