STENOGRAPHIC MINUTES Unrevised and Unedited Not for Quotation or Duplication

HEARING ON WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE

AT K-TOWN: HOW MISMANAGEMENT HAS

DERAILED DOD'S LARGEST SINGLE

FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT

Thursday, June 28, 2007

House of Representatives,

Committee on Oversight and

Government Reform,

Washington, D.C.

"This is a preliminary transcript of a Committee Hearing. It has not yet been subject to a review process to ensure that the statements within are appropriately attributed to the witness or member of Congress who made them, to determine whether there are any inconsistencies between the statements within and what was actually said at the proceeding, or to make any other corrections to ensure the accuracy of the record."

Committee Hearings

of the

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES



- 1 | Court Reporting Services, Inc.
- 2 HGO179000
- 3 | HEARING ON WASTE, FRAUD, AND ABUSE
- 4 AT K-TOWN: HOW MISMANAGEMENT HAS
- 5 DERAILED DOD'S LARGEST SINGLE
- 6 FACILITY CONSTRUCTION PROJECT
- 7 Thursday, June 28, 2007
- 8 House of Representatives,
- 9 | Committee on Oversight and
- 10 Government Reform,
- 11 Washington, D.C.

15

16

17

18

19

20

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m. in
room 2154, Rayburn House Office Building, the Honorable Henry
A. Waxman [chairman of the committee] presiding.

Present: Representatives Waxman, Cummings, Davis of Illinois, Tierney, Watson, Higgins, Davis of Virginia, Shays, Platts, Duncan, Issa, and Sali.

Staff Present: Phil Schiliro, Chief of Staff; Phil
Barnett, Staff Director and Chief Counsel; Karen Lightfoot,
Communications Director and Senior Policy Advisor; David

Rapallo, Chief Investigative Counsel; John Williams, Deputy 21 22 Chief Investigative Counsel; Margaret Daum, Counsel; Suzanne Renaud, Counsel; Molly Gulland, Assistant Communications 23 24 Director; Earley Green, Chief Clerk; Teresa Coufal, Deputy Clerk; Caren Auchman, Press Assistant; Zhongrui ''JR'' Deng, 25 Chief Information Officer; Leneal Scott, Information Systems 26 27 Manager; Sam Buffone, Staff Assistant; David Marin, Minority Staff Director; Larry Halloran, Minority Deputy Staff 28 29 Director; Jennifer Safavian, Minority Chief Counsel for Oversight and Investigations; John Brosnan, Minority Senior 30 Procurement Counsel; Emile Monette, Minority Counsel; Patrick 31 Lyden, Minority Parliamentarian and Member Services 32 Coordinator; Brian McNicoll, Minority Communications 33 Director; and Benjamin Chance, Minority Clerk. 34

Chairman WAXMAN. The meeting of the Committee will please come to order.

I would like to ask unanimous consent that the Chairman and the Ranking Member or his designee each have ten minutes of time for questioning when we begin this morning.

Today's hearing will be the seventh hearing the

Oversight Committee has held this year on waste, fraud, and

abuse in the Federal Government. We are holding this hearing

to examine what has gone wrong at the K-Town Mall, a \$200

million Defense Department construction project.

On September 28, 2006, this Committee held a hearing on the Baghdad Police College. This was a U.S. project to build new barracks and classrooms to educate and train Iraqi police forces. As we learned at that hearing, the project was in shambles. I have some pictures of that project which I would like to show.

At the hearing we heard testimony from the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction that construction was so deficient that toilets were draining through the reinforced concrete floors and literally raining on the cadets. Auditors told us about light fixtures so full of urine and feces that they would not operate.

The excuse from the Defense Department was that this was a war zone.

Today we consider a different construction project.

This project is not in a war zone. It is not in Iraq or Afghanistan. This project is being built on a United States military base in Germany. U.S. project officials live and work every day next to the facility. It is called the Kaiserslautern Military Community Center, also referred to as the K-Town Mall. Yet, it is also over budget, behind schedule, and falling apart.

The K-Town Mall is the Pentagon's largest single facility construction project in the world. It will have a hotel, sports bar, slot machines, and over 800,000 square feet of retail space. But, just like the Baghdad Police College, the construction has been deficient, and U.S. oversight has been wholly inadequate.

I have some pictures of this project, and the similarities are striking. Here is one showing how the roof is leaking continually and is causing damage to the finished construction underneath. This will cost millions of dollars to replace. Here are some additional pictures of the faulty construction, and here is another picture showing how flammable sealant was used in kitchen exhaust ducts.

How could this have happened? How could construction of a modern-day facility in a western country on a U.S. military base resemble the shoddy and makeshift practices of a war zone? That is what we are here to find out.

Certainly there are problems with the contractor on this

project, which is a German government-controlled entity called LBB, and we will hear about some of these deficiencies today. But the bottom line is that this is a U.S. Government project. We are spending over \$200 million in U.S. funds to build the K-Town Mall, yet the Air Force has failed in its responsibilities to conduct proper planning and oversight. The project is millions of dollars over budget, has no validated cost estimate. The project was supposed to be done last year, but now there is no working completion date in sight.

I want to introduce for the record an audit issued by the Air Force Audit Agency just last week on June 22nd. This audit report is the European Area Audit Office, 22nd of June, 2007. This report details literally dozens of oversight defects by the U.S. Government in the K-Town Mall project. Let me just read a few from it.

'The Air Force did not provide adequate oversight of the planning procedures. The Air Force did not establish a process for the contractors to provide contractor qualification for U.S. review. The Air Force did not establish procedures directing project managers to review and validate cost estimates and did not properly monitor and approve contractor payments. The U.S. Air Force paid for materials in excess of approved contract quantities and did not properly appoint certifying and accountable officials.''

This is a long report, over 100 pages, so I asked my staff to prepare a short fact sheet with the key auditor findings, and that fact sheet is available to Members, and I ask unanimous consent it be included in the record. Without objection.

[The referenced information follows:]

****** COMMITTEE INSERT *******

Chairman WAXMAN. GAO investigators also visited the K-Town Mall. We are fortunate that they can be here today to tell us what they learned. As we will hear, they saw irresponsible management, shoddy work, and millions of dollars in waste.

The Federal Government spent a record amount, over \$400 billion, on Federal contracts last year. Over 40 cents of every discretionary Federal dollar now goes to a private company, but far too much of this spending is being squandered.

The report I released yesterday identified 187 contracts worth over \$1 trillion that had been plagued by waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement since 2000. The same pattern happens over and over again. The contractors get rich, the work doesn't get done, and the taxpayers get soaked.

As the main oversight committee in the House we have an essential job to do. We need to examine what went wrong so we can hold officials accountable and enact reforms, and that is what I hope we can begin to do today by holding this important hearing.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Waxman report follows:]

Chairman WAXMAN. I want to recognize Representative Shays, who will deliver the opening statement on behalf of Congressman Tom Davis, the Ranking Member.

Mr. SHAYS. Thank you, Mr. Waxman. This is, in fact, Representative Tom Davis' statement.

Good morning. Let me first commend Chairman Waxman for holding a hearing on acquisition issues that does not involve Halliburton. We hope today's broader perspective marks the beginning of a trend.

As the Chairman said, we need today to discuss the challenges facing the Department of Defense's largest ongoing facilities construction project, the Kaiserslautern Military Community Center at Ramstein Air Base in Germany. The facility was designed as a massive, multi-use complex featuring retail, hotel, and entertainment space to service American personnel stated in Germany and for others passing through Ramstein, but today the project stands unfinished after chronic delays, lax management and oversight, huge cost overruns, dangerous design flaws, vandalism, and allegations of corruption.

According to the Government Accountability Office, which brought this matter to the Committee's attention, these problems go well beyond the risks inherent in foreign construction projects. This acquisition effort seems to have collapsed under the combined weight of several daunting but

not altogether unique complications.

First, the project is supported by four different funding sources, each with different spending rules, currently valued at over \$170 million. The acquisition requires coordination of expenditures from Air Force working capital funds, other non-appropriated accounts, and \$21 million in appropriated military construction funding.

Second, the facility is being built under a riskier fast track design/build process.

Third, the project must be constructed in accordance with a NATO status of force agreement which requires the German government to manage construction using German contractors to perform the work.

Fourth, the Air Force decided not to use the U.S. Army
Corps of Engineers, the Defense Department's resident
construction management experts, to oversee the project.

And, finally, to top it all off, the Air Force Project
Management Office was under-staffed. The result was a
high-risk, high-visibility project managed by too few people.

Any one of these factors presents significant management challenges. Together, they spell disaster in the form of inadequate and unfocused high-level leadership, poor planning, poor design requirements, and an inadequate number of trained personnel overseeing the project.

The Air Force recognizes the project has serious

problems in management and oversight, and it is in the process of taking steps to get control of the situation.

Some of the identified challenges have been mitigated; others remain works in progress.

There is still a great deal of money committed to the project and substantial funding remains in the pipelines in Germany for other construction endeavors. We need to be sure this project is completed properly and that the future projects do not fall prey to the same oversight mistakes that steered this project into a cost and scheduling ditch.

I hope this hearing will focus on what needs to be done to get this project back on track and what should be done to protect the integrity of future projects built under the existing status of force agreement in Germany. We need to know what has gotten better, what is still being fixed, and what is still broken, and we need to refine our understanding of the difference between interim findings that may make this complex process look bad now, and the real problems that will actually affect the cost to taxpayers in the end.

I do need to sound a note of caution, however. The GAO audit findings being presented today are only preliminary. Criminal and administrative investigations of the project are still underway. Without the final results of those efforts, we are not in a position to get the full story in this hearing. It might have been wiser to wait, but as we proceed

today we should take care not to jeopardize the hard work of the Department of Justice and the Air Force in pursuing serious allegations of civil and criminal violations in connection with this project.

Investigators from the GAO are here today to provide their initial views on these issues, and we commend them for their hard work. We also value the experience and the perspectives our Air Force witnesses bring to this discussion of the critical challenges faced by this construction project.

Much is at stake in terms of U.S. tax dollars and in terms of ensuring our troops get the best possible services and accommodations while deployed overseas.

We look forward to the testimony of all the witnesses and to a frank, constructive discussion.

That is the end of his statement.

[Prepared statement of Mr. Davis of Virginia follows:]

231 ******** INSERT *******

214

215

216

217

218

219

220

221

222

223

224

225

226

227

228

229

232 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

I want to welcome now our witnesses for this hearing,
Greg Kutz, who is joined by Bruce Causseaux and Terrell Dorn
from the Government Accountability Office, who will present
the interim results of their investigation into deficiencies
at the K-Town Mall.

We also want to welcome Brigadier General Danny Gardner, who is the Director of Installations and Mission Support for the United States Air Forces in Europe.

Hopefully we will get an explanation of what has been happening at the K-Town Mall.

I thank you all very much for being here. It is the practice of this Committee to ask all witnesses to take an oath before they testify.

[Witnesses sworn.]

Chairman WAXMAN. The record will indicate that each of the witnesses answered in the affirmative.

Your prepared statements are going to be in the record in their entirety. We would like to ask you to proceed in any way you wish in your oral presentation to us.

Mr. Kutz?

STATEMENTS OF GREGORY D. KUTZ, MANAGING DIRECTOR, FORENSIC AUDITS AND SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; TERRELL G. DORN, DIRECTOR, PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; BRUCE A. CAUSSEAUX, SENIOR LEVEL CONTRACT AND PROCUREMENT FRAUD SPECIALIST, FORENSIC AUDITS AND SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; BRIGADIER GENERAL DANNY K. GARDNER, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS AND MISSION SUPPORT, UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE

STATEMENT OF GREGORY D. KUTZ

Mr. KUTZ. Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to discuss our initial findings relating to the KMCC project. The bottom line of our testimony today is that the KMCC project is in serious trouble. Ineffective management and oversight have resulted in a situation with no good solutions.

Our testimony has three parts: first, the current problems; second, the causes of these problems; and, third, the effects of the problems and implications for future projects in Germany.

First, it was initially estimated that the KMCC would cost about \$150 million and be completed in early 2006.

Today neither the Air Force nor the German construction agency, LBB, have a reliable cost estimate or completion date.

KMCC currently faces a multitude of problems that threaten the completion of this important project. For example, German contractors are leaving the construction site in part because they aren't getting paid. The number of workers has dwindled from hundreds to what we understand to be about 50 today. Construction flaws include significant water leaks, as you mentioned, related to the roof, which will require millions of dollars to fix.

Examples of other problems include vandalism in over 200 of the hotel rooms, turnover in key LBB personnel, and the firing of a company that LBB hired to manage the project, and ongoing fraud investigations.

Under the causes of the problems, from the beginning KMCC was a high-risk overseas project. Key risk factors, which are also shown on the monitor, include an accelerated schedule due to the need for the 350 hotel rooms; LBB having control over contracting and management; in effect, a cost-plus percentage of cost agreement; scheduling and coordination of over 30 German trade contractors; currency exposure due to a Euro-denominated contract; and financial risks borne by the Air Force and its funding partners.

However, rather than beef up financial contract and

construction oversight, the Air Force provided minimal oversight. For example, it appears that millions of dollars of invoices and alleged change orders were paid for by the Air Force with little or no supporting documentation. We refer to this as a pay-and-chase process, which is highly vulnerable to fraud, waste, and abuse.

Unfortunately, LBB failed to effectively design the project and oversee the work of the trade contractors.

Ironically, LBB will receive a 5.6 percent fee on top of every dollar of construction cost overruns for this project.

Let me now turn to Terry Dorn, who will discuss the effects of the problems and implications for future projects in Germany.

313 | STATEMENT OF TERRELL G. DORN

Mr. DORN. Mr. Chairman, failure of the Air Force and LBB to meet the project's construction schedule affects all of the funding partners. For example, Air Force estimates it is losing \$10,000 per day because the hotel rooms being built by this project are not available, requiring many transiting service members from places such as Iraq and Afghanistan to stay off base in higher-cost German hotels.

AAFES, which uses non-appropriated funds, bears the heaviest burden. Not only is their proportional share of both current and future construction and possible delay costs the largest, but because they are a retail operation they also suffer from lost profits and lost opportunities. Their ability to plan future operations also suffers without a firm opening date, because they don't know when to stock the shelves and they don't know when to hire new employees.

Additionally, AAFES is returned a portion of those profits as dividends, which are used to support morale and welfare activities for our service members and their families. Because of the double hit of increased construction cost from this project and lost sales, AAFES will not be able to return as much money to morale and welfare activities as they had planned. They may also have to delay construction

of two shopping centers on other military bases and delay renovation of other facilities.

Air Force officials estimate that there is at least \$400 million in additional military construction and operations and maintenance projects slated for Germany over the next five years. Absent better controls, these projects face the same type of heightened risks associated with the Kaiserslautern construction project.

In summary, the Kaiserslautern Military Community Center project is in serious trouble and needs serious attention by Air Force and LBB to mitigate the risks. While both recognize some of the issues and are taking some steps to address them, due to inadequate internal controls and mounds of unprocessed change requests, there is an increased risk of fraud and waste.

Due to reported design issues, the lack of a construction schedule, shoddy construction work requiring rework, work stoppages, and the large backlog of unprocessed change requests, the project's schedule and consequently its budget are at risk of large increases.

The largest share of those budget increases will be passed along by Air Force to AAFES, affecting their available capital for new projects and reducing the amount of dividends they can provide for the morale and welfare funds for our service members and their families serving overseas.

361	Mr. Chairman. that concludes our opening statement this
362	morning. We are prepared to answer any questions for the
363	Committee.
364	[Prepared statement of the Government Accountability
365	Office follows:]
366	******* TNSERT ******

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Causseaux, you are here to answer 367 368 questions? 369 Mr. CAUSSEAUX. Yes, sir. 370 Chairman WAXMAN. Okay. Thank you. 371 General Gardner? STATEMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERAL DANNY K. GARDNER 372 General GARDNER. Good morning, Chairman Waxman and 373 374 distinguished members of the Committee. It is an honor for 375 me to be here today. 376 Mr. Chairman, I have a brief opening statement, but my 377 written statement presents the facts of this situation to the best of my knowledge. 378 379 In opening, I would like to state that the 380 Kaiserslautern Military Community Center project, known as 381 the KMCC, remains a cornerstone requirement for U.S. Enduring 382 Presence in the European Theater. It will help provide quality of life transit capability to America's finest going 383 384 to, coming from, or supporting any UCOMM or CINTCOMM area of responsibility. 385 This project is governed by the ABG-75 administrative 386 387 agreement, a bilateral agreement between the U.S. and the Federal Republic of Germany. This agreement details the

388

roles, responsibilities, and procedures of all parties in the acquisition of U.S. facilities projects in Germany.

As you are all aware, this project is experiencing management, technical, and fiscal issues which are significantly delaying its completion.

Mr. Chairman, if you will indulge me for a moment, I would like to explain the contractual relationships of the parties involved in construction in the Federal Republic of Germany in terms of a football team, something we can all relate to. This is not to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is a game, but the analogy will serve to better illustrate the roles and responsibilities of the various parties.

In my analogy, the players are the contractors. The quarterback is the construction manager, JSK. The coach is our German construction agent, LBB Kaiserslautern. The owners and investors are the German and U.S. Government, respectively. Our quarterback, or our construction manager, is our key player. JSK is responsible for orchestrating the plays while working the field.

Our coach, LBB Kaiserslautern, developed a strategy to be successful on the field and responsible for evaluating and adjusting performance of the quarterback and players. The owners and investors provide resources for the coach to hire players, develop strategy, and succeed in the field. The owners and investors can be somewhat involved in the pre-game

strategy, but in Germany once the game begins or contracts are awarded the success of the team lies with the coach, the quarterback, and the players.

In the case of KMCC, we have experienced several weaknesses, and in some cases complete failure in our quarterback, JSK, and our coach, LBB Kaiserslautern. These weaknesses and failures have brought us to where we are today. The owners and U.S. officials are working hand-in-hand to determine solutions to the challenges our team is facing.

It is my belief that the challenges surrounding the KMCC project are deeply rooted in an irreversible decision by our German construction agent to use an acquisition methodology known as trade lots. Although the decision was well intended, it was ill fated. Simply defined, trade lots dispense with the use of single general contractor normally fiscally responsible for all aspects of single contract. Instead, trade lots award numerous contracts to individual trades, such as electrical, mechanical, and architectural, to finish this.

This method was touted as offering two strategic advantages. First, it would better serve the local economy surrounding Ramstein Air Base by allowing smaller, local firms to bid and perform on numerous smaller contracts. Second, this method of contracting would afford the opportunity to fast track construction.

Early trades such as site work, foundation, structural work could therefore be designed and constructed while subsequent trades continued with design efforts. Barring a very costly full termination and re-solicitation, this decision cannot be undone.

With few exceptions, most of the project challenges can be linked to the weaknesses of our construction agent to properly develop and manage the execution of this project. One manifestation was an exceptional number of construction change orders due to design errors and omissions. This led to the agent's inability to orchestrate the schedule and maintain quality control on more than 35 different contracts across seven projects and four funding sources. Further, they were not structured or resourced to process this large number of change orders in a manner that would keep construction on time and within budget.

The resulting haste in change order processing then led to accountability issues. In December of 2005 I began to see indications that the project was not going as smoothly as we had hoped, specifically in regards to scheduling work. We began engaging with our agent to find ways to influence changes on the construction site.

In September of 2006 LBB replaced JSK and assumed the role of a general contractor. Simultaneously, we ramped up our oversight to a level not required by our ABG-75. Though

some effective corrections have been made, there are still many challenges ahead.

We have learned many lessons from this project that we have applied to other projects across USAFE.

Returning to my football analogy, great effort has been exerted by USAFE and our German partners to turn this team around. Our commander and vice commander, as well as our embassy staff, have personally engaged with senior German officials to find solutions in order to complete this project as quickly as possible and within U.S. and German laws governing construction.

These efforts have led to additional changes within the leadership of the project and promise to bring fresh game plan to the players on the field.

It is my belief that our current strategy represents the most attractive course of action. We must continue construction to avoid extensive delay costs and to bring the facilities to a point where they can generate income and provide vital mission support.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate your genuine concern in this effort and I respectfully request the Committee's support as we work through the remaining challenges to complete this project as quickly as possible and bring this badly needed mission support facility online.

Thank you. I look forward to your questions.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much for your testimony.

We are going to proceed now, without objection, with questions in the regular order, five minutes each Member. I am going to start.

General Gardner, on page three of your written statement you say that the K-Town Mall project was put on a fast track. I would like to ask you about this.

According to your testimony, the Air Force had a major interest in completing the project by 2005. Why was this project so important?

General GARDNER. Sir, we have a Rhein Main transition program where we were closing our base in Frankfort, Rhein Main Air Base, and the objective was to close that base, transfer the missions from Rhein Main and duplicate those missions to the extent that we could at Ramstein and at Spangdahlem. The closure of that base was to happen in December of 2005. It did happen in December of 2005. And the opening of the facilities, the VQ area, the visiting quarters area of that facility was to open simultaneously with that.

But I also point out to you, Mr. Chairman, that the

December 2005 date was a desired date by USAFE for the

facilities. It was never a contractual date that was set up

by our contracting agent.

Chairman WAXMAN. The Air Force audit also referred to

this pressure. On page three the audit states, 'The senior management emphasis was on expediting design and schedule, rather than ensuring personnel conducted appropriate design reviews.' What I don't understand is how a project that was so important could go so off course.

Mr. Kutz, how would you answer this question? How did we end up with a \$200 million white elephant when we were supposed to have an urgently needed facility for our troops?

Mr. KUTZ. Well, our testimony talks about three parts to that. There are inherent risks involved with overseas contracting. There is the limitations based upon the agreement with the German government. You have got currency risks. Then, with respect to the actual German agency, LBB, they failed to provide effective oversight and management of the design and implementation. The third part of this is Air Force not having effective and proactive controls in place and oversight to identify and deal with the problems earlier, and we see it as all three being a combination of the perfect storm, if you will, creating this situation.

Chairman WAXMAN. Was one of the factors the pressure to cut corners in order to get the job done quickly? If this were the case, this approach certainly produced the exact opposite result. What do you think about that?

Mr. KUTZ. I do believe that a lot of the oversight was relaxed, in part because they wanted to get it done, and so

there was a tendency to want to pay the bill, and, as we mentioned in our statement, even if there was no support for the invoices or change orders. That was because of the schedule-driven project.

Chairman WAXMAN. General Gardner, did any official involved in this project ever object to the proceeding on this risky fast track approach?

General GARDNER. There were some communications between the partners on the fast track approach, but in the end, in order to get the facility open in December of 2005, all parties agreed that the fast track was an acceptable manner, with some stipulations that were identified in the long run.

Chairman WAXMAN. We have a memo. We will make it available to you. This was sent in September of 2004 to the civil engineer and the Director of Services for the United States Air Forces in Europe. This memo was sent by the two other key stakeholders in this project, the Army and Air Force Exchange Services and the Air Force Services Agency. In this memo they warn that the fast track process was eliminating 'the time needed to adequately review and resolve critical design issues.''

Have you ever seen this memo before?

General GARDNER. Yes, sir, I have seen it.

Chairman WAXMAN. Let me read the next sentence. 'This accelerated process has contributed to critical design

process omissions, design coordination problems, and schedule complications that may cause cost increases and project delays.''

General, this memo was written in 2004, well before the majority of the construction had taken place. Can you tell us why the Air Force disregarded the objections of these key officials and proceeded with this approach, despite these warnings?

General GARDNER. Yes, sir. This was before my time, but let me try to give you what I think happened based upon what I have been able to research.

The individuals involved in this, we did actually go through a process of looking at it, analyzing it, and determined that the risk was--we knew that there was a risk involved. We would not have the idea it would be as risky as it has turned out, but we did know there would be a risk, and that all parties, again, involved agreed that the fast track method was an appropriate method to start this particular project.

Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Kutz, what is your view of the memo and the way it proceeded?

Mr. KUTZ. My staff had seen this memo before, and, again, I think it just showed that, I guess, the incentive was to get it done quickly rather than to get it done with the all controls and additional caution. You know that

high-pressure schedules are oftentimes a problem that causes failure in a project.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Davis?

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Thank you, Mr. Waxman, for holding this hearing. This is a kind of microcosm of what goes wrong in contracting.

Mr. Kutz, your statement here weaves a pretty woeful tale. You say the German government entity charged with managing the project performed poorly, as did many of the German contractors. You don't spare the Department of Defense, either, stated that the Air Force oversight was grossly inadequate for such a large, high-risk program. Did anyone or any entity perform well here?

Mr. KUTZ. I suppose some of trade contractors did because, again, I understand German trade contractors do good work generally and there is more of a history with German construction that I am not as well aware of, but certainly I am sure some of them did good work. I think it was more the oversight, the fast track, the design had flaws, and, of course, Air Force did not provide any oversight.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Is this a problem throughout the Air Force in the way they oversee these, or is this just one isolated case where the contracting officer, or whoever was responsible, just fell asleep?

616 Mr. KUTZ. I can't speak beyond this. Mr. CAUSSEAUX. No. We have no indication that this is 617 indicative of systemic problems, but, again, we only looked 618 at this project so we can only speak for this particular one 619 620 at this time. 621 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. How much do you think American 622 taxpayers are out on this? How much did we lose? Mr. KUTZ. Only a fraction of this is coming from the 623 624 MILCON appropriations. Most of this is not appropriated 625 money. 626 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Coming from where? 627 Mr. KUTZ. Soldier morale programs at the end of the day. Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. So how much was lost when you put 628 629 all that through? 630 Mr. KUTZ. At the end of the day I don't think anybody 631 knows. I mean, there is no estimate of the cost of the 632 project right now, and the original estimate, Mr. Davis, was 633 \$150 million. There is no estimate today. Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Let me ask you this: did anybody 634 get fired over this? 635 636 Mr. KUTZ. I would defer to Air Force on that. 637 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Anybody fired? General GARDNER. No, sir. Not to my knowledge anyone 638 has been fired. But I would like to say, if I could--639 640 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Anybody promoted?

General GARDNER. Sir, could I set the record straight on 641 642 the money? Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Sure. 643 General GARDNER. We are within our budget authority on 644 645 this project. We still have \$55 million that we haven't 646 spent on this project. The prognosis, even with the repairs 647 of the roof, which is substantial, even with the prognosis we will be under our project program amount. 648 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. But you admit this wasn't very 649 well handled, don't you? Or are you going to defend it? 650 651 General GARDNER. I am not defending our contracting agent. No, sir, I am not. 652 The other thing, though, I will tell you--653 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Did the contracting agent do 654 their job in this case or did they fall down? 655 656 General GARDNER. The contracting agency obviously fell in this case. 657 658 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Was anybody reprimanded for this? 659 General GARDNER. Sir, they have been--Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Was anybody demoted or fired? 660 General GARDNER. Sir, there have been people. I am 661 sorry. I thought you were talking about the U.S. side being 662 fired. No one on the U.S. side has been fired that I am 663 aware of. On the contracting agent's side, yes, sir. JSK, 664 which was a contracting agent for the LBB, was totally 665

removed from the project. Four individuals have also been 666 l 667 fired. Senior management on site have been removed from the 668 site, as well, per my assistants. Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. But from the government side, the 669 people overseeing it, no heads rolled? Nothing? 670 General GARDNER. The individual, the contracting agent 671 is a German organization, so yes, government organizations 672 673 have--Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. On the German side. 674 General GARDNER. Yes. 675 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. But I am saying--676 General GARDNER. Not on the U.S. side. 677 678 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Right. 679 Mr. Kutz, you point out that the Air Force provided 680 minimal oversight, and in some cases actually circumvented payment processes. A major reason behind this seems to have 681 been a Air Force's desire to complete the project on 682 schedule; is that correct? 683 684 Mr. KUTZ. Yes. Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Was the key element behind this 685 mess an unreasonably ambitious schedule for project 686 687 completion? Mr. KUTZ. That was certainly one of the key elements. 688 Again, I think there were a multitude of factors that 689 690 contributed to this, including some that aren't under the

control, like the currency exchange. The Euro dollar has gone up by 30 percent since the beginning of the project, so that is outside of anyone's control.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Right, and probably you could argue that wasn't even foreseeable.

To your knowledge, nobody on the American side of this thing, though, was reprimanded, demoted?

Mr. KUTZ. No, none that we were aware of. I think the Air Force would know better, but we are not aware of any.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Do you think the problems were caused by the complexity of the various funding streams, which included both, as we noted, appropriated and non-appropriated funds, as well as some money from the German government?

Mr. KUTZ. Yes, that contributed.

Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. Do you think the fact that a majority of the funds here were not DOD appropriated funds was a cause of some of the lax oversight?

Mr. KUTZ. That was one of the reasons they didn't engage the Corps of Engineers. Apparently, in most projects like this the Corps of Engineers would be engaged to provide oversight, at least certain elements of financial and construction oversight. Because it was not appropriated, in part, that was not done in this case.

715 Mr. DAVIS OF VIRGINIA. My time is up. Thanks

716 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis.

Mr. Cummings?

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am confused. Mr. Kutz, you said from the very beginning there was no good solutions to this problem. General Gardner tells us that apparently he has got a plan that this thing is going to come in under budget. I mean, do you agree with that?

Mr. KUTZ. No. Not at all.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Why not?

Mr. KUTZ. The project is already 18 months behind schedule and there is no estimate for cost and schedule. I am not sure how you can say you are going to be under budget. There is going to be significant litigation, claims responding. There is re-work, and there are replacement of the roof, not just to fix the leaks. They are going to have to tear out the roof, put a new roof in. I think it is very ambitious to say this is going to be within any budget at this point.

Mr. CUMMINGS. General, I am under the impression from your testimony that you believe the German agency and the German contractors are to blame for the problems with the project. I don't see one sentence in this testimony that acknowledges any fault on the part of the Air Force. Is that correct? You don't believe the Air Force did anything wrong here? I understand nobody has been demoted or dismissed.

General GARDNER. Sir, with the advantage of 20/20 hindsight, there are things that we could have done better or would do differently, and those things are what we call lessons learned that we have already instituted across USAFE in project management.

But overall, again, we have trust in our contracting agent, which is LBB in this case, in accordance with international agreements, and in accordance with international agreements they are authorized or expected to build these facilities with their own right and under their own responsibilities, so we follow. We sit on the sideline once the game gets started, as I was pointing to earlier.

Mr. CUMMINGS. But--there is a big but here--we hold the money; is that right?

General GARDNER. That is correct.

Mr. CUMMINGS. We hold the money.

General GARDNER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. CUMMINGS. And so, because we hold the money, I assume there are certain controls that we should have; is that correct?

General GARDNER. We have that, sir. The oversight that was alluded to earlier, we have a program management office on site. The program management office is the ones that identified the leak problems, for example, on the roof, and they are the ones that have identified the kitchen duct

766 problem.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Are you telling this Committee this morning that it is adequate, this oversight is adequate or has been adequate?

General GARDNER. The oversight, again in hindsight, we could have maybe have increased the number of people in the program office, but--

Mr. CUMMINGS. Let's talk about it. You don't seem to want to admit that there are some major problems here with the Air Force, but I would like to ask about when the Air Force first became aware of the problems with construction and finances and the scheduling. On page three of your written testimony you state that the project indicators, both financial and schedule, began slipping in September of 2006; is that correct?

General GARDNER. No. The schedule had already started skipping [sic] before September of 2006.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I am sorry. And is--

General GARDNER. But that is when we began to realize that there were more issues than just schedule slippage, because that is when we realized that we had a--well, actually it was before that when we had a number of change orders that our contracting agent had approved.

Mr. CUMMINGS. I would hope so, Brigadier General, because the hotel was supposed to be done by December of

791 | 2005; is that correct?

792 General GARDNER. That is right. Yes, sir.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Yet you seem to be asserting that the Air Force had no idea there was anything wrong until after the date this project was supposed to be 100 percent complete.

796 Can you explain that statement?

General GARDNER. The project was scheduled to be completed, the hotel was completed contractually April 2006.

I began to realize that we were having some major issues with schedules in--

Mr. CUMMINGS. You just got slipped a note. I want to make sure we are accurate here. Why don't you read your note.

General GARDNER. VQ was scheduled to open in April of 2006.

Mr. CUMMINGS. Okay. Let me ask you this, then, General. There was a press story running in Bloomberg News yesterday in which you were quoted. In it you made this statement, 'There had been an environment of trust between the U.S. forces and LBB until about 18 months ago, when significant coordination and scheduling problems on LBB's part became apparent.' Eighteen months ago was December, 2005, so according to your statement in Bloomberg yesterday, the Air Force became aware of the significant coordinating and scheduling problems in 2005, a year before the date you

assert in your testimony today. Which statement is accurate? 816 817 Did the Air Force become aware of these problems in 818 September of 2006 or were there indicators in 2005? 819 General GARDNER. As I stated in my verbal testimony, I 820 became aware of significant problems with scheduling in 821 December of 2005. In the beginning of January of 2006 is 822 when I began to have a series of meetings with our 823 contracting agent in order to determine what is the magnitude 824 of these problems. 825 Mr. CUMMINGS. And so why do you take action then? 826 General GARDNER. We did take action. 827 Mr. CUMMINGS. What did you do? 828 General GARDNER. We worked with our contracting agent to determine why are we behind schedule and began to take action 829 830 as to how we were going to get back on schedule. 831 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. 832 Mr. Shays? 833 Mr. SHAYS. Thank you. 834 General Gardner, I want to be fair to you, and I know this Committee does, as well. Sometimes when people testify 835 836 they don't do as well as they should, but this is almost 837 bizarre to me, and so I want you to stop and maybe explain to 838 Maybe we are thinking of something different than you 839 are thinking. When was this facility supposed to be complete? 840

General GARDNER. The VQ was scheduled to be completed in April of 2004. That is when we were to get BOD.

Mr. SHAYS. April of --

General GARDNER. I am sorry, April of 2006.

Mr. SHAYS. Let me say something to you. You do not need to speak quickly.

General GARDNER. April, 2006.

Mr. SHAYS. April, 2006. And what you are saying to us is in December of 2005 you began to be aware that there were some challenges in completing the project. It seems to me if it is supposed to be done just five months later, for you to be aware of it so late is stunning. Explain to me why you would be aware so late that there were delays.

General GARDNER. Because we were being told by our contracting agent that everything was on schedule.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, being told by your contractor and having people there seeing that the contractor must be smoking something--in other words, did you not have anyone who was following this project and watching it and checking out to make sure that at least the contractor was saying things correctly?

General GARDNER. Sir, that is exactly what we were doing. That is, again, the reason we had a series of meetings with them.

Mr. SHAYS. No, you weren't doing it, because you should

have known before December of 2005. Clearly you should have known.

The other thing that just leaves me uncomfortable, and it is an impression that you wanted to leave with us but it doesn't make sense to me. I mean, when we read the document from GAO, this looks like a disaster of a project that is going to have significant cost overruns, and you are trying to give us the impression that you are under-budgeted. The way I think you are doing it is by not adding in the cost that will be needed just to get us up to a certain state of correction before you complete the project.

For instance, the claims, what are the kinds of claims against this building right now? In other words, if you don't pay a contractor, you have money in the bank, but that is money that is allocated somewhere. I mean, are you trying to give us the impression that you have unallocated dollars that will make you feel comfortable and Air Force comfortable that you are going to be under budget?

General GARDNER. Sir, our prognosis, based upon our contracting agent, as well as the other government officials that looked at this, we agree that at this particular point in time we are under the budget. That is to include the repairs that have been identified in this Committee this far. It does not include, however, the unknowns. We don't know what claims are out there yet as far as what the Germans

would refer to as hindrance. We don't know what those may be and how that will account in here. But many of those claims costs, we are working with our German counterparts in order to recover some of those claims.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, I became the general contractor of my house when my contractor left me a few years ago, and I would never feel comfortable saying that we are going to be under cost, because the fact is you have problems with your contractor because you are over cost. Rarely do you have problems with a contractor when you are under cost.

Mr. Kutz, walk me through. And I want you to be candid on how you are reacting to General Gardner's response to us.

Mr. KUTZ. It is just optimistic. I mean, I just don't see facts behind it from what we can see.

Let me give you an example. There are tens of millions of dollars of change orders in the pipeline that have not been reviewed. There is no support for most of those, or many of those. Some of them have been paid for, some of them haven't, and that is based on our own--

Mr. SHAYS. You have one change order, you have added cost and the change order they can charge you top dollar because it is a change order. How many change orders are there?

Mr. KUTZ. I don't know today, but as of February there were 500 or 600 that were in the pipeline, according to their

916 consultant.

919

920

921

922

923

924

925

926

927

928

929

930

931

932

933

934

938

917 Mr. SHAYS. Five or six hundred change orders?

918 Mr. KUTZ. That is what we understand, yes.

Mr. SHAYS. Yes. Okay. Mr. Dorn?

Mr. DORN. I would like to comment first to add to what Greg said. If you don't know the cost of the change orders and the cost of the claims that still haven't come in yet, there is no way you can know that you are going to be under budget under your programmed amount. Being under the programmed amount doesn't mean that there hasn't been any waste; it just means that your programmed amount was a lot higher than your initial contract.

Mr. SHAYS. Well, my time has run out, but basically two issues right now. You are going to have claims and you are going to have change orders and, thirdly, you are going to have repairs. Those three things are going to increase your cost, so you are going to have to find where did you save money in your project.

At any rate, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

935 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much.

936 Mr. Davis?

937 Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Thank you very much, Mr.

Chairman. I want to thank you for calling this hearing.

Following up pretty much the same line of questioning,

940 Mr. Kutz, I want to try and understand exactly how much this

project is going to ultimately cost. I am looking at the Air Force audit report, and it says that in 2003 the K-Town Mall project would cost \$132 million. Is that correct?

Mr. KUTZ. That could be one of the early numbers. There are a number of numbers of what it was going to originally cost. Our best guess was 150, from what we could tell.

Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Then by January of 2006 the audit says that the cost of the project had risen to about \$180 million, and by September of 2006 the estimate was \$201.6 million. Now, I understand that some of that increase was because of the change in the value of the Euro, but a lot of that increase was for increased contractor cost; is that not correct?

Mr. KUTZ. That could be rework and other types of things, or just changes in quantity and other types of prices of materials.

Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. General Gardner, do you agree with the Air Force auditors that the latest estimate for the cost of this project is approximately \$200 million?

General GARDNER. I am glad you asked me that question, Mr. Congressman. If I could clear the record, the current amount is the PA amount. The program amounts for this project is \$181,997. The cost prognosis, including all the repairs, all of the change orders, the 776 change orders, including all those, we are looking at roughly \$174 million.

I will tell you, however, that does not include the claims that we were referring to here. We have not gotten around to the claims.

There is Article 18 of the ABG-75 says that the U.S. Air Force or U.S. Government will not be held, cannot be held responsible for faults caused by the German government or their representatives that they hire. Article 40 of ABG-75 says those discrepancies and disputes will be handled at the ministerial level. That is what we are in the process of doing. We are trying to work those disputes that were referred to, the claims that we are talking about, at the ministerial level. We have no idea what those numbers are going to be just yet.

But I just wanted to make sure that the record is straight. These are prognoses from everybody who has looked at this other than our GAO and audit agency, is \$174 million is where we are at the present time based on our best prognosis.

Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Now, are you getting any money for the project from the German government?

General GARDNER. There is a small amount. For the claims, no, but there is a small portion of this, about \$11 million, that we get through a Rhein Main transition program which is paid for by the partners. This money is used to pay for 200 of the rooms in the VQ area, at least portions of the

991 VQ area.

Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Mr. Kutz, in your testimony you say that even \$200 million is an estimate that is too low.

Do you still--

Mr. KUTZ. We don't really have an estimate, but it is hard to believe there could be a valid estimate when there is no schedule completion date. I mean, no one has. Maybe the General has a new schedule completion date that he would like to go on record with, because I just don't know how you can make an estimate of cost when you don't know when it will be done.

Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. General, let me ask you, is there a time for reassessing the ultimate cost of the project where you can come in with an amount that probably would get agreed to by the GAO or auditors who would look at it?

General GARDNER. We are constantly looking at funding because, contrary to what some might believe, we are good stewards of American dollars. We are constantly looking at our expenses, where do we need to make adjustments, and so forth.

As we speak today, I can't predict what is going to happen into the future, but as we sit today the prognosis is just as I have just read it to you. That is where we are.

And the \$200 million that you have seen floating around is a figure that we use when we take people around visiting, this

1016 is a \$200 million project. It is not a \$200 million project. 1017 It is really about a \$181 million project, but we have used 1018 the \$200 million as a kind of a round figure for our tourists. 1019 1020 Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Could it be that you really don't 1021 know what the cost of the project is going to be? 1022 General GARDNER. Ultimately, including the claims and 1023 the unknowns, no, we do not know. Mr. DAVIS OF ILLINOIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. 1024 1025 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Davis. 1026 Mr. Issa? Mr. ISSA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank you 1027 1028 for holding this hearing. It is always refreshing when we 1029 can have a totally bipartisan hearing, one in which we are 1030 looking at the kind of mistakes that are endemic in our large 1031 bureaucracy. 1032 I don't claim to be an expert on contracting. 1033 biggest building I ever built was 200,000 square feet. 1034 it will tell you that, given a budget of \$200 a square foot, given the ability--General Gardner, let's start it off. Were 1035 1036 you there at the start of the project? 1037 General GARDNER. No, sir, I was not. Mr. ISSA. Okay. Where were you at the start of the 1038 1039 project?

General GARDNER. I was on another assignment in

1040

1041 Brussels	
---------------	--

1045

1046

1047

1048

1049

1050

1051

1052

1053

1054

1055

1056

1057

1058

1059

1060

1061

1062

1063

1064

1065

1042 Mr. ISSA. What were you doing?

1043 General GARDNER. I was the Deputy U.S. Military 1044 Representative to NATO.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. So you weren't in contracting? wasn't a skill set you brought here today except what you have learned on the job?

General GARDNER. That is correct, sir.

Mr. ISSA. Isn't that one of the problems of the U.S. military is, with the exception of the Corps of Engineers, for the most part putting on that uniform doesn't give you the qualifications, graduating from the Air Force Academy with an engineering degree in aeronautical engineering doesn't make you a general contractor? Isn't that generally one of the problems of men and women in uniform?

General GARDNER. Sir, I can't comment to that.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. We will take that as a yes.

Did anyone ever consider doing a PPV type project, in fact, having a partnership? You know, Paris Hilton is in the news, but Baron Hilton built a lot of hotels with 350 rooms and he came in on time and under budget. Was this ever considered in the contracting?

Mr. Kutz, did you see anything in the record that said that at the time the Germans and the Americans were figuring it out they considered the idea that they would go to

1066 somebody skilled in producing hotels? Mr. Dorn? Anybody? 1067 Because I will tell you I don't believe for a minute that you 1068 are going to do better the next time unless you start off 1069 with a different attitude on how we approach the project to 1070 begin with. 1071 Go ahead, sir. 1072 Mr. CAUSSEAUX. The U.S. Forces are obliged, under the 1073 ABG-75 agreement, to contract through using essentially an 1074 indirect process where a German agent -- in this case 1075 LBB--represents the American interest. That does not 1076 mitigate the U.S. obligation to provide general oversight of 1077 that venture. 1078 Mr. ISSA. So you get to be in the airplane, but you 1079 don't get to touch the controls, but you get to complain about the altitude and direction? 1080 1081 Mr. CAUSSEAUX. The German government --1082 Mr. ISSA. I am not a football guy. I am going to have 1083 to do this in Air Force terms. 1084 Mr. CAUSSEAUX. Well, in all deference to the General, 1085 while--Mr. ISSA. This is a fly-by wire with no connections. 1086 1087 [Laughter.] 1088 Mr. CAUSSEAUX. With all respect to the General, I agree 1089 with his analogy that this is not a game; what I don't agree

necessarily, however, is that the German government was an

1090

owner. I believe the United States is the owner. It is our money. We have a vested interest.

The fact that this was a fast track process, there was a decision made not to engage a general contractor, driven, I believe, primarily by the fact that it was a fast track. The Air Force opted not to have the Corps of Engineers engaged. There were designers. The design was incomplete. And there were multiple funding sources collectively and, given the size and order of magnitude of the project, made this a high-risk project.

The Air Force needed to have adequate oversight and they did not.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. You know, did any of you see anywhere in the contract history somebody looking at what it would cost to buy Euros at the front end of the project, since this was clearly known as a Euro-denominated project? Does anybody think for a minute that they simply write checks for fuel around the world and they don't hedge it in any way, shape, or form?

Mr. KUTZ. I don't believe the Federal Government hedges, but any business would have hedged this kind of a project.

There is no question about that.

Mr. ISSA. You mean the Federal Government just calls up every day and says what it is going to cost us for fuel?

1115 Mr. KUTZ. I believe that is correct.

Mr. ISSA. There is no contracting ahead, no forcing the vendor to hedge?

Mr. KUTZ. I am pretty sure that that is the case.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. So for this Committee, we should understand that all that talk about world class private sector type thinking is just bull; that, in fact, that is not going on; that what would normally go on--Southwest Airlines doesn't have a problem when they are dealing in buying fuel. They are going to have to buy at variable prices. They hedge it. They set a contract.

You didn't do that. You didn't fix the contract cost or exposure, you didn't deal with the German government and say, Because we don't control this we are going to put a cap on meeting the performance. We will pay for change orders but we are not going to pay for the basic question of whether you build this right. Is that true that the basic contract the day it was signed was flawed and that the Air Force doesn't know how to write a contract that protects the interest of the American people? Is that true?

Mr. CAUSSEAUX. Again, this was not a contract--

1136 Mr. ISSA. Yes or no. I don't have much time. Please.

Mr. CAUSSEAUX. No.

Mr. ISSA. Okay. Let's go through a couple more.

I heard you say that you need more people, General

1140 Gardner. How much do those people cost and how are they

scored? You need more people to do oversight, but I understand from the testimony that you don't really have control, so you can look at it and you can complain, but you can't get there. And don't answer that because I think it answers itself.

I am looking at pictures from just a couple of weeks ago. Now, again, I haven't done a project of this size, but this is not within three months of completion today, even if it wasn't damaged. So I ask you, General Gardner, tell me why three months before the project was to be done was the first time you knew it wasn't three months of completion, because this is a recent picture. This means that today it is not within three months. Could you answer that for us, please, if the Chairman will allow?

General GARDNER. Yes. The picture you are looking at is the mall portion of the complex. The VQ, itself, is in January of--

Mr. ISSA. Wait a second. Just correct, if I can, this section here, this is the hotel. This high-rise section is not a mall.

Chairman WAXMAN. Your time has expired--

1162 Mr. ISSA. Would the Ranking Member give me some of his 1163 time?

1164 Chairman WAXMAN.--but I want to give him the opportunity
1165 to answer the question.

1166 General GARDNER. In December of 2005 the hotel was still 1167 on schedule for BOD at the end of April. The hotel is 1168 different from the mall complex there. The mall complex we knew would be about four to six months later. 1169 Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Issa. 1170 1171 Mr. Tierney? 1172 Mr. TIERNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am curious when the General indicates that nobody on 1173 the Air Force side has been held accountable and no one has 1174 1175 been disciplined or fired on that. We talked about the 1176 extraordinary number of change orders, many of which the Air Force didn't even know about. 1177 1178 Mr. Kutz, in your report you mentioned that there were 1179 only eight offices in the U.S. project management office, 1180 none of whom, I understand, were warranted contract officers; is that right? 1181 1182 Mr. KUTZ. That is correct. 1183 Mr. TIERNEY. You then mentioned that the director of the office may have been responsible for some of the decisions 1184 1185 that led to the situation today, correct? 1186 Mr. KUTZ. Correct. 1187 Mr. TIERNEY. And in retrospect, when they were offered the help of the Army Corps of Engineers, the people who have 1188 1189 expertise on that, that was rejected?

Mr. KUTZ. That was rejected. Yes.

1190

Mr. TIERNEY. Do you know if the director of the program management office played any role in recommending against seeking the additional contracting resources from the Army Corps of Engineers?

Mr. KUTZ. I don't know.

Mr. CAUSSEAUX. My understanding was that the Air Force requested or decided not to engage the Army Corps of Engineers from a cost factor and because there had been indications that they had some difficulties dealing with the Corps of Engineers, and because this project is largely funded by non-appropriated funds versus MILCON or appropriated funds, it was not required that the Corps of Engineers be engaged. But they did have that option.

Mr. TIERNEY. Okay. And do we know what role the director of the program management office played in all those decisions?

Mr. CAUSSEAUX. I do not.

Mr. TIERNEY. I just want to explore the idea of this official that I would think that in that position that he had he had some responsibility in those decisions. When I look at page 11, Mr. Kutz, of your testimony, you say he left his position and left the Air Force in 2006; is that right?

Mr. KUTZ. That is correct.

Mr. TIERNEY. Do you know why he left and what the circumstances were around his departure?

Mr. KUTZ. For another job with the contractor in Dubai, 1216 1217 I believe. 1218 Mr. TIERNEY. I understand the Air Force is involved in a 1219 criminal investigation in this matter? 1220 Mr. KUTZ. Of this individual, yes. Mr. TIERNEY. So I think we have to be a little delicate 1221 1222 | how we discuss it, but your testimony says that the Air Force officers have been searched and documents have now been 1223 1224 seized; is that correct? 1225 Mr. KUTZ. Correct. 1226 Mr. TIERNEY. General Gardner, do you know where this official is today? 1227 General GARDNER. I believe he is somewhere in the Middle 1228 1229 East, sir. Mr. TIERNEY. Do you know where he is specifically in the 1230 Middle East? 1231 1232 General GARDNER. I believe he is in Dubai, but I am not 1233 sure. 1234 Mr. TIERNEY. He is in Dubai? And I guess Committee 1235 staff had the opportunity to track him down. They were 1236 interested in having him here today to testify. Do you 1237 happen to know what company he is working for in Dubai, 1238 General? 1239 General GARDNER. I believe he is working with Jacobs. 1240 Mr. TIERNEY. And, in fact, isn't that the same company

that the Air Force hired to help oversee this project?

General GARDNER. We do have two employees from Jacobs that work with our quality control assurance guys.

Mr. TIERNEY. Well, this is serious stuff and I think we ought to let the Air Force and the investigators carry on their own investigation on that, but we push fast track schedule, we hire minimal oversight staff, reject the help of experienced agencies. It just seems to me like a recipe for disaster on that, and I would expect that somebody is going to take responsibility. I don't see a lot of responsibility acknowledged in your testimony, General.

But just on the point of missing change orders, the 427 change orders I think is something of a stunning number for a project on this.

Mr. Kutz, just so we understand that process, the Government has approved the overall scope of the work on the project, and if the contractor thinks a change is needed it submits a change order, then the United States Government has to approve that change order before the work can be done, and certainly before any bills are paid; is that right?

Mr. KUTZ. Actually, LBB would submit the change order. They would work on those with the contractors that they had effectively subcontracted with.

Mr. TIERNEY. Okay.

Mr. KUTZ. And then they would submit that to the Air

1266 Force.

1273

1274

1275

1276

1277

1278

1279

1280

1281

1282

1283

1284

1285

1286

1287

1288

1289

1267 Mr. TIERNEY. And then the Air Force decides whether or 1268 not to approve it and to pay it?

1269 Mr. KUTZ. Correct, although in many cases they paid 1270 before they got the change order.

Mr. TIERNEY. Well, if they did that, that is not normal course of business, right?

Mr. KUTZ. No, not at all.

Mr. TIERNEY. All right. I was going to say you caught me up there for a second. Because in general you submit it, it gets approved, only if it is approved it gets paid.

Mr. KUTZ. Well, keep in mind some of the change orders really aren't change orders. They are like one line that says something was done. They are still waiting for hundreds of supporting change orders for work that was supposed to have been done.

Mr. TIERNEY. So the documentation was supposed to accompany it; it never did show up or hasn't shown up to this date on it?

Mr. KUTZ. Correct.

Mr. TIERNEY. Okay. I am looking through your report here. You found in a lot of cases the Air Force didn't even know about some of these change orders before they were paid.

Mr. KUTZ. That is correct.

1290 Mr. TIERNEY. At all.

Mr. KUTZ. Yes, because a large number of them came in, 1291 1292 we understand, in the summer of 2006. Some of those dated 1293 back into 2005. Mr. TIERNEY. Okay. Tell us a little bit about what kind 1294 of documentation would really usually accompany a change 1295 1296 order request. General GARDNER. The change orders, they can vary in 1297 size, but they are normally about this size. 1298 Mr. TIERNEY. It is hard to believe that somebody would 1299 1300 miss that or not realize that it hadn't shown up at some point. 1301 Chairman WAXMAN. The gentleman's time is up, but you may 1302 1303 answer that question. 1304 Mr. TIERNEY. It really wasn't a question. Thank you, 1305 Mr. Chairman. I quess I am just so stunned that over 400 of these fairly significant items here were just missed 1306 somewhere along the line. 1307 I yield back. Thank you. 1308 Chairman WAXMAN. Mr. Duncan? 1309 1310 Mr. DUNCAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to see if I can come a little closer to an 1311 understanding about the cost of all this, because I think Mr. 1312 Kutz said he couldn't give an estimate of what the cost would 1313 1314 end up being.

We have a fact sheet given to us by the Committee that

1315

says, as a result of these deficiencies, that auditors 1316 estimated that costs for the K-Town Mall have increased from 1317 1318 \$131.3 million to at least \$201.6 million. Although the project was originally scheduled to be operational by the end 1319 of 2005, the auditors reported it is only 65 percent finished 1320 and has no determined completion date. 1321 Is that all correct and accurate? 1322 1323 Mr. KUTZ. That is the Air Force Audit Agency's report, I believe. We have not done sufficient work to have our own 1324 1325 estimate. Mr. DUNCAN. And you said that only a small fraction, you 1326 said, of the money was coming from the MILCON program? 1327 Mr. KUTZ. That is correct. 1328 Mr. DUNCAN. And I think I read someplace else where \$21 1329 1330 million had come from that program? Mr. KUTZ. Something along those lines, yes. U.S. 1331 dollars. 1332 Mr. DUNCAN. But then you said some of the rest of it or 1333 all of the rest of it or something was from soldier morale 1334 programs? What was the term you used? 1335 Mr. KUTZ. Army/Air Force Exchange was the largest 1336 funding partner, and then Air Force Services is the second 1337 largest. Between the two of them, it is 75 or 80 percent. 1338 To the extent that there are issues with this program, it 1339 will impact soldier morale programs. 1340

Mr. DUNCAN. So the largest funds were coming from the Army and Air Force Exchange Program, which is subsidized by the taxpayers?

Mr. KUTZ. Most of that comes from profits from--

Mr. CAUSSEAUX. Revenue generated from the exchanges.

Mr. KUTZ. -- operating exchange programs.

Mr. DUNCAN. Well, you know, I think what disturbs so many people is that when we hear about these cost overruns in almost every department of the Federal Government, but particularly in the Defense Department, nobody really seems to care because it is not coming out of their own pockets. I mean, you care when you are sitting here in front of the Congressional Committees and testifying because you don't like being here, but really, as several Members have pointed out, nothing seems to ever happen to anybody. As the term is, nobody seems to ever be held accountable and nobody seems embarrassed, nobody ever seems ashamed, nobody ever seems to--you know, we hold these hearings, but then we just have these things happen over and over again.

And then what we hear, whenever we find a program in the Federal Government that is messed up, they always say one of two things or both. They always say they were under-funded, they need more people, or they need more money--you know, they need more money so they can lose even more--or their technology was out of date, their computers were out of date.

You hear that over and over again. Yet, the technology owned by the Federal departments and agencies is far better and far more expensive and far advanced over what the private sector has. But when things like this happen in the private sector, things happen.

Anyway, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Duncan.

Ms. Watson?

Ms. WATSON. I want to thank all of you gentlemen and the Chairman for being here, but I think we are gagging at gnat and swallowing an elephant. I have sat in this Committee and I have heard and spoken of \$9 billion missing in Iraq and monies that were to be used for contracts and to be handed out to the workers and so on, and no one can explain. We even had the ambassador who was there during that time said it was only Iraqi money.

I am very, very familiar with this area of Germany. In fact, I worked for the Air Force and I was in France and spent my weekends over in Germany, so I am familiar with this area and I think it is commendable that we are building this mall. However, I am very, very upset about taxpayers' money disappearing. This is not even a war zone, not even a war zone, but I am talking about in theater, and taxpayers' money disappearing without the oversight, without the management, and so on.

So, Mr. Kutz, I thank you for the work you do, but this is exemplary of a bigger, bigger problem that we are using this money without the proper management, oversight, and without people who have the expertise in place.

You know, I don't have really any problem with this because, you know, we are trying to service the civilians and the military in a foreign country, and I am all for that, but what I have the problem with is the mismanagement of our monies and the fact that currently tax cuts, where are we going to get the pool of money to really provide the construction and the needs and whatever domestically and in theater and in other places?

So none of you have to respond, but I am frustrated, because when we talk about real dollars on projects that really would be meaningful in terms of outcomes, we don't get the answers.

I want you to continue to give your reports. I want you to give us strong recommendations as to how we can look at the overall system of management accountability.

We are the Committee that looks at fraud, waste, and abuse, but we need to have some over-arching principles, and we need to have answers why they are not being followed.

Thank you so very much. I give back my time, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you very much, Ms. Watson.

1416 Mr. Platts?

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate your holding this hearing. I appreciate our witnesses being here today. I apologize for coming in late from another commitment as this issue was addressed.

When I look at the problems that are clearly identified with this project, it is kind of two-fold. One is the waste of those tax dollars and other dollars related to the operation of our facilities that support our men and women in uniform and their families, the exchanges and the projects that can be built, or in this case maybe not done because of the loss of money on this project.

I see a double hit, that loss of money and the fact that the quality of life for our men and women who are courageously serving us along with their families and those who either pass through Germany or are there has not yet been improved because this project is far from completion.

In my numerous visits overseas I have come through
Ramstein a number of times and have seen this project
underway, and the fact that we are now a year past when it
was supposed to have been done, that is a year of lost
quality of life improvements for our men and women in uniform
and their families, and no date certain yet of when it will
be done, so it is both a dollar issue and a quality of life.

What I wanted to focus on specifically is my

understanding from the audit that was done that there are recommendations, and specifically that--and, General, if you could address this--that there were recommendations from the auditors that would address internal controls relating to some of the change orders, as well as to the process for reviewing the invoices submitted and when the work was done, that recommendations were made, but those in charge of the project refused to accept those recommendations and act on them and said, No, we think we are doing what we need to do, even though the evidence tells us otherwise.

I guess it is two-fold. One is, to the best of your knowledge, who made those decisions not to accept the recommendations of the auditors? And any basis for why they did not accept that, given the information we know today of the wrongs that were being committed?

General GARDNER. We are in the process of trying to figure out how do we get this project completed. We have contractors that have walked off the site because we haven't paid them. Our guys have refused to pay them because change orders have not been completed. We know now that these change orders that we are talking about, the work was done, the work was needed, and we will eventually pay for those change orders. We know that.

What we did was set up a process to try to get money to the contractors to get them back to work so that we could

finish up the project. For every day that these contractors are off the site they are actually charging us money, so we are incurring hindrance costs, delays, and all types of other types of costs as a result of contractors not being at work.

So what we have done is tried to find ways within the law. This has all been coordinated with our legal staff, coordinated with our FM staff, and that was the process that we have used. So I feel comfortable with what we have done with that.

Mr. PLATTS. You are addressing where change orders were reviewed and were accurately fulfilled and payment, but my understanding is there is significant evidence of improper oversight, of perhaps—I think one number is \$13 million that could not be accounted for, expenditures, and at least \$13.7 million in construction change orders that the auditors reported that the Air Force was not able to validate. Is that an inaccurate statement?

General GARDNER. I don't know the exact part that you are reading from, but it is true that in the summer time frame of last year we received a register of modifications—the number was 549—of change orders that our agent had approved or someone had approved that we were not aware of. There were 549 of them.

We have since gone back out on the site and worked with our organization or the German contracting agent to verify

that the work had been done on these.

The process to do a change order, according to the ABG-75, should take 30 days. Some cases, because the way you go through the process of the change order, verifying, negotiating the prices, checking the prices and so forth, especially when you have got a change order this size--17,000 line items in this document here--it takes a while. That is what has happened, is that we have been trying to figure out a way. We know the work has been done. We can verify that. But we do not have a means to pay the contractor, get them on site, so they are walking off. So we are in this catch-22.

Mr. PLATTS. Mr. Chairman, could I do a follow-up here,

if T max/2

if I may?

Chairman WAXMAN. Yes.

Mr. PLATTS. Thank you. I want to follow up quickly with our GAO officials.

General, one, I appreciate your efforts and your staff in trying to get this project back and for your and your fellow men and women in uniform's service. We want you to be successful getting this project back and success for the benefit of the taxpayers and for the families and our men and women in uniform.

General GARDNER. Thank you.

Mr. PLATTS. I do want to follow up on that issue of the auditors' recommendation. In your review, are there still

significant recommendations of the auditors to prevent further problems that are not yet being implemented and accepted and pursued by those overseeing the project?

Mr. KUTZ. We don't know that. Our work is still

ongoing.

I would say this: this is the situation. There is no real good solution necessarily. Just as important as this project is really the hundreds of millions of additional projects that are going to be happening, and at the front end--now you are not the front end any more. You are now at the back end of this, trying to deal with a real kind of a mess. For the projects going forward, it would be more important to deal with the front end so we don't have these kinds of discussions.

Granted, you could still have problems, but you have a better chance of preventing at the front end. Now you are really in a situation of having, in many cases, to pay, regardless of whether you are going to get the money back, for rework or other types of problems here.

So the only thing I would just comment on is the General said that the work has been done, and I expect hopefully most of it has, but I am not sure how he can conclusively state that where there are change orders with--supposed change orders. I said alleged in my opening statement--with no support. Again, I trust that most of it has been done, but

also some of the people that are involved in this process are under investigation for fraud. So to the extent of saying that the work has been done, you don't know for sure.

General GARDNER. I beg to differ with you, but we do know.

Mr. PLATTS. I think your point that the work not being done up front. And, General, I understand that was prior to your time--

General GARDNER. Right.

Mr. PLATTS.--in your position, this change order with thousands of line items. If there had been a more thorough vetting and oversight up front we probably wouldn't have that type document. You are always going to have change orders, but probably not to this degree maybe if it was better laid out and overseen from the beginning. I think that is part of your point.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

Chairman WAXMAN. Thank you, Mr. Platts.

As we conclude this hearing, General, I want to make it very crystal clear why this Committee is so concerned with the failure of the Air Force. It doesn't matter who the contractor is, whether it is an Iraqi contractor or German contractor or an American contractor. As I understand, there are special rules for international agreements, but you are the U.S. Government. You hold the money, and with it you

hold the responsibility to ensure that it is not wasted.

Your written testimony says you are the third line of defense in protecting U.S. interests and resources. I disagree. You write the checks. You are the first line of defense for the American taxpayers. When you compare your testimony here today with this 112-page audit, you get a completely different picture. This Air Force audit report details at least 30 critical failures, not by contractors but by Air Force officials who were supposed to oversee this project, and these are fundamental, core responsibilities that have been disregarded.

I don't have any further questions for you, but I just want you to take that back and understand that is why Congress is concerned. It is not just for you to point fingers; it is to make sure these kinds of things never happen again.

Thank you very much. That concludes our hearing today. We stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:30 a.m., the committee was adjourned.]

HGO179.000

PAGE

PAGE

19

2

STATEMENTS OF GREGORY D. KUTZ, MANAGING DIRECTOR, FORENSIC AUDITS AND SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; TERRELL G. DORN, DIRECTOR, PHYSICAL INFRASTRUCTURE, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; BRUCE A. CAUSSEAUX, SENIOR LEVEL CONTRACT AND PROCUREMENT FRAUD SPECIALIST, FORENSIC AUDITS AND SPECIAL INVESTIGATIONS, GOVERNMENT ACCOUNTABILITY OFFICE; BRIGADIER GENERAL DANNY K. GARDNER, DIRECTOR OF INSTALLATIONS AND MISSION SUPPORT, UNITED STATES AIR FORCES IN EUROPE PAGE 13 STATEMENT OF GREGORY D. KUTZ PAGE 13 STATEMENT OF TERRELL G. DORN PAGE 16

STATEMENT OF BRIGADIER GENERAL DANNY K. GARDNER

*****	**************************************		
******	COMMITTEE INSERT *******		
		PAGE	6
******	INSERT *******		
		PAGE	7
*******	INSERT *******		
		PAGE	11
******	INSERT *******		
		PAGE	18
******	INSERT *******		
		PAGE	24