

**STATEMENT OF**  
**MAJOR GENERAL GARY S. MCKISSOCK**  
**UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS**  
**DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR**  
**INSTALLATIONS AND LOGISTICS**  
**HEADQUARTERS, U.S. MARINE CORPS**  
**BEFORE THE**  
**COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**  
**OF THE**  
**UNITED STATES SENATE**  
**CONCERNING**  
**REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE**

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee:

I am Major General Gary S. McKissock, Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics, Headquarters, U. S. Marine Corps. I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today. I am particularly pleased that you have chosen to focus on Real Property Maintenance. The Marine Corps faces a continuing challenge to best utilize its scarce resources. Within the resources provided, we in the infrastructure business have been focused on making smart choices that will give us noticeable improvements in the condition of our facilities in the short term and measurable benefits in the long term.

The Real Property Maintenance (RPM) program has a strategic plan and goals in place to guide us over the next decade towards resolving our most serious deficiencies. In addition, in concert with OSD and the other services, we are developing tools to better articulate and benchmark the Real Property Maintenance requirements. We're on the right track, but the road to a sound infrastructure position is long and challenging. The Marine Corps recognizes and appreciates Congress' continuing role in helping us meet this challenge.

The Marine Corps Real Property Maintenance program reflects a balanced selection of absolutely indispensable projects and funding which finally set us on course towards a reduced backlog of Real Property Maintenance. Taken by itself, however, this program is hardly sufficient to ensure the long-term health of our aging infrastructure or to provide Marines with the minimal standards of work, living, and family support facilities. Only a sustained financial commitment at this funding level over the next 5-10 years will allow the Marine Corps to regain control of its degrading infrastructure.

I would like to address the perception some may have that the Marine Corps got itself into this predicament of deteriorating infrastructure by funding other things besides facilities.

While it is true that the Marine Corps could have funded facilities programs at higher levels in the past few years, one must ask, “At what cost?” How could we honestly have chosen to improve the condition of our facilities, when the Marine Corps’ inventory of amphibious assault vehicles, HMMWV’s, heavy trucks, weapons, and other equipment--the stuff that gets us to war and back--are well beyond their service life and costing an extraordinary amount of money to maintain? How could we improve the condition of our facilities when our helicopters and KC-130s are over 40 years old with barely enough spare parts to keep them flying? The Marine Corps has been spending a large sum of money to keep these aging systems operational when what we really need to do is modernize them quickly. If that doesn’t happen, recovery and readiness--and the full ability to do the President’s bidding in the foreseeable future--will be seriously degraded.

In the past few years, if we had taken money away from our weapons systems and repaired buildings instead, then I’m afraid, as our Commandant said, the Marine Corps would not have been able to claim the title of “America’s 911 Force.” Marines taking care of Marines means that, bottom line, we just won’t fly planes that are dangerous, or put our Marines in tanks that can’t survive the battlefield. Our quality of life promise to Marines has long been to give them fighting instruments that will allow them to come home safely from combat. The Marine Corps has had to make some very tough choices on how to best spend limited resources. Thus, for understandable reasons, limiting investment in facilities and infrastructure for combat readiness has been the only possible choice.

All that said, the Marine Corps realizes we cannot continue to postpone maintenance and repair of our facilities and infrastructure to the degree that we have in the past. It’s just costing too much to bandage decaying buildings. We cannot continue to use our O&M money to fund

what is in essence a facilities “Service Life Extension Program” (without the benefits of modernization or full renovation) while growing our backlog of maintenance and repair projects. We need to be able to use O&M funds for their intended purpose of maintaining facilities to the end of their normal useful life span (about 50 years) rather than continuing to pour these funds into deteriorated facilities that by all rights ought to be demolished. And finally, we need to build MILCON programs that Congress can embrace fully; the kind that will get funded and ultimately convince Marines across the country that all of us in Washington, DC are dedicated to providing them respectable places to work and live.

The Marine Corps has always proudly and selflessly done more with less, and we have done so without complaint. But we cannot do more with nothing. The Marine Corps needs a prolonged commitment to facilities and infrastructure programs. Without such attention, the Marine Corps could become America’s “91” instead of “911” force with the facilities to match. As the Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics, I am compelled to ensure that the Marine Corps provide its Marines facilities that will support effective training, maintenance, operations, and quality of life. The Marine Corps’ strategic goals and stringent planning process have us on the right path towards achieving recapitalization of our infrastructure while realizing noticeable improvements in quality of work and life facilities. We ask only that Congress partner with us to make these plans reality.

Now, I would like to give you more detailed information about the plans and goals in Real Property Maintenance. I think you will see that the Marine Corps’ fiscal year 2000 program, and our developing outyear program, reflect a balanced effort between repair and investment to achieve efficiency and economy in funding our most critical needs, while also

attempting to offset the previous decline in resources available to facilities maintenance and construction.

### **REAL PROPERTY MAINTENANCE (RPM)**

The Marine Corps' Real Property Maintenance program has struggled with some particularly onerous problems in the past few years that have resulted in a significant backlog of maintenance and repair projects (BMAR). Because our decaying infrastructure has not been replaced at a manageable rate, the Marine Corps has had to use O&M funds to bind together old, inadequate buildings rather than to maintain newer structures through to their useful service life. The Marine Corps has responded to these challenges by developing plans to improve the condition of facilities, to demolish inadequate facilities, and to develop a strong RPM program in the FYDP. I understand that GAO has made some criticisms of the management of Real Property Maintenance within the DoD. In many cases we agree with them and have been working with OSD and the other services to make improvements.

In order to slow the deterioration of our infrastructure and to improve the condition of our facilities, our Real Property Maintenance goal is to reduce our backlog of maintenance and repair to \$106 million by fiscal year 2010. Our plan for the upcoming budget does not support this level of funding, but it does allow for significant backlog reduction over the FYDP. This is a considerable improvement over projections as recently as the 1999 budget submission where we were projecting BMAR to exceed a billion dollars by 2003.

Our plans for Real Property Maintenance also include management improvements. We are currently fielding a database system to tie mission impact to facility condition that we expect to be fully operational by the end of this year. We are also working with OSD and the other services to establish a sustainment level of Real Property Maintenance. This system, which

relies heavily on industry maintenance costs, will establish a guideline for adequate funding. We are also improving our cost analysis techniques so we can learn where our efficiencies and inefficiencies lie using activity based costing (ABC)/ activity based management (ABM).

Additionally, the Marine Corps has implemented a demolition program to remove excess and inadequate infrastructure and eliminate the associated support costs. OSD directed the Marine Corps to demolish 2.1 million square feet of facilities between 1998 and 2000. In 1998, as part of our RPM program, we demolished 1 million square feet and are on track to eliminate the remaining 1.1 million. After 2000, we will continue to evaluate and eliminate additional excess facilities from the inventory. I must note however, while all excess inventory needs to be removed, the Marine Corps has few excess facilities. Our demolition program represents only about 2% of our plant and cost avoidance will be modest.

Finally, the fiscal year 2000 program and associated outyear plans reflect funding levels that put the Marine Corps on track to meet DoD goals and stop the growth of BMAR. Congress provided a generous increase in fiscal year 1999, targeted at Quality of Life, and we have continued this effort. The fiscal year 2000 request includes repairs, not only to barracks and messhalls, but also to keep steam plants operational, to ensure runways don't have foreign object debris problems, to keep sewer lines functioning, and to repair the potholes in roads, among other things. These infrastructure issues in many cases have more global impact on quality of life than the specific building problems and we know they cannot be ignored. All told our investment in Real Property Maintenance increased by \$22 million from fiscal year 1999 and continues with an increasing profile across the FYDP.

With regard to legislative changes to improve the RPM posture, the Marine Corps offers no legislative proposals. We do not support legislated funding constraints. Commanders must

have the flexibility to be able to move resources to their highest priority requirements to accomplish their military missions. While historically the Marine Corps has not migrated funds out of Real Property Maintenance, it is essential that the commander on the ground retains the ability to transfer funds out of our programs and into readiness accounts like training.

In conclusion, Mr. Chairman, I would like to thank the Committee for its strong support of the Marine Corps facilities maintenance program as well as the Military Construction program. The benefits to the Marine Corps in terms of improved readiness and quality of life are substantial. Congressional support in the past indicates that you have a deep appreciation for the relationship between facilities, warfighting capability, and quality of life. There is no question that replacement and modernization of inadequate facilities can improve mission capability, productivity, readiness, and sustainability. The fiscal year 2000 Marine Corps facilities maintenance request is a full-bodied and balanced submission that supports Congressional and DoD guidance, reflects a judicious and discerning planning process, and reveals the Marine Corps' heightened priorities towards revitalizing and modernizing our facilities and infrastructure. We do this all in the name of the highest quality of life: Bringing Marines home safely from the battlefield.

Mr. Chairman, this concludes my statement. I will be pleased to answer any questions you may have.