

[H.A.S.C. No. 111-124]

HEARING
ON
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011
AND
OVERSIGHT OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED
PROGRAMS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING
ON
**BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

HEARING HELD
FEBRUARY 24, 2010



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 2010

58-171

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina	HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas	ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi	MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii	WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas	W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas	J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
ADAM SMITH, Washington	JEFF MILLER, Florida
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina	FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania	ROB BISHOP, Utah
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey	MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California	JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
RICK LARSEN, Washington	TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
JIM COOPER, Tennessee	BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia	CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam	K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana	DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
PATRICK J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania	ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia	MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire	DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut	JOHN C. FLEMING, Louisiana
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa	MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania	THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona	TODD RUSSELL PLATTS, Pennsylvania
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts	
GLENN NYE, Virginia	
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine	
LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina	
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico	
FRANK M. KRATOVIL, JR., Maryland	
ERIC J.J. MASSA, New York	
BOBBY BRIGHT, Alabama	
SCOTT MURPHY, New York	
WILLIAM L. OWENS, New York	
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma	

ERIN C. CONATON, *Staff Director*

WILL EBBS, *Professional Staff Member*

JENNESS SIMLER, *Professional Staff Member*

LIZ DRUMMOND, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF HEARINGS

2010

	Page
HEARING:	
Wednesday, February 24, 2010, Fiscal Year 2011 National Defense Authorization Act—Budget Request from the Department of the Navy	1
APPENDIX:	
Wednesday, February 24, 2010	47

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 24, 2010

FISCAL YEAR 2011 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT— BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

McKeon, Hon. Howard P. “Buck,” A Representative From California, Ranking Member, Committee On Armed Services	3
Skelton, Hon. Ike, a Representative from Missouri, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services	1

WITNESSES

Conway, Gen. James T., USMC, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps	8
Mabus, Hon. Ray, Secretary of the Navy	4
Roughead, Adm. Gary, USN, Chief of Naval Operations, U.S. Navy	6

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS:

Conway, Gen. James T.	99
Mabus, Hon. Ray	55
McKeon, Hon. Howard P. “Buck”	53
Roughead, Adm. Gary	75
Skelton, Hon. Ike	51

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:

[There were no Documents submitted.]

WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:

Mr. Bartlett	121
Mr. Skelton	121

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:

Mr. Akin	126
Mr. Hunter	131
Mr. Lamborn	130
Mrs. McMorris Rodgers	130
Mr. Thornberry	125
Ms. Tsongas	125
Mr. Wilson	128

FISCAL YEAR 2011 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT—BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, Wednesday, February 24, 2010.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:04 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ike Skelton (chairman of the committee) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. IKE SKELTON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. Today the House Armed Services Committee meets to receive testimony on the fiscal year 2010 budget request for the United States Navy and Marine Corps.

Appearing before the committee the Honorable Ray Mabus, Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Gary Roughead, Chief of Naval Operations [CNO]; and General James T. Conway, Commandant, United States Marine Corps.

Now, Mr. Secretary, we note that this is your first time testifying before our full committee, and we welcome you—and Admiral Roughead.

General Conway, thank you for your continued service, and thank you for the service of those that serve with you, and under you.

Today the United States Navy has 194 ships under way. Of those 143 are deployed. These numbers equate to over 53,000 sailors deployed in support of the Navy's missions worldwide. To support combat operations, the Navy has 15,600 individual augmentees deployed in the CENTCOM [United States Central Command] area of responsibility.

The United States Marine Corps is almost 30,000 Marines deployed. A little over 15,000 Marines are on the ground in Afghanistan. Many of those are currently engaged in hostile combat in and around the town of Marjah in the Helmand Province.

I am sure I speak for all members of our Committee when I say that our thoughts and prayers are with all the deployed sailors and Marines, with their families, and with particular concern for those Marines who are currently engaged in the combat operations.

And I have said this before, but it bears repeating. Our sea services are this nation's fast response force. The Navy power base is maneuvered from the sea. Marine Corps is and should remain an amphibious assault force and a crisis aversion force.

Current operations over the last seven years have stressed our Marine Corps, and fashioned them to more the medium-heavy ground combat force. And I am a bit concerned about that.

We remain committed to provide our sailors and Marines with equipment they need to accomplish the task before them. There are challenges. The Navy must recapitalize the main battle fleet to numbers which can support the COCOM's [Unified Combatant Command's] requirements. The 30-year Shipbuilding Plan submitted with the budget request only partially accomplishes this task. I will repeat that, only partially accomplishes this task. From that plan it appears the costs associated with replacing the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine is so high that efforts to restore numbers in the surface force and the attack submarine force may have to be sacrificed to pay for the national strategic deterrence mission of the ballistic missile submarine.

Shipbuilding plans don't address the requirement of a 38-ship force of amphibious assault ships. At best the shipbuilding plan provides a force of amphibious ships in the low 30s. And it seems to me that might be an unacceptable risk. And I am sure that our Committee will carefully review this proposed Navy shipbuilding plan.

I am very concerned about the looming strike fighter shortfall in Navy aviation. In short, I don't understand why the F/A-18 Strike Fighter program has not been extended. By any analysis, more Navy and Marine Corps fighters will be needed to meet validated inventory requirements by the middle of the decade. Delays in the Joint Strike Fighter Program only exacerbate the problem of a near-term strike fighter shortfall.

The Navy and Marine Corps continue to be challenged in maintenance and recapitalization. I am pleased to see an increase in the Navy's request for operation and maintenance funds. I note that in Admiral Roughhead's response to the ranking member's request for the Navy unfunded priority list, the CNO lists spare parts and deferred maintenance as his three most vital shortfalls.

Year over year deferred maintenance seems to pile up. If we cannot seem to find the funding to maintain our ships and our planes and our equipment, I am deeply concerned about the additional cost of replacing them prior to the end of their expected life service.

Deployments have always been a part and parcel to sea service. That happens every day. Sea services have always lived in a reality of deployment. Reset, retraining, redeployment. And I have been very concerned that the average Navy deployment cycle has gradually increased from a traditional 6-month deployment with an 18-month maintenance and retraining period to deployments averaging 8 months with comparable reduction in the maintenance and retraining period.

The stress on the force, frankly, is increasing. I would like to address the relocation of the Marines from Okinawa. It is essential that we preserve the unique strategic relationship that exists between Japan and our country. At the same time it is imperative that we reduce our force structure in Okinawa and retain the strategic capabilities associated with the third Marine Expeditionary Force.

While I understand the desire of the new government of Japan to review the current basing agreements, we need to move forward with the overall realignment that includes a replacement facility and the Guam relocation.

In the end we need to ensure that the Marine Corps and the supporting communities are in a better position.

We need to get this move right. We can't go back and undo a mistake.

And now I turn to my good friend, the ranking member, the gentleman from California, Buck McKeon.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Skelton can be found in the Appendix on page 51.]

STATEMENT OF HON. HOWARD P. "BUCK" MCKEON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA, RANKING MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Mabus, Admiral Roughead, General Conway, good morning. Welcome.

In particular, General, with your forthcoming retirement, I guess this is your last posture hearing. I am sure you have been looking forward to this with mixed emotion.

We look forward to all of your testimony here today. And really appreciate your service and what you do for the country, and your leadership.

The President's Fiscal Year 2011 Defense Budget for the Department of the Navy requests \$179.1 billion for discretionary and war funding. According to the Defense Department, this represents an increase of \$5.2 billion over fiscal year 2010 enacted levels.

From what I gather in the press, the three of you deserve a significant amount of credit for your advocacy for Navy and Marine Corps personnel and programs.

However, I am concerned that the Department's [of Defense] efforts to make balance a fixture in the QDR [Quadrennial Defense Review] and the out-year budget is shortsighted, and puts the Department on the wrong path for the next 20 years.

While the QDR states that U.S. forces must be able to deter, defend against and defeat aggression in anti-access environments, neither the Department of the Navy's fiscal year 2011 budget request, nor the long-term shipbuilding or aviation plans appear to make significant long-term investments in the capabilities that would be required to achieve that goal.

We have previously received testimony that the QDR and the fiscal year 2011 budget proposed a number of new initiatives designed to provide robust capabilities for tomorrow's force, such as a new SSBN [Nuclear-Powered Submersible Ship with Ballistic Capability] submarine, the F-35 ballistic missile defense, the *Virginia*-class attack submarine.

While I agree that investments in these areas are necessary, they are neither sufficient, nor do they tell the full story.

For example, the decision to fund the new SSBN submarine from within the Navy's shipbuilding procurement account could decimate the shipbuilding program in the out-years because the new SSBN will cost at least \$7 billion, or close to half of the Navy's re-

cent ship construction budgets. The F-35 program continues to experience developmental delays that only exacerbate the Navy and Marine Corps' strike fighters' shortfall. Yet the QDR and the budget request do nothing to rectify this situation.

We are building two *Virginia*-class attack subs per year starting in fiscal year 2011. Yet the shipbuilding plan we just received has our force falling to 39 by 2030, leaving our combatant commanders worse off than they are now.

The proposed regional missile defense architecture relies on the Navy's surface combatants. Nevertheless, the shipbuilding plan proposes a smaller surface combatant fleet than the last plan did. I need not go on. I am hopeful that you can provide further insights for this committee to help us understand how the QDR and the fiscal year 2011 budget reflect a comprehensive approach to providing the capabilities the Navy and Marine Corps will need in the future.

Lastly, the President has asked Congress to consider a major personnel policy change that could affect readiness. Therefore, Admiral Roughead, and General Conway, I will be requesting your views on whether the current law prohibiting the service of openly gay men and women should be repealed, and on the suggestion that a moratorium on implementing current law be put into effect while the Department of Defense studies and reviews the issue.

I am disappointed that the decision has been made not to let the service chiefs testify before the military personnel subcommittee's hearings on "don't ask, don't tell." That decision limits the ability of members to fully understand and explore the concerns of the service chiefs about a repeal of current law. I would hope that we could continue that discussion.

Once again, I thank you for being here today. I look forward to your testimony. I ask unanimous consent that my full opening statement be included in the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection it will be.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McKeon can be found in the Appendix on page 53.]

Mr. MCKEON. I yield back my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much.

Mr. Secretary, the floor is yours.

STATEMENT OF HON. RAY MABUS, SECRETARY OF THE NAVY

Secretary MABUS. Mr. Chairman, Congressman McKeon, members of this committee, it is a real pleasure to be here today before the House Armed Services Committee. The CNO, the Commandant, and I are grateful for the commitment that the members of this committee have shown to our men and women in uniform in the Navy and the Marine Corps. We are exceptionally proud to be here today representing our sailors, Marines, civilians, and their families.

The Navy and Marine Corps remain the most formidable expeditionary fighting force in the world, capable of global operations across the entire spectrum of warfare. Today, as the Chairman noted, 40 percent of our forces are deployed and over half the fleet is at sea.

In Helmand province, Afghanistan, more than 15,000 Marines are engaged in major combat, counterinsurgency, and engagement

operations, including the effort to clear the Taliban stronghold of Marjah.

They are supported there by naval aircraft flying close air support from *Eisenhower* [USS *Dwight D. Eisenhower*], and from our forward-deployed expeditionary aviation assets. A total of more than 12,000 sailors are on the ground in Iraq, Afghanistan, and across the broader Middle East, and another 9,000 sailors and Marines are embarked on our ships at sea.

Off the coast of Africa, ships are protecting international commerce off Somalia, and ships are operating as partnership stations with our regional allies. Off the coast of South America more ships are stemming the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States. Our ballistic missile defense forces are ready to defend against any threat to international peace in Europe, the Middle East, and the Pacific Rim.

Our forward-deployed forces continue their role as a strategic buffer and deterrent against rogue regimes and potential competitors alike. And in Haiti, nine ships and 1,900 Marines from the 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit continue to provide humanitarian aid, disaster relief and medical assistance.

The Navy and Marine Corps are flexible, responsive, and everywhere the nation's interests are at stake. Our global presence reduces instability, deters aggression, and allows us to rapidly respond to any crisis that borders a sea. I believe that the President's fiscal year 2011 budget for the Department of the Navy is a carefully considered request that gives us the resources we need to conduct effective operations and to meet all the missions we have been assigned.

Our shipbuilding and aviation requests concur with the findings of the QDR and its objectives of prevailing in today's wars, preventing conflict, preparing for future wars, and preserving the force.

With this budget, the Navy and Marine Corps will continue to maintain the maritime superiority of our forces, sustain a strong American shipbuilding base, and ensure our capacity for rapid global response.

Across the 5 years we have requested the funds to build an average of 10 ships a year, including one carrier, one big-deck amphib, 10 *Virginia*-class submarines, and 17 Littoral Combat Ships.

We will leverage the technologies captured from the canceled CGX [Next Generation Cruiser] program, and truncated DDG-1000 [*Zumwalt*-Class Destroyer] program, into what will become the Flight III *Burke*-class DDGs. These technologies include SPY-3 [AN/SPY-3 radar] and the air and missile defense radar.

Through the submitted shipbuilding plan, we will increase the size of our fleet to approximately 320 ships by 2024. In our shipbuilding program I believe we have made the most cost-effective decisions to achieve the most capable force. One that achieves equal flexibility to confront missions across the spectrum of conflict, from the technically complex, like ballistic missile defense and integrated air defense, to low-intensity humanitarian response and regional engagement.

In aircraft procurement, we have requested just over 1,000 aircraft across the FYDP [Future Years Defense Program], including

both fixed and rotary wing. Over the next year, the Navy and Marine Corps will continue to move ahead with changes to our acquisition process in compliance with the Weapons System Acquisition Reform Act. We are aggressively developing our acquisition strategies to ensure that on-time and on-budget becomes standard for the Navy and Marine Corps.

I am grateful for the support of this committee for the decision to recompete the LCS [Littoral Combat Ship] program when it failed to meet program standards. I can assure you that we will not hesitate to recompete or cancel other programs whenever substandard performance demands change.

Change is also required to address the way in which the Navy and Marine Corps use and produce energy. Energy reform is an issue of national security, and it is essential to maintaining our strategic advantage, our warfighting readiness, and our tactical edge.

By 2020, I have committed the Navy to generate half of all the energy we use from alternative sources. This is an ambitious goal. Nothing has ever been accomplished without taking some bold steps. Forty years ago I stood watch on the deck of the USS *Little Rock* as a very young junior officer. Today, I have the solemn privilege of standing watch on behalf of our Navy and Marine Corps in a time of war and national challenge.

I am honored by the trust the President and the Congress have placed in me, and fully recognize the solemn obligation I have to those who defend us. I, along with the CNO and the Commandant, look forward to hearing your thoughts and answering your questions that you have concerning our budget requests, our programs, our policies. I also look forward to working closely with you as we move forward to sustain the Navy and Marine Corps as the most formidable expeditionary fighting force in the world.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Secretary Mabus can be found in the Appendix on page 55.]

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Secretary, thank you, and we think you are off to a great start.

Admiral Roughead, please.

**STATEMENT OF ADM. GARY ROUGHEAD, USN, CHIEF OF
NAVAL OPERATIONS, U.S. NAVY**

ADMIRAL ROUGHEAD. Thank you, sir. Chairman Skelton, Congressman McKeon, members of the committee, it is indeed my honor to be before you again representing the more than 600,000 sailors and Navy civilians.

As you mentioned, Mr. Chairman, 65,000 of them are deployed, 12,000 on land in the Central Command Area of Operations, and 56 percent of our fleet is underway, carrying out our maritime strategy, a prescient precursor to the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review.

They are projecting power into Afghanistan, building partnerships in Africa, delivering relief in Haiti, silently patrolling under the sea in every ocean, and providing ballistic missile defense in the Arabian Gulf, Western Pacific, and Eastern Mediterranean, with pride and determination.

They are even deployed on the first Littoral Combat Ship two years ahead of schedule. And in the first week of that ship's deployment, she seized over a quarter of a ton of cocaine in the Caribbean. As our sailors and Navy civilians who make all things possible, and thanks to your support, we made important progress in building tomorrow's Navy, remaining ready to fight today and supporting our sailors and Navy civilians and families last year.

This year's budget submission will take us even further. As the high demand for our Navy continues apace, we have stabilized end strength and the tone of the force remains positive. We will continue to aggressively improve wellness programs and medical and social services for our wounded warriors. Indeed, for all who serve.

For our fleet as a continuously deployed force, we must continue to reset in stride, conducting regular maintenance and training so that our ships and aircraft reach their expected service lives. This year's budget aligns our baseline budget for operations and maintenance accordingly, and reflects a significant shift away from supplemental funding. I strongly request your support for this important change.

While we reset, we must also procure ships and aircraft to reach our procurement of more than 313 ships. Last year, we commissioned 9 ships, and over the next decade our plan procures an average of 10 ships per year, significant growth for the near term.

For aviation, I remain committed to bringing new capabilities online, the Joint Strike Fighter and unmanned aircraft, and maintaining the readiness of our current Naval Air Force, all of which give our nation flexibility and response, unencumbered by overseas basing. Affordability for all our plans will remain fundamental to our decisions. The effectiveness of our unmanned systems, ships, and aircraft is a feature of the systems which connect them.

Last year, I brought information capabilities and resources under a single Information Dominance Directorate within the Navy staff, and commissioned Fleet Cyber Command 10th Fleet, and I see the benefits of that change every day.

I am proud of our Navy's accomplishments last year, and I am confident we can achieve even more with this year's budget submission. Our risk continues to trend toward significant, and achieving the right balance, within and across, my priorities remains critical to mitigating it. But I remain optimistic because of the outstanding sailors and Navy civilians and the spirit of our nation.

We have seen more challenging times and emerged prosperous, secure, and free. I ask you to support our 2011 budget request, and thank you for all you do to make the United States Navy a global force for good, today and into the future.

Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Roughead can be found in the Appendix on page 75.]

The CHAIRMAN. Admiral, thank you very, very much.

General Conway, there is a lot of hard work left between now and the time we bid farewell to you. Carry on in the future. Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF GEN. JAMES T. CONWAY, USMC,
COMMANDANT, U.S. MARINE CORPS**

General CONWAY. Mr. Chairman, Congressman McKeon, distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to report to you on the posture of your Marine Corps. My pledge, as it has been over the years, is to provide you today a candid and honest assessment.

Having recently returned from a trip to theatre, I am pleased to report to you on the magnificent performance of Marines and sailors in combat. If you count a full-year enlistment as a generation of Marines, we are now experiencing our third generation of great young patriots since our nation was provoked on 9/11.

The first generation broke trail, leading the strikes into Afghanistan and Iraq. Our second generation quelled the once-volatile province of Anbar. Today there are less than 175 Marines in Iraq, but our third generation has more than 15,000 serving in Afghanistan.

The Marines are fighting a skilled and determined enemy, but with the Afghan security forces, they are once again proving they are the strongest tribe in the Taliban stronghold of Helmand. Let me assure you from what SAR [Sergeant] Major and I have witnessed firsthand, the highest morale in the Corps resides in those units posted in Afghanistan.

My written statement to the committee provides a snapshot of the Corps and describes our near-term focus, our long-term priorities, and our vision of the future. That vision matches closely the results of the Quadrennial Defense Review. The Secretary of Defense seeks to create a U.S. military more closely focused on hybrid threats, yet capable of responding to a major contingency. That combination essentially describes the Marine Corps that we have built today.

A Corps that we call a two-fisted fighter, able to perform equally well in a counterinsurgency, or in a high-intensity combined arms fight. Our resource expenditures, moreover, reflect our dual or swing capacity. That is to say that 100 percent of Marine Corps equipment can be used in a hybrid conflict or in a major fight.

Equivalent procurement is indeed our primary concern as we look at the fiscal year 2011 budget and beyond. Our requirements for equipment density in Afghanistan, and our resolve to reestablish our maritime pre-positions quadrants, have driven equipment stocks to an all-time low in our operating forces at home station.

The ability to properly train for a deployment, and certainly the ability to respond to an unexpected contingency is at significant risk, based on this increasing shortfall. Congress has promised to resource us for a reset in constitution, but increasingly, we cannot wait for the guns to fall silent in Afghanistan for such an effort to begin. We ask for your help in this critical area.

Our military construction accounts in the fiscal year 2011 budget and the FYDP are sufficient to help maintain the promise we have made to our Marines that they will have quality living spaces at home between deployments. One need only visit some of our major bases and stations to realize that we waited too long to begin this effort.

Similarly, we believe that even in wartime we must continue a heavy emphasis on education of our officers and staff NCOs [Non Commissioned Officers]. A strong reservoir of strategic and operational thinkers is a must on sophisticated joint and combined battlefields. Therefore, a quality Marine Corps University with facilities to match our already world-class student body, faculty, and curriculum is a major priority. We trust we will receive your full support in our MILCON [Military Construction] investments that will repay huge dividends in the years to come.

Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, I must admit my own surprise that our Corps of Marines and their families have remained so resilient over these nine years of conflict. They have been incredibly determined, loyal, and courageous in an effort to see these two wars to a successful close. Much of the credit goes to you in the Congress for providing them with the finest in equipment, warrior care, quality of life for our families, and compensation.

The number one question in the minds of our troops is always: Is the country behind us? The members of Congress have answered that question in spades, both by your apportionment of the nation's precious resources, but also through personal efforts to visit troops in theatre, and those who are wounded at Bethesda and Walter Reed.

As a result of all the above, and the natural tendency for Marines to stick around for a fight, our recruitment and retention are at all-time highs. I predict that for the second year in a row we will close out reenlistment opportunities for first-term and career force Marines at the halfway point of the fiscal year. Clearly, such a phenomenon would not be possible if Marines and their families were not happy in the service of their country.

One day this long war with terrorists and Islamic extremists will be over. Your Marine Corps will cease being a second land army and gladly rejoin our Navy brothers aboard amphibious ships in order to project America's global presence, demonstrate American good will, and if need be, protect America's vital interests.

Until that day comes, however, your Corps will continue, as we say, to do windows. That is, we will continue to take aboard the indomitable youth of America and make them Marines with the absolute conviction that as a result they will one day be better citizens. We will be trained and as equally prepared to rout Taliban fighters in Marjah as we are to feed beleaguered Haitians outside Port-au-Prince. With your continued support and that of our loyal countrymen, we will do whatever the nation asks us to do and do it exceedingly well.

Thank you, sir, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Conway can be found in the Appendix on page 99.]

The CHAIRMAN. General, thank you very much. I think that all of us, and I know I speak for all the members of the committee, when I say we are immensely proud of the young men and young women who wear your uniforms, we are immensely proud and thankful for their families and the reflection of the high state of morale of which you gentlemen spoke.

I have been blessed to be in the Congress several years, and I remember very well President Ronald Reagan aiming for a 600-ship Navy. That was a very worthy goal at the time. Today, we haven't even reached his halfway mark on that goal. We don't even have 300 ships out there.

The oceans haven't gotten any smaller. Technology has gotten a lot better and one of the arguments is we don't need as many ships. Nevertheless, it is imperative that we have enough presence to make a difference, much less an ability to fight. How do you, Mr. Secretary, speed up your suggested building and numbers rate? We need to know.

Secretary MABUS. Mr. Chairman, we have today, as you pointed out, 285 ships in our battle fleet and more than half of them are underway today. We are very cognizant of the fact that our force structure requirement of 2005 said that 313 ships are a floor and it is a floor that both the CNO and I recognize and need to build to get to that level.

We think that the 5-year shipbuilding plan and the longer 30-year shipbuilding plan that we have submitted on this budget, which builds an average of 10 ships a year, 50 ships over this 5-year period, drives us toward that goal. By 2020, we will have reached the goal of more than 313 ships in the Navy.

We think it is important to note as you did that these ships that we are building today are incredibly capable, incredibly technologically advanced and crewed by the best sailors and Marines that we have ever had, but at some point quantity becomes a quality all its own. And as you pointed out, the oceans haven't gotten any smaller and we do need to make sure that we are driving to increase the size of our fleet. And we believe that the budget that we have submitted to you and the shipbuilding plan that we have submitted to you do both of those things.

The CHAIRMAN. One of the problems that we faced a few years ago and it was a surprise to my friend, Mr. Taylor, the Chairman of the Seapower Subcommittee, and as well to me, the retirement list of ships wasn't even made known to us officially. Of course, that was long before anyone sitting at the table here had any say on it.

But a good part of it is the possibility of reviewing the retirement list and maybe we can get some more work out of some of these ships and help with the numbers. And as you have so correctly noted, quantity has a quality of its very own. I charge you with carefully deciding what ships should be with, should be on the retirement list.

General, let me ask you the fact that so many Marines today, the whole generation of Marines actually, find themselves fighting as Army soldiers in a desert? What will that do to the Marine culture of future years?

General CONWAY. Sir, as I said in the opening statement, we consider ourselves a multicable force and therefore available to do whatever the nation would ask us to do. And, of course, as you note correctly, over the past 8 or 9 years, we have been asked to serve as a second land army alongside our brothers in the United States Army. Our gear has begun to, has accomplished the protection that is required and in the process has gotten heavier.

We are a long way from salt sea air and our comfort zones as a naval force and yet, I would argue that we are doing it pretty well. That is not to say we want to continue to do it when the need is gone. We see the great value that we offer to the nation. We see our niche within the organization of the armed forces being just what you described in your opening statement and that is a naval force capable of extending America's presence and protecting our vital interests overseas.

We have distinctly in our plans thought processes that will shed us of some of this heavier equipment, examine in detail what the amphibious lift, what the STRATCOM [United States Strategic Command] aviation lift would look like for rapid deployment and that is the Marine Corps we intend to be in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. Admiral Roughead, what worries you the most as you sit there this morning?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. What worries me the most, Mr. Chairman, as I look to the future as is insuring, as you pointed out in your statement, that as we get into what I consider to be the midterm of our shipbuilding plan that we have taken a good look at the costs associated with the replacement for the *Ohio*-class submarine and then the numbers of ships that were procured in significant numbers by class in the 80s as they reached the end of their service lives and the recapitalization that will be required for that.

But that is beyond the scope of this budget that we have submitted, but as I look to the future and think about the issues my successors will deal with, that is what I think about.

The CHAIRMAN. Can we take that decision on the new *Ohio*-class submarine down the road in favor of additional numbers of ships, other types of ships? Because you don't really need it until 10, 12, 15 years out.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. No, sir. I think we have to be moving on that ship right now. The reason being is that that submarine will—the last submarine of the *Ohio*-class replacement—will come off of its last patrol in 2080. And the need to put in the types of systems and capabilities to take that ship out to that period of time requires significant thought and development and now is the time to start.

It is absolutely consistent with where we have been with the *Ohio* class and I believe now is the time to be moving on that and I appreciate the support for that.

The CHAIRMAN. You understand our concern about ship numbers, do you not?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Absolutely, Mr. Chairman. I deal with the demands that we have coming in on a daily basis and I do believe that what we have done in the last couple of years to get some direction and stability in what I consider to be a workhorse of the fleet, the *Arleigh Burke* class, getting that line restarted is absolutely critical to field any capabilities we need getting to the downselect on Littoral Combat Ship is going to allow us to build those in the most affordable way.

So I believe that this program that we have put together addresses the numbers in the best way.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you so much. Mr. McKeon.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Admiral Roughead and General Conway, in your personal view, should the current law prohibiting the service of openly gay men and women be repealed and what is your personal view with regard to the suggestion that a moratorium on implementing the current law be put into effect while the Department of Defense studies and reviews the issue taking place?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Mr. McKeon, my personal view is what is in the best interest of the United States Navy. And that is to go forward with the assessment that has been called for by the Secretary of Defense to allow us to assess the force that we have today. There are a lot of bits of information and surveys that have taken place, but there has never really been an assessment of the force that serves. And equally important to that force is the opinions of the families who support that force.

That needs to be done because only with that information can we talk about the force that we have, not someone else's, not another country's—about the United States Navy in my case. So we need to proceed down that path. With regard to a moratorium, I believe that it would be extremely confusing to the force and I do not recommend that.

Thank you.

General CONWAY. Sir, our commander in chief has spoken and the Secretary of Defense has devised a way through a working group to examine the data, I think, in a way that has never been done and I support his efforts and we will contribute to that effort as it goes down range. However, I would encourage your work, mine and that of the working group to be focused on a central issue and that is the readiness of the armed forces of the United States to fight this nation's wars.

That is what our armed forces are intended to do. That is what they have been built to do under the current construct and I would argue that we have done a pretty good job bringing that to pass. So my concern would be if somehow that central purpose and focus were to become secondary to the discussion because that is what your armed forces is all about.

Mr. MCKEON. And the moratorium?

General CONWAY. Sir, in terms of the moratorium, I agree with the CNO. Our commanders out in the field are trying to execute the guidance to the absolute best of their abilities. There is an expression we have, keep it simple. I would encourage you either to change the law or not, but in the process half measures, I think, will only be confusing in the end.

Mr. MCKEON. Thanks very much. Admiral, as I alluded to in my opening statement, I remain concerned that the QDR's focus on today's wars is precluding the department from making the investments that are required for our long-term national security interests. Let me provide a specific example.

The committee has been briefed that the far-term planning period in the long-range shipbuilding plan is characterized from 2031 to 2040. It is characterized by the emergence of a near-peer competitor. While one may debate whether a near-peer competitor could emerge sooner than that, it is reasonable to assume that the threat of a peer competitor, particularly one with significant anti-

access capabilities, would increase the Navy's reliance on large surface combatants, attack and guided missile submarines and amphibious ships.

Unfortunately, our force structure assumes the greatest risk in these exact platforms during this period. Large surface combatant force levels decrease from a high of 96 to a sustained low of 60 in the 60s and 70s. Attack submarines decrease from a high of 55 to 39 with sustained low levels in the low 40s during that period. Cruise missile submarines, which also provide significant capabilities for special forces, disappear entirely. Amphibious ships sustained lows in the—of 29 and 30—10 percent below the limit of acceptable risk for these forces, and over 30 percent below the current requirement.

In your professional assessment are you confident that this force could deter or defeat at low to moderate risk a near-peer competitor with access capability? And if not, please characterize the risk that you see to our national security?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. Thank you for the question. And as I look at the force that we have laid out—the force that exists today, and particularly the force that is addressed by the budget that is being submitted—I do believe that even though there is much talk and discussion about focusing on the wars that we are in—I will tell you that the United States Navy is all in, in Afghanistan, and in Iraq, and in that critical area.

But at the same time I think it is noteworthy that we have increased our submarine production to two submarines a year. And the *Virginia* class is out—deployed. It is a terrific submarine. We are moving forward, as I said, with the ballistic missile defense—or the ballistic missile submarine. The advances and the investments that we are making with regard to ballistic missile defense in our surface combatants is exactly the type of capability that we are going to need in integrated air and missile defense. Not just for ballistic missiles, but against the cruise missile threat.

Taking some of the technologies that we will prove in the DDG-1000. Coupling that with the direction that we are going with our ballistic missile force, and the *Arleigh Burke* class, and in our cruisers, I believe we will then be able to better inform the next surface combatant that will address those challenges that are out there in the future.

In aviation we have to get to the Joint Strike Fighter. It is an incredible capability. And in this budget, I am extremely pleased with what we have been able to do with unmanned systems. Particularly the demonstration that we are moving forward with the unmanned carrier airborne system. That is also going to inform us about that time period that you are talking about there. That is going to be extremely important to us. And we need to be able to continue that demonstration project.

And in the area of cyber that is not so much hardware, but the reorganization that we have made this past year in the Navy, and the stand-up of the 10th fleet, allows us to get into that battle space if you will. And that battle space is going to become equally important as that which is kinetic.

So I do believe that we are laying in the right types of capabilities that we are going to need for the future.

Mr. MCKEON. Thank you. Understanding that technological advances will benefit both our forces, and those of a potential peer competitor in the interim, would you be in a better position with those—with this proposed force structure than you are today if you had more cruisers, destroyers, and submarines in the force?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Mr. McKeon, we are ramping up our ballistic missile defense capability, not just in the building of the new DDG-51 restarts, but also going back in. And the beauty of the weapons system that we currently have is that it allows us to modify the current ships so that they are BMD [Ballistic Missile Defense]-capable. We are also adding to our missile inventory in that regard.

With respect to submarines, we are meeting all of the critical requirements that the COCOMs have levied on us. And I see the benefit of what our submarines are doing every day around the world. I have the privilege of being debriefed by the young commanders as they come back in. And our submarine force is meeting the critical requirements of the COCOMs, and doing it exceedingly well.

Mr. MCKEON. Well, as I mentioned in my opening statement, I think the three of you have done an outstanding job, given the limits of the top line for the Navy and the Marines. I am just concerned that the top line isn't what we need. And so I think, as the Secretary said earlier to us, that our numbers look good for the few years ahead. But in the out-years it is a fantasy. Not you, Secretary, Secretary Gates.

And I think that that is a concern that we all need to be really aware of. I think that there are probably areas where we can save money. But even in our best efforts, I think we are still not getting all that we need to protect us in—out into the future. So thank you again for all that you are doing, and I appreciate it.

Yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Before I call Mr. Ortiz—Admiral, as we speak today, how many sailors do you have in either Iraq or Afghanistan doing Army type of work?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Right now, Mr. Chairman, we have 12,000 sailors on the ground in Iraq and in Afghanistan. And around 6,000 of them are doing things that are not necessarily within what we would consider our core or adaptive core capabilities.

The CHAIRMAN. In other words, they are doing Army work?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. They are working as—in support of our ground forces. They are doing extraordinary work I might add. And we benefit from that experience as well. Because that time that they spend in the fight, on the ground with other services—when they come back into the Navy, they bring perspectives, they bring leadership experiences. And observations on ways of doing things that they otherwise wouldn't have.

And I am also very pleased that they promote at a higher rate than those who have not had this experience.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. And we now go to the 5-minute rule. Mr. Ortiz.

Mr. ORTIZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Mabus, Admiral Roughead, General Conway, I want to thank you all for the great service that you have given to our coun-

try. And thank you so much for joining us today. I just have a few questions for all of you on the subject of wind farms, and military readiness.

My district in South Texas trains half of the Navy and Marine Corps pilots in the country. And you can imagine that I am so proud of these young men and women. And I want to make sure that I do everything within my power to provide them the best training facilities in the country.

Now multiple wind farms have emerged in my district—and God knows we need all the energy we can get—in very close proximity to my two Naval air training bases. These wind farms are impacting the use of radar throughout the district, and forcing changes in training routes. And interfering with air defense radars. And this is what I hear.

And I understand that this same issue is also impacting other Naval installations. My concern is not with the development of the wind farm energy. But rather the negative impact that these wind farms have on our military readiness. Now I wonder what is the Navy doing to ensure that these wind farms do not impact radar or military training?

And I just want to know, because we have different agencies. And I see where some departments are granting grants for wind energy, solar energy. And I just wonder if the agencies are talking to one another to see that whatever they do does not impact on the training that we have. Not only in my facilities in South Texas, but in other facilities throughout where we conduct training.

And maybe all of you can respond, and give me some insight to my question?

Secretary MABUS. Thank you, sir. We are proud of Kingsville, and we do think that they train the best pilots in the world there. We are very aware of the wind farm issue around Kingsville. And of the other issues that may impact training from various directions with various other government agencies. And we are keeping a close eye on the wind farms around Kingsville. Thus far it is our belief that it, they have not interfered with the core training, the essential training that is necessary for the pilots.

If proposals were made to construct wind farms that did, we would of course want to take some action to make sure that that did not happen. We work closely with other agencies to make sure that military readiness, national defense capabilities, are not impacted. And that they understand how our needs would be affected.

Mr. ORTIZ. General, would you like to add to—

General CONWAY. Sir, we have several training aviation bases in Arizona, and California in addition to our training basis that we share with the Navy in Texas. And our concern actually is more with low-flying helicopters, and the potential danger that some of these wind farms could have if the pilots aren't well aware of their presence.

And that is the sort of extraordinary effort that we are taking at this point to make sure that wind farms that we might put on our own bases—and we have some at the Marine Corps Logistics Base, Barstow. But others in the vicinity of some of our training bases are well noted on our aviation maps. And the pilots in low

light or low-visibility conditions are certainly aware of their presence.

Mr. ORTIZ. Admiral.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. We pay particular attention to all of our training space. Not just the air training space that affects the bases in Texas, but all around the country. And our local commanders pay particular attention to it. Here in Washington we do. And when we get a sense that there could be some encroachment, engage with the appropriate agencies, and communities. Because in many cases the communities are seeking this sort of development as well—to try to come to a solution that allows us to accommodate the important training needs that we have, and the needs of the communities. So we do pay very close attention to it.

Mr. ORTIZ. Again thank you so much for your service, and thank you for joining us today.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Bartlett, please.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you all very much for your service.

Admiral, I guess what you see depends on where you sit. My understanding is that the Navy is able to respond to little more than 40 percent of the requests of the combatant commanders for submarines. So I guess critical depends upon where you sit. I think that the new Chinese anti-ship missile may be a huge game changer. I see little recognition of that in the QDR, in the budget, or in your testimony today.

Admiral, you mentioned that you were aggressively pursuing unmanned aircraft in the Navy. And yet we are not aggressively pursuing unmanned ships in the Navy. I know why. It is because we have too few ships. They are too valuable. We have people on ships not because we need them there to sail the ships, but because we need them there for damage control.

We need to be moving to a very much larger Navy with very much smaller platforms so that we can move away from manned platforms. Half the cost of keeping the ships at sea as you know, sir, is the personnel. Which means if you get rid of half the personnel, you can have 50 percent more ships. If you get rid of all the personnel, you have 100 percent more ships.

We are going to be attacked where we are the weakest. I know that during the Clinton years we largely waived EMP [Electromagnetic Pulse] hardening on most of our new platforms. To what extent are you EMP-hardened? How much fighting capability would remain if you had an EMP lay down of 100 kilovolts per meter, which is but half of what the Russian generals told the EMP Commission the Soviets had developed, and the Russians had available?

Admiral, I am very pleased to note your emphasis on—focus on energy. I hope that means that you are aggressively supporting the increased nuclearization of our major platforms. Seems to me kind of silly to have a carrier that is fueled for 30 years, and it is supported by ships that are fueled for a few days.

These are my observations, my comments, my questions. Could you respond? Thank you.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. The—first off on the meeting of the 40 percent of the requirements. As I mentioned, the meeting of the critical requirements as a former fleet commander—I was the one that had to fulfill those needs. And I am very comfortable with the fact that the critical requirements are being met for our submarine force.

The survivability relative to electromagnetic pulses is—it is indeed a consideration and something that as we put our network architectures together is working through that survivability is very key to us. With regard to your specific question about the strength of the pulse and the effect on our systems, it—with that detail of question, Mr. Bartlett, I would like to be able to take that one for the record if I could and get back to you.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix beginning on page 121.]

Admiral ROUGHEAD. As we look at ships of the future and what that force must be in previous testimony and in discussions, I have said I do not have an aversion to nuclear power, but I think that there are more factors involved than simply the cost of the fuel itself. It is the construction cost. It is the maintenance cost. It is the cost of the people. And I believe all of that needs to be taken into the equation as we look at alternative energy systems for our force of the future.

With regard to the unmanned systems, the one area that I would also add where we are moving forward on is an underwater unmanned systems which I think are extraordinarily important to our future and which they themselves have some unique power requirements and we are working on that. But all of that is on my scope and I look forward to working on them in the coming months and years.

Mr. BARTLETT. You will address the other two questions in writing, my question about the Chinese anti-ship missile and why you still have people on ships?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. The one of the reasons that we have people on ships is that we have not gotten to the full automation that we need, but I think the LCS is a perfect example of what we are doing to bring people off of ships.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentlemen. The gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank all of you including my former governor and attorney general, Secretary Navy Mabus—Secretary of the Navy Mabus for being here. I thank all of you for what you do.

General Conway, let me start by saying that today's Washington Post had a very disturbing photograph on the front of a mine resistant vehicle that had been attacked in Afghanistan. I would like to take the occasion to say that it is my hunch that had that been an up-armored Humvee [High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle], every Marine in that vehicle probably would have died. It is my hunch that because of that vehicle, probably every Marine in that vehicle lived.

And I want to commend your General Brogan for the job he has done in putting that program together on what seems to be now an afterthought, fairly short notice and the outstanding job he has

done and I would hope that he would be properly recognized for that.

Secretary Mabus, you had the distinction, if my memory is right, of being the youngest attorney general and the youngest governor in Mississippi. I want to give you a third distinction and that is the fleet only grew on your watch. The bleeding started about 1990 best of my knowledge. Last year for the first time, we actually grew the fleet. We went from 285, which is too small, to 287, which is too small, and the irony is that you and many other CNOs have come before this committee and said we need a 313-ship Navy, but your budget request would actually shrink about three ships. That is unacceptable.

If administratively you can't get us towards 313, then we are going to have to do it legislatively. Now, one of the ways we can do this is we are going to commission 7 ships this year, but you are asking for permission to decommission 10. That doesn't get you there. That is going the wrong way. So I want to—I have had this conversation with our Chairman and I—and I just want to put you on notice as my friend and someone who I want to work with.

Decommissioning 10 ships this year is unacceptable. It is going to be my intention with the support of our Chairman to introduce to have in this year's bill that we are going to have legislatively a three-to-two ratio. For every three ships that are commissioned by the Navy, you will be giving commissions to decommission two. That is going to get us finally on the right track towards 313. Again, if it's not done administratively we are going to have to do it legislatively.

One of the proposals that Captain Ebbs has wisely asked the Navy to look into will be a SLEP [Selected Life Extension Program]—program certified fixed engine for your frigates—for about \$3 billion, we can keep those approximately 25 frigates in the fleet for another 5 years. Now, that would be my first preference. If you have a better preference to grow the fleet, I want to hear your ideas, but I think that is certainly something we need to look into particularly for the missions you mentioned off of Latin America, for chasing pirates off of Somalia.

That frigate is more than adequate. If we need to spend some money to get another 5 years out of those hulls, then let's do it and let's start planning on doing it.

What I want you to look into now is, you know, we keep making mistakes. One of the concerns of the F-35, and I am totally in support of, the CNO's plan to get the F-35 into the fleet. The question that is being asked as far as the thermal footprint of the F-35, on the ships we are constructing today, are we planning ahead for the delivery of that vessel so that the thermal footprint as far as the backlash shield on the carrier and the deck, the large big deck amphibs—that this plane is going to fly off of, are we taking the steps today to build them to handle that thermal footprint for when that plane is delivered a few years in the future.

Secretary MABUS. And to my friend, Gene Taylor, who I served with in other capacities, in terms of the last question that you asked, the thermal footprint, we are taking the steps both with the blast deflector on the carriers whether it will need to be strengthened at all, but if it does, that is a very straightforward fix for that

blast deflector. We are beginning tests on the USS *Wasp*, a big deck amphib, in terms of the STOVL [Short Takeoff and Vertical Landing] version and the thermal footprint coming down from that for the Marine version.

So yes, we are beginning to take steps to make sure that when the Joint Strike Fighter joins the fleet that the fleet is absolutely ready and capable of handling it.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, in the 8 seconds I have, take a look at the 10 ships you asked to decommission, narrow that down to two because we need to stop the bleeding this year. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentlemen. Gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Akin.

Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to all of you in the panel here this morning. I had a couple of quick questions. I hope they are quick. The first would be Admiral Roughead and also General Conway. We have had some trouble with welding and—particularly welding, I guess, on some LPDs [Amphibious Transport Dock Ships] and part of that it turns out is a workforce problem where we don't have enough welders sometimes with the timing of when we build ships.

So my question is I understand that there could well be a serious workforce problem at the shipyards out in San Diego and we currently have three LPDs scheduled for 2011, 2013 and 2015. My first question is would you be open-minded at least if it saves money and if it averts some of that work—it puts the work in a more consistent way across the yard to consider 2011, 2012 and 2013—excuse me, the MLPs [Marine Landing Platform]. Did I say LPDs? The MLPs which were the Marine landing platform ships.

If we were to consider 2011, 2012, 2013 as opposed to 2011, 2013, 2015, are you open-minded to at least looking at that if it saves money?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Thank you for the question, sir, and I would say that the shipbuilding plan that we have in place is one that balances many factors to include how that money is spread over time and what the needs of the Navy are and the development of that. As you know, the MLP is also a new class of ship and acceleration there may not be possible. So I think as we look at that, we have to be very mindful and very careful of how that balance can be affected.

Mr. AKIN. Certainly. And obviously there is a lot of factor that goes into that. My second question is my understanding is that your intent is to meet the March 1st goal in terms of the Joint Strike Fighter situation to get the discount on buying F/A-18s at a lower price.

First of all, is it correct that you do intend to file that paperwork on March 1 to allow us to get a discount on the price of the planes?

Secretary MABUS. We received the letter of intent from the contractor on Monday. We know that the deadline is March 1st. We are working with the Office of the Secretary of Defense who would have to make that notification to meet that—to meet that deadline.

Mr. AKIN. So the supplier did give us that 10 percent number that we had talked about then?

Secretary MABUS. Yes.

Mr. AKIN. Okay. And so your intent then is to meet that deadline as far as you know?

Secretary MABUS. As we are working hard to meet that deadline given the very limited time we have got to do it, and we are working very hard with the staff of the Office of the Secretary of Defense to do that.

Mr. AKIN. Good. Thank you. Third question is, and this is something that I have been beating this drum for a couple of years, and—but I am confused and I finally started to figure out why I am a little confused in this subject.

In March of 2008, the department briefed the committee that the shortfall of fighters was 188. In January of 2009, we were told it was 243. In March of 2009, we were told the shortfall was 312. As if by magic 2 months later of 2009, we are told the shortfall was 146. The beginning of this month, the Secretary of Defense testified the shortfall was 100 aircraft. Last week, the committee was told the shortfall was 177. And then 5 days later, my staff was told the shortfall was 100.

So that is why I have been a little confused about this. We have gotten some different numbers. None of the numbers said zero and all of them said we do have a fighter shortfall. So I guess my next question would be in order to deal with that problem, would you consider purchasing more aircraft? Is that at least one option on the table, yes or no?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Mr. Akin, we have been working the strike fighter management very, very carefully and particularly in the case of Navy, we have made some adjustments to squadrons. So we have been bringing our number down and we will continue to look at how we manage our strike fighter force into the future. It in no way should detract from the imperative to get to Joint Strike Fighter and the foremost in my mind is—

Mr. AKIN. Excuse me, sir. I—my clock has only got 5 seconds.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Okay.

Mr. AKIN. So the quick question is would you consider purchasing additional aircraft as one possibility to deal with that problem?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. My focus right now, sir, is on looking at the SLEP program for our A's and D's [F/A-18 A and D models]. That is where I am going to be spending most of my time looking at.

Mr. AKIN. But you didn't answer my question.

The CHAIRMAN. Admiral, would you like to answer his question so we can go onto the next one—questioner?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. As we go into POM [Program Objective Memorandum] 12, sir, we are going to look at how to best manage the strike fighter fleet. We have some procurements of 18s [F/A-18s] laid into this budget, but I also believe it is important that we look at the other levers as well.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Snyder, please.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Mabus, you talk about standing on the USS *Little Rock* and General Conway was born in Arkansas. Admiral Roughead, if you told me you ever served on the USS *Razorback*, which is a retired submarine sitting in the Arkansas River, my Arkansas trifecta will be complete. But

General Conway, a quick question and you can give us a quick answer as you want.

Are you satisfied that the rules of engagement in Afghanistan are satisfactory given the difficult challenge our men and women have there?

General CONWAY. Yes, sir, I am. I ask that question every time I go which is about once every 4 months. My commanders are comfortable with it. We are pretty good at it and because it is who we are with our air ground team and they understand the rationale behind. So they support it.

Dr. SNYDER. Good. Thank you. Secretary Mabus, the topic has come up about “don’t ask, don’t tell” and I had a conversation yesterday with an officer who is currently serving on active duty who is a lesbian who says, “Okay. We appreciate they are doing the study. How the hell am I going to be able to participate in that study?”

How will somebody who is currently gay or lesbian serving in the military be able to share their views on the impact on readiness, anything else intel, without being outed under the current policy?

Secretary MABUS. It is at least my understanding that as this study is being shaped by general counsel, the Department of Defense, Jay Johnson, and the head of the U.S. Army, Europe, General Ham, that they are going to try to have mechanisms for anonymous input so that there would not be the jeopardy of violating “don’t ask, don’t tell” to simply respond to the survey. As I said, it is early in the process of developing this survey. But when—but Jay Johnson, the General Counsel of Defense, said that they are trying to structure it in that way.

Dr. SNYDER. Yesterday I asked General Schwartz, and you may have heard about this. I assume, Secretary Mabus, that you and the Admiral and General are familiar with this split of authority we currently have between the circuits regarding “don’t ask, don’t tell” between the Witt case in the Ninth Circuit, and the Cook case in the First Circuit. And so when the question is asked, “Should there be a moratorium?” we have this—you all have a challenge that has been laid on you in the fact that the law has changed in the Ninth Circuit.

How are you all currently responding to the fact that the Ninth Circuit has conferred Constitutional protections of what they are calling intermediate scrutiny under the due process requirements? How are you all responding to that in how do you process cases in the Ninth Circuit?

Secretary MABUS. Again it is my understanding, Congressman, that we are—and we do understand the split of decisions between the two circuits right now. That we are proceeding to follow the law as written across the Navy and the Marine Corps as the—I believe that—

Dr. SNYDER. So you are going to ignore the Ninth Circuit opinion?

Secretary MABUS. No, sir. But I believe that that opinion is being appealed.

Dr. SNYDER. No, it is not.

Secretary MABUS. Try to recognize—

Dr. SNYDER. It is not being appealed.

Secretary MABUS. Then I am incorrect.

Dr. SNYDER. It is not being appealed. And that is the challenge. I am not harassing you all about this. I think this is a—this is one of the problems we are going to have when we say we can study this for a year, and put this off.

We have a—we now have people that have Constitutional protection in the Ninth Circuit at some level that we expect you to respond to. The problem is when the admiral sends them to Little Rock, or General Conway sends them to the East Coast, they lose that protection. And I am not sure how this gets worked out. I suggested yesterday one way to do it would be to make the venue for all these cases be in the Ninth Circuit. Then you have some consistency.

But you—General Conway, I think you appropriately said there is some confusion. That there would be a moratorium. You already have confusion. There is already legal confusion that you all didn't bring on yourselves. It is being laid on you. But I think you are going to need to figure that out, and fairly quickly. Cause it is currently the law in the Ninth Circuit. And it is not being appealed.

So I think this will be an ongoing discussion. By the way, the—recognizing the venue of the Ninth Circuit might deal with some of Senator Levin's concerns. I haven't talked to him about it. But it may be a way of getting at some of this transition.

I wanted to ask have you all—the Andy Krepinevich Group put out this study called “Why AirSea Battle?” and talks about Iran, and China, and where we look at things going in the future. Admiral Roughead, have—are you familiar with that—his report?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. I am. And it is being reflected in the air-sea battle that the Navy, the Air Force, and the Marine Corps—the air-sea battle study that we are conducting—

Dr. SNYDER. Its currently undergoing?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Right. Right.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Who is next? The gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Forbes.

Mr. FORBES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And General, and Mr. Secretary, and Admiral, we thank you for being here. You are all good men. And we appreciate your service to our country. But even good men can take positions some time that can be detrimental to I think the well-being of the country. And I was a little taken aback, Mr. Secretary, by your statement that the shipbuilding plan that was sent over is going to respond to the Chairman's concern about the number of ships that we have in the Navy.

And I am concerned for two reasons. One is that the number of ships that we have in the Navy. And I am concerned for two reasons. One is that OMB [Office of Management and Budget] disagrees with your numbers. As you know they say it is on course to be at 270 ships as opposed to your projections. And when Secretary Gates sat exactly where you are sitting, he said that that shipbuilding plan was a “fantasy.”

When I look, Admiral Roughead, at your concern that what keeps you up at night is your worry about having the resources to have the ships that we need down the road. And then I look at your spe-

cific decision on Mayport, which is going to spend \$1 billion with all the other needs we have. This is the strategic dispersal plan, which I understand is the basis upon which at least the chairman of the Joint Chiefs said was the basis upon his decision to think a carrier should be shifted to Mayport. Have you read this plan? The strategic dispersal plan?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. There have been several strategic dispersal plans over the year, sir. And I don't know which one that—

Mr. FORBES. This is the one that I understand was the one written by Admiral Robert Thomas. Have you ever read his strategic dispersal plan, which is the one that is always circulated as the basis for relocating the carriers?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. We are looking at strategic dispersal.

Mr. FORBES. Have you read his plan?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. I would have to look at that copy, sir, to see if I have seen it.

Mr. FORBES. Have you ever read a copy by Admiral Thomas?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. I mean, we work on strategic dispersal, and determining where the best places for the fleet should be.

Mr. FORBES. Are you familiar with Admiral Thomas?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. I am.

Mr. FORBES. Do you have respect for Admiral Thomas, and his decisionmaking capabilities?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. He is a very good officer. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORBES. Have you ever asked him the risk assessment that he placed on anything happening that would necessitate a shift to Mayport?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. In fact Admiral Thomas works—worked for me. So when we were—

Mr. FORBES. And did he tell you that that was a very slight risk?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. The strategic dispersal plan is based on the consequences of what could happen in the Tidewater area should there be a manmade or natural disaster.

Mr. FORBES. And it was a comparison specifically between that and Mayport. And did he ever tell you as he told me that the risk of that was very, very slight. In fact, less than 10 percent.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. And what risk is that, sir?

Mr. FORBES. The risk that you would have a disaster that would create a problem that would have necessitated the move of the carrier to—

Admiral ROUGHEAD. I think that we may be talking about two different types of risk—one natural, one manmade.

Mr. FORBES. Let me focus, then, on the natural disaster risk.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir.

Mr. FORBES. Because in that program it states that there is no advantage between Norfolk and Florida. And yet if you look, Florida since 1900 has had 225 hurricanes. Norfolk 7. If you look at that channel going out of Norfolk, it is a mile wide whereas in Florida only one carrier sunk there would stop all the ships in it.

But this is what I want to get to. Recently you have submitted a list of unfunded priorities to Congress. These are requirements your commanders say they need to fulfill their mission. General

Conway has submitted a similar list. There are some huge things in there. Engines that we can't do. Planes that we can't get. Ship maintenance that we can't get. The cost of moving that carrier to Mayport would cover every single one of the requirements unfunded on your list, and on General Conway's.

So my question to you is this. Which is more important? Moving the carrier to Florida, or doing all the items on the unfunded priority list that you have submitted, and that General Conway has submitted? Second one is, how do you agree with Admiral Thomas' strategic dispersal plan, but disagree with his risk assessment? And then thirdly, how do you explain by any objective, legitimate analysis that there isn't a benefit to Norfolk over Jacksonville, or over Florida when you look at natural disaster situations?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. I will take the first one last, because I think you are comparing Norfolk to Florida. I think it is important as you look at storm tracks to compare Norfolk to the Jacksonville area. And they are very, very similar. In fact, as a—yes, sir?

Mr. FORBES. Just ask you to look at the charts of the two.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. I have looked at them many times. And Mayport fares quite well in that regard.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Sanchez.

Ms. SANCHEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you, gentlemen, again for being before us. I have various areas I want to ask you about. Just for note, I received today a copy of the letter, Secretary, that you sent to my senator, Dianne Feinstein, with respect to our Marine Base, Camp Pendleton. And one of the problems that we have in Orange County, which is moving traffic. Oh, and of course the—we have this toll road that we are trying to figure out how to build, et cetera.

So I would like to in the near future have a discussion with you. We don't have to do it here today—about this and what we might do to maybe still try to find a solution with you all.

I just want to say that on “don't ask, don't tell”—obviously; Mr. Snyder piggybacking on many of his remarks—is a big issue for us. And in California in particular being in that Ninth Circuit court. And just want to note that it is my understanding that, for example, out of all—I do a lot of work with our NATO allies, and out in the European theater as you—many of you know. And just would like to note that I believe in speaking to most of my colleagues from other parliaments out there, that only Turkey and the United States as members of NATO are the only ones who have limited policies, or an actual ban on having gays in the military.

So I think it is incredibly important that we address this sooner than later. And the parliamentarians out there—our colleagues—said that the—when they—when some of them went to implement this the quicker they went with it, the easier it was to get to it. So just from that standpoint—and I have said this to Mrs. Davis, our personnel subcommittee chairwoman, that I would like to see this addressed this year rather than sit around waiting for some more dialogue.

I want to talk a little bit to something really positive that we heard the other day from the Secretary when the Department of Defense took a very commendable step to ban the prohibition of

women from serving on our Navy submarines. I think it is very forward-looking. I think it is time to do that. We still sometimes even have a discussion about whether women should be in the military on this committee. Thank God we haven't had to vote on that for the last 5 or 7 years.

And we all know that one of the reasons is that there is so much talent in that 50 percent of potential work force. My question to you, Mr. Secretary, is—that I understand that this is just the beginning, and there is a lot of work to get through in order to make this happen. I would like you to address what are the challenges that you are going to foresee—that you foresee with respect to this. And how might this Congress help you to move forward that issue of doing that.

And before you answer that, let me just pose another question out to our commandant. And then I will be quiet. And hopefully you guys can answer this. And that would be with respect—commandant to the U.S. Marines undertaking the operation Marjah there in Afghanistan in the last few days. I am interested to know the role that the Afghan national army played in that.

How many of their troops were involved? And what you think the assessment is there? In particular, I think given to, and I believe it was General Petraeus who said, "We might be at this at least for 12 to 18 months, and that may fly in the face of the 18-month limit that Mr. Obama discussed with respect to Afghanistan." So if, Mr. Secretary, you could answer that first question. And then, General, get your thoughts together to answer the other?

Secretary MABUS. We learned a lot of lessons integrating female sailors onto our surface ships that we can apply to integrating women into the submarine fleet. For starters, the two platforms that women would be going to first. The SSBNs, and the SSGNs [Nuclear-Powered Cruise Missile Submarines] don't require any modifications to their—to their hull structure—to their compartments or berthing or anything.

The challenges that were faced, and faced very successfully when women were integrated onto our surface fleet were things like making sure that we had a critical mass of women on a ship so that women were not too small a group. To make sure that we had a senior—a more senior woman officer at first. A department head to be a mentor to the younger women coming in for their first tour at sea.

And also to make sure that we reach out to the submarine force, and to the families to make sure that any concerns that they have are addressed. And we think that they will be. And that this will be a very successful integration.

General CONWAY. Ma'am, with regard to the Afghan national army and police, roughly 4,000 is the answer in terms of numbers. They have a good fighting spirit. They are not nearly as sophisticated as we are at company and battalion level. But in terms of actual small unit tactics, they mix it up pretty good. We think that Marjah will be a contested area for as long as we are there, or until the Taliban pack it up. It is a drug center. It is an area where they have had a long-term presence. In some ways they have families there. So although we intend to secure the area and put the Afghan police in eventually to help control it, the nature of an insur-

gency is that they could well be back in small numbers attempting to contest the area. So I think General Petraeus is probably right.

The CHAIRMAN. Before I call on the gentleman from South Carolina, General, where are we on Guam?

General CONWAY. Sir, at this point I think it is fair to say that we are awaiting the determination of the Japanese government in terms of how they see their part of this. In the meantime, it is fair to say we continue to look at what Guam means. Again, you nailed it in your opening statement in terms of the strategic importance, we believe, of armed forces in the Pacific, and of course particularly Marines.

One thing that has changed somewhat since the original agreements is that we have grown the force by some 27,000 additional Marines, and 3,000 or 4,000 of those would be assigned to the Pacific. So we are trying to balance the numbers in our own thought process with regard to established agreements.

So at this point, it is between governments and we very much await the next determination by the Japanese government in terms of how they think we should go forward.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I actually appreciate your bringing up Guam before we could begin, because I visited, and I know how strategically located it is. Also, the people of Guam should be appreciated. They are so patriotic. The highest percentage of National Guard membership of any state or territory of the United States is Guam. And what wonderful people.

And General, Mr. Secretary, Admiral, thank you for being here today. I was very grateful to grow up in Charleston, South Carolina. And I grew up in the shadow of the Navy base, and so I have a great appreciation of your service and Navy and Marine personnel, and we are grateful to have the Nuclear Power School in the community. It is a great opportunity for young people.

I am honored now to represent Parris Island Marine Corps Station, Beaufort, Beaufort Naval Hospital. And then, I am particularly grateful I have a son, active duty Navy, and he is following in the tradition of his late grandfather and uncle, who were dedicated Marines.

So Mr. Secretary, I am concerned about the current plans for wounded warrior support at the new Walter Reed National Military Medical Center when it opens at Bethesda in September, 2011—it is, or 2011.

It is not in the same level of support currently furnished by the Army at Walter Reed. Wounded warriors who move to the new medical center will experience a significant degradation of services and support and I believe that is unacceptable.

As an example, I understand that there will be a shortfall of 150 barrack spaces when the new medical center opens for the wounded warriors who are currently in the warrior transition barracks at Walter Reed.

What assurances can you give that all of the wounded warrior support now provided at Walter Reed, including first priority for barracks space on the Bethesda campus, will be available when the new medical center opens in September, 2011?

Secretary MABUS. Congressman, there is no more important thing that we do than to care for those who have borne the burden of battle and who return as wounded warriors. All three of us on a very regular basis visit Bethesda, visit our wounded warriors that are returning.

And we are very focused in the Department of the Navy, and I think it is fair to say in the Department of Defense, to making sure that as the transition occurs, as Walter Reed moves to the Bethesda campus, that no wounded warrior fall between the cracks. That there is no degradation of care. That there is absolutely world-class care, as you in Congress and we in the Department know that there have to be.

You can be assured that our attention is focused very directly on this. And not just on putting Walter Reed and Bethesda together, but also on the myriad of other things that wounded warriors require from our Wounded Warrior Regiment with the Marines, our Safe Harbor Battalion with the Navy, with their non-medical care, with making sure that they are transitioned either back to the fleet, back to their Marine brethren, or into their community, is seamless.

We are trying to work with the VA [Veteran's Administration] to make sure that there is no gap there. And finally, one thing that I am particularly proud of, we just did a wounded warrior hiring conference to make sure that as wounded warriors recover, and as they transition out back to the civilian workforce, that they have a job waiting for them when they get there.

Mr. WILSON. And Mr. Secretary, I want to commend you on just what you have cited. And even if it took up all my time, the issue is that important. But particularly on barrack space, that needs to be addressed, so I hope that as you pursue the other issues relative to this and the wounded warrior program, I wish the American people could see what has been done on behalf of the young people who have lost arms, legs. It is extraordinary the efforts that have been made, and very heartwarming. But I am very, very concerned about the barracks space, so I hope that will be an emphasis that you have.

Secretary MABUS. Yes, sir.

General CONWAY. Sir, if I can complement the Secretary's answer for just a moment, and perhaps allay some of your concerns. We certainly need barracks space, especially for our Marines, and I would argue potentially sailors, who come for initial treatment for their families, for themselves, and for people who are assigned back to Bethesda for follow-on treatment.

But our intent with our casualty care is as soon as possible, to get them out closer to home station, closer to their homes if it is a recovery period. And we do not want to have them at Walter Reed-Bethesda for any longer a period of time than is absolutely necessary. So I think that will mitigate some of your concern in this regard.

Mr. WILSON. Excellent. Thank you very much.

General CONWAY. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady from California, Mrs. Davis.

Mrs. DAVIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and certainly Secretary Mabus, and Admiral Roughead, and General Conway, thank you so

much for your extraordinary service to our country, and for worrying I think every day about the men and women who serve. I know you show a great deal of compassion for the mission that they are performing and how they are performing it.

I wanted to actually ask several of the questions that have already been asked, but have sort of a brief follow-up to a few of those. On the MLP, I am wondering, once you have a better sense of how it is going to work together, if there is any opportunity to bring that schedule together so that there is more predictability on the part of those who are trying to build those for us? Is there any chance of trying to do that, rather than spreading it out once we get underway?

Secretary MABUS. Well, as the CNO said, it is a new hull form—

Mrs. DAVIS. I missed your response, but I wanted to follow up.

Secretary MABUS [continuing]. And one of things that we looked at was the health of our industrial base. And trying to ensure that there was a base of work spread out over the 5 years so that our shipbuilding yards would be able to maintain that critical workforce, that critical infrastructure that we need so much.

And that was one of the factors, although not the determining factor, but one of the factors that went into putting those ships in 2011, 2013, and 2015.

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes. I think they would probably suggest that it is better for them to bring them together in terms of their workforce, but perhaps that could be explored further at another time.

And women on submarines, is there any role for Congress to play at this point? Is there anything that you need from us?

Secretary MABUS. I think we are well along. The Secretary of Defense has done the notification to Congress that is required by law that we are beginning to proceed down the track. And I think that the support of Congress on this is crucial, but I think that we have all the levers that we need to move expeditiously to do this.

Mrs. DAVIS. Okay. Nothing in the reauthorization language? You are set?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. There is a 30-day wait period, ma'am, so any impediment to that would not be helpful. So—

Mrs. DAVIS. All right. Thank you.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. And it is a good plan, I can assure you of that. And the submarine force is prepared to execute.

Mrs. DAVIS. Thank you. I wanted to turn—very briefly, you may be aware there is a DOD-wide program called My Spouse Career Advancement Account that has recently been frozen. I know just from several weeks ago even speaking with many of the spouses, they count on this. I mean, this has really been so important to them.

And could you enlighten us a little bit as to whether or not there is a possibility that, even though it has been frozen for now, that those spouses who are in the program can continue with their education? And do you think that there is, again, a role for Congress in weighing in on this right now?

Secretary MABUS. After the question was asked yesterday, looked into this last evening. The information that I received, because this is a DOD-wide program, is that the site was frozen for software

concerns for some other types of concerns on there. But that the people who were receiving the payments could expect to continue to receive those payments. That was the information I got, as I said, last night from DOD.

Mrs. DAVIS. Oh, are you saying that people in the program will continue? What about just trying to apply now? Or is the program itself going to be discontinued for some time?

Secretary MABUS. That is an answer I cannot give you. I don't know.

General CONWAY. Ma'am, if I can help. I also researched it and it is my understanding that this is a temporary halt to the program, not a close-out of the program, pending the problems that the Secretary spoke of.

Mrs. DAVIS. Okay. What might be important is communicating as best we can, obviously, to the number of people that are very concerned about this out in the community. And I think we all agree on, this is an important quality-of-life issue for our service men and women, and some way of clarifying that is very important right now.

Secretary MABUS. The only thing I would like to add right now is that I completely agree with the importance of this program, with what you said.

Mrs. DAVIS. Yes, thank you. The QDR points out the need to increase key enabling agents—assets, I am sorry—for the Special Operations Forces, including logistics, communications, intelligence, and other critical capabilities. And the Naval Special Warfare Command depends on the Navy, of course, for certain enablers.

Yet at the same time that they are looking to the Navy for that, the Navy's end strength is coming down, as we know. And I am wanting to know whether there is an issue here in terms of being able to have out of that pool of specialists, some of our special warfare people that would be in the future?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. As far as the Special Warfare, our SEALs [Navy Sea, Air and Land teams], we have a great plan there. There are many demands for people, and we are looking at how we can best resource that now.

Mrs. DAVIS. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentlelady.

And Mr. Conaway, the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CONAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chief, thank you for being here. Mr. Secretary. Commandant, it is great to see you again.

That was a great day in Fredericksburg, Texas, when you and your bride came down for the ribbon-cutting on the new wing of the Nimitz Museum. And with some training and hard work and dedication on his part, Mike Hagee might be able to MC something a little better than—next time.

My issue is going to be a little bit more mundane. It is not nearly as glamorous as some of the other stuff, but it stretches across everything you do. And that is, the commitment by the three of you to audit the financial statements of the respective entities that you are responsible for.

Mr. Secretary, you made the statement a while ago about bold steps required for the alternative energy. I appreciate the same

bold steps for the Department of the Navy to be clean, unqualified, audited, financial statements and everything that entails. Internal controls, all the other systems that we have in place. And that the business transpiration agency has the dubious distinction of having responsibility but no authority to make things happen across a lot of lines.

I want to brag on the Marine Corps. Commandant, you have said you will get it done, and I hope there is a way to hand off that same commitment to the 35th commandant of the Marine Corps, because it doesn't happen, period, without the three of you gentlemen saying make it happen.

Now, I understand you got a zillion other things that might look more important, but the benefits are indisputable of being able to have good data, quick data. As I told the Air Force yesterday, if we ask you guys a question that stumps you, some person on the back bench will get into a panic mode to try to cobble together some answer out there with systems that may involve 50 different systems that are not integrated, they are not doing the things they do.

So simple heading out, or at least an answer for the record, is that—is that commitment to get the Navy Department—Department of the Navy—audited, and the Marine Corps audited way up on your list of things that you need to get done?

Secretary MABUS. Congressman, my first elected job was state auditor of Mississippi.

Mr. CONAWAY. Oh, fantastic.

Secretary MABUS. I understand the value of good audits in government. And I do want to echo what you said about the Marine Corps. We are way down the line on getting a fully auditable statement for the Marine Corps. And we are moving in that direction for the Navy.

And in fact, we have got a Deputy Under Secretary of the Navy for Business Transformation that that is one of the prime jobs that that individual is accountable for. And I do check on that on a very regular basis.

Mr. CONAWAY. Okay. CNO, I don't know if you have got a dog in that fight, but any push you could help to get the—

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Absolutely, sir, because I think your comments are right on the money.

Mr. CONAWAY. Okay.

General CONWAY. Sir, you know the term "wind dummy"? We have volunteered to be the wind dummy on this one with some trepidation, but it is absolutely the right thing to do and we are proceeding apace.

Mr. CONAWAY. Well, thanks. I mean, if the good citizens of District 11 keep sending me up here, I want to keep niggling you guys about this because I do think it is important. So with that, Mr. Chairman, thank you all for your long service to our country. Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman from Texas. Mr. Lamborn.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, thank you for being here, General Conway and Admiral Roughead. Thank you both for your service to our nation.

I would like to turn my attention, if I could, to Ballistic Missile Defense issues right now. And as the long-range shipbuilding plan

lays out, the President's new Phased, Adaptive Approach to providing missile defense to Europe will have a significant impact on the Navy's resources obviously in the years to come. How does the Navy plan to support its growing missile defense requirements while fulfilling its current missions including anti-ballistic missile ship defense?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. The way that we will deploy it, sir, is in consonance with what the combatant commanders have requested. We have been performing the mission on the Western Pacific now for a few years and the demands have also been added into the Arabian Gulf and into the Mediterranean.

So in our plan, we are taking the number of Ballistic Missile Defense ships in this FYDP from 21 to 38. We are increasing the number of missiles which is as important to be able to not have to be changing missiles around. But the fact that our ships are multi-mission ships allow them to do much more than missile defense and that is all managed by our Navy commanders in the regions where those ships are operating.

So I am very, very pleased that not only are we building some more missile defense ships, but we are providing the back-fits and we are increasing the missile inventory. And we have also been spending quite a bit of effort and time and the coordination between commanders in different regions and I believe we have advanced our missile defense capability quite a bit.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you. Mr. Secretary, do you have anything to add?

Secretary MABUS. Just to emphasize what the CNO said. These are very capable ships in a number of missions and while we are retrofitting and building new missile defense ships, we are not losing sight of the other duties that they perform. And also, that in this budget we have asked for funds to fit a good many of our existing destroyers and cruisers, DDGs [Guided Missile Destroyers] and CGs [Guided Missile Cruisers], with the Aegis BMD [Ballistic Missile Defense] capability and in order to reach the end strength of those ships that we need to respond to all the demands.

Mr. LAMBORN. Let me ask that in a further point on anti-ballistic, anti-ship ballistic missiles. Have you had the opportunity to review the recent study on different possibilities for defending against anti-ship ballistic missiles? And as a following to that, what are the various technological and at what platform solutions to this challenge?

Secretary MABUS. We are very focused on anti-ship ballistic and cruise missiles. And one of the things that the CNO has said earlier in his testimony is that we are looking at technologies from other ships, particularly the truncated DDG-1000, as we are going forward with the next generation of DDG-51s to get sensor systems, radar systems.

In the new DDG-51s, the SPY-3, coming off the DDG-1000, the air and missile defense radar so that we get a full picture of the battle space of both from anti-air and anti-ballistic missile and anti-cruise missile ships and an integrated hull on each ship and in a group of ships for integrated air and missile defense.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you. Admiral Roughead, on the DDG-1000, last year the administration decided to continue funding the DDG-

1000 program for three ships. How is this program progressing and with regards to—with regards to both the hull and the mission systems equipment?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. The program is progressing on track with regard to the development of the systems and also, it—the DDG-1000 is under construction. So the issue will be one of the Nunn-McCurdy breach as a result of the truncation and the departments working its way through the appropriate steps that have to be taken relative to that.

Mr. LAMBORN. On that, let me ask you. It is my understanding that the Navy is pursuing a fixed price contract for the second and third DDG-1000. Is this accurate and what does that mean for controlling overall program costs?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. My hopes are is that it will maintain the cost where it needs to be and we are pursuing those contracts.

Mr. LAMBORN. A big firm fixed price?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. I would like to get back to you on that one, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. We have three votes. However, let's go as far as we can and we will break for those votes and then return. Mr. Wittman.

Mr. WITTMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, General Conway, Admiral Roughead, thank you so much for joining us today. We appreciate your hard work and efforts. I wanted to direct a question to Admiral Roughead just as a follow-up from Congressman Forbes' question.

In looking at the analysis that was done, the risk analysis, about placing a home port facility there in Mayport and we had talked earlier with the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Mullen, about how much of a quantifiable risk assessment was done and then looking at that in that being very spongy as far as the—as a hard number on the risks that we are trying to mitigate with putting a carrier down there and then with the unfunded programs list that is out now that has about \$530 million of unfunded needs there on that list, what that leads me to is to follow up on his question.

And that is obviously your decisions revolve around ranking where your needs are. And can you tell me in relation to the unfunded needs list, would you say the unfunded needs are ranked higher or lower than the need to mitigate a risk to place a home port facility there in Mayport?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Well, I would say, sir, that the fact that when we built our budget and took it to the levels where it was, and as you know, our budget is a balance of many different needs that we have, that when I made the proposal on this year's budget, that—what we funded with regard to O&M [Operations and Maintenance] and the risk that we were taking was where I thought it was prudent to be and included in the budget are the preliminary steps for the home port in Mayport.

So given the fact that the steps needed to build the port in Mayport were in our budget and those are the unfunded programs. Then the Mayport project has a higher priority for me.

Mr. WITTMAN. Okay. I am trying to get from you where in the scheme of things though if you—obviously there are limited re-

sources there and I know that you have—and we are still trying to figure out exactly where it is some of the planning dollars that go into beginning the process there at the location in Mayport, but also the unfunded needs list, you know, has, obviously, ship-building needs there, weapons procurement, ship maintenance and all of those things concern us because there are needs out there.

What I am trying to figure is that within the finite universe of resources, if we are talking about a billion dollars to upgrade the port there in Mayport versus the \$530 million in the unfunded needs list, would you say that the \$1 billion needed in the years to come, and again, looking at your unfunded needs was that goes out in the same future, would you say that the \$1 billion necessary to build the facility at Mayport is a higher or lower priority than the \$530 million on the unfunded needs list?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Well, first, sir, the Mayport is not a billion dollar project. It is not a billion dollar project. It is just slightly over half of that.

Mr. WITTMAN. Okay.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. But what Mayport is, it is not a new carrier port. Mayport has been an aircraft carrier port since 1952 and that dispersion has given us some strategic flexibility on the East Coast. What we are doing is we are bringing that port as a carrier port to be able to service our carrier fleet which is now all nuclear. So for me, that strategic flexibility is important. That is why I made the recommendation to the Secretary to go forward with that and then that was affirmed. And so that money in the plan to enhance the carrier port of Mayport is a priority.

Mr. WITTMAN. Sure. Well, in the decisionmaking, obviously you are looking at what risks you would be mitigating by having a duplicative facility there in Mayport. And I guess my question is with the lack of quantifiable risk assessment that is going on there, is that risk high enough to substantiate that being put in front of the—if you say \$600 billion or \$600 million versus the \$530 million of the unfunded needs, tell me is there still—do you believe is the risk still high enough for having to move a carrier there that you would put the Mayport facility before the unfunded?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Sir, I believe that the risk of having all of our eggs in one basket for our aircraft carriers in the Tidewater area, and I don't dispute the value of—but having all of our eggs in one basket there when we have not done that on the East Coast or on the West Coast is not in the best interest of the Navy or the nation.

Mr. WITTMAN. Okay.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentlemen. We have time for one more member, the gentelady from Guam, 5 minutes.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary and Admiral and General, thank you for your testimony.

Mr. Secretary, I appreciated meeting with you recently to discuss the military buildup on Guam and working with my office and the government of Guam to make sure that we get this buildup done right as our Chairman, Mr. Skelton, has stated over and over again. However, there remains significant hurdles to the military buildup. The recent news that the Port of Guam was denied a Recovery Act Grant funding from the Department of Transportation

was deeply disappointing. Simply put, without funding for the port, the buildup cannot occur.

Mr. Secretary, while I appreciate your leadership in DOD to support the port's grant, we need to know what the Navy is doing to address Guam's civilian infrastructure needs. Is the Navy working with the Department of Interior, the White House and OMB to develop a strategy to address the funding of civilian infrastructure requirements?

Yesterday, I was at a meeting from 1:00 to 5:00 p.m. with the Department of Interior and various federal agencies to discuss the buildup. We concluded with this, number one, we need a funding plan for this buildup. And secondly, we need one coordinator to handle this buildup so the DOD doesn't point to the various federal agencies for funding and the federal agencies go right back and say, "Well, this is DOD's responsibility." We are caught in the middle.

I think it is important to note the EPA [Environmental Protection Agency] and their comments on the draft EIS [Environmental Impact Statement] also stated that the lack of information on infrastructure funding is one major reason for their low scoring of the document. Also, many of the civilian impacts are exasperated by the 2014 completion date. When does the Department of Navy believe it can complete construction? Given the government of Japan's indecision, isn't this the right time to extend the timeline to reflect reality?

Secretary MABUS. I enjoyed our meeting as well, Congresswoman, and as far as the grant to Apra Harbor, you know, from the Department of Transportation following the meeting and following my trip to Guam to look at Apra Harbor and other things, I met twice with the Secretary of Transportation to urge him to give that grant to Guam and to Apra Harbor to fulfill that.

In the Department of the Navy and, I think, in the Department of Defense, we support a government-wide approach to the Guam buildup. It is a very important move for us as it is for the people of Guam to echo what General Conway said. The strategic value of Guam and of moving Marines to Guam is crucial. We have in terms of our processes elevated Guam inside the Department of the Navy with the Guam Executive Council which meets on a very regular basis to make sure the decisions move quickly.

The Department of Defense has set up the Guam Oversight Council along with the Deputy Secretary of Defense to do the same thing. We do need, I believe, to make sure that there is a whole of government approach to this very important issue because it is crucial for the Navy, and the Marine Corps to—for the strategic dispersal of our forces, and for the buildup on Guam that we do this right as the Chairman—

Ms. BORDALLO. All right.

Secretary MABUS [continuing]. Said in his statement.

Ms. BORDALLO. Mr. Secretary, my time is running out. But is there some way to recoup these funds for our port? Without the port development, the buildup just cannot continue.

Secretary MABUS. My understanding is there may be other funds like this in the future that Guam can compete for. And once again, I will urge the Department of Transportation to fund that port in

Guam, and to fund that particular grant that Guam has applied for, and I believe has made a very good case for.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. This is my greatest concern right now. We just had news of that a couple weeks ago, and it was a real blow to our people. Because you know, we had made plans for this. And as I said, if this doesn't go on—and, of course, the Japan decision also is important to us. But I would appreciate anything you could do to help us in this area.

Secretary MABUS. Yes, Ma'am.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentlelady.

Mr. Secretary, is there any need or indication on where the Japanese government, is timewise?

Ms. BORDALLO. May.

Secretary MABUS. In terms of their re-look at this issue, my understanding is that a decision is forthcoming by May.

Ms. BORDALLO. May.

The CHAIRMAN. By May?

Secretary MABUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay. We will return. We have three votes. We will return and resume.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. Who is next? We will resume. And thank you, gentlemen, for waiting for us.

Mr. Courtney, 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want to thank all the witnesses for their great testimony this morning. I also want to recognize that all three participated in a funeral last week at Westmont Presbyterian Church to say good-bye to just a great friend, and a great American, Jack Murtha.

General Conway, I want to particularly publicly thank you for the tremendous eulogy. Powerful words that painted a picture that I just think the whole country really needed to hear about his contribution to the people who wear the uniform. So bravo. It was just a splendid job.

And again I would just say that his presence is actually felt in this budget today. The advance procurement in 2007, which Chairman Skelton and Chairman Taylor, along with Mr. Murtha fought for to get a Congressional plus-up for the *Virginia*-class program today is bearing fruit with the two-a-year 2011 shipbuilding plan. And that would not have happened without his intervention.

This place moves pretty fast in terms of, you know, the process resuming, you know, after some of the folks here leave, and pass on. But I think it is important again just to recognize for a moment the contribution he made to the Navy, and to this important program.

Earlier, Mr. Chairman, asked Admiral Roughead the question about whether or not the SSBN program could maybe be sort of put off. Because it does present financial challenges down the road as you pointed out. And you responded. But I want to actually give you a chance to maybe expand a little bit in terms of why that is a priority for the country right now. You know, a question which I always ask you, because people ask why submarines, and again

if you could maybe enlarge on your earlier answer I would appreciate it.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. Thank you. And now is the time to go forward with the replacement for the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine. As I have looked at this, and studied it, and considered several of the options as to how best to go forward.

Given the fact that we will be taking this class of submarine out to 2080, we have to ensure that the technology that we put into that ship, that its survivability, its reliability, its operational availability enable it to operate not just for that length of time, but in the environments where others are going to try to negate that advantage that we have with our ballistic missile submarine fleet.

So now is the time to begin that process. Now is the time to work closely with our friends in the U.K. to ensure that we go forward, and bring that submarine in on time. If we delay, I think you rush, you suboptimize. And at the end of the day you very well could end up spending more money on it than you otherwise would if you didn't have a good, thoughtful design.

Mr. COURTNEY. And this year's budget, again, there is money for the design aspect of it, which again is consistent with the procurement reform bill that we passed last year, which is to avoid design-build happening at the same time. But to really sort of think things through.

I guess what I would want to ask just in terms of—you know, hopefully this is not wishful thinking. But I mean if we do think ahead, and use the best talent possible, and look at successful programs like *Virginia* class and other shipbuilding, I mean, do you think that there is a possibility that we could, you know, potentially get a point where the \$6 billion to \$7 billion projected cost—I mean, we might be able to do a little better than that down the road.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. I think we should look at every way that we can legitimately take cost out, but yet maintain that capability that we are going to need for the next seven decades. So I will be relentless in looking for those opportunities. But I emphasize that it has to legitimately be taken out. It can't simply be well we will build it cheaper, and then you compromise on a lot of other things.

But we owe it to you. We owe it to the taxpayer to make sure that every ship that we buy, that we are taking cost out of it in every possible way.

Mr. COURTNEY. All right. Mr. Secretary, you wanted to comment at all on that?

Secretary MABUS. One of the things we tried to do with the 30-year shipbuilding plan was to be absolutely realistic in terms of what ships would cost. Realistic in terms historically of what Congress has appropriated for ships. But also to show the impact that putting the new SSBN in our core budget would have on the rest of the fleet. And to be realistic about that so that decisions could be made at the appropriate time in terms of how we fund our fleet, and how we fund this replacement.

Mr. COURTNEY. All right. Thank you. I mean obviously this is going to be an issue for decades for committees like this. But I fully

support the effort again to invest in, you know, the planning, and designing, because I think that will pay off long term.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. We have two members that haven't asked questions yet. But let me ask Admiral Roughead—I was at a ship-building port not too long ago. And I saw a ship being built for the United States Coast Guard. I think it is called the National Security Cutter. And I was just wondering why that particular ship that we don't have to redesign or reconfigure won't do for the Navy? I have seen no request for anything like it or for that particular ship itself.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir. And we have looked at a variety of options for the type of capabilities we need to meet our—the needs of the maritime strategy. And the Coast Guard and the National Security Cutter, that ship is optimized for their missions. And as we look at what we have to do, and as a Navy, and as a Navy that has to have versatility and agility built into our ships.

Because I think it is important that our ships be able to provide for a range of missions, and not simply be focused on one. I would say maybe perhaps the exception to that is the ballistic missile submarine because of what its mission is.

But we have to provide for a range of capabilities. For us, speed becomes important. And that led us to the LCS. I, since becoming CNO, I have looked at the speed requirements again, and I have reassured myself that we are in the right place. But what we are building now meets the requirements that we have to deliver the type of navy the nation needs to be able to operate in the places where we expect to have to operate in the future.

The CHAIRMAN. May I ask, Admiral, for the record, ask some bright shipbuilder over the Navy Systems Command to give us the pros and cons of that particular ship, including the cost? Would you do that for our record?

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix beginning on page 121.]

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir, I will.

The CHAIRMAN. No rush, 2 or 3 weeks, whatever.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir, I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. And it is easy to do, but that would—I really had to scratch my head when I saw that ship. You know, why can't we have the plans and we wouldn't have to start from scratch there.

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Yes, sir, I will do that.

The CHAIRMAN. Would you do that then? Thank you so much.

Mr. Coffman.

Mr. COFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen, thank you again for your service to our country.

General Conway, what do you see as the primary force protection challenges in Afghanistan right now? And does the Marine Corps have everything it needs in Afghanistan?

General CONWAY. Yes, sir, I think it is fair to say that we do have everything that we need. That of course has been my number one priority since I have been in this job, is to make sure those troops, especially at the point of the spear, have everything they need.

That said, we push industry for more. And by that, I am talking about personal protective equipment in particular that is more lightweight and would not be as burdensome as some of the pictures you have probably seen coming out of Marjah, 80 to 100 pounds on the backs of some of our Marines carrying their sustainment load and the things they need to work 24/7.

We need a helmet that will stop 762 [7.62mm ammunition]. Right now, the biggest threat in Marjah is not necessarily the IEDs [Improvised Explosive Devices] for our killed in action, it is the sniper that can take a long-range shot and can penetrate our protective equipment, particularly the helmet. So we continue to pound the table on that with hopes that one day we will have that piece of gear in hand.

Mr. COFFMAN. Thank you. General Conway, are you confident that the EFV [Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle] will provide adequate protection against IED threats? How has the program been modified to counter this threat?

General CONWAY. Sir, it is an interesting question, because just in the last couple of days we have completed blast tests with the EFV as compared to an MRAP [Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle], an RG33, which is actually the mid-level CAT-2 MRAP. I was very pleasantly surprised at how well it progressed. I mean, about the same for underbody explosions, and for underwheel or undertrack explosions, but actually the EFV was markedly better against direct fire and indirect fire.

I will get you a copy of that study. And by the way, I would asterisk it by saying, because the report did, this is before we apply modular armor that we would want to incorporate if we were in an IED-rich environment.

Mr. COFFMAN. Thank you, General Conway. General Conway, was the decision to delay the EFV's low-rate production in fiscal year 2014 to 2015 based on technology development concerns, or was it budget-driven?

General CONWAY. Congressman, I would say it was probably a combination of both. We have seven new vehicles that are paid for and are going to be arriving in the test beds throughout the spring and summer. There are some KPs—knowledge points—that we have to go through with those vehicles to determine what our full-rate production needs to be, to determine if they are going to be passed, the reliability concerns that they have had in the past.

And I think in fairness, the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense wanted us to have some of the answers to those issues before we got into a full rate of buy-in procurement.

Mr. COFFMAN. General Conway, how do you plan to integrate the MATV [MRAP All Terrain Vehicle] and the MRAP vehicles into your current tactical wheeled vehicle fleet management program?

General CONWAY. Well, sir, we see a future value in, again, the smallest of the MRAPs, the CAT-1s, and now the MATVs, which is in some ways a replacement for the up-armored Hummer. With regard to our combat engineers, our road clearance depths, perhaps some other small units. But as was answered earlier, in some ways it goes against two years, as a fast and relatively light expeditionary force.

So we are going to preserve them, keep them available, so if we get into another static environment like this in the future, that we will have those vehicles available. But again, a small percentage of them will be incorporated I think into the TOE [Table of Equipment] of some of our support battalions.

Mr. COFFMAN. General Conway, in looking at the shipbuilding plan, do you have any concerns about the forced entry requirement in terms of amphibious capability?

General CONWAY. Sir, the CNO, under the observance of the Secretary of the Navy, have agreed that 38 is the requirement. We have said that we must be willing to accept risk down to about 33 ships. And if you look at the 30-year shipbuilding plan, it will sort of run high and lows between that 30 and I think we get as high as 36 in the out-years.

But we also need other parts of the fleet to be equally strong. You know, we want those surface craft out there that give us the force protection shield. We want the support of the aircraft carriers if we need their aviation strike capacity. And we want the subs out at distance screening the whole of the effort. So we need a strong and balanced fleet I think. More amphibians is always better, but we understand the fiscal pressures that we are dealing with today.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

It looks like our last questioner is the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Nye.

Mr. NYE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. First of all, I want to thank you all for being here and for your service to our country.

And I want to start by saying I just returned from a trip to Afghanistan, and I am particularly impressed with the continued dedication of our men and women in uniform out there. Not limited to, but particularly including the Marines and sailors who we may not expect to see in the desert, but often do. They are doing terrific work and I really appreciate what they are doing. I hope you will pass our thanks on to those folks. We know we have given them a tough mission.

We have difficult decisions to make here as well, and I don't think anyone would suggest that any of you have an easy job. Just looking at an article from Inside the Navy recently, Secretary Mabus, you were quoted.

"Looking ahead at some of the potential future budget constraints that we might face in the coming years, having said expected future resource streams will severely constrain our choices, and that reducing Navy and Marine Corps programs to within available resources may require difficult and undesirable choices."

I couldn't agree with you more. It is a tough position that we are in, having to make some decisions in a constrained environment. You were also quoted as saying, "We need to be prepared to rethink old assumptions and re-evaluate past practices." Again, I agree with that.

We have to make tough decisions based on scarce resources. We have heard a number of issues raised by many members of this committee about how we are going to spend our resources and our military dollars. And of course, we would all like to make sure that they are spent in the most efficient and effective way possible.

I will tell you, and I am sure it is going to be no surprise to you to hear me say that I was disappointed to see in the final QDR language a sentence recommending moving a carrier to Mayport, Florida, and investing a substantial amount of money in building that home port, which would be the fifth U.S. nuclear carrier home port.

We have talked about it before, that is why I don't think you are going to be surprised to hear from me about it today. But I will tell you, I was disappointed in a number of things, and one was in what I see as a lack of transparency in the decisionmaking process that led up to that. I will give you a couple of examples of why that troubles me.

And we talked with the Secretary and Admiral Mullen about it in the past couple of weeks. We heard from Secretary Gates that he essentially affirmed a statement that Senator Nelson said that he had told him about a little over 2 months prior to the QDR being issued that—and I want to make sure that I get the wording right—but he said I think that they had nothing to worry about.

We saw some drafts of the QDR come out around December that suggested that the optimal solution would be a backup port in Mayport, rather than a full home port. And then, different language come out in the final version a few weeks later.

I asked Admiral Mullen about it in his testimony, and he said essentially that it was a judgment call. We have asked over the past year for some more strategic analysis of the risks that we are trying to mitigate in Norfolk, and I am unsatisfied with the fact that I don't think we have really received that now.

Under Secretary Flournoy said essentially they had been given two viable options to assess and choose between. Having a backup port or having a full fifth nuclear carrier home port in Mayport. And apparently, according to the QDR language, a decision was made to go with the one that costs a lot of money.

Now, we can argue about the costs, somewhere between half a billion and a billion. We think it is going to be on the upper end of that. As I mentioned now, I was disappointed with the transparency of the process, or lack thereof.

But I have asked for a GAO [Government Accountability Office] study to be conducted, which has started to lay out on the table all of the potential costs included in this type of decision, so we can make that tough decision about how we are going to allocate those defense dollars.

But Admiral Roughead, I just wanted to ask you one question. Admiral Mullen said in his testimony when I asked him about this, about the strategic dispersal issue. And I think you used the words today, "eggs in one basket kind of idea."

And I asked Admiral Mullen if that type of thinking or philosophy would apply to every military asset or base that we have got, not simply nuclear home port for carriers, but every other base, including SSBNs put in Georgia, and other things like strategic bombers.

And he said essentially that, yes, it does apply to anything that we are going to have to evaluate like that. Would you agree with Admiral Mullen on that?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. I would agree that we have to take a good look at where we have the redundancies that are important. And

you cite the case of a strategic ballistic submarine. Their home port is in Georgia. But I can take that ship to Groton, Connecticut, and maintain it there. I can take that ship to Norfolk, Virginia, and maintain it there. So I have three options, even for ballistic missile submarines.

The aircraft carrier on the east coast of the United States is the only ship that I have that I do not have another option to put into to do either routine or emergent maintenance.

Mr. NYE. Another option on the East Coast, although there are three others on the West Coast, just to make sure we are clear on that.

I think I am out of time. I will submit additional questions for the record. But I appreciate we are going to continue working going forward on this to find the right use of our defense dollars. And appreciate the work you have put into it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Sestak.

Mr. SESTAK. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. You bet.

Mr. SESTAK. Mr. Secretary, CNO, I want to first thank you very much for how well you have handled that Petty Officer Roach case on accountability of some sailor that had been accused of being gay, later was discharged, and you held those accountable for their mistreatment. And I very much appreciate it. If anyone doesn't think that the service doesn't care about accountability, they should know what you both did. Thank you very much.

But I do have a question, Mr. Secretary, and it may I understand from my staff had been asked before. As in that incident we had been asking someone to live a lie, to quote the Chairman. It had to do against the greatest ideals that we have in the service, that is, of integrity, which you stood up and followed.

I personally don't understand the year it takes to study the implementation. We can ask the Marine Corps to fly in off of amphibians into Pakistan—or into Afghanistan—in 30 days and they can put the operation together and make it happen. This is something that has to do with our principles, our ideals.

Why, except for your concern potentially about the legality of it, if really does take a year to implement, we cannot at least put out an executive order under stop-loss in order to prevent these good men and women, particularly in a time of war when we need them, from being discharged?

Besides the legality question that the Defense Department may have, because there is obviously various opinion. If that was not something, would you be opposed to it, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary MABUS. Congressman, the legality argument on that seems to me to be the primary one. And to an earlier question, the CNO said that the confusion that would be inherent in something like that I think is an important consideration.

Mr. SESTAK. But besides that, would you be opposed if it was determined to be legal?

Secretary MABUS. I do think that—my understanding that the way the President, as our Commander in Chief, requested Congress to change the law, to repeal the law. But also, at the same time,

he asked the Department of Defense to take a careful look at how to implement this law so that—how to implement it should Congress decide to change it so that it would be implemented in a very smooth, very professional, very consistent—

Mr. SESTAK. Only because of time then—and I don't mean to be rude interjecting—your support of then of that does take that long? But I mean you don't have an opinion then if the legality was turned out to be okay. You still feel it needs that type—that length of implementation?

Secretary MABUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. SESTAK. A study? Thank you. I just was curious. I have seen the military do things so quickly, and so well. And just—it kind of passes me by. But I appreciate your comment.

Commandant, the Army has testified over the past years, and the Chairman agreed with this last month that it cannot meet its other war plans elsewhere like 2057 for South Korea—because of Army readiness, and because of the lack of training in combined arms for example.

Is the Marine Corps in a similar state? If so, and—because I have one last question for the CNO—and if so, how long would it take it to be back to where it could respond to that breadth of war plans that we have, because of Iraq.

General CONWAY. Check. We are in the same place. We have been focused on counterinsurgency now for a number of years, and our forces are very good at that. But in the process we sacrifice sort of our combined arms kind of skill levels. We are encouraged that if we can stay below 20,000 in Afghanistan we are going to extend our home station time to about 14 months after a 7-month deployment.

And we are going to use a chunk of that time to get back to combined arms. To get back to amphibious types of exercises with the Navy—

Mr. SESTAK. What length of time do you think it would take if you had to guess if we stay below 20,000?

General CONWAY. Sir, I don't think it would be one for one. You know, we have been away from it now for six years or so. I don't think we will be back in six years. I think we have got to develop that expertise, and get it embedded. So I am guessing probably the better part of a decade—

Mr. SESTAK. Before we can meet the breadth of war plans again?

General CONWAY. Well, we can meet the war plans now—

Mr. SESTAK. On a different timeline?

General CONWAY. To be as good as we were in 2002 I think—

Mr. SESTAK. Okay.

General CONWAY [continuing]. Is probably going to take 8 to 10 years.

Mr. SESTAK. And since I am a sophomore I have to be quick, because Mr. Skelton will cut me right off. But—very quickly. There has always been this question about 315 ships. Do you really think as we look at how technology—particularly knowledge is so important in warfare, that when using the long metric of numbers of ships as far as trying to determine our prowess in the future?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. I do not believe we are wrong in looking at the numbers of ships. I think it is how we apply those ships, and

the range of missions, and geographic areas where we are expected to be. And you do get to a numbers point as far as being in many places doing different things in large ocean areas. And that is where the number generates.

I think there are many who say, you know, we are bigger than the next 13 Navies. But the fact of the matter is that our Navy really has existed not for a cataclysmic sea battle all the time. But rather for that presence, and the security, and the stability that it provides.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Before I call on Mr. Franks, I would urge and ask Mr. Secretary would you please provide the committee a copy of the ongoing force structure assessment when it is complete. We would certainly appreciate that—

Secretary MABUS. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN [continuing]. Very, very much. I am sitting here thinking listening to your testimony how blessed we are to have leaders such as you heading the services that you do, and do so ably, and so well—people who wear the uniform and work for you—I hope that you will carry our appreciation back to them. And General Conway we wish you Godspeed. And we are going to work you hard between now and the time we say farewell to you. Admiral Roughead, thank you so much for your excellent testimony. And welcome Secretary Mabus. We expect a lot of hard work out of you.

With that, Mr. Franks, and Mr. Taylor will assume the chair.

Mr. FRANKS. Well thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank all of you. Let me just echo the chairman's remarks related to your service. General Conway, I guess I would single you out here a little bit, you know? General MacArthur once said that, "Old soldiers don't die, they just fade away."

And I know that Marines have a completely different perspective. Old Marines don't die. They just charge in a new direction. And I want you to know that we are very, very grateful for your service. We talk about freedom in this place, and we know that it is people like you that—that carry it with you everywhere you go. And you have given your life to the cause.

And I want you to know that I believe my children, and the children of this country even though they may not remember everything about you will live in a safer place, and walking the light of liberty, because you were once commandant of the Marine Corps. And thank you very much.

With that, Secretary Mabus, you know how politicians are? They have to hit other politicians. And I don't—do you think that you have a clear unimpeded latitude to speak in complete—in candor about the—in public about the short- and long-term resource needs of the Department of Navy?

Secretary MABUS. Yes, sir.

Mr. FRANKS. Okay. So I guess I have to—you know, I am stuck here. I have to ask given that the fleet is the smallest that it has been in several decades, and given the growing cost of shipbuilding we seem unlikely to reach Admiral Roughead's 313-ship fleet any time soon? I mean, every year for the past 15 years the shipbuilding accounts have been several billion dollars short of what is

needed. And we primarily underestimate the cost of each new vessel. That kind of goes with it, I guess.

We face a fighter gap based on of course the Navy testimony of upwards of 250 aircraft by 2018. And that is about one half of our carrier-based aircraft. And there is a widening gap in the Marine Corps reset funding that could approach \$30 billion. I mean these are pretty short—serious shortfalls in my judgment.

And of course on the threat side of the equation, the Chinese have launched 16 new submarines, and from 2005 and 2007. And they have announced that they will design and build a new class of destroyers that are also working on—that they are also working on the first of likely several carriers. Which in my opinion is it seems that China has developed, and is enhancing its—area-denial capability based on their aggressive submarine acquisition program, and their acquisition of several—and development of several different anti-ship cruise missiles.

And, I mean, they are just projecting power in a lot of different directions. And I think it seems that they are deliberately basing that on our assessed vulnerabilities. At least it appears to me that way. So my point is—and there is a question in here somewhere—the best means of assuring peace in the western Pacific in my judgment is maintaining a sufficient military power in the region to deter aggression. It is not a new concept.

But the QDR was eerily silent on China. And based on your recent comments—and Australia—I mean, it sounds like we maybe have a different perspective of that concern. So with all that said, do you think and believe that the Navy is programming sufficient funds both in fiscal year 2011, and across the future years to fully address China's military expansion?

Secretary MABUS. Yes, sir. I do. And to talk just very briefly about a few of the things that you said. We try to be very realistic in this budget, and in this 30-year shipbuilding plan about the cost of each of our vessels. Because frankly it doesn't do us any good to come in low, and then continually to ask for more money. If we are going to get the size of fleet that we need, we have to be realistic about what they are going to cost.

We are also taking some pretty aggressive actions to drive down the cost of ships. The downselect of the OCS is the thing that springs to mind. In terms of our capability in the Pacific, and particularly the western Pacific, we are very mindful of what is happening. The Chinese capabilities and the things that they are doing—they haven't been nearly as transparent about as we would like. But we do understand the types of ships they are building. We understand the types of anti-access missiles, both ballistic missiles, and cruise missiles that they are fielding. And we understand what they are doing with their fleet.

We have great confidence that the ships that we have today, and the ships that we are building for the future, and our total force concept will meet whatever challenge—and I won't just limit it to the Chinese. That whatever challenge we face in the Pacific, we feel that—that the fleet can meet it, and that the Navy and Marine Corps team will be there to hedge and deter in a very effective way.

Mr. FRANKS. All right. Well, thank you all. And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. TAYLOR. [Presiding.] Yes. Thanks to the gentleman.

The Chair will recognize the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And General Conway, on possibly your last presentation here before the Armed Services Committee, I want to thank you for your service. And in the last year I have had the extraordinary opportunity to visit with your Marines at Camp Leatherneck. I was so impressed. And then a great honor that I cherish. My wife and I being the—reviewing at Parris Island in November. You should be so grateful for the young people that you are providing opportunity.

And Admiral Roughead, I always want to thank you for your service at the Naval academy, and then commanding the USS *Port Royal*, which is named after a port in South Carolina. And thank you for your service, and hospitality.

I yield, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Mr. TAYLOR. The Chair thanks the gentleman.

And I would like to take this opportunity to thank all three of you gentlemen for your service to our nation. Commandant, we are going to miss you. I know you are going to do great things no matter what you do after uniform. But we certainly value every day that you have served us.

Secretary Mabus, we are very, very, lucky that you gave up your private sector probably cushy job for this, but we—again, we are lucky to have you.

And Admiral Roughead, we always value you as the only—I believe the only commander of both the Atlantic and the Pacific fleets to have served the United States Navy. A very rare, and well-deserved distinction.

Secretary Mabus, before you leave I would like to hand deliver to you a letter that—from myself, Senator Cochran, and Senator Wicker. A similar letter was delivered to Northrop Grumman last week. And it basically says that the Congress has authorized and appropriated five ships—already authorized, already appropriated. And yet for whatever reason Northrop and the Navy have not come to terms—gotten those ships started.

The admiral has made an excellent case that he needs a bigger fleet. The Congress has already responded to that—appropriating the money. We need to get going. And so I don't know if it is Northrop's delay. I don't know if it is the Navy's delay. But there is a delay that needs to be addressed that I am going to ask you to take a look at that.

But again thank all of you for your service. And with that, this meeting is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:13 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

FEBRUARY 24, 2010

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

FEBRUARY 24, 2010

Opening Statement of Chairman Ike Skelton
Hearing on the FY 2011 Department of the Navy Budget Request

February 24, 2010

Washington, D.C. – House Armed Services Committee Chairman Ike Skelton (D-Mo.) delivered the following opening statement during today's hearing on the Fiscal Year 2011 budget request of the Department of the Navy:

"Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. Today the House Armed Services Committee meets to receive testimony on the Fiscal Year 2011 budget request for the United States Navy and Marine Corps. Appearing before the committee are the Honorable Ray Mabus, Secretary of the Navy; Admiral Gary Roughead, Chief of Naval Operations; and General James T. Conway, Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps.

"Mr. Secretary, I note that this is your first time testifying before this committee, welcome. Admiral Roughead and General Conway, thank you for your continued service as you lead the wonderful Sailors and Marines in the active duty and reserve forces of our sea services.

"Today the United States Navy has 194 ships underway; of those, 143 are deployed. These numbers equate to over 53,000 Sailors deployed in support of the Navy's missions worldwide. To support current ongoing combat operations, the Navy has 15,600 Individual Augmentees deployed in the CENTCOM area of responsibility.

"The United States Marine Corps has almost 30,000 Marines deployed. A little over 15,000 Marines are on the ground in Afghanistan. Many of those are currently engaged in hostile combat in and around the town of Marja in the Helmand province. I am sure I speak for all Members of the committee when I say that our thoughts and prayers are with all the deployed Sailors and Marines, and with their families, with particular concern for those Marines who are currently engaged in combat operations.

"I have said this before, but it bears repeating. Our sea services are this nation's fast response force, the Navy power base is 'maneuver from the sea', and our Marine Corps is, and should remain, an amphibious assault force and a crisis aversion force. Current operations over the last seven years have stressed our Marine Corps and fashioned them more to a medium-heavy ground combat force. I am concerned about that.

"We remain committed to providing our Sailors and Marines with the equipment they need to accomplish the tasks before them. However, there are challenges. The Navy must recapitalize the main battle fleet to numbers which can support the COCOMs requirements. The 30-year shipbuilding plan submitted with the budget request only partially accomplishes this task. From that plan it appears the cost associated with replacing the Ohio Class ballistic missile submarines is so high that efforts to restore numbers in the surface force and the attack submarine force may have to be sacrificed to pay for the national strategic deterrence mission of the ballistic missile submarine.

“The shipbuilding plan does not address the requirement of a 38 ship force of amphibious assault ships; at best the shipbuilding plan provides a force of amphibious ships in the low 30s. It seems to me that might be an unacceptable risk. I am sure that this committee will carefully review the Navy shipbuilding plan.

“I am very concerned about the looming strike fighter shortfall in Naval Aviation. In short, I do not understand why the F/A 18 strike fighter program has not been extended. By any analysis, more Navy and Marine Corps fighters will be needed to meet validated inventory requirements by the middle of this decade. Delays in the Joint Strike Fighter program only exacerbate the problem of a near-term strike fighter shortfall. Just as worrisome, internal Navy analysis estimates that it will cost 40 percent more to operate JSF than what the current fleet of strike aircraft now costs.

“The Navy and Marine Corps continue to be challenged in maintenance and recapitalization. I am pleased to see an increase in the Navy’s request for operations and maintenance funds. I note that in Admiral Roughead’s response to the Ranking Member’s request for the Navy unfunded priority list, the CNO lists spare parts and deferred maintenance as his three most vital shortfalls.

“Year after year, deferred maintenance seems to pile up. If we cannot seem to find the funding to maintain our ships, planes, and equipment, I am deeply concerned about the additional costs of replacing them prior to the end of their expected service life.

“Deployments have always been a part and parcel of the sea service. The sea services have always lived in a reality of deployment, reset, re-training, and then re-deployment. However, I am very concerned that the average Navy deployment cycle has gradually increased from the traditional 6 month deployment with an 18 month maintenance and re-training period to deployments averaging 8 months with comparable reduction in the maintenance and re-training period. The stress on the force seems to be increasing.

“Finally, I would like to address the relocation of Marines from Okinawa. It is essential that we preserve the unique, strategic relationship that exists between Japan and the United States. At the same time, it is imperative that we reduce our force structure in Okinawa and retain the strategic capabilities associated with the third Marine Expeditionary Force. While I understand the desire of the new Government of Japan to review the current basing agreements, we need to move forward with the overall realignment that includes a Futenma Replacement Facility and the Guam relocation. In the end, we need to ensure that the Marine Corps and the supporting communities are in a better position. We need to get this right.

“I now turn to my good friend, the Ranking Member of this committee, Buck McKeon for any opening comments he might care to make.”

###



McKeon Opening Statement for Hearing Fiscal Year 2011 Budget Request for the United States Navy and Marine Corps

Washington, D.C.—U.S. Rep. Howard P. "Buck" McKeon (R-CA), the top Republican on the Armed Services Committee, released the following opening statement for the committee's hearing on the Administration's Fiscal Year 2011 budget request for the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps:

"Secretary Mabus, Admiral Roughead, and General Conway, good morning and welcome. Mr. Secretary, please accept my special welcome for your first appearance before this committee. We look forward to developing a collaborative and productive relationship with you and your staff. To the service chiefs, welcome back. Our country is blessed to have leaders like you and we thank you for all the hard work you do on behalf of our men and women in uniform. We look forward to your testimony today.

"The President's Fiscal Year 2011 defense budget for the Department of the Navy requests \$179.1 billion for discretionary and war funding. According to the Defense Department, this represents an increase of \$5.2 billion over FY 10 enacted levels, or slightly less than one percent real growth. The news was even better for shipbuilding, which saw an increase of \$1.9 billion over Fiscal Year 2010 enacted levels. This is clearly not the cut to the defense budget that many anticipated. From what I gather in the press, the three of you deserve a significant amount of credit for your advocacy for Navy and Marine Corps personnel and programs.

"However, I do have significant concerns, particularly with future planning and the out-year budgets. Three weeks ago I expressed these same concerns to Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen. While we all support the commitment captured by the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) and the Fiscal Year 2011 budget to winning the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, I believe the Department's efforts to make *balance* a fixture in the QDR and the out-year budget is short-sighted and puts the Department on the wrong path for the next 20 years. Choosing to win in Iraq and Afghanistan should not mean our country must also choose to assume additional risk in the conventional national defense challenges of today and tomorrow.

"Nowhere is this more evident than the long range shipbuilding plan and the Navy and Marine Corps' strike fighter shortfall. In fact, the long range shipbuilding plan, submitted by the Secretary of Defense along with the budget request, explicitly states, 'In summary, then, the QDR has resulted in revised mission priorities to better focus the Department on the war we are in...through the foreseeable future.' This emphasis on developing capabilities for today's conflicts and assessing risk based on today's operating environments puts our future force in jeopardy. While the QDR states that U.S. forces must be able to deter, defend against, and defeat aggression in anti-access environments, neither the Department of the Navy's Fiscal Year 2011 budget request, nor the long term shipbuilding or aviation plans, appear to make significant long-term investments in the capabilities that would be required to achieve this goal.

"We have previously received testimony that the QDR and the FY11 budget proposed a number of new initiatives designed to provide robust capabilities for tomorrow's force, such as a new SSBN submarine, the F-35, ballistic missile defense, and the Virginia-class attack submarine. While I agree that investments in these areas are necessary, they are neither sufficient, nor do they tell the full story. For example:

- "The decision to fund the new SSBN submarine from within the Navy's shipbuilding procurement account could decimate the shipbuilding program in the outyears because the new SSBN will cost at least \$7 billion, or close to half of the Navy's recent ship construction budgets. Should Congress still consider this investment to be

'balanced' when we can no longer build amphibious ships, surface combatants, or attack submarines in the numbers we need because we're forcing the Navy to pay for this unique, strategic asset out of hide? This risk increases as we consider the probability that the SSBN(X) will exceed current cost estimates.

- "The F-35 program continues to experience development delays that only exacerbate the Navy and Marine Corps' strike fighter shortfall. Yet the QDR and the budget request do nothing to rectify this situation. The Secretary has stated that the shortfall is only 100 aircraft, but that presumes we make further reductions in Marine Corps force structure—that the Marine Corps admits are *not possible* at this time—and a service life extension program that is *not funded* anywhere in the Future Years Defense Program. Moreover, this shortfall is measured against our current operational demand—in an environment in which we have uncontested air dominance. It is not measured against any established requirement or future operational plan that requires these aircraft.
- "We're building 2 Virginia class attack subs per year starting in Fiscal Year 2011. This is largely due to Congressional action, not the Department's. But even building 2 per year, we fail to meet our minimum requirement for submarines. The requirement is 48. With the 53 we have today, we cannot meet our Combatant Commander's critical and high priority requests. Yet the shipbuilding plan we just received has our force falling to 39 by 2030, leaving our Combatant Commanders worse off than they are now. The QDR and the shipbuilding plan do nothing to remedy this situation.
- "The proposed regional missile defense architecture relies on the Navy's surface combatants. Yet the QDR and the budget provide no more surface combatants to take on this new mission. The last requirement was 88 and was established before the Navy had this additional responsibility. In addition, we will not be recapitalizing the cruisers, so the Committee has been told that we will need more than one destroyer to do what a cruiser could do. Nevertheless, the shipbuilding plan proposes a *smaller surface combatant fleet* than the last plan did. It acknowledges that DoD would propose to take these already over-taxed resources away from the Navy's other missions.

"I need not go on. I am hopeful that you can provide further insights for this Committee to help us understand how the QDR and the Fiscal Year 2011 budget will provide the foundation for the capabilities our future force requires to operate successfully in anti-access environments and reflect a comprehensive approach to providing the capabilities the Navy and Marine Corps will need in the future.

"Lastly, we continue to face significant challenges in the Operations and Maintenance accounts and the President has asked Congress to consider a major personnel policy change that could also affect readiness. Therefore, Admiral Roughead and General Conway, I will be requesting your views on whether the current law prohibiting the service of openly gay men and women should be repealed and on the suggestion that a moratorium on implementing current law be put into effect while the Department of Defense studies and reviews the issue.

"I am disappointed that the decision has been made not to let the service chiefs testify before the Military Personnel Subcommittee's hearing on Don't Ask, Don't Tell. That decision limits the ability of members to fully understand and explore the concerns of the service chiefs about a repeal of current law. I would hope that we could continue that discussion.

"Since there are many more issues worthy of our discussion, I will conclude to maximize our time for questions and answers. Once again, thank you for being here today. I look forward to your testimony. I yield back, Mr Chairman."

###

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASE BY THE HOUSE
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

**STATEMENT OF
THE HONORABLE RAY MABUS
SECRETARY OF THE NAVY
BEFORE THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
ON
24 FEBRUARY 2010**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASE BY THE HOUSE
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Written Congressional Testimony of the Honorable Ray Mabus
Secretary of the Navy
February 24, 2010

Chairman Skelton and Congressman McKeon, it is a pleasure to be here today with the House Armed Services Committee as the representative of the nearly 900,000 Sailors, Marines, and civilians that make up the Department of the Navy. The Chief of Naval Operations, the Commandant of the Marine Corps and I are privileged to lead some of the best men and women in the country, who are selflessly serving the United States all around the world in support of our safety, our security, and our national interests.

The Navy and Marine Corps remain the most formidable expeditionary fighting force in the world. We are America's "Away Team". The mission and experience of our team is well matched to the multiple and varied challenges that threaten our nation's security and global stability.

Today the Navy and Marine Corps are conducting operations across the spectrum of military operations, from major combat and ballistic missile defense to humanitarian assistance and disaster relief.

Fifteen thousand Marines are at the forefront of our nation's defense, serving in and around Helmand Province, Afghanistan. By spring this number will grow to almost 20,000. It is a testament to the responsiveness and combat capability of the Marine Corps that the first troops to depart for Afghanistan in the wake of the President's December 1st

announcement were 1500 Marines from Camp Lejuene, North Carolina. The new arrivals, who deployed before the end of last year, joined the Second Marine Expeditionary Brigade already in place. Together they are taking the fight to the Taliban and al-Qaeda in their sector and assisting the Afghan Provincial Government in reestablishing control. General Conway describes their capability as a “two-fisted fighter,” capable of simultaneously combating an adaptive and insidious insurgency among the Afghan civilians while maintaining the skill set to conduct major combat operations.

The Navy in Afghanistan is contributing Special Operations Forces, Explosive Ordnance Disposal Teams, Seabee civil engineering assets, all of the airborne expeditionary tactical Electronic Warfare capability, medical and intelligence professionals, and logistical support. From our carriers operating in the Indian Ocean, we are launching a significant percentage of the close air support that watches over our Marines and Soldiers on the ground. The Navy has over 12,000 Sailors on the ground in Central Command supporting joint and coalition efforts in both Iraq and Afghanistan and another 9000 Sailors at sea supporting combat operations.

The Navy and Marine Corps today are globally engaged in a host of other security and stability operations. In our cruisers and destroyers, the Navy has built a strong ballistic missile defense force. These multi-mission ships routinely deploy to the Mediterranean, the Arabian Gulf, and the Western Pacific and extend an umbrella of deterrence. Across the Future Years’ Defense Program we will expand this mission and operationally

implement the President's decision in September 2009 to focus on sea-based ballistic missile defense.

That capability is complemented by the continued preeminence of the ballistic missile submarines in our strategic deterrent force, who operate quietly and stealthily on station every day of the year.

In the Gulf of Aden and Western Indian Ocean, Combined Task Force 151 is leading the international effort to combat piracy in the Gulf of Aden. They are coordinating their operations with forces from the European Union, NATO, and a total of twenty-four nations contributing ships, aircraft, and staff personnel as well as operational and intelligence support.

Our ships and maritime patrol aircraft in the Caribbean and off South America are working with the Coast Guard-led Joint Interagency Task Force-South, which ties together information and forces from thirteen nations to stem the flow of illegal narcotics into the United States. In 2009 alone they contributed to the seizure or disruption of almost 220,000 kilograms of cocaine with a street value of over \$4 billion.

Both the Navy and Marine Corps routinely conduct training exercises and multi-lateral operations with nations all around the world to solidify our relationships with traditional allies and forge partnerships with new friends. Global Partnership Stations in Africa, South America, and the Pacific are training hundreds of Sailors, Marines, and Coast

Guardsmen from dozens of nations and are supporting regional diplomatic and humanitarian engagement efforts, like those of the hospital ship USNS *COMFORT* and the Fleet Auxiliary USNS *RICHARD E. BYRD* in the summer of 2009. The two ships together treated over 110,000 patients in the Caribbean, South America, and Oceania, and the USNS *COMFORT* furthered an existing partnership with numerous civilian aid organizations.

The Navy-Marine Corps team remains on the front-line of response to natural disasters. In 2009 we provided humanitarian assistance to Indonesia, the Philippines, and American Samoa, and delivered thousands of tons of food, water, and medical supplies to those affected by devastation. After the January 12 earthquake in Haiti, the Navy and Marine Corps responded immediately. Within a week of the earthquake, 11 Navy ships, including the carrier USS *CARL VINSON*, the big-deck amphibious ship USS *BATAAN*, and the hospital ship USNS *COMFORT* were on station off the coast of Haiti. These ships embarked 41 Navy and Marine Corps helicopters and approximately 2000 Marines of the 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit. On station, our units treated patients, provided helicopter lift capability, and delivered hundreds of tons of relief aid. Additional personnel and capabilities continued to flow in over the next weeks. Our mission there will continue as long as required.

The Navy and Marine Corps are flexible, responsive, and everywhere that our nation's interests are at stake. The Navy and Marine Corps' global presence reduces instability, deters aggression, and allows for rapid response to a wide range of contingencies.

In order to ensure our continued global mobility, the Department of the Navy strongly supports accession to the Law of the Sea Convention (UNCLOS). The United States must continue to take maximum advantage of the navigational rights contained in the Convention. Ratification would enhance stability for international maritime rules and ensure our access to critical air and sea lines of communication.

I have now been the Secretary of the Navy for nine months, and in that short period of time I have met thousands of our Sailors and Marines serving on the front lines at sea and ashore. I have been constantly inspired by the high morale, courage, and commitment to serving our country displayed by every one of them as they conduct our missions. In return, I have continually expressed to them the appreciation of the American people for the sacrifices they and their families are making every day.

I have met our operational commanders and seen first-hand the warfighting readiness of our Fleet and our Marine Forces. I have inspected the facilities of our industry partners who are building the Navy and Marine Corps of tomorrow. With the advice and support of my leadership team, I have made some initial decisions to better prepare the Navy and Marine Corps for the challenges of the future. These observations and our initial actions have given me a good picture of the Navy and Marine Corps, and from this vantage I can report to Congress and the President the current state of the Services, the budgetary

requirements we need to successfully perform our mission, and the future direction I believe we must take.

The Department of the Navy's Fiscal Year 2011 (FY 2011) Budget request reflects the President's priorities, Secretary Gates' strategic and fiscal guidance, and fundamentally aligns with the 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) priorities:

- (1) *Prevailing in today's wars*
- (2) *Preventing and deterring conflict*
- (3) *Preparing for a wide range of future contingencies*
- (4) *Preserving and enhancing the All-Volunteer Force*

This Budget request of \$160.7 billion will maintain across the Future Years' Defense Program our commitment to a strong industrial base. The FY 2011 request of \$18.5 billion for contingency operations includes incremental costs to sustain operations, manpower, equipment and infrastructure repair as well as equipment replacement to support our focus on increasing threats in Afghanistan and elsewhere.

In the FY 2011 Budget request, we have included funds for 9 ships, including 2 additional *VIRGINIA* class submarines, 2 destroyers in the restarted *ARLEIGH BURKE* line, a lower-cost commercial variant of the Mobile Landing Platform, the multi-role Landing Helicopter Assault Replacement, a Joint High Speed Vessel and 2 Littoral Combat Ships, which will be constructed under the terms of the down-select we will conduct this fiscal year. In aviation, we have requested 206 aircraft in FY 2011, including 20 F-35 Joint Strike Fighters for both the Navy and Marine Corps, 24 MH-60R

and 7 P-8As to begin replacing our aging ASW and maritime patrol squadrons, 18 MH-60S for logistics support, 28 H-1 variant helicopters and 30 MV-22 for the Marine Corps, 22 F/A-18E/F and 12 F/A-18G to continue replacing the EA-6B. For Marine Corps ground operations, we have requested funding for an additional 564 LVSR and HMMWV tactical vehicles. The FY 2011 Budget request also contains development funding for the Navy Unmanned Combat Aerial System and continues development of the Broad Area Maritime Surveillance UAV. And we have continued our support of the Naval Expeditionary Combat Command, including funding for a fourth Riverine Squadron.

The Department's long-range shipbuilding and aviation intentions are designed to sustain our naval superiority and they achieve a balance of capability and affordability that both wins today's wars even while preparing for the challenges of the future.

There are four strategic, tactical, and personnel management imperatives I believe the Department of the Navy must also address to maintain preeminence as a fighting force and successfully address whatever comes in the future. These four areas reinforce the strategic framework of the QDR and address the areas of risk it identifies. They are:

- (1) Taking care of our Sailors, Marines, Civilians, and their Families*
- (2) Treating energy in the Department of the Navy as an issue of national security*
- (3) Creating acquisitions excellence*
- (4) Optimizing unmanned systems*

They underpin the development of our FY 2011 Budget request, execute Presidential policy, and comply with and respond to Congressional direction.

Taking Care of Sailors, Marines, Civilians, and their Families

Sailors and Marines are the fundamental source of our success. They are our most important asset, and they must always come first in our minds and in our actions. One of my most important responsibilities as Secretary is to ensure adequate compensation, medical care, and family support services are provided to our Sailors, Marines, civilians, and their families.

The Navy and Marine Corps will continue to recruit and retain the same high quality individuals we brought into and kept in the service in 2009. We remain committed to providing a competitive pay and benefits package to aid recruiting. The package includes not only basic pay and housing allowances, but also provides incentives for critical specialties in health care, explosive ordnance disposal, and nuclear propulsion.

Beyond compensation, we recognize that quality of life programs are crucial to retention and the military mission. We are providing expanded career opportunities, opportunities for life-long learning, and a continuum of care and family support. The Department continues to support a wide array of readiness programs, including deployment support services, morale and welfare services, and child and teen programs. Our innovative personnel management and human resource programs were in fact recognized by civilian

experts as among the best in the country when, in October 2009, the Navy was named by Workforce Management Magazine as the winner of the Optimas Award for General Excellence.

Since the attacks of September 11, 2001, over 10,000 Marines and Sailors have been wounded in action. Their service has been exemplary and unselfish, and in their sacrifice they have given so much of themselves for our country. The Department of the Navy, through the Wounded Warrior Regiment and the Navy Safe Harbor Program, provides support and assistance to our wounded, ill, and injured service members and their families throughout recovery, rehabilitation, and reintegration. And we continue to provide encouragement and support for wounded Sailors and Marines, in partnership with the Department of Veterans Affairs, long after they have left the Service.

Our medical community has continued to strive for excellence in the care of our Sailors and Marines. Navy Medicine has reached out to its civilian colleagues, and we have established partnerships with civilian hospitals to improve our understanding and care for those affected by traumatic brain injuries, mental health issues, amputation, and disfiguring injuries. I had the opportunity last fall to see this first-hand, when I witnessed groundbreaking pro-bono work in reconstructive surgery on behalf of Wounded Warriors at the UCLA Medical Center.

We will continue to aggressively address the issues of sexual assault prevention and response. Sexual assault is a criminal act that is corrosive to the readiness and morale of

a professional military organization. In the FY 2011 Budget request, we have requested funds to support a reinvigorated program under the supervision of a new Office of Sexual Assault Prevention and Response, which I created within the Secretariat to focus attention on the issue, develop effective training, and coordinate prevention and response programs across the Navy and Marine Corps.

In 2010, the Department will move forward on expanding the opportunities for women in the Navy. We will establish a process to integrate women into the submarine force, beginning with nuclear-trained and Supply Corps officers on our ballistic and guided missile submarines.

After eight years of continuous combat operations, the Navy and Marine Corps' people remain strong, and the CNO, CMC, and I are very focused on maintaining the overall health of the force. The FY 2011 Budget request reinforces these goals and is designed to provide the fiscal support necessary to sustain the force. The visible support of Congress to our personnel programs is deeply appreciated and has been vital in maintaining overall readiness.

Energy Reform

The way in which we use and produce energy is an issue of national security and is essential to maintaining our warfighting capabilities. At present, we simply rely too

much on fossil fuels, which are susceptible to both price and supply shocks caused by events in volatile areas of the world largely outside the scope of our control. Those potential shocks have, in turn, strategic, operational, and tactical effects upon our forces. In addition, fossil fuel emissions are the root cause of many of the impending security challenges of tomorrow, and the QDR has correctly identified that climate change and its effects: rising sea levels, pressure on natural resources, and changes to the polar regions, will increasingly affect our force structure and the global security environment as the 21st century progresses. In order to improve our long-term strategic and fiscal position, I have set the Navy and Marine Corps on a path to change the way in which we use and produce energy.

In October 2009, I issued five energy targets. They are ambitious in their scope, but I firmly believe that little will be accomplished without bold, innovative, and timely action. The most important of the targets commits the Navy and Marine Corps to generating half of all the energy we use, including that used by the operational fleet, from alternative sources by 2020. I have also committed the Navy and Marine Corps to consider energy as a mandatory evaluation factor in contracting, and to consider as an additional factor in our business dealings, the energy footprint of the companies that sell to the Navy and Marine Corps.

America is a world leader precisely because of our willingness to not just embrace change, but to create it. The U.S. Navy has always been a technological leader. We moved from wind to coal in the 19th Century, coal to oil early in the 20th Century, and to

nuclear power in mid-century. In every transition there were opponents to change, but in every case the strategic and tactical position of naval forces improved. In this century, I have asked the Navy to lead again by pioneering technological change through use of alternative energy. But I want to reiterate that every action and program we undertake must and will have as an effect improved warfighting capability. And we will strive in every case to improve energy efficiency and reach cost-neutrality over the life of the program.

Many of our initiatives are already doing this. We conducted a ground test of an F/A-18 Hornet jet engine this fall running on a biofuel blend and we intend to conduct an airborne test of the "Green Hornet" later this year. In late 2010, the Navy will also conduct tests of a more efficient F/A-18 engine, which will increase the aircraft's range. Afloat, the USS *MAKIN ISLAND*, the first ship constructed with a hybrid-electric drive that dramatically lowers fuel consumption at lower speeds, saved approximately \$2 million in a single transit to her new homeport in San Diego. Over the life of the ship, we estimate the savings will be up to \$250 million using today's fuel prices. Writ large across the Navy, as we begin to retrofit our DDG fleet with similar propulsion systems, the potential fuel savings will only grow.

In addition to these tactical applications, we have implemented a number of energy projects at our facilities ashore, and numerous other efficiency initiatives throughout the Fleet. As the President clearly stated in Copenhagen, changing the way we use and produce energy is a national security imperative.

Acquisition Excellence

The ships and aircraft of the Navy and Marine Corps are unmatched at sea and over land. Our precision munitions, networked targeting systems, armored vehicles, stealth technology, and unmanned vehicles are advanced systems that define the leading edge of warfare in all domains.

These truths have been brought home to me during my visits with the defense industry. I have had the opportunity to visit shipyards, aircraft manufacturers, factories, and depots; and I applaud the hard work and dedication of this country's skilled workforce – Americans who take as much pride in their patriotism as they do in their craftsmanship.

The issue before us all, however, is affordability. Acquisition costs are rising faster than our budget's top-line, and without deliberate, sustained action to reverse this trend, we put the size and capability of the future force at risk. In accordance with the Weapons System Acquisition Reform Act passed by Congress in 2009, the Navy and Marine Corps will aggressively pursue additional ways to make the acquisitions process more rigorous; we will prudently safeguard the resources entrusted to us by the American taxpayer, and we will fully meet the obligation we hold to our Sailors and Marines.

This requires close examination of the way we do business in our policies, practices, priorities, and organization, with a clear focus on controlling cost. The Navy and Marine

Corps will continue initiatives to raise standards, to improve processes, to instill discipline in procurement, and to strengthen the professional corps that manages our major defense acquisition programs.

We are pressing forward with key initiatives that promise to improve our ability to affordably deliver combat capability to the fleet.

We are improving the quality of our cost estimates, which underpin our investment decisions. We are strengthening our cost estimating group, requiring independent cost estimates, and incorporating Departmental best practices in the formulation of our Service Cost Position for all major programs. We are using these realistic cost and schedule estimates to drive difficult decisions at the front end of the requirements process.

We are developing our acquisition strategies with the intent of expanding the use of fixed price contracts, leveraging competition, and tightening up on the use of incentive and award fees to ensure quality systems are delivered consistently on budget and on time to our Sailors and Marines. When we could not achieve these objectives this past year on the Littoral Combat Ship program, we rewrote the program's acquisition strategy to improve performance through competition. I thank the Committee for its strong support of this revised strategy, and I assure you that I will not hesitate to re-compete or cancel programs when sub-standard performance demands change.

We are demanding strict discipline in the execution of our contracts. Before commencing production on new start ship programs, I have reported to you the results of reviews conducted to ensure that designs are mature. We are specifically clamping down on contract changes, the most-often cited reason for cost growth, through improved policies and increased oversight.

Our goals for modernizing today's force and recapitalizing the fleet affordably cannot be accomplished without a healthy industrial base and strong performance by our industry partners. We have worked hard to procure our ships, aircraft, and weapon systems at a rate intended to bring stability to the industrial base and enable efficient production. The Navy's long-range shipbuilding plan was developed with particular regard for maintaining the unique characteristics and strength of the base and our efforts support the QDR's emphasis on maintaining the defense industrial base with appropriate levels of competition, innovation, and capacity. The Future Years' Defense Program outlines construction of a balanced force of 50 ships, an average of 10 ships per year, which requires the full breadth of capabilities and services provided by our major shipbuilders and vendors.

In the end, industry must perform. We will work with our shipyards, aircraft manufacturers, and weapon systems providers to benchmark performance, to identify where improvements are necessary, to provide the proper incentives for capital investments where warranted, and to reward strong performance with terms and conditions that reflect our desire for a strong government-industry partnership.

To meet our objectives, we must be smart buyers. The acquisition workforce has been downsized over the past fifteen years and in truth our professional acquisition corps has been stretched too thin. Accordingly, and with your strong support, we are rebuilding the acquisition workforce through a number of parallel efforts. We must both increase the number of acquisition workers and restore to the government the core competencies inherent to their profession. The Department has added 800 acquisition professionals in the last year towards the goal of increasing the community by 5000 over the Future Years' Defense Program. This represents a 12 percent growth in our workforce.

Unmanned Systems

The complex nature of today's security environment, as well as current and future anti-access threats faced by the United States require that the Navy and Marine Corps investigate the contributions unmanned systems can make to warfighting capability.

Unmanned systems are unobtrusive, versatile, persistent, and they reduce the exposure of our Sailors and Marines to unnecessary threats. They perform a vast array of tasks such as intelligence collection, precision target designation, oceanographic reconnaissance, and mine detection, and that array will grow exponentially year to year.

Navy and Marine Corps unmanned systems have already made key contributions to operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and in the counter-piracy effort off the coast of Africa. Unmanned aircraft systems have flown thousands of flight hours in support of Operation

Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Unmanned ground vehicles employed by the Marine Corps have conducted thousands of missions detecting and/or neutralizing improvised explosive devices. And unmanned maritime systems have provided improved port security.

We continue to support research and development activities to improve these capabilities and increase the level of autonomy in unmanned systems. Over the Future Years' Defense Program we will continue to focus on transitioning from research and development and limited deployments, through test and evaluation, to full fleet integration and operations. In order to best direct our research and harness the capabilities of unmanned systems, I am tasking the Department to develop a comprehensive roadmap for unmanned system development, to include a coordinated strategy for air, ground, surface, and subsurface systems focused on integration and interoperability with our existing platforms and capabilities.

The initiatives and investments contained in the FY 2011 Budget request will move us onto this path. I look forward to reporting continued progress throughout the year.

Closing

In this statement, I have discussed the strategic and tactical imperatives that guide the Department and influence the future decisions we will make. Specific programmatic requests are reflected in the FY 2011 Budget request, which I believe incorporates the

difficult trade-offs and disciplined decision making that you and the American taxpayer expect of us. We have carefully weighed risks and made proposals to you that will ensure we retain a ready and agile force capable of conducting the full range of military operations. And we will continue to work hard to be effective stewards of the resources you allocate to us.

Forty years ago I stood watch on the deck of the *USS LITTLE ROCK* as a young junior officer. Today I have the solemn privilege of standing watch on behalf of our Navy and Marine Corps in a time of war and national challenge. I am honored by the trust the President and Congress have placed in me and I fully recognize the solemn obligation I have to those who defend us.

That obligation fueled my desire to observe our people up close in their varied and often dangerous jobs. I've seen first hand the courage of our young Marines in Helmand, the determination of a wounded SEAL to walk despite losing two legs, the pride of a young Sailor in a hot engine room, the selfless dedication of corpsmen, nurses and doctors caring for the fallen.

Sacrifice and service created and preserve the freedom and opportunity that we enjoy as Americans. Although we aspire to create a world in which violence and aggression have been eliminated, we understand that peace and stability are often secured only when strong nations and good people are willing and prepared to use decisive force against those who threaten it. The Navy and Marine Corps stand ready to do so.

Your commitment to the service of our country and your recognition of the sacrifice of our Sailors, Marines, civilians and their families has been steadfast and is fully reflected in the support of this Committee for our key programs and our people.

I, along with my partners, the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Roughead, and the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Conway, look forward to hearing your thoughts and answering any questions you may have about our Budget request or specific programs of interest. I also look forward to working closely with Congress as we move forward to sustain the Navy and Marine Corps as the most formidable expeditionary fighting force in the world.

Thank you and Godspeed.

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASE BY THE HOUSE
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

**STATEMENT OF
ADMIRAL GARY ROUGHEAD
CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS
BEFORE THE
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
ON
24 FEBRUARY 2010**

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASE BY THE HOUSE
ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

Navy FY 2011 Posture Statement

Chairman Skelton, Representative McKeon, and members of the Committee, it is my honor and pleasure to appear before you, once again, representing the more than 600,000 Sailors and civilians of the United States Navy. Every day, our dedicated Navy men and women are forward deployed protecting the global commons in every domain: sea, land, air, space, and cyberspace. I appreciate your continued support for them as our Navy protects our Nation and our national interests.

When I signed our Maritime Strategy with General Conway and Admiral Allen more than two years ago, I was confident that the strategy would prepare us well for the current and future security environments. Since then, it has guided our operations and investments, and I am further convinced of its relevance to our operations today and of its enduring attributes. The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) validated the underlying principle articulated in the Maritime Strategy that preventing wars is as important as winning wars. The QDR also declared that U.S. security and prosperity are connected to that of the international system, that deterrence is a fundamental military function, and that partnerships are key to U.S. strategy and essential to the stability of global systems. These themes reinforce the tenets of our Maritime Strategy and the six core capabilities it identified for our maritime Services: forward presence, deterrence, sea control, power projection, maritime security, and humanitarian assistance and disaster response (HA/DR).

My priorities for the Navy remain unchanged: to build tomorrow's Navy, to remain ready to fight today, and to develop and support our Sailors, Navy civilians, and their families. We are making progress in these areas thanks to your continued support. Some highlights follow.

We added nine new ships to our Fleet in 2009, including USS FREEDOM (LCS 1), currently on its first deployment, and USS INDEPENDENCE (LCS 2), our second Littoral Combat Ship. We delivered three DDG 51 destroyers and restarted the DDG 51 line to increase surface combatant capacity for maritime security, deterrence, and anti-submarine warfare. We are adapting our force to meet the President's demand for sea-based ballistic missile defense (BMD) of Europe while sustaining our current BMD missions in the Arabian Gulf and Western Pacific. Our Virginia Class submarine program continues to excel with the delivery of USS NEW MEXICO (SSN 779) four months ahead of schedule. We rolled out our first carrier variant of Joint Strike Fighter (F-35C) aircraft, the timely delivery of which remains essential to fulfilling our strike fighter requirements. We are conducting the first deployment of our Vertical Take Off and Landing Unmanned Aerial Vehicle (VTUAV) and we expect the first test flight of our Navy Unmanned Combat Aerial System demonstrator this year.

In the information and cyberspace domain, I established Fleet Cyber Command/U.S. Tenth Fleet as the global operator of Navy's cyber, networks, cryptology/signals intelligence, information, electronic warfare, and space operations. I restructured the Navy staff to bring all Navy information capabilities and resources under our new Information Dominance Deputy Chief of Naval Operations and created the Navy Information Dominance Corps, integrating more than 45,000 Sailors and civilians from our existing intelligence, information professional,

information warfare, meteorology/oceanography, and space communities. About 1,400 of these Sailors are deployed globally as individual augmentees (IAs) today, most supporting operations in the Central Command (CENTCOM) area of responsibility.

More than 40 percent of our Fleet is underway daily, globally present and persistently engaged. Our forward presence enabled the rapid response of our aircraft carrier USS CARL VINSON and numerous other surface and USNS ships, helicopters, and personnel to Haiti to provide humanitarian aid after the devastating earthquake in January. We remain engaged in operations in Afghanistan and in the drawdown of U.S. forces in Iraq. Navy has more than 21,000 active and reserve Sailors on the ground and at sea in CENTCOM. This includes a doubling of our construction battalion (SEABEE) presence in Afghanistan and ongoing IA support to both operations. I recently issued our *Navy Vision for Confronting Irregular Challenges* to shape how our Navy will plan for, resource, and deliver a wide range of capabilities to confront irregular challenges associated with regional instability, insurgency, crime, and violent extremism at sea, in the littorals, and on shore.

Our Navy continues to support our people and their families. We are in the process of expanding opportunities for service at sea to women in the Navy by opening to them assignments on submarines for the first time in history. Our Navy has received 19 national awards in the past 18 months for its workforce planning, life-work integration, diversity, and training initiatives. Most notably, *Workforce Management* magazine awarded Navy the 2009 Optimas Award for General Excellence, which recognized the U.S. Navy as an employer of choice among the ranks of previous distinguished recipients such as Google, Intel, and Hewlett-Packard. We have met or exceeded overall officer and enlisted (active and reserve) recruiting goals for 2009 and we are on track to achieve similar success in 2010. I appreciate the support of Congress for our Fleet and its dedicated Sailors, Navy civilians, and their families that serve our nation every day.

I continue to focus on ensuring our Navy is properly balanced to answer the call now and in the decades to come. Last year, I stated our risk was moderate trending toward significant because of the challenges associated with Fleet capacity, increasing operational requirements, and growing manpower, maintenance, and infrastructure costs. This risk has increased over the last year as trends in each of these areas have continued. We are able to meet the most critical Combatant Commander demands today, but I am increasingly concerned about our ability to meet any additional demands while sustaining the health of the force, conducting essential maintenance and modernization to ensure units reach full service life, and procuring our future Navy so we are prepared to meet the challenges of tomorrow.

The costs to own and operate our Fleet continue to rise due to increasing operational demands, higher maintenance requirements, and growing manpower costs. Over the last decade, the overall size of our active Fleet decreased by more than 30 ships, about 10 percent, and our active duty end strength decreased by about 13 percent, while operational demands globally have grown. Our Navy's high tempo of operations has placed additional stress on our smaller Fleet of Sailors, ships, and aircraft and we are consuming the service life of our Fleet at a higher than expected rate. We are implementing force management measures in the near term to stretch the capacity of our 285-ship force to meet increasing global requirements. Through our Fleet Response Plan, we are tailoring our training and maintenance cycles to generate ready forces,

allowing us to meet the most critical Combatant Commander requirements today. The impact of these measures on our Fleet has been felt in longer deployments and shorter dwell times, which increase stress on our Sailors and drive up maintenance requirements and costs for our ships and aircraft. Regular maintenance of our ships and aircraft, and training and certification of our crews between deployments, is essential to our ability to sustain our force. It is how we reset. This “reset in stride” is different from other Services. It ensures our ships and aircraft maintain the required continuous forward presence whether supporting coalition troops in Afghanistan, deterring North Korea and Iran, or providing humanitarian aid in Haiti. For our Navy, continuous reset translates into decades of service for each ship and aircraft, a significant return on investment.

Our reset and readiness are tied directly to our operations and maintenance (O&M) funding. Over the last decade, we have relied upon a combination of base budget and overseas contingency operations (OCO) funding to operate and maintain our Navy. Our FY 2011 OCO request for O&M is tightly focused on supporting our ongoing and increased operations in CENTCOM. Our FY 2011 base budget request for O&M is focused on properly sustaining our ships and aircraft so they reach their expected service life; funding enduring readiness requirements, particularly in aviation; and funding price increases, most notably in fuel, to support our enduring operations. Together, our OCO and base budget O&M requests reflect our commitment to resource current operations while preserving our Fleet for future operations. I ask for your full support of this year’s O&M request.

Our FY 2011 budget request achieves the optimal balance among my priorities to build tomorrow’s Navy, to remain ready to fight today, and to develop and support our Sailors, Navy civilians, and their families. It supports our Maritime Strategy and the 2010 QDR and continues us on the path we started in FY 2010 to support our forces forward, take care of our people, continue rebalancing our force to meet current and future challenges, and reform how and what we buy. Highlights follow.

Build Tomorrow’s Navy

Since the release of our Maritime Strategy, I have stated that our Navy requires a minimum of 313 ships to meet operational requirements globally. This minimum, a product of our 2005 force structure analysis, remains valid. We are adjusting our requirement to address increased operational demands and expanding requirements, as outlined in the QDR, for ballistic missile defense, intra-theater lift, and forces capable of confronting irregular challenges. Our shipbuilding plan addresses these operational needs by growing our Fleet to 315 ships in 2020 and peaking at 320 ships in 2024. Per the President’s direction, we will improve our capacity to conduct sea-based ballistic missile defense of Europe by increasing our inventory of Aegis-capable ships through our restarted DDG 51 production line and modernization of our existing cruisers and destroyers. The funding for these upgrades will deliver the capability and capacity of ships required to perform this mission while maintaining sustainable deployment ratios for our Sailors. To fulfill Combatant Commander requirements for intra-theater lift, we will increase the number of Joint High Speed Vessels (JHSV) in our Fleet; the large payload bays, speed, and shallow draft of these versatile ships make them capable of supporting a wide range of naval missions, including security cooperation, security force assistance, and logistics support. To

provide forces capable of confronting irregular challenges, we will continue to pursue the planned number of Littoral Combat Ships, providing a flexible and modular ship optimized for operations close to shore. We are moving from developing a Maritime Prepositioning Force (Future) squadron optimized for high-end, forcible entry operations to augmenting our three existing Maritime Prepositioning Squadrons (MPS) with enhanced sea basing capabilities that are useful across a wide range of military operations. The augmented MPS will support our amphibious warfare force, which we will build to a minimum of 33 ships to increase our capacity to conduct theater security cooperation, sustain combat and assistance operations from the sea, and hedge against future conflict.

We have improved the balance among capability, capacity, affordability, and executability in our procurement plans by developing a shipbuilding plan that procures our most needed capabilities, increases Fleet capacity in the near-to-mid-term, and is fiscally executable within the FYDP. It carefully manages increasing levels of operational and institutional risk, recognizing that, for as much as our Navy does to protect our national security and prosperity, the overall economy of our nation undoubtedly does more. I am confident our near-term plan provides the capability and capacity we need to conduct contingency operations and build partner capacity while retaining our ability to deter aggressors, assure allies, and defeat adversaries. Beyond 2024, I am concerned about the decrease in Fleet capacity that will occur as our legacy cruisers, destroyers, submarines, and amphibious ships reach the end of their service lives. Many of these ships were brought into service during the 1980s, when we procured some ship classes at a rate of four to five ships per year. While economic and security conditions are sure to change between now and then, it takes 10 to 15 years to design and build our ships, which then remain in service for 20 to 50 years. A long view is necessary to ensure our Navy has sufficient capacity to protect America's global national interests in the future.

As directed by the QDR, we are working with the Air Force and Marine Corps on an Air Sea Battle concept that will identify the doctrine, procedures, training, organization, and equipment needed for our Navy to counter growing military threats to our freedom of action. This joint effort will help us inform investments and identify future opportunities to better integrate naval and air forces across the entire range of operations. We are already moving forward with the Air Force to streamline capabilities, manpower, and resources related to our unmanned aviation systems. We continue to pursue our unique maritime aviation capabilities in carrier-based strike, anti-submarine warfare, and naval special warfare missions.

Underpinning the capacity and capability of our Fleet is a highly technical and specialized industrial base. A strategic national asset, our shipbuilding and aviation industrial base is essential to sustaining our global Fleet and remains a significant contributor to our nation's economic prosperity. Our shipbuilding industrial base directly supports more than 97,000 uniquely-skilled American jobs and indirectly supports thousands more through second and third tier suppliers. The highly specialized skills in our shipbuilding base take years to develop and, if lost, cannot be easily or quickly replaced. Level loading and predictable ship procurement allow industry to stabilize its workforce and retain the critical skills essential to our national security.

I am committed to reducing the total ownership cost of our Fleet so that what we buy today does not pressurize our ability to operate tomorrow. Significant cost drivers for our Fleet include increasing technical and design complexity, changes in requirements, reductions in the number of ships procured, and higher labor costs. To reduce these costs, we are pursuing common hull forms and components, open architecture for hardware and software, and increased modularity. Moreover, we are considering total ownership costs in procurement decisions. We are exploring new ways to design our ships with greater affordability throughout their lives, including reducing costs of fuel consumption, maintenance, and manpower and by increasing the efficiency of our maintenance and support processes and organizations. We are leveraging open production lines to deliver proven and required capabilities, such as in our DDG 51 and EA-18G programs. We are promoting longer production runs with our Virginia Class SSNs, EA-18G and F/A-18E/F, P-8A, BAMS, and DDG 51 programs. We are capitalizing on repeat builds to control requirements creep and increase predictability with our aircraft carrier, destroyer, and submarine programs. Finally, we are pursuing evolutionary instead of revolutionary designs to deliver required future capabilities. Our future missile defense capable ship, for example, will be developed by spiraling capability into our DDG51 Class ships, instead of designing and building a new cruiser from the keel up.

I remain committed to delivering a balanced and capable Fleet that will meet our national security requirements. I seek your support for the following initiatives and programs:

Aviation Programs

Aircraft Carrier Force Structure

The Navy remains firmly committed to maintaining a force of 11 carriers for the next three decades. With the commissioning of USS GEORGE H. W. BUSH (CVN 77) and inactivation of the 48-year-old USS KITTY HAWK (CV 63), our last conventionally powered aircraft carrier, we now have an all nuclear-powered carrier force. Our carriers enable our nation to respond rapidly, decisively, and globally to project power, as we have done in Iraq and Afghanistan, or to deliver humanitarian assistance, as we have done in Haiti, while operating from a small, yet persistent, footprint that does not impose unnecessary political or logistic burdens on other nations. Our carriers remain a great investment for our nation.

Our eleven-carrier force structure is based on worldwide presence and surge requirements, while also taking into account training and maintenance needs. I thank Congress for granting us a waiver to temporarily reduce our force to ten carriers for the period between the inactivation of USS ENTERPRISE (CVN 65) and the delivery of GERALD R. FORD (CVN 78). We will continue to meet operational commitments during this 33-month period by managing carefully carrier deployment and maintenance cycles. After the delivery of CVN 78, we will maintain an eleven-carrier force through the continued refueling program for NIMITZ Class ships and the delivery of our FORD Class carriers at five-year intervals starting in 2020.

CVN 78 is the lead ship of our first new class of aircraft carriers in nearly 40 years. FORD Class carriers will be our nation's premier forward-deployed asset capable of responding to crises or delivering early decisive striking power in a major combat operation. These new carriers incorporate an innovative new flight deck design that provides greater operational

flexibility, reduced manning requirements, and the ability to operate current and future naval aircraft from its deck. Among the new technologies being integrated in these ships is the Electromagnetic Aircraft Launch System (EMALS), which will enable the carrier's increased sortie generation rate and lower total ownership costs. EMALS is on track for an aircraft demonstration later this year and is on schedule to support delivery of CVN 78 in September 2015.

Strike Fighter Capacity: Joint Strike Fighter and F/A-18 E/F

Our Navy remains committed to the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program. The timely delivery of the F-35C carrier variant remains critical to our future carrier airwing strike fighter capacity. Our Navy has the necessary tactical aircraft capacity in the near term to support our nation's strategic demands; however, a January 2010 assessment forecasts a decrease in our carrier-based strike fighter capacity that peaks in 2014 and remains through 2019. We have a plan to address this capacity decrease that involves several management and investment measures.

Our force management measures are targeted at preserving the service life of our existing legacy strike fighter aircraft (F/A-18A-D). We will reduce the number of aircraft available in our squadrons during non-deployed phases to the minimum required. We will reduce our Unit Deployed squadrons (UDP) from twelve aircraft to ten aircraft per squadron to match the corresponding decrease in Marine Corps expeditionary squadrons. We are accelerating the transition of five legacy F/A-18C squadrons to F/A-18 E/F Super Hornets using available F/A-18E/F aircraft and will transition two additional legacy squadrons using Super Hornet attrition reserve aircraft. These measures make our legacy strike fighter aircraft available for High Flight Hour (HFH) inspections and our Service Life Extension Program, which together will extend their service life and manage to some extent the decrease in our carrier-based strike fighter capacity through 2018. These measures expend the service life of our Super Hornets earlier than programmed, so we are refining our depot level production processes to maximize throughput and return legacy strike fighter aircraft to the Fleet expeditiously. Our FY 2011 budget procures 22 additional F/A-18E/F aircraft.

Our investment measures are targeted at extending the service life of our F/A-18A-D aircraft and procuring Joint Strike Fighter (JSF). HFH inspections, which have been in place for two years, provide the ability to extend the service life of our legacy F/A-18A-D aircraft to 8,600 flight hours, while engineering analysis is underway to determine the SLEP requirements necessary to reach the service life extension goal of 10,000 flight hours. The HFH and SLEP programs increase our institutional risk by diverting investment and maintenance funds from other accounts, but they are necessary measures to address our strike fighter decrease while preserving our investment in JSF.

I remain committed to the JSF program because of the advanced sensor, precision strike, firepower, and stealth capabilities JSF will bring to our Fleet. While the overall schedule for JSF has slipped, causing us to reduce the overall rate of procurement, initial operating capability is still planned for 2014 and we have not reduced the total number of airframes we plan to buy. We are monitoring the JSF program closely and managing our existing strike fighter capacity to meet power projection demands until JSF is delivered. Procurement of an alternate engine for JSF

increases our risk in this program. The Navy does not have a requirement for an alternate engine, and its additional costs threaten our ability to fund currently planned aircraft procurement quantities, which would exacerbate our anticipated decrease in strike fighter capacity. Our FY 2011 budget request procures seven F-35C aircraft.

EA-18G Growler

The proliferation of technology has allowed state and non-state actors to use the electromagnetic spectrum with increasing sophistication. Airborne Electronic Attack (AEA) provides one of the most flexible offensive capabilities available to the joint warfighter and it remains in high demand in traditional, irregular, and hybrid conflicts. The Navy continues to provide extensive AEA support from our carriers afloat and from our expeditionary EA-6B Prowler squadrons deployed currently to Iraq and Afghanistan.

We are leveraging the mature and proven F/A-18E/F airframe production line to recapitalize our aging EA-6B aircraft with the EA-18G Growler. As directed in the QDR, we are planning to procure an additional 26 EA-18G Growler aircraft across the FYDP to increase joint force capacity to conduct expeditionary electronic attack. Our program of record will buy 114 total EA-18G aircraft, recapitalizing 10 Fleet EA-6B squadrons and four expeditionary squadrons. The program continues to deliver as scheduled. In September, our first EA-18G transition squadron, based at NAS Whidbey Island, reached Initial Operational Capability and it will deploy as an expeditionary squadron later this year. Our FY 2011 budget requests funding for 12 EA-18Gs.

P-3 Orion and P-8A Poseidon Multi-Mission Maritime Aircraft

Your continued support of the P-3 and P-8A force remains essential and is appreciated greatly. Our P-3 Orion roadmap focuses on sustainment and selected modernization until it is replaced by the P-8A Poseidon. These aircraft provide capabilities ideally suited for regional and littoral crises and conflict, and are our pre-eminent airborne capability against submarine threats. Our P-3s are in high demand today for the time-critical intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance they provide to the joint force on the ground in CENTCOM and for their direct contributions to our maritime domain awareness in key regions across the globe.

P-3 Zone 5 wing fatigue has resulted in the unplanned grounding of 49 aircraft between 2007 and 2009, with more expected. Mitigation measures include a combination of targeted Zone 5 modifications and outer wing replacements. As of December, we have returned 12 aircraft to service after completing Zone 5 modification and 32 aircraft are currently being repaired. As part of our sustainment program, we have included \$39.6 million in our FY 2011 budget request to conduct outer wing installations on nine of our P-3 aircraft. P-3 sustainment and modernization programs are critical to ensuring successful transition to the P-8A, while preserving essential maritime and overland battle space awareness.

The P-8A completed its first Navy test flight this past October and will resume integrated flight testing in March of this year. The P-8A will achieve initial operating capability and begin replacing our aging P-3 aircraft in 2013. Our FY 2011 budget request procures seven P-8A aircraft.

MH-60R/S Multi-Mission Helicopter

The MH-60R and MH-60S successfully completed their first deployment together this past summer with the USS JOHN C. STENNIS carrier strike group. The MH-60R multi-mission helicopter replaces the surface combatant-based SH-60B and carrier-based SH-60F with a newly manufactured airframe and enhanced mission systems. With these systems, the MH-60R provides focused surface warfare and anti-submarine warfare capabilities for our strike groups and individual ships. Our FY 2011 budget request procures 24 MH-60R helicopters. The MH-60S supports surface warfare, combat logistics, vertical replenishment, search and rescue, air ambulance, airborne mine counter-measures, and naval special warfare mission areas. Our FY 2011 budget request procures 18 MH-60S helicopters.

Surface Ship Programs**Littoral Combat Ship (LCS)**

LCS is a fast, agile, networked surface combatant that is optimized to support naval and joint force operations in the littorals and capable of supporting open-ocean operations. It will operate with tailored-mission packages to counter quiet diesel submarines, mines, and fast surface craft. The modular and open architecture design of the seaframe and mission modules provides the inherent flexibility to adapt or add capabilities beyond the current Anti-Submarine, Mine Countermeasures, and Surface Warfare missions. These ships will employ a combination of manned helicopters and unmanned aerial, surface, and undersea vehicles.

USS FREEDOM (LCS 1) has completed her post-delivery testing, trial, and shakedown periods and commenced her maiden deployment in February to Southern Command and Pacific Command. Her deployment two years ahead of schedule will allow us to incorporate operational lessons more quickly and effectively as we integrate these ships into our Fleet. USS INDEPENDENCE (LCS 2) completed builder's trials in October 2009 and acceptance trials in November 2009. We accepted delivery of INDEPENDENCE on 18 December 2009, and commissioned her 16 January 2010. In March 2009, fixed price contracts were awarded for USS FORT WORTH (LCS 3) and USS CORONADO (LCS 4) which are now under construction by Lockheed Martin and General Dynamics respectively.

I am impressed and satisfied with the capabilities of both LCS designs and am committed to procuring 55 of these ships. Affordability remains the key factor in acquiring LCS in the quantities we require. After careful review of the FY 2010 industry proposals, consideration of total program costs, and ongoing discussions with Congress, we made the decision to cancel for affordability reasons the Phase II requests for proposals for three FY 2010 LCS ships and adjust our acquisition strategy. In FY 2010, we will conduct a competition among the existing LCS industry participants to down-select to a single LCS design. The winner of the down-select will be awarded a block buy contract for up to 10 ships, to be procured from FY 2010 through FY 2014 at a rate of two ships per year, built in one shipyard. To sustain competition and increase capacity, the winner of the down-select will be required to deliver a Technical Data Package to the Navy to support competition for a second contract source. We plan to award up to five ships to a second source beginning in FY 2012 with one ship and continuing with an additional two ships per year through FY 2014. The winner of the down-select will provide combat systems equipment, up to 15 ship sets, for the ships built by the two contract sources: 10 sets for the 10

ships under contract with the winner of the down-select and up to five additional sets for the five ships being procured by the second contract source. The five additional sets will later be provided as government-furnished equipment to support the second source LCS contract. We intend to procure all future LCS ships within the FY 2010 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) revised cost cap. Our down-select strategy leverages competition to the maximum extent practical, provides for economic procurement quantities, improves learning curve and commonality opportunities, and ultimately provides for program stability. We recently issued the requests for proposals for this contract and expect industry bids in March of this year.

Consistent with our new strategy, our FY 2011 budget requests two LCS seaframes and an additional \$278 million to secure an LCS block buy, which is essential to lowering unit costs. I request your support as we acquire LCS in the most cost-effective manner and deliver its innovative capability in sufficient capacity to our Fleet.

Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD)

Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD) incorporates all aspects of air defense against ballistic, anti-ship, and overland cruise missiles. IAMD is vital to the protection of our force, and it is an integral part of our core capability to deter aggression through conventional means. The demand for sea-based ballistic missile defense (BMD) is increasing significantly. The Navy's mature and successfully demonstrated maritime BMD capability will play a primary role in the first phase of our nation's plan to provide for the missile defense of Europe. Aegis BMD counters short, medium, and some intermediate range ballistic missiles through active defense and is able to pass target information to other BMD systems, thereby expanding the BMD battlespace and support of homeland defense. Currently, 20 ships (four cruisers and 16 destroyers) have this capability and are being used to perform maritime BMD. All of the Arleigh Burke Class destroyers and nine of the Ticonderoga Class cruisers are planned to receive BMD capability through our modernization program.

DDG 51 Restart and Future Surface Combatant

To address the rapid proliferation of ballistic and anti-ship missiles and deep-water submarine threats, as well as increase the capacity of our multipurpose surface ships, we restarted production of our DDG 51 Arleigh Burke Class destroyers (Flight IIA series). These ships will be the first constructed with IAMD, providing much-needed Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) capacity to the Fleet, and they will incorporate the hull, mechanical, and electrical alterations associated with our mature DDG modernization program. We will spiral DDG 51 production to incorporate future integrated air and missile defense capabilities.

We are well underway with restarting DDG 51 production. We awarded advance procurement (AP) contracts for DDG 113 and 114, and expect to award an AP contract for DDG 115 in the coming months, to support the long lead items necessary for production of these ships. I thank Congress for supporting our FY 2010 budget, which funded construction of DDG 113. We anticipate a contract award for DDG 113 production this Spring. Our FY 2011 budget requests funding for the construction of DDG 114 and DDG 115 as part of our plan to build a total of eight DDG 51 ships through the FYDP.

The Navy, in consultation with the Office of the Secretary of Defense, conducted a Radar/Hull Study for future surface combatants that analyzed the total ship system solution necessary to meet our IAMD requirements while balancing affordability and capacity in our surface Fleet. The study concluded that Navy should integrate the Air and Missile Defense Radar program S Band radar (AMDR-S), SPY-3 (X Band radar), and Aegis Advanced Capability Build (ACB) combat system into a DDG 51 hull. While our Radar/Hull Study indicated that both DDG 51 and DDG 1000 were able to support our preferred radar systems, leveraging the DDG 51 hull was the most affordable option. Accordingly, our FY 2011 budget cancels the next generation cruiser program due to projected high cost and risk in technology and design of this ship. I request your support as we invest in spiraling the capabilities of our DDG 51 Class from our Flight IIA Arleigh Burke ships to Flight III ships, which will be our future IAMD-capable surface combatant. We will procure the first Flight III ship in FY 2016.

Modernization

As threats evolve, we must modernize our existing ships with updated capabilities that sustain our combat effectiveness and enable our ships to reach their expected service life, which in the case of our destroyers and cruisers, is more than three decades. Our destroyer and cruiser modernization program includes advances in standard missiles, integrated air and missile defense, open architecture, and essential hull, mechanical and electrical (HM&E) upgrades. Maintaining the stability of the cruiser and destroyer modernization program is critical to achieving relevant future Navy capability and capacity.

Our Navy plans to conduct DDG modernization in two six-month availabilities. The first availability is focused on HM&E modifications, while the second availability, conducted two years later, is focused on combat systems modernization. The program will commence in FY 2010 and focuses on the Flight I and II DDG 51 ships (hulls 51-78). All ships of the class will be modernized at midlife. Key tenets of the DDG modernization program include: an upgrade of the Aegis Weapons System to include an Open Architecture (OA) computing environment, an upgrade of the SPY radar signal processor, the addition of Ballistic Missile Defense capability, installation of the Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile (ESSM), an upgraded SQQ-89A(V)15 anti-submarine warfare system, integration with the SM-6 Missile, and improved air dominance with processing upgrades and Naval Integrated Fire Control-Counter Air capability.

The Cruiser Modernization Program will modernize all remaining cruisers (Baseline 2, 3, and 4). The first fully modernized cruiser, USS BUNKER HILL (CG 52), was completed in June 2009. The key aspects of the CG modernization program include: an upgrade to the Aegis weapons system to include an OA computing environment, installation of an SPQ-9B radar, addition of the Evolved Sea Sparrow Missile (ESSM), an upgrade to Close In Weapon System (CIWS) Block 1B, an upgraded SQQ-89A(V)15 anti-submarine warfare system, and improved air dominance with processing upgrades and Naval Integrated Fire Control-Counter Air capability. Six Baseline 4 cruisers will receive the Ballistic Missile Defense upgrade.

Our FY 2011 budget requests funding for the modernization of three cruisers and three destroyers.

DDG 1000

The DDG 1000 Zumwalt guided missile destroyer will be an optimally crewed, multi-mission surface combatant designed to fulfill long-range precision land attack requirements. In addition to providing offensive, distributed and precision fires in support of forces ashore, these ships will serve as test-beds for advanced technology, such as integrated power systems, dual band radars, and advanced survivability features, which can be incorporated into our other ship classes. The first DDG 1000 is under construction and approximately 20 percent complete. We recently notified Congress of a Nunn-McCurdy breach in this program as a result of our decision to reduce the number of DDG 1000s in the original program. DDG 1000 will be a three-ship class. It is scheduled to deliver in FY 2013 with an initial operating capability in FY 2015.

Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV)

Intra-theater lift is key to enabling the United States to rapidly project, maneuver, and sustain military forces in distant, overseas operations. The Joint High Speed Vessel (JHSV) program is an Army and Navy joint program that will deliver a high-speed, shallow draft surface ship capable of rapid transport of medium payloads of cargo and personnel within a theater to austere ports without reliance on port infrastructure for load/offload. In addition, the Navy JHSV will be capable of supporting extensive Security Force Assistance and Theater Security Cooperation operations, including the hosting of small craft for training. A JHSV Production Readiness Review was completed in October 2009 and the first vessel construction began this past December with an anticipated delivery to the Army in FY 2012. The second ship, a Navy vessel, is scheduled to be delivered in 2013. Our FY 2011 budget includes funds for the construction of Navy's third JHSV. Navy continues oversight of JHSV procurement for the five Army-funded vessels in this program. The Army assumes full responsibility for these five vessels following acquisition.

Submarine Programs**Virginia Class SSN**

The VIRGINIA Class submarine is a multi-mission submarine that dominates in the littorals and open oceans. Now in its 13th year of construction, the VIRGINIA program is demonstrating that this critical undersea capability can be delivered affordably and on time. Thanks to Congress, these ships will begin construction at a rate of two a year in 2011, with two ship deliveries per year beginning in 2017. The Navy continues to realize a return from investments in the VIRGINIA cost reduction program and construction process improvements through enhanced shipbuilder performance on each successive ship. These submarines are under budget and ahead of schedule, and their performance continues to exceed expectations with every ship delivered. Three of the five commissioned ships completed initial deployments prior to their Post Shakedown Availabilities, a first for the Navy. I am pleased with the accomplishments of the combined Navy-Industry team and look forward to even greater success as we ramp up production to two submarines next year.

SSGN

Our Navy has four guided missile submarines that provide high-volume strike and irregular warfare capabilities in support of operations and missions across the broad spectrum of conflict. SSGNs are performing well on deployment, and we are learning valuable lessons from each mission. Combatant Commanders value the long-range strike capability they provide and

we are investigating options to sustain this capability in the most operationally and cost effective manner, to include options for expanding the long-range strike capacity of the submarine fleet.

SSBN and OHIO Replacement

Our Navy supports the nation's nuclear deterrence capability with a credible and survivable fleet of 14 OHIO Class ballistic missile submarines (SSBN). Originally designed for a 30-year service life, this class will start retiring in 2027 after more than 42 years of service.

The United States needs a reliable and survivable sea-based strategic deterrent for the foreseeable future. To ensure there is no gap in this critical capability, our FY 2011 budget requests research and development funds for the OHIO Replacement to support the start of construction of the first ship in FY 2019. The OHIO Replacement will be a strategic, national asset with the endurance and stealth to enable our Navy to provide continuous, survivable strategic deterrence into the 2080s. Appropriate R&D investment is essential to design a reliable, survivable, and adaptable submarine capable of deterring all potential adversaries. We completed our Analysis of Alternatives study in 2009, and Milestone A is planned for April 2010. The OHIO Replacement program will leverage the many successes of the VIRGINIA SSN program to achieve acquisition and total ownership cost goals. The United States will realize significant program benefits as a result of our close partnership with the United Kingdom's VANGUARD SSBN replacement program, particularly in the design and construction of a common missile compartment. Our cooperation with the UK mitigates technical risk and shares design costs.

Amphibious Warfare Ships

Our amphibious warfare ships provide essential capabilities for the full range of military operations, including theater security cooperation, humanitarian assistance, conventional deterrence, and forcible entry as part of major combat operations. With the unique capability to move hundreds of personnel and substantial material through complementary surface and air capabilities, these ships are key to our ability to overcome geographic, political, and infrastructure impediments to access. The Commandant of the Marine Corps and I have determined that a minimum of 33 amphibious assault ships represents the limit of acceptable risk in meeting the 38-ship requirement for supporting a forcible entry operation conducted by an assault echelon of two Marine Expeditionary Brigades (MEB). Our 33-ship force would be comprised of 11 LHA/D amphibious assault ships and a mix of 11 LPD 17 amphibious transport dock ships and 11 LSD dock landing ships. At this capacity, we are accepting risk in the speed of arrival of the combat support elements of the MEB. The QDR and our 30-Year Shipbuilding Plan account for 29-31 amphibious warfare ships within the FYDP. We plan to procure the 11th LPD-17 in 2012, which will allow us to realize a 33-ship minimum amphibious force in about FY 2016. We continue to review options to achieve and sustain the minimum 33 amphibious ship assault echelon force.

LPD 17 Class Amphibious Warfare Ship

The LPD 17 Class amphibious warfare ships represent the Navy and Marine Corps commitment to an expeditionary Fleet capable of power projection, security force assistance, and theater security cooperation in diverse operating environments. These ships have a 40-year expected service life and will replace four classes of older ships: the LKA, LST, LSD 36, and

the LPD 4. Two LPD-17 Class ships have completed their initial deployments, and USS NEW YORK (LPD 21), forged with steel from the World Trade Center, delivered in November 2009. We continue to apply the lessons learned during construction and initial operation of the early ships to those under construction. Quality is improving with each ship delivered as we continue to work closely with the shipbuilder to address cost, schedule, and performance concerns.

LHA Replacement (LHA(R))

LHA(R) is the replacement for our aging TARAWA Class ships, which will reach the end of their already extended service life between 2011-2015. LHA(R) will provide us flexible, multi-mission amphibious capabilities by leveraging the LHD 8 design and increasing aviation capacity to better accommodate the Joint Strike Fighter, MV-22, and other aircraft that comprise the future Marine Corps Air Combat Element. We laid the keel of the lead ship, USS AMERICA (LHA 6), in April 2009 and our FY 2011 budget includes one LHA(R) which is split-funded in FY 2011 and FY2012.

Mobile Landing Platform (MLP) and Future Maritime Preposition Force (MPF(F))

The MPF(F) program was envisioned as a forward-deployed squadron of ships capable of at-sea assembly and rapid employment of forces in an area of interest during a crisis. Our requirement for amphibious and joint forcible entry operations was reevaluated during the QDR and, as a result, we have adjusted our approach to augment our three existing Maritime Prepositioning Squadrons (MPS) instead of developing an MPF(F) squadron. MPF(F) was optimized for high-end, forcible entry operations, while the augmented MPS will provide enhanced sea basing capabilities across a wide range of contingency operations. Each existing MPS will be augmented by one Large Medium-Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) cargo ship (transferred from the Army), a T-AKE combat logistics ship, and a new Mobile Landing Platform (MLP). The MLP will be based on existing designs for commercial ocean-going tankers and will meet most of the mission requirements envisioned for the original MLP design. The three augmented MPS reflect the QDR's emphasis on day-to-day deterrence and partner capacity building, while continuing to meet forcible entry needs. Our FY 2011 budget request procures one MLP.

Information Dominance Programs

Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS)

We are investing in unmanned aircraft to meet an increasing warfighter demand for Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR), and we are making technology investments to expand UAS operations to other mission areas. The Broad Area Maritime Surveillance (BAMS) UAS will enhance our situational awareness and shorten the sensor-to-shooter kill chain by providing persistent, multiple-sensor capabilities to Fleet and Joint Commanders. The Vertical Take-off and Landing Tactical Unmanned Air Vehicle (VTUAV) Fire Scout is on its first deployment aboard the USS McINERNEY (FFG 8). We are developing a medium endurance maritime-based UAS and a Small Tactical Unmanned Aerial System (STUAS) that will support a variety of ships, Naval Special Warfare and Navy Expeditionary Combat Command units, and Marine Corps elements.

The Navy Unmanned Combat Aircraft System demonstration (UCAS-D) is designed to prove carrier suitability of an autonomous, unmanned, low observable, carrier-based aircraft. This effort includes maturing technologies for aircraft carrier catapult launches and arrested landings, as well integration into carrier-controlled airspace. Initial flight tests to demonstrate carrier suitability are scheduled to start later this year and autonomous aerial refueling demonstrations are planned for 2013. We will leverage the lessons learned from operating the demonstrator in developing a low-observable unmanned carrier-launched airborne strike and surveillance system.

Mobile User Objective System (MUOS)

Our Maritime Strategy demands a flexible, interoperable, and secure global communications capability that can support the command and control requirements of highly mobile and distributed U.S. and coalition forces. Satellite communications give deployed forces a decisive military advantage and often offer the only communication means to support on-going operations. Rapidly expanding joint demand for more access at ever-higher data rates requires moving beyond our current legacy Ultra High Frequency (UHF) satellite capabilities. The Mobile User Objective System (MUOS) will satisfy those demands when initial operational capability is reached in FY 2012. I request your continued support of MUOS and the critical UHF satellite communication capability it will provide to the joint warfighter as the aging UHF Follow-On (UFO) constellation degrades.

Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN)

The Navy is continuing its transition from disparate independent computer networks to a single secure network environment. We are currently evolving our ashore network from the Navy Marine Corps Intranet (NMCI), the largest intranet in the world, to the Next Generation Enterprise Network (NGEN). NGEN Increment 1 is the follow-on to the existing NMCI contract, which expires at the end of FY 2010. NGEN will sustain the services currently provided by NMCI, while increasing government command and control of our network and enabling secure, reliable, and adaptable global information exchange. Future NGEN increments will expand on services currently provided by NMCI and support seamless transition between afloat and ashore environments. A continuity of services contract is expected to be awarded this spring and NGEN Initial Operating Capability is scheduled for the summer of 2012.

E-2D Advanced Hawkeye

The E-2D Advanced Hawkeye aircraft, which replaces the E-2C, will improve nearly every facet of tactical air operations and add overland and littoral surveillance to support theater Integrated Air and Missile Defense against air threats in high clutter, complex electro-magnetic and jamming environments. The airborne radar on the E-2D, with its improved surveillance capability, is a key pillar of the Navy Integrated Fire Control concept. The E-2D is scheduled to begin operational test and evaluation in 2012. The first Fleet squadron transition is planned for 2013, with deployment planned for October 2014. Our FY 2011 budget requests four E-2D Hawkeye aircraft.

Remain Ready to Fight Today

Our Navy continues to operate at a high tempo. We are filling new Combatant Commander requirements for ballistic missile defense, electronic attack, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR), combat support, combat service support, and maritime security force assistance, in addition to conducting ongoing deployments in support of our maritime and national strategies.

In CENTCOM alone, we have more than 9,000 Sailors at sea, including a U.S. Navy aircraft carrier and air wing dedicated to providing 24/7 air support to U.S. and coalition forces on the ground. Navy Riverine forces are on their sixth deployment to Iraq, conducting interdiction patrols and training their Iraqi counterparts. Our surface ships in the region are providing ballistic missile defense and conducting counter-terrorism, counter-piracy, maritime security, theater security cooperation, and security force assistance operations. On the ground in CENTCOM, we have more than 12,000 active and reserve Sailors supporting Navy, joint force, and coalition operations. Navy Commanders lead six of the 12 U.S.-led Provincial Reconstruction Teams in Afghanistan. We have doubled our construction battalions (SEABEES) in Afghanistan, increasing our capacity to build forward bases for U.S. forces and improve critical infrastructure in that country. Our Naval Special Warfare Teams continue to be engaged heavily in direct combat operations and our Explosive Ordnance Disposal teams continue to conduct life-saving counter-Improvised Explosive Device operations on a daily basis. As we shift our effort from Iraq to Afghanistan, demand for Navy individual augmentees (IAs) has grown. We are providing IAs to support the increase of U.S. forces in Afghanistan while our IAs in Iraq remain at current levels to support the withdrawal of U.S. combat troops, maintain detention facilities and critical infrastructure, and assist coalition efforts until they can be turned over to Iraqi forces. During my recent trip to CENTCOM, I met with many of our dedicated Navy men and women supporting these efforts and I could not be more proud of their contributions. Their expert skill, ingenuity, competence, and drive are impressive and unmatched.

Our high tempo will likely continue as combat forces draw down in Iraq and Afghanistan. Navy enabling forces will remain in CENTCOM to provide protection, ISR, and logistics support to our troops and partner forces in the region, while we will continue to maintain a forward-deployed presence of about 100 ships around the world to prevent conflict, increase interoperability with our allies, enhance the maritime security and capacity of our traditional and emerging partners, and respond to crises. Global demand for Navy forces remains high and continues to rise because of the unequalled and unique ability of our naval forces to overcome diplomatic, geographic, and military impediments to access while bringing the persistence, flexibility, and agility to conduct operations from the sea.

Reset in stride is how our Navy prepares our Fleet to deploy again. Lifecycle maintenance and training between deployments is essential to our reset and to the ability of our ships and aircraft to reach their expected service lives. Although we are on pace to grow our Fleet for the next 10 years, our Fleet reduced in size over the past decade. As a result, while we continue to maintain the same number of ships at sea assigned to Combatant Commanders, we have a historically low number of ships available for at-sea training, exercises, and surge

operations. Our FY 2011 budget request balances the need to meet increasing operational requirements, sustain our Sailors' proficiency, and conduct the maintenance required to ensure our ships and aircraft reach their full service lives. Highlights follow of initiatives that ensure our Navy remains ready to fight today.

Depot Level Maintenance

Our ships and aircraft are capital assets that operate in challenging physical and security environments. Keeping these assets in acceptable operating condition is vital to their ability to accomplish assigned missions and to reach their expected service lives. Timely depot level maintenance, performed in a cycle determined by an engineered assessment of expected material durability and scoped by actual physical condition, will preserve our existing force structure and ensure it can meet assigned tasking. Continued investment in depot level maintenance is essential to our efforts to achieve and sustain the force structure required to implement the Maritime Strategy.

Last year, I established the Surface Ship Life Cycle Management (SSLCM) Activity to address deficiencies in our ship class maintenance plans that could prevent our ships from reaching their full service life. SSLCM has established an engineered approach to surface ship maintenance that optimizes existing maintenance availability work packages and better tracks ship material condition through robust inspections and corrosion control tasks. We accelerated our review of the requirements for certain ship classes, significantly improving the accuracy of our surface ship maintenance requirements in FY 2011 over prior years. We are committed to a full review of all surface ship class maintenance plans, which will take several years. The value of investing in an engineered approach to maintenance is evident in our submarine force, where we have successfully extended the time between scheduled availabilities based on demonstrated material conditions and verification of engineering analysis. Because we have invested in this engineering and planning effort, we have been able to safely recover additional operational availability and reduce the overall depot level maintenance requirement for our submarines. This significant step has provided some of the resources needed to make additional investments in surface ship maintenance.

Our combined FY 2011 budget funds 99 percent of the projected depot ship maintenance requirements necessary to sustain our Navy's global presence. Our budget funds aviation depot maintenance to provide 100 percent of the airframes for deployed squadrons and 96 percent of the non-deployed airframes. I request that you fully support our baseline and contingency funding requests for operations and maintenance to ensure the effectiveness of our force, safety of our Sailors, and longevity of our ships and aircraft.

Shore Readiness

Our shore infrastructure is a fundamental enabler of our operational and combat readiness and is essential to the quality of life and quality of work for our Sailors, Navy civilians, and their families. As I described last year, rising manpower costs and growing operational demands on our aging Fleet have led our Navy to take risk in shore readiness. This risk increases our maintenance, sustainment, restoration, and modernization requirements and continues our reliance on old and less efficient energy systems. These factors increase the cost of ownership of our shore infrastructure and outpace our efforts to reduce costs through facilities improvements

and energy upgrades. At our current investment levels, our future shore readiness, particularly the recapitalization of our facilities infrastructure, is at risk.

To manage our risk in shore infrastructure, our FY 2011 budget request prioritizes funding for our most critical needs, including Navy and Joint mission readiness, nuclear weapons security and safety, and improving our bachelor quarters through sustained funding for our Homeport Ashore initiative. To guide investment in other areas ashore, we continue to pursue our capabilities-based Shore Investment Strategy, which targets our investment in shore infrastructure to where it will produce the highest return on investment and have the greatest impact on achieving our strategic and operational objectives, such as in areas that enable critical warfighting capabilities, improve quality of life, and fulfill Joint requirements.

We have made essential progress and improvements in nuclear weapons security, child care facilities, and bachelor's quarters. Thank you for funding all our requested military construction projects in 2010, as well as 19 additional projects and our Reserve program. Your support allowed us to address ship, aircraft, systems, infrastructure, and training requirements, while enhancing the quality of life and quality of service for our Sailors and their families. Your similar support and assistance through the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 was also very helpful. As you requested, we identified Military Construction projects for Child Development Centers and barracks and prioritized them according to operational need and the ability to obligate funds quickly. We selected infrastructure and energy projects based on mission requirements, quality of life impact, environmental planning status, and our ability to execute quickly. Our aggressive execution schedule is on track; we have awarded all but one of our 85 initial projects and construction outlays are ramping up swiftly.

Training Readiness

Our Fleet Synthetic Training (FST) program provides realistic operational training with seamless integration of geographically dispersed Navy, Joint, Interagency and Coalition forces. Using virtual and constructive training environments has allowed us to reduce our energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions while providing the level of sophistication necessary to prepare our Sailors for operational and tactical mission proficiency. We continue to evolve FST to provide our Sailors with exposure to a multitude of warfare areas. Last year, we conducted our first BMD Fleet Synthetic Training event, proving the viability and effectiveness of integrated Navy, Joint and partner-nation BMD training.

The proliferation of advanced, stealthy, nuclear and non-nuclear submarines continues to challenge our Navy's ability to guarantee the access and safety of joint forces. Effective Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW) training with active sonar systems is vital to meeting potential threats. The Navy remains a world leader in marine mammal research and we will continue our robust investment in this research in FY 2011 and beyond. Through such efforts, and in full consultation and cooperation with other federal agencies, Navy has developed effective measures that protect marine mammals and the ocean environment from adverse impacts of mid-frequency active (MFA) sonar while not impeding vital Navy training. We continue to work closely with our interagency partners to further refine our protective measures as scientific knowledge evolves. It is vitally important that any such measures ensure the continued flexibility necessary to respond to future, potentially unforeseen national security requirements.

Over the last year, we completed environmental planning for seven existing and proposed at-sea training and combat certification areas. We expect to complete planning for another six areas by the end of 2010 as we continue to balance our responsibility to prepare naval forces for deployment and combat operations with our responsibility to be good stewards of the marine environment.

Conducting night and day field carrier landing practice (FCLP) prior to at-sea carrier qualifications is a critical training requirement for our fixed-wing carrier-based pilots, who must develop and maintain proficiency in the fundamentals necessary to conduct safe carrier-based flight operations. We continue to seek additional airfield capacity in the form of an outlying landing field (OLF) that will enhance our ability to support FCLP training for fixed-wing, carrier pilots operating from Naval Air Station Oceana and Naval Station Norfolk. The additional OLF will allow Navy to meet training requirements and overcome challenges related to capacity limits, urban encroachment, and impacts from adverse weather conditions at existing East Coast facilities. In August 2009, the Navy announced that the release of the draft environmental impact statement (EIS) for construction and operation of an OLF would be delayed. This delay was necessary to ensure Joint Strike Fighter noise analysis is included in the OLF draft EIS. The Navy is committed to developing, with local, state, and federal leaders, a plan to ensure the OLF provides positive benefits to local communities while addressing Navy training shortfalls.

Energy and Climate

Energy reform is a strategic imperative. The Secretary of the Navy and I are committed to changing the way we do business to realize an energy-secure future. In alignment with the Secretary of the Navy's five goals, our priorities are to advance energy security by improving combat capability, assuring mobility, "lightening the load", and greening our footprint. We will achieve these goals through energy efficiency improvements, consumption reduction initiatives, and adoption of alternative energy and fuels. Reducing our reliance on fossil fuels will improve our combat capability by increasing time on station, reducing time spent alongside replenishment ships, and producing more effective and powerful future weapons. Most of our projects remain in the demonstration phase; however, we are making good progress in the form of hybrid-electric drive, delivered last year on the USS MAKIN ISLAND (LHD 8), bio-fuel engines, advanced hull and propeller coatings, solid state lighting, and policies that encourage Sailors to reduce their consumption through simple changes in behavior.

Thanks to your support, the American Reinvestment and Recovery Act (ARRA) funded Navy energy conservation and renewable energy investment in 11 tactical and 42 shore-based projects totaling \$455 million. Tactical projects included alternative fuel, drive, and power systems, while ashore projects included alternative energy (wind, solar and geothermal) investments in ten states and the installation of advance metering infrastructure in three regions. Our FY 2011 budget continues to invest in tactical and ashore energy initiatives, requesting \$128 million for these efforts.

In our Maritime Strategy we addressed maritime operations in an era of climate change, especially in the ice diminished Arctic. In May 2009, I established the Navy's Task Force on Climate Change (TFCC) to develop policy, investment, and force-structure recommendations

regarding climate change in the Arctic and globally over the long-term. Our focus will be to ensure Navy readiness and capability in a changing global environment.

Second East Coast Carrier-capable Port

Hampton Roads is the only nuclear carrier capable port on the East Coast. A catastrophic event in the Hampton Roads Area affecting port facilities, shipping channels, supporting maintenance or training infrastructure, or the surrounding community has the potential to severely limit East Coast Carrier operations, even if the ships themselves are not affected. Consistent with today's dispersal of West Coast aircraft carriers between California and Washington State, the QDR direction to make Naval Station Mayport a nuclear carrier-capable homeport addresses the Navy's requirement for a capable facility to maintain aircraft carriers in the event that a natural or manmade disaster makes the Hampton Roads area inaccessible. While there is an upfront cost to upgrade Naval Station Mayport to support our nuclear aircraft carriers, Mayport has been a carrier homeport since 1952 and is the most cost-effective means to achieve strategic dispersal on the East Coast. The national security benefits of this additional homeport far outweigh those costs.

United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

The Law of the Sea Convention codifies navigation and overflight rights and high seas freedoms that are essential for the global mobility of our armed forces. It directly supports our national security interests. Not being a party to this Convention constrains efforts to develop enduring maritime partnerships, inhibits efforts to expand the Proliferation Security Initiative, and elevates the level of risk for our Sailors as they undertake operations to preserve navigation rights and freedoms, particularly in areas such as the Strait of Hormuz and Arabian Gulf, and the East and South China Seas. By becoming a party to the Convention, the U.S. will be able to expand its sovereign rights to the increasingly accessible outer continental shelf areas of the resource rich environment of the Arctic, as well as in other locations where technological advances are opening up previously unobtainable resources. Accession to the Law of the Sea Convention remains a priority for our Navy.

Develop and Support our Sailors, Navy Civilians and their Families

Our Sailors, Navy civilians, and their families underpin our Maritime Strategy and are the foundation of our nation's global force for good. We have great ships, aircraft, weapons, and systems, but it is our skilled and innovative Sailors who turn these ships, aircraft, and technologies into capabilities that can prevent conflict and win wars. In January 2010, we released the Navy Total Force Vision for the 21st Century to guide our efforts to attract, recruit, develop, assign, and retain a highly-skilled workforce and reaffirm our commitment to supporting our uniformed and civilian people wherever they serve and live.

We have transitioned from reducing end strength to stabilizing our force through a series of performance-based measures. Our stabilization efforts remain focused on maintaining a balanced force in terms of seniority, experience, and skills while supporting growth in high-demand areas such as cyber and special operations. We recognize the importance of retaining the talent and experience of our Sailors after they complete their active duty obligation so we are actively removing barriers associated with the transition between active and reserve careers to allow for a continuum of service over a lifetime. Our FY 2011 budget requests authorization and

funding for 328,700 active end strength and 65,500 reserve end strength. We continue to request OCO funding for our individual augmentees that are performing non-core Navy missions in support of contingency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. OCO funding remains critical to our ability to meet these missions without adversely impacting Fleet readiness or Sailor dwell time.

We continue to provide support to our Sailors and their families, including those who are wounded, ill and injured, through expanded Fleet and Family Support services, Navy Safe Harbor, and our Operational Stress Control program. We are addressing aggressively the recent rise in suicide rates by implementing new training and outreach programs for Fleet commanders, Sailors, and Navy families to increase suicide awareness and prevention. We are focused on reducing sexual assaults in our Navy through our new Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office and initiatives that emphasize our intolerance for sexual assault and related behavior in our Navy. We remain committed to helping our Sailors balance work and family commitments through initiatives such as 12-month operational deferments for new mothers (the most comprehensive policy of all military services), 21 days of administrative leave for adoptive parents, 10 days of paternity leave, a Career Intermission pilot program, and flexible work options. I continue to emphasize diversity outreach and mentorship to ensure we attract, leverage, and retain the diverse talent of our nation. Diversity among U.S. Naval Academy and Navy Reserve Officer Training Corps (NROTC) applicants and graduates continues to grow each year. Through our Naval War College and Naval Postgraduate School, we are providing Joint Professional Military Education and world-class higher education and training to our Sailors. We continue to build our Foreign Area Officer program to strengthen existing and emerging international partnerships.

Our FY 2011 budget request represents a balanced approach to supporting our Sailors and their families, sustaining the high tempo of current operations, and preserving Fleet and family readiness. I request the continued support of Congress for our FY 2011 manpower and personnel initiatives.

Recruiting and Retention

Our Navy has attracted, recruited and retained a highly-skilled workforce over the past several years, and we expect this success to continue into FY 2011. FY 2009 marked the second consecutive year Navy achieved its aggregate officer and enlisted recruiting goals in both the active and reserve components. At the forefront of this effort is our highly trained and professional recruiting force, which has postured us to respond to changing trends. We continue to attract the highest quality enlisted recruits in our history. We are exceeding DoD and Navy standards for the percentage of non-prior service enlisted recruits who have earned a high school diploma and whose test scores are in the upper mental group category. We met the Navy standard of 95 percent of recruits with a high school diploma in FY 2009 and are currently at 96 percent this fiscal year. We exceeded the Navy standard of 70 percent of recruits in the upper mental group category in FY 2009 (77 percent tested into this group) and we are currently at 78 percent this fiscal year.

Navy will remain competitive in the employment market through the disciplined use of monetary and non-monetary incentives. Using a targeted approach, we will continue our recruiting and retention initiatives to attract and retain our best Sailors, especially those within

high-demand, critical skill areas that remain insulated from economic conditions. Judicious use of special and incentive pays remains essential to recruiting and retaining these professionals in the current economic environment, and will increase in importance as the economic recovery continues. Our goal remains to maintain a balanced force, in which seniority, experience, and skills are matched to requirements.

Diversity

Our Navy draws its strength and innovation from the diversity of our nation. We continue to aggressively expand our diversity. We are committed to implementing policies and programs that foster a Navy Total Force composition that reflects America's diversity. We have increased diverse accessions through targeted recruiting in diverse markets, developed relationships with key influencers in the top diverse metropolitan markets, and are aligning all Navy assets and related organizations to maximize our connection with educators, business leaders and government officials to increase our influencer base. Recruiting and retaining a diverse workforce, reflective of the nation's demographics at all levels of the chain of command, is a strategic imperative, critical to mission accomplishment, and remains focus area for leaders throughout our Navy.

We continue to expand our relationships with key influencers and science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM)-based affinity groups to inform our nation's youth about the unique opportunities available in our Navy. To increase our accessibility to diverse markets, we established NROTC units at Arizona State University and Tuskegee University. Tuskegee University accepted students in the fall of 2009, and ASU will accept students in the fall of 2010. Our diversity outreach efforts have contributed to our 2013 U.S. Naval Academy and NROTC classes being the most diverse student bodies in our history. In the years ahead, we will continue to focus our efforts on retaining this talent by building and sustaining a continuum of mentorship approach that reaches out and engages Sailors throughout their career. This approach includes social networking, strong relationships with affinity groups, and various programs offered by our Sailors' immediate commands and associated leadership in addition to their respective enterprises and communities.

Women on Submarines

The Secretary of the Navy and I are in the process of changing the Navy policy that restricts women from serving aboard our submarines. This move will enable our Navy and, specifically, our submarine force to leverage the tremendous talent and potential of our female officers and enlisted personnel. Initial integration will include female officers assigned to ballistic missile (SSBN) and guided missile (SSGN) submarines, since officer accommodations on these submarines have more available space and appear to require less modification. The plan also integrates female supply corps officers onto SSBNs and SSGNs at the department head level. We are planning the first female submarine officer candidate accessions into the standard nuclear training and submarine training pipelines this year, making it possible to assign the first women to submarines as early as FY 2012. Integration of enlisted females on SSBNs and SSGNs and integration of officer and enlisted female personnel on attack submarines (SSNs) will occur later, once the extent of necessary modifications is determined. This initiative has my personal attention and I will continue to keep you informed as we integrate these highly motivated and capable officers into our submarine force.

Sailor and Family Continuum of Care

We remain committed to providing our Sailors and their families a comprehensive continuum of care that addresses all aspects of medical, physical, psychological, and family readiness. Our FY 2011 budget request expands this network of services and caregivers to ensure that all Sailors and their families receive the highest quality healthcare available. Navy Safe Harbor, Navy's Operational Stress Control Program, Reserve Psychological Health Outreach Program, Warrior Transition Program, and Returning Warrior Workshop are critical elements of this continuum.

Navy Safe Harbor continues to provide non-medical support for all seriously wounded, ill, and injured Sailors, Coast Guardsmen, and their families through a network of Recovery Care Coordinators and non-medical Care Managers at 16 locations across the country. Over the past year, Safe Harbor's enrollment has grown from 387 to 542. Over 84,000 Sailors have participated in Operational Stress Control (OSC) training, which is providing a comprehensive approach designed to actively promote the psychological health of Sailors and their families throughout their careers while reducing the traditional stigma associated with seeking help. The Warrior Transition Program (WTP) and Returning Warrior Workshops (RWW) are essential to post-deployment reintegration efforts. WTP, established in Kuwait and expanded via Mobile Care Teams to Iraq and Afghanistan, provides a place and time for individual augmentees to decompress and transition from life in a war zone to resumption of life at home. The RWW identifies problems, encourages Sailors to share their experiences, refers family members to essential resources, and facilitates the demobilization process.

Stress on the Force

As we continue to operate at a high operational tempo to meet our nation's demands in the Middle East and around the world, the tone of the force remains positive. We continue to monitor the health of the force by tracking statistics on personal and family-related indicators such as stress, financial well-being and command climate, as well as Sailor and family satisfaction with the Navy. Recent results indicate that Sailors and their families remain satisfied with command morale, the quality of leadership, education benefits, health care, and compensation.

Suicide affects individuals, commands and families. We continue efforts at suicide prevention through a multi-faceted approach of communication, training, and command support designed to foster resilience and promote psychological health among Sailors. Navy's calendar year 2009 suicide rate of 13.8 per 100,000 Sailors represents an increase from the previous year rate of 11.6 per 100,000 Sailors. Although this is below the national rate of 19.0 per 100,000 individuals for the same age and gender demographic, any loss of life as a result of suicide is unacceptable. We remain committed to creating an environment in which stress and other suicide-related factors are more openly recognized, discussed, and addressed. We continue to develop and enhance programs designed to mitigate suicide risk factors and improve the resilience of the force. These programs focus on substance abuse prevention, financial management, positive family relationships, physical readiness, and family support, with the goal of reducing individual stress. We continue to work towards a greater understanding of the issues

surrounding suicide to ensure that our policies, training, interventions, and communication efforts are meeting their intended objectives.

Sexual assault is incompatible with our Navy core values, high standards of professionalism, and personal discipline. We have reorganized our efforts in this critical area under the Navy Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) program, which takes a multi-faceted approach to raise awareness of effective prevention methods, victim response and offender accountability. Recent program reviews undertaken by the Government Accountability Office, the Defense Task Force on Sexual Assault in the Military Services, and the Navy Inspector General will help us to identify program gaps and refine our program so we can continue to promote a culture that is intolerant of sexual assault.

Learning and Development

Education and training are strategic investments that give us an asymmetric advantage over our adversaries. To develop the highly-skilled, combat-ready force necessary to meet the demands of the Maritime Strategy and the Joint Force, we have 15 learning centers around the country providing top-notch training to our Sailors and Navy civilians. We continue to leverage civilian credentialing programs to bolster the professional qualifications of Sailors in all ratings and increase Sailor equity in their own professional advancement. We are balancing existing education and training requirements with growth in important mission areas such as cyber warfare, missile defense, and anti-submarine warfare. Cultural, historical, and linguistic expertise remain essential to the Navy's global mission, and our budget request supports expansion of the Language, Regional Expertise, and Culture (LREC) program for NROTC midshipmen, as well as implementation of the AF-PAK Hands Program. We recognize the importance of providing our people meaningful and relevant education, particularly Joint Professional Military Education (JPME), which develops leaders who are strategically-minded, capable of critical thinking, and adept in naval and joint warfare. Our resident courses at Naval War College, non-resident courses at Naval Postgraduate School and Fleet Seminar program, and distance offerings provide ample opportunity for achievement of this vital education. I appreciate the support of Congress in the recent post-9/11 GI Bill. We have led DoD in implementing this vital education benefit and continue to carefully balance our voluntary education investments to further develop our force.

Conclusion

Our Sailors are performing brilliantly, providing incredible service in the maritime, land, air, space, and cyberspace domains around the world today. I am optimistic about our future and the global leadership opportunities that our Navy provides for our nation. Our FY 2011 budget request continues the progress we started in FY 2010 to increase Fleet capacity, maintain our warfighting readiness, and develop and enhance the Navy Total Force. I ask for your strong support of our FY 2011 budget request and my identified priorities. Thank you for your unwavering commitment to our Sailors, Navy civilians, and their families, and for all you do to make our United States Navy an effective and enduring global force for good.

Not public until released by the
House Armed Services Committee

STATEMENT OF

GENERAL JAMES T. CONWAY
COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS

BEFORE

THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE

ON

THE 2010 POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

FEBRUARY 24, 2010

Not public until released by the
House Armed Services Committee

Chairman Skelton, Congressman McKeon, Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide a written report for the record on the current posture of the Marine Corps. My pledge, as always, is to provide you with a candid and honest assessment. On behalf of all Marines, their families, and our civilian employees, I want to thank you for your concern and continued support.

This brief statement contains a summary of our near-term focus and enduring priorities, an update on your Marine Corps today, a discussion of the challenges we see ahead, and our vision of the future. In addition to any testimony you wish to receive from me, I have directed the Deputy Commandants of the Marine Corps to meet with you as individuals and members of your respective subcommittees, and to provide you any other information you require. Our liaison officers will also deliver copies of *2010 U.S. Marine Corps Concepts and Programs* to the offices of each member of the committee. This almanac and reference book contains detailed descriptions of all our major programs and initiatives. We hope you will find it useful.

I. YOUR MARINE CORPS

We believe that Americans expect their Marines to be ready to respond when our country is threatened; to arrive on the scene on short notice anywhere in the world via the amphibious ships of the United States Navy, as was necessary when a disastrous earthquake recently struck Haiti; and to fight and win our Nation's battles. The public invests greatly in the Marine Corps. In turn, our commitment is to uphold their special trust and confidence and provide them the best return on their investment.

Characteristics. Your Marine Corps is a young force that provides great value to the Nation.

- The average age of a Marine is 25 years old.
- Almost half of the enlisted force — 84,830 Marines — is between the ranks of private and lance corporal (pay grades E1 - E3).¹
- Almost 70 percent of your Marines are on their first enlistment, and some 30,000 have been in uniform for less than a year.²
- The ratio of officers to enlisted Marines is 1:9 — the lowest of all the services.³
- More than 136,000 Marines (67 percent) are in deploying units — what we call the Operating Forces. Nearly 30,000 Marines are forward deployed, forward based, or on training exercises around the world.
- For 6.5 percent⁴ of the baseline 2010 Defense budget, the Marine Corps provides:
 - 17 percent of the Nation's active ground combat maneuver units
 - 12 percent of the Nation's fixed wing tactical aircraft

1. As of 23 December 2009.

2. As of 1 December 2009, the percentage of Marines on their first enlistment was 68.6 percent, and the number of Marines with less than one year on active duty is 29,032.

3. Authorized endstrength of 202,000 = 21,000 officers + 181,000 enlisted Marines = 1:9.

4. 6.5 percent of DoD budget represents FY10 USMC Green dollars and Direct Blue (Navy) dollars.

- 19 percent of the Nation's attack helicopters

Expeditionary. The Marine Corps is the Nation's naval expeditionary, combined-arms force-in-readiness. To Marines, *expeditionary* connotes *fast*, *austere*, and *lethal*.

- Expeditionary means rapid deployment by air or sea to respond to crises of temporary duration. For example, within 24 hours of the speech by the President of the United States in December announcing the current strategy in Afghanistan, the lead elements of 1st Battalion, 6th Marines from Camp Lejeune, North Carolina were en route to Afghanistan.
- Expeditionary means being efficient and effective while operating in an austere environment — a task-organized force that is manned and equipped no larger or heavier than necessary to accomplish the mission.
- Expeditionary means being prepared for decisive action — to be lethal, if necessary — but also possessing the lesser-included capabilities for security cooperation, humanitarian assistance, or disaster relief.
- In summary, the term expeditionary to Marines goes to the very heart of our service culture, core values, and warrior ethos. Service as part of an expeditionary force means embracing a Spartan way of life and regular deployments on foreign soil in furtherance of our Nation's interests.⁵

Organization. The Marine Corps is the only general-purpose force in the Department of Defense that is trained and equipped as the Nation's first responders.

- We organize in Marine Air-Ground Task Forces (MAGTFs). Under a single command element, the MAGTF integrates three major subordinate elements: (1) Ground Combat Element, (2) Aviation Combat Element, (3) Logistics Combat Element. Each element of the MAGTF is complementary, and Marine Corps forces are most effective and best employed as MAGTFs within the joint or multinational command structure.
- MAGTFs are adaptive, general-purpose rapid response forces. They are multi-capable, transitioning seamlessly from fighting conventional and hybrid threats to promoting stability and mitigating conditions that lead to conflict. For example, in 2003, after completing a conventional, 350-mile attack over land from Kuwait to Baghdad, I Marine Expeditionary Force — a 60,000-Marine-plus MAGTF — was able to transition quickly to security and stability operations.

Near-Term Focus. We understand the economic challenges facing our country and the hard decisions Congress must make. We thank you for your unwavering support. This report discusses the near-term focus of the Marine Corps:

- The current fight in Afghanistan and the responsible drawdown in Iraq
- Readiness and reset of equipment

5. This is consistent with the official Defense Department definition of an expeditionary force: "An armed force organized to accomplish a specific objective in a foreign country." *Joint Pub 1-02 Department of Defense Dictionary of Military and Associated Terms* (Washington, D.C.: 2001, as amended through 31 August 2005), p. 193.

- Modernization of the MAGTF
- Preparing for the next contingency and the uncertainties of the future

Enduring Priorities. Through the future years defense plan and beyond, we are focused on:

- Providing the Nation a naval expeditionary force fully prepared for employment as a MAGTF across the spectrum of operations
- Remaining the most ready when our Nation is least ready
- Providing for our Marines and their families

II. IRAQ AND AFGHANISTAN

Operation IRAQI FREEDOM. Since testimony before your committee last year, the Marine Corps has transferred authority for Anbar Province to the U.S. Army and is near completion of a responsible drawdown from Iraq.

- From 2003-2009, our force levels in Iraq averaged 25,000 Marines.
- As of February 19, 2010, there were 159 Marines in Iraq. By spring of this year, our mission in Iraq will be complete and your Marines will redeploy.

Operation ENDURING FREEDOM. In Afghanistan, the mission has expanded.

- As of September 23, 2009, there were more Marines in Afghanistan than in Iraq.
- By March 2010, there will be more than 18,500 Marines in Afghanistan, and by mid-April, that number will grow to a robust MAGTF of 19,400 personnel with equipment, and will be commanded by a Marine two-star general.
- Your Marines have already had success and have made a difference in some of the toughest regions of Afghanistan, primarily Helmand Province in the South — formerly a Taliban stronghold, and the source of the highest volume of opium production in the world. However, more work remains to be done.

Summary

- Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have required the Marine Corps to fight as a second land army. Although we have been successful in our assigned missions in Iraq and Afghanistan, that success has come at the price of degraded readiness for our designed missions. The Marine Corps will always do whatever the Nation requires. But, as Congress has authorized and resourced, the Marine Corps is trained, organized, and equipped for our primary mission as a force in readiness.
- The harsh environments and tempo of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan through eight years of combat have accelerated wear and tear on our equipment. The enemy's weapon of choice

— the improvised explosive device or IED — has forced us to increase the weight of our personal protective equipment and the armor on our vehicles.

- The distributed nature of operations has shown us that our legacy tables of equipment were inadequate. The required type and number of ground vehicles, radios, and other major end items of equipment have significantly increased. In our infantry battalions, for example, the number of tactical vehicles has almost doubled while the number of radio sets has grown sevenfold. Our preliminary estimates indicate that the cost of restructuring the Marine Corps' tables of equipment would be \$5 billion over FY 2012 through FY 2015.
- The amount of equipment that has been damaged, destroyed, or has reached the end of service life from accelerated use has increased, and the cost associated with fixing or replacing this equipment has increased significantly.
- Based upon the Marine Corps current analysis, our estimated reset cost is \$8 billion. The \$8 billion consists of \$3 billion requested in the FY11 OCO and an additional long term reset liability of \$5 billion upon termination of the conflict.
- Equipment on hand at home station to support training has been seriously degraded. Particularly worrisome is our capacity to respond to other contingencies.
- We are institutionalizing the lessons learned in Iraq and Afghanistan in training, education, organization, doctrine, and capability development. One of the ways we are doing this is through the *Marine Corps Center for Lessons Learned*.
- The current operating environment in Iraq and Afghanistan has led to an exponentially increased need for intelligence collection assets down to lower levels of command. The Marine Corps Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance Enterprise (MCISR-E) provides support to the MAGTF in this operating environment by organizing all of the intelligence disciplines, sensors, and equipment and communication architecture into a single capability that is integrated and networked across all echelons.

III. READINESS

1. Personnel Readiness

Our people — the brave men and women who wear our uniform and the spouses, children, and the parents who support them — are our most valuable resource. In 2009, your Corps lost 65 Marines to enemy action in combat. We also lost 52 Marines who died by suicide — this serious issue, which will be discussed later in this report, has my personal attention.

Endstrength. Current authorized endstrength is 202,100 Marines in the active component and 39,600 Marines in the Selected Reserve.

- During fiscal year 2007, the Marine Corps requested and received authorization to grow 27,000 additional personnel by the end of fiscal year 2011.
- We completed our growth during fiscal year 2009 — two years ahead of schedule. We attribute this to four factors: quality recruiting, exceptional retention, reduced personnel

attrition, and a great young generation of Americans who want to serve their country during wartime.

- With this personnel increase, we will improve training, upgrade readiness, and enhance the quality of life for all personnel and their families. The goal is to build the equivalent capacity of three Marine Expeditionary Forces — the largest MAGTF and principal Marine Corps warfighting organization.
- We are continuing to shape the Marine Corps with the right mix of units, grades, and occupational specialties.

Quality

- **Recruiting.** In fiscal year 2009, we exceeded goals in numbers and standards for the active component and the Selected Reserve. The active component accessed 31,413 personnel, and the Selected Reserve accessed 9,627 personnel. In fiscal year 2010, our goal is to access 27,500 enlisted personnel in the active component and commission 1,800 new officers.
- **Enlistment Standards.** One of the Department of Defense standards for new recruits is that at least 90 percent will possess a high school diploma. The Marine Corps has chosen to maintain a higher standard; our goal is a high school graduation rate of 95 percent. In fiscal year 2009, for our combined active and reserve components, the high school graduation rate of our recruits exceeded 98 percent.
- **First Term Reenlistments.** In fiscal year 2009, 8,011 first-term Marines reenlisted, meeting 109.2 percent of our goal. This represented a retention rate of 33.7 percent, exceeding our traditional retention rate of 24 percent. In the first quarter of fiscal year 2010, 5,194 first-term Marines have already reenlisted — 77 percent of the goal for the entire year.
- **Subsequent Term Reenlistments.** In fiscal year 2009, 7,985 Marines who had completed at least two enlistment contracts chose to reenlist again. This number represented 107 percent of our goal and a 78.6 retention rate — the highest in history. In the first quarter of fiscal year 2010, 5,685 Marines who had completed at least two enlistment contracts chose to reenlist again — 82 percent of the goal for the entire year.
- **Officers.** The quality of officers accessed and retained remains high. In one example, the share of Marine-option United States Naval Academy candidates in the top third of their graduating class greatly exceeded representative levels in 2008. The number of Naval Academy graduates who chose to become Marine Corps officers last year was 270 — the highest number in history for the second year in a row.
- In fiscal year 2009, our officer retention rate was 93 percent and during fiscal year 2010, we expect officer retention to remain stable.

Reservists. The Marine Corps Reserve is a full partner in the total force. As of January 2010, there were 39,164 Marines in the Selected Reserve and another 55,233 in the Inactive Ready Reserve. Marine Forces Reserve includes 183 training centers in 48 states, the District of Columbia, and Puerto Rico.

- The extensive contributions of the Reserve have reduced deployment requirements for the active component, thereby improving the health of the total force. More than 54,000 Marines from the Selected Reserve and the Inactive Ready Reserve have mobilized and deployed in support of Operations IRAQI FREEDOM, ENDURING FREEDOM, or other operational commitments around the globe.⁶

“Every Marine into the Fight.” The majority of your Marines joined the Corps after our Nation was already at war. They expect to train, deploy, and fight because that is what they believe Marines are supposed to do. As such, the 2007 “Every Marine into the Fight” initiative adjusted personnel assignment policies so Marines serving in non-deploying units or the supporting establishment would have the opportunity to deploy. At the same time, we monitor carefully the frequency and duration that units and individual personnel spend deployed.

- To date, 73 percent of the available Marines have deployed in support of Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and ENDURING FREEDOM, or other operational commitments around the globe.
- **Individual Deployment Tempo.** We measure individual deployment tempo on a two-year sliding scale — the number of days deployed out of the previous 730 days. In the last seven years, we have seen a twentyfold increase in the individual deployment tempo of Marines in the active component. In October 2002, the number of Marines who deployed for at least 120 consecutive days in a two-year period was 4,845. As of January 2010, 100,760 Marines had deployed for at least 120 consecutive days.
- **Unit Operational Tempo.** The metric we use to measure unit operational tempo is the ratio of “deployment to dwell” — months deployed to months at home station. We limit the duration of deployments for units and individual Marines to no more than seven months for battalions and squadrons. Higher headquarters units deploy for one year.
- Our goal is to achieve a 1:2 deployment to dwell ratio in the active component and a 1:5 ratio in the reserve component. Our reserve units are currently operating at a ratio that more closely approximates a ratio of 1:4, while many of our active component units, on average, are nearing the goal of 1:2 (see Table 1).

Table 1. MAGTF Unit Deployment to Dwell Ratios⁷

<u>MAGTF Element</u>	<u>Average Ratio</u> <u>(Months Deployed : Months Home Station)</u>
Command Element	1 : 1.43
Ground Combat Element	1 : 2.08
Aviation Combat Element	1 : 2.11
Logistics Combat Element	1 : 1.79

6. As of 3 January 2010.

7. As of 18 November 2009.

- The subordinate units most frequently deployed are Intelligence Battalions, 1:1.01 (Command Element); Infantry Battalions, 1:1.78 (Ground Combat Element); VMU Squadrons, 1:1.10, and Attack Helicopter Squadrons, 1:1.28 (Aviation Combat Element); and Explosive Ordnance Disposal Companies 1:1.30 (Logistics Combat Element).

Suicide Prevention. The number of Marines who have died by suicide in recent years is shocking and unacceptable. **This issue has my personal attention, and we have multiple programs at work to reverse this trend.**

- **Causes.** Our studies have shown that regardless of duty station, deployment, or duty status, the primary stressors associated with Marine suicides are problems in romantic relationships, physical health, work-related issues, such as poor performance and job dissatisfaction, and pending legal or administrative action. Multiple stressors are typically present in a suicide. This is consistent with the findings of the other services and civilian agencies.
- **Deployments.** We analyze suicides monthly and annually for combat-related trends such as the number of deployments and dwell time. Although it is reasonable to assume that one or more deployments may cause an increase in suicides, to date, we have been unable to establish a direct correlation between deployments and suicides.

Civilian Employees. Civilian employees are a vital part of the Marine Corps. In fiscal year 2010, civilian federal employees will number more than 25,000. Through initiatives in management and career development, the Marine Corps is dedicated to maintaining a civilian workforce with the leadership skills and technical competencies necessary to meet the challenges of today as well as those of the future.

- Traditionally, civilian employees have served primarily in the supporting establishment. Now, more than ever before, they are deploying with the operating forces and serving in positions traditionally occupied by active duty Marines. For example, we are in the process of hiring more than 260 tactical safety specialists, who will each rotate on deployments with the operating forces. We are also participating in DoD's program to build a deployable Civilian Expeditionary Workforce.

Families. While we recruit Marines, we retain families. More than 45 percent of your Marines are married, and we believe that investing in military families is critical to the long-term health of the institution. When Marines know that their loved ones at home station have access to quality housing, healthcare, child development services, and education, they are better prepared to face the rigors of deployment and more inclined to stay in uniform when they return home.

- **Family Readiness Programs.** Our baseline budget in fiscal years 2010 and 2011 for family programs is \$399 million per year. We have reformed our family readiness programs at every level of command at all of our installations. As an example, we have created more than 400 full-time positions for family readiness officers down to the battalion and squadron level.

- **Child Care.** Today, we are currently meeting 64 percent of potential need for child care spaces. To meet the DoD standard of 80 percent of potential need based on the current population, we would require approximately 3,000 additional spaces. With your support, we have programmed an additional 2,615 spaces that will open over the next 18-24 months.
- **Families with Special Needs.** With an increase of \$11 million for the Exceptional Family Member Program in this year's baseline budget, we have made great strides improving the programs that support special needs family members. Enrollment is now mandatory and more than 8,900 exceptional family members are in the program. The Marine Corps assigns a caseworker to each family, who assists during relocation, deployment, and life events. In addition, the Marine Corps now underwrites the cost of up to 40 hours of respite care per month for families in the program. To date, the Marine Corps has provided more than 250,000 hours of respite care.

Wounded Warriors. About 9,000 Marines have been injured or fallen seriously ill while serving in support of Operations IRAQI FREEDOM or ENDURING FREEDOM. We are deeply committed to their care as well as the welfare of their families. Since activation in April 2007, the Wounded Warrior Regiment has provided a wide range of non-medical care for the injured and ill. The Marine Corps now also has wounded warrior battalions at Camp Pendleton and Camp Lejeune.

- **Infrastructure.** The Marine Corps is investing \$50 million from the 2009 Overseas Contingency Operations supplemental for the construction of resource and recovery centers at Camp Pendleton and Camp Lejeune. These recovery centers will provide spaces for counseling, physical therapy, employment support, financial management, and other training and outreach programs in support of our wounded.
- **Outreach.** With a 24-hour call center for wounded Marines and their families, the Wounded Warrior Regiment has contacted 99.4 percent of all Marines (7,654 out of 7,703) who were wounded since the beginning of Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and ENDURING FREEDOM, in order to determine their health status. We also maintain a toll-free number to the medical center in Landstuhl, Germany for families to contact their loved ones who have been wounded.
- **Recovery Care.** The Marine Corps has 42 recovery care coordinators, who coordinate non-medical services for Marines and their families during recovery, rehabilitation, and transition.
- **Mental Health**
 - **Traumatic Brain Injury.** Naval medicine remains at the forefront of researching and implementing pioneering techniques to treat traumatic brain injury. One technique, Hyperbaric Oxygen Treatment, is showing great promise. We anticipate a study to begin this spring that tests the efficacy of this revolutionary treatment. The Marine Corps has a formal screening protocol for Marines who suffer concussions or who are exposed to blast events in theater.
 - **Post-Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD).** We are attentive to the mental health of our warriors and we are dedicated to ensuring that all Marines and family members who bear the invisible wounds caused by stress receive the best help possible. We developed the

Combat Operational Stress Control (COSC) program to prevent, identify, and holistically treat mental injuries caused by combat or other operations.

- With the increased workload, we do have concerns about the capacity of mental health care in military medicine. Operational support and current treatment facility demands continue to stretch our mental health professional communities, even though DoD has taken many steps to increase mental health services. Our shortages of mental health professionals are a reflection of Nation-wide shortages of this specialty. We are actively engaged in discussions about possible solutions.

2. Equipment Readiness

We have sourced equipment globally, taking from non-deployed units and strategic programs to support our forces in theater. As a result, the amount of equipment remaining for non-deployed units to use for training and other potential contingencies is seriously deficient.

- For example, while the overall supply rating of Marine Corps units in Afghanistan is near 100 percent, the supply rating of units at home station is less than 60 percent.
- Additional equipment is being procured with supplemental funds, but the production rates are too slow to meet our requirements for new equipment orders.

Equipment Reset. As mentioned previously, the distributed and decentralized nature of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan has shown us that our legacy, 20th century tables of equipment are significantly inadequate. Moreover, the tempo of operations has accelerated the wear and tear on equipment. Also, the diversion of equipment in theater from Iraq to Afghanistan has delayed reset actions at our logistics depots in the United States.

- Our preliminary estimates indicate that the cost of restructuring the Marine Corps' tables of equipment would be **\$5 billion** over FY 2012 through FY 2015.
- In light of the continued high tempo of operations in Afghanistan, and the delay in reset actions due to the diversion of equipment in theater, we estimate the cost of reset for the Marine Corps to be **\$8 billion** (\$3 billion requested in the FY11 OCO and an additional \$5 billion reset liability upon termination of the conflict).

Aviation Readiness. All Marine Corps aircraft in support of overseas contingency operations are exceeding programmed rates, and are thus consuming service life at a rate sometimes three times higher than that scheduled for the lifetime of the aircraft. (See Table 2.) This will eventually result in compressed time lines between rework and, ultimately, earlier retirement of the aircraft than originally programmed.

- It is critical that our aviation modernization programs, discussed in the next section of this report, continue to receive the support of Congress.
- The majority of our legacy platforms are at the end of their service life and most of the production lines are closed.

Table 2. Fiscal Year 2009 USMC Aircraft Utilization Rates
Overseas Contingency Operations

<u>Aircraft</u>	<u>Average Age</u> (Years)	<u>Programmed Rates</u> (Hours/Month)	<u>OCO Rates</u> (Hours/Month)	<u>OCO Life</u> <u>Usage</u>
AH-1W	19	19.5	32.7	1.7x
UH-1N	35	21.7	30.0	1.4x
CH-46E	41	13.6	31.1	2.3x
CH-53D	40	23.8	50.3	2.1x
CH-53E	21	19.2	33.6	1.8x
MV-22B	3	20.9	29.4	1.4x
AV-8B	13	20.9	24.1	1.2x
F/A-18A	23	25.5	72.5	2.9x
F/A-18C	16	23.9	65.5	2.7x
EA-6B	27	26.4	66.0	2.5x

Note: Programmed rates are defined in the Weapon System Planning Document and are based on the projected dates an aircraft will be replaced by a new platform or reworked to extend its service life. Programmed rates include monthly flight hours and the associated logistical support required for each aircraft.

Strategic Prepositioning Programs

- Marine Corps prepositioning programs trace their origins back 30 years, when the Iranian revolution, the Soviet invasion of Afghanistan, the Iraqi attack on Iran, and the deepening civil war in Lebanon collectively brought to the forefront the limitations of strategic airlift to respond to no-notice contingencies. The solution — the Secretary of Defense testified in 1980, and Congress agreed — was prepositioned combat equipment, ammunition, and supplies afloat on commercial vessels underway or docked in strategic locations. The Marine Corps developed three squadrons of maritime prepositioned ships and, in 1982, began prepositioning equipment and ammunition underground in Norway.
- The first real test for these programs was in 1991, during Operation DESERT SHIELD. In 2003, in Kuwait, the Marine Corps downloaded 11 vessels from all three prepositioned squadrons and moved 648 principal end items from Norway in preparation for Operation IRAQI FREEDOM. Without this capacity, the Marine Corps would not have been able to move half of the entire operating forces — more than 60,000 fully equipped Marines — halfway around the world for a 350-mile attack on Baghdad.
- When completely loaded, Marine Corps prepositioning vessels today carry more than 26,000 pieces of major equipment including tanks, wheeled tactical vehicles, and howitzers, as well as the necessary supplies to support the force.

- When measured against authorized allowances, the percentage of major item equipment (Class VII) currently present in the prepositioned fleet is 94 percent; the percentage of supplies currently present is in excess of 99 percent.⁸
- In Norway, the current percentage of on-hand major end item equipment (Class VII) measured against authorized allowances is 47 percent; the percentage of on-hand supplies is 78 percent.⁹
- It is important to note that these programs are not just a strategic war reserve. Marine Corps prepositioning programs support forward-deployed training exercises and, along with the amphibious ships of the U.S. Navy, the steady state requirements of the combatant commanders. For example, using the equipment positioned in Norway, the Marine Corps provides security force assistance to partner nations in U.S. European Command and U.S. Africa Command.
- In summary, Marine Corps prepositioning programs are vital to the Nation and they require the continued funding and support of Congress.

3. Infrastructure

Bachelor Housing. Our number one priority in military construction is barracks. In years past, due to fiscal constraints, we had focused on operational concerns. We now have a program under way that will provide adequate bachelor housing for our entire force by 2014. Table 3 depicts Marine Corps fiscal year 2011 investment in new barracks.

Table 3. USMC Fiscal Year 2011 Barracks Construction

<u>Location</u>	<u>FY11 Investment</u>	<u>New Barracks Spaces</u>
Twentynine Palms, CA	\$53.2 million	384
Camp Lejeune, NC	\$326.6 million	2,794
Cherry Point, NC	\$42.5 million	464
Camp Pendleton, CA	\$79.9 million	860
MCB Hawaii, HI	\$90.5 million	214
MCB Quantico, VA	<u>\$37.8 million</u>	<u>300</u>
Total	<u>\$630.5 million</u>	<u>5,016</u>

8. Data as of 18 February 2010. To clarify any misperceptions, these are not the formal readiness percentages the Marine Corps uses in separate reports to Joint Chiefs of Staff, the Office of the Secretary of Defense, and Congress. The readiness percentages in those reports are a measurement against MARES reportable items, a more select range of equipment.

9. Data as of 18 February 2010.

- The Marine Corps is committed to funding the replacement of barracks furnishings on a seven-year cycle and to funding the repair and maintenance of existing barracks to improve the quality of life of Marines.

Summary

- **Our equipment shortfalls are serious and the impacts on readiness have been significant.** Our non-deployed units do not have the required amount of equipment they need to train or support other contingencies. Moreover, the harsh environments of Iraq and Afghanistan, the tempo of operations, and our employment as a second land army since 2004 has accelerated wear and tear on our equipment and delayed the reset activities necessary to prepare for the next contingency.
- We estimate that the cost of restructuring the Marine Corps' tables of equipment from FY 2012 through FY 2015 would be **\$5 billion** and the cost to reset for the Marine Corps will be **\$8 billion** (\$3 billion requested in FY11 OCO and an additional \$5 billion reset liability upon termination of the conflict).
- **Iraq and Afghanistan have not adversely affected personnel readiness or the resiliency of the force.** The Marine Corps continues to recruit and retain the highest quality people. Your Marines want to make a difference; they understand being a Marine means deploying and fighting our Nation's battles. Indeed, the Marines with the highest morale are those currently in Afghanistan.
- The Marine Corps has achieved its goal of 202,000 active duty personnel and has done so with no compromise in quality. However, the Marine Corps has not achieved the correct mix of skills and pay grades. Continued funding will be needed to balance the force correctly.
- Our personnel growth has outpaced our growth in infrastructure, and your continued support is needed to provide the additional barracks, messing, and office spaces required.

IV. MODERNIZATION OF THE MAGTF

Our modernization effort is not merely a collection of programs but a means of aligning the core capabilities of the MAGTF across the spectrum of present and future security challenges. All of our procurement programs are designed to support the full range of military operations.

The Individual Marine. *Marines* are the heart and soul of your Corps. The trained, educated, and physically fit Marine enables the Corps to operate in urban areas, mountains, deserts, or jungles. However, we are concerned about weight. Depending on the enemy situation, and including helmet, body armor, individual weapon, water, ammunition, and batteries, the weight of gear for a Marine on foot-patrol in Afghanistan can average 90 pounds. There is a delicate balance between weight and protection, and we continue to pursue the latest in technology to provide Marines with scalable protection based on the mission and threat.

Tactical Vehicles. The Marine Corps currently has a total ground tactical vehicle quantity of nearly 47,500. Over the next ten years, we plan to replace about 50 percent of that total.

- We are planning, programming, and budgeting toward a balanced fleet of vehicles. Our chief considerations are mobility, survivability, payload, transportability, and sustainability. Our goal is a portfolio of vehicles that is able to support amphibious operations, irregular warfare, and operations ashore across the range of military operations. We envision a blend of Expeditionary Fighting Vehicles, Marine Personnel Carriers, Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles (MRAPs), and replacements for our High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWVs).
- **The Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV)** is the number one modernization program in the ground combat element of the MAGTF. The requirements of the current and future security environment have driven the research and development of the critical capabilities associated with the EFV. **The Marine Corps has not taken a myopic view of the EFV; we are well aware of the fiscal realities and developmental challenges associated with such a revolutionary vehicle.** We are, however, convinced that national security demands the capabilities of the EFV and justifies the costs. This vehicle will save lives and enable mission success across an extremely wide, and highly probable, range of operational scenarios.

Fire Support. We are modernizing Marine Corps land-based fire support through a triad of weapons systems — a new and more capable 155mm howitzer, a system of land-based rockets, and a helicopter-transportable 120mm mortar. Each of these is extremely accurate. This accuracy is critical in counterinsurgency operations and irregular warfare because accuracy reduces the instances of civilian casualties and collateral damage to local infrastructure.

- **The Lightweight 155mm Towed Howitzer (M777)** weighs about half of the cannon it is replacing and fires projectiles to a range of 15-19 miles. Our Marine Expeditionary Brigade in Afghanistan has 15 of these howitzers at three different locations, which have collectively fired more than 600 rounds since April 2009.
- **The High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (M142 HIMARS)** provides high-value rocket and missile fire in support of ground forces. Each system carries six rockets or one missile. Like our new lightweight howitzer, HIMARS has proven itself over the past year in Afghanistan, delivering long-range precision fires.
- **The Expeditionary Fire Support System** is a rifled 120mm mortar, internally transportable 110 nautical miles by both the MV-22 Osprey and the CH-53E helicopter. This will be the primary indirect fire-support system for helicopter-transported elements of the ground combat element. A platoon equipped with these new mortars recently deployed with the 24th Marine Expeditionary Unit.

Marine Aviation. Marine pilots are naval aviators; they are trained to fly from the ships of the U.S. Navy or from expeditionary airfields ashore in support of Marines on the ground. We are in the midst of an unprecedented modernization effort. By 2020, we will have:

- Transitioned more than 50 percent of our aviation squadrons to new aircraft
- Added 5 more operational squadrons and almost 100 more aircraft to our inventory

- Completed fielding of the tilt-rotor MV-22 Osprey and the upgraded Huey (UH-1Y) utility helicopter
- Updated our entire fleet of aerial refuelers to the KC-130J model
- Fielded the upgraded Cobra (AH-1Z) attack helicopter and the Joint Strike Fighter (F-35B)
- Fielded an entirely new family of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS)
- Introduced a new model of the heavy-lift CH-53 cargo helicopter

The Joint Strike Fighter. The Marine Corps is on track to activate the Department of Defense's first operational Joint Strike Fighter squadron in 2012. Although our investment in this program may seem high, it is important to note that the Marine Corps has not bought a fixed-wing tactical aircraft in 11 years, and that the Joint Strike Fighter will ultimately replace three different types of aircraft currently in our inventory.

- The short takeoff and vertical landing (STOVL) variant (F-35B) of the Joint Strike Fighter will be transportable aboard the amphibious ships of the U.S. Navy; it will be able to operate under the same austere conditions as does the AV-8 Harrier; it will be able to carry more bombs and loiter overhead longer than does the F/A-18 Hornet; and it will be a better electronic warfare platform than our legacy EA-6 Prowler.

The Osprey. We are very pleased with the performance of the tilt-rotor MV-22 Osprey. The Osprey provides greater speed, more range, and enhanced survivability compared to other rotary wing platforms. It flies more than twice as fast and carries three times the payload at more than six times the range of the medium-lift helicopter it is replacing.

- Osprey squadrons have completed three successful deployments to Iraq and one aboard ship. One squadron is currently in Afghanistan. We are nearing delivery of our 100th operational aircraft, and at a current build of 30 Ospreys per year, we are replacing our CH-46E medium-lift helicopter squadrons at a rate of two squadrons per year.

Logistics Command and Control. *Global Combat Service Support System* — Marine Corps is the cornerstone of our logistics modernization strategy.

- The program is a portfolio of information technology systems that will support logistics command and control, joint logistics interoperability, secure access to information, and overall visibility of logistics data. It will align Marine Corps logistics with real-world challenges, where speed and information have replaced mass and footprint as the foremost attributes of combat operations; it will replace 30-year old legacy supply and maintenance information technology systems; and it will provide the backbone for all logistics information for the MAGTF.

V. VISION

The current transnational struggle against violent extremism will not end anytime soon. Other threats — conventional and irregular — will continue to emerge and the complexity of the future operating environment will only increase. As we look to the future, we believe we must refocus on our core competencies, especially combined-arms training and operations at sea with the United States Navy.

2010 Quadrennial Defense Review. We believe the report from the Quadrennial Defense Review offers an accurate and informed analysis of the challenges in the future security environment, particularly with respect to growing complexity of hybrid threats and the spread of advanced anti-access capabilities.

- We concur with the overarching need for a comprehensive and balanced approach to national security — a whole of government approach.
- We agree with the need for a U.S. military that is balanced in capabilities for irregular warfare and conventional conflict. For the Marine Corps, we have always believed in such a balance. Our equipment and major programs, and our means of employment as an integrated MAGTF, reflect our commitment to be flexible in the face of uncertainty. **One hundred percent of our procurement can be employed either in a hybrid conflict or in conventional combat.**
- Finally, while our current focus is rightly on today's fights, we believe it is critical that we do not underestimate the need to maintain the ability to gain access in any contested region of the world.

Seabasing and the Navy-Marine Corps Team. With oceans comprising about 70 percent of the earth's surface and the world's populations located primarily on the coasts, seabasing allows our Nation to conduct crucial joint operations from the sea.

- Seabasing is a capability and a concept. It is the establishment of a mobile port, airfield, and replenishment capability at sea that supports operations ashore. In effect, seabasing moves traditional land-based logistics functions offshore.
- From the sea, U.S. forces will be able to conduct the full range of military operations, from disaster relief and humanitarian assistance to irregular warfare and major combat operations. Sea-based logistics, sea-based fire support, and the use of the ocean as a medium for tactical and operational maneuver permit U.S. forces to move directly from sea to objectives ashore.
- There are misperceptions that the United States has not conducted an amphibious operation since Inchon during the Korean War in 1950. Since 1982, our Nation has conducted more than 100 amphibious operations. For example, the Navy-Marine Corps Team has been on the scene in Bangladesh (1991), the Philippines (1991), Liberia (1996), and East Timor (1999).
 - After 9/11, U.S. amphibious forces, from a seabase, led the first conventional strikes against the Taliban in Afghanistan.

- In 2004, the 15th Marine Expeditionary Unit was on station in Southeast Asia to support the relief efforts after the Tsunami.
- In 2005, from a seabase in the Gulf of Mexico, the Navy and Marine Corps supported recovery efforts after Hurricane KATRINA.
- In 2009, off the coast of Somalia, when pirates boarded the *Maersk Alabama*, the 13th Marine Expeditionary Unit and the USS *Boxer* were on station to support the counterpiracy operations.
- Last month, with Haiti's airfield overwhelmed and their seaport disabled by wreckage following the earthquake, the USS *Bataan* Amphibious Ready Group and the 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit provided a significant and sustainable delivery of food, water, and other supplies without the logistical burden ashore.
- **Seabasing — Maritime Prepositioning Force (MPF) Enhancements**
 - Critical to seabasing are the logistics vessels of the Maritime Prepositioning Force. As discussed in the Long-Range Plan for Naval Vessels, we have restructured our Maritime Prepositioned Force (Future) program and will enhance the current capabilities of each of our three existing Maritime Preposition Force Squadrons.
 - One mobile landing platform (MLP), one Large Medium-Speed Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) ship, and one *Lewis and Clark* class (T-AKE) cargo ship will be added to each squadron of the MPF.
 - The MLP will interface with the LMSRs, which are being added to each MPF squadron from FY09-11, thus providing the capability to transfer cargo while at sea and making each MPF squadron highly responsive to demands across the full-spectrum of operations.
- **In summary, as the security environment grows more complex, so does the value of amphibious forces.**

Expeditionary Operations in the Littoral Domain. The littoral domain is where the land and sea meet. This is where seaborne commerce originates and where most of the world lives. Littorals include straits — strategic chokepoints that offer potential control of the world's sea lanes of communication. The Navy-Marine Corps team and the vitality of the amphibious fleet is critical to overcoming anti-access challenges in locations along the coastlines of the world where there are no American military forces or basing agreements.

- The QDR emphasized the need for U.S. naval forces to be capable of robust forward presence and power projection operations, while adding capability and capacity for working with a wide range of partner navies. Amphibious forces are perfectly suited for engagement and security force assistance missions, as well as humanitarian missions such as are ongoing in Haiti. In short, the strategic rebalancing directed in the QDR places high demands on our amphibious forces.
- Given the fiscal constraints facing the Department of the Navy, the Secretary of the Navy, Chief of Naval Operations, and I agreed that 33 amphibious ships represents the limit of acceptable risk in meeting the 38-ship requirement we established in a letter to the committee on 7 January 2009.

- We currently have a 31-ship force in the U.S. amphibious fleet. The Long-Range Plan for Naval Vessels projects a 33 ship amphibious inventory in the near-term.
- With a robust inventory of amphibious ships the Navy-Marine Corps team will be able to:
 - Better address the growing steady state combatant commander requirement for theater security cooperation, forward presence, and crisis response.
 - Strengthen our Nation's relations with allied and partner countries through peacetime engagement and training exercises.
 - Better ensure our Nation is ready to respond with humanitarian assistance when disaster strikes anywhere around the globe.
 - In the event of major conflict, improve our response time to gain theater access with combat forces without having to rely on basing agreements with foreign governments.
- Finally, to clarify any misperceptions about the numbers of amphibious ships cited in the 2010 QDR Report, those numbers of ships are neither shipbuilding requirements nor targets; they are simply statements of the amphibious ship numbers across the FY 2011-2015 future years defense program.¹⁰

Training, Education, and Professional Development

- ***“Two-Fisted Fighters.”*** The QDR Report calls for increased counterinsurgency capacity in the general purpose forces of the United States.¹¹ The Marine Corps has long recognized the special skills required to operate with host nation forces and among local populations. Evidence of this dates back to the Marine Corps publications of *Small Wars Operations* (1935) and the *Small Wars Manual* (1940), both comprehensive texts on counterinsurgency operations and irregular warfare. Today, through standing Marine Corps organizations such as the *Center for Advanced Operational Culture Learning* and the *Center for Irregular Warfare*, and programs such as the *International Affairs Officers Program*, we continue to build capacity in foreign language, and regional and cultural skills.¹²
- ***Leadership Development.*** We recognize the need for a diversity of skills and specialties, and our standing guidance to promotion, command, and special selection boards is to give due consideration to personnel with special skills and non-traditional career patterns.
- ***Marine Corps University.*** Annually, a percentage of Marine Corps officers from the rank of captain through colonel attend year-long resident courses in professional military education

10. Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR Report)* (Washington, DC: Feb 2010), p. xvi, 46.
 11. Department of Defense, *Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR Report)* (Washington, DC: Feb 2010), pp. 20-26.
 12. Each year, the Marine Corps selects officers for the **International Affairs Officer Program**, which consists of two professional tracks: Foreign Area Officer (FAO), and Regional Area Officer (RAO). The International Affairs Officer Program provides graduate-level study and language training for nine geographic areas. There are 329 international affairs officers on active duty (262 FAOs, 67 RAOs). The officers in this program possess advanced knowledge and expertise in the language, culture, and political-military affairs of a given region. Since 2008, the Marine Corps has doubled the number of accessions in the FAO program, and accessions will continue to increase through 2015. Moreover, the Marine Corps provides mid-grade officers (major – lieutenant colonel) for the **Afghanistan-Pakistan (AFPAK) Hands Program**. Our current requirement is to provide 63 officers — three cohorts of 21 officers each.

at Marine Corps University in Quantico. The Marine Corps University is regionally accredited to award postgraduate degrees and, in 2009 alone, University schools awarded 200 master's degrees.¹³

- Facilities are an integral part of supporting professional military education. To that end, the Marine Corps fiscal year 2011 military construction budget request includes funding for additions in Quantico to the General Alfred M. Gray Research Center and the Staff NCO Academy. These projects will support our plan to upgrade the infrastructure of the Marine Corps University.
- **Acquisition Professionals.** The Marine Corps has an active acquisition professional program in place to meet the need identified in the QDR “for technically trained personnel — cost estimators, systems engineers, and acquisition managers — to conduct effective oversight.”¹⁴ There are about 520 acquisition billets in the Marine Corps — 400 are entry and mid-level positions filled by enlisted Marines and officers, and 120 are senior-level acquisition professional positions filled by field grade officers who oversee our major ground and aviation programs. Our acquisition professional officers are members of the Defense Acquisition Community; they possess Level II certification, four years of acquisition experience, at least 24 undergraduate credit hours in business.

Future Realignment of Marine Forces in the Pacific. The governments of the United States and Japan have agreed to invest in a realignment of forces that will result in Marine Corps forces postured in the Pacific for a long-term presence on Japan, Guam, and Hawaii. Critical requisites to the implementation of this realignment are:

- Japanese construction of a replacement for Marine Corps Air Station Futenma that meets both operational and safety requirements.
- An appropriate force laydown that supports the operational requirements of the Commander, U.S. Pacific Command.
- Adequate available airlift and sealift within theater to transport Marines to training areas and partner countries.
- Adequate training areas and ranges in Guam and the Northern Mariana Islands that can maintain readiness as well as support security cooperation with our regional partners.
- An enduring, sustainable “live where you work,” base on Guam that maximizes operational effectiveness, minimizes encroachment, accommodates future development, and provides a quality of life on Guam commensurate with any other U.S. base.
- Continued political and financial support by the governments of the United States and Japan.

Refined planning and staff interaction processes within the Department of Defense have made significant contributions to our efforts to align these requirements. Planned and executed

13. The Marine Corps also has a separate, voluntary graduate education program, through which officers attend **Naval Postgraduate School** and other secondary institutions to obtain advanced degrees. There are 300 officer billets in the Marine Corps that require master's degrees. The Marine Corps also maintains an active **fellowship program**.

14. DoD, *QDR*, p. 76.

properly, this realignment effort will result in an enduring solution that provides forward deployed combat ready Marine forces to uphold our Nation's commitment to the security and stability of the Pacific region.

Energy and Water Initiatives. We believe energy and water are two of our Nation's most valuable resources. We are focused on improving our stewardship at our installations and on the battlefield.

- ***Our Installations.*** We have already gained efficiencies and achieved savings at all our major installations. We have three major goals:
 1. From 2003-2015, reduce energy consumption by 30 percent
 2. Through 2020, reduce water consumption by 2 percent per year
 3. By 2020, increase the use of alternative energy at our installations to 50 percent of the total energy consumed
- ***On the Battlefield.*** Operations in Afghanistan have forced us to reevaluate energy and water distribution and usage in expeditionary environments. We believe the future security environment will again require the Marine Corps to operate over long distances in austere environments, and we are actively pursuing a wide range of solutions to:
 - Lighten the combat load of our Marines and Sailors
 - Reduce our overall footprint in current and future expeditionary operations
 - Lessen energy consumption and dependence on fossil fuels
 - Achieve resource self-sufficiency in expeditionary environments

CONCLUSION

As a naval expeditionary force in the form of an elite air-ground team, the Marine Corps is ready and willing to go into harm's way on short notice and do what is necessary to make our country safe. America expects this of her Marines. In the complex and dangerous security environment of the future, the Marine Corps stands ready for the challenges ahead. We appreciate the continued support of Congress. Thank you again for this opportunity to report on the posture of your Marine Corps.

**WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING
THE HEARING**

FEBRUARY 24, 2010

RESPONSE TO QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. SKELTON

Admiral ROUGHEAD. The National Security Cutter (NSC) was designed to conduct an offshore patrol mission that is very different from Navy missions, and the NSC does not meet Navy requirements for speed, draft, survivability, and manpower requirements. The Navy is building the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) to meet its Joint Staff-validated warfighting requirements. NSC would require significant and costly design changes to meet LCS capability requirements, which would likely result in the end cost of a modified NSC exceeding that of LCS. A more detailed comparison of LCS and NSC characteristics follows.

In speed, LCS has a sprint speed of more than 40 knots; NSC sprint speed is 28 knots. In draft, LCS draft is approximately 13 feet to engage threats in the Littorals; the NSC draft is 22.5 feet, restricting its access in shallow waters. The inability of NSC to meet speed and draft requirements fundamentally limit the areas where the NSC can effectively operate. In survivability, LCS is built to Naval Vessel Rules and provides Level 1 survivability, which provides for shock hardening, protection against chemical, biological, radiological attack, and damage control/fire-fighting capability against destructive fires. NSC does not provide Level 1 survivability as it was not designed to operate in the same threat environment as LCS. In manpower requirements, LCS has a core crew of 40 personnel with 35 personnel comprising the mission package detachment and aviation detachment; the size of NSC crew is 110, 35 more than LCS at full mission capability. Additionally, LCS is designed to employ modular mission packages that address specific naval capability gaps in mine countermeasures, surface warfare, and anti-submarine warfare. NSC does not have the space or ability to employ these mission packages. [See page 37.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. BARTLETT

Admiral ROUGHEAD. Navy expects all recent ship classes to survive a 100 kilovolts per meter (kV/m) event with some degradation to mission possible. Regarding your specific question about remaining warfighting capability after an electromagnetic pulse (EMP) laydown of 100 kV/m, the answer is classified and I will provide it to you via separate correspondence. [See page 17.]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING

FEBRUARY 24, 2010

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MS. TSONGAS

Ms. TSONGAS. The FY10 NDAA contained language that mandated that no funds could be obligated by the Navy for construction or advanced procurement of surface combatants to be constructed after FY11 until multiple conditions had been met:* Submission of an acquisition strategy for surface combatants approved by USD AT&L and briefed to and approved by the JROC;* Verification by an independent review panel that the Navy considered numerous factors including modeling and simulation, operational availability, life cycle costs including manning, cost and schedule ramifications of accommodating new sensors and weapons to counter future threats; and* Conclusions of a joint review by SECNAV and Director MDA defining additional requirements for investment in Aegis BMD beyond the number of ships planned to be equipped for this mission in the FY 2010 budget submittal. Further, the FY10 NDAA required an update to the Navy's Open Architecture report to Congress upon submittal of the FY12 budget to reflect the Navy's combat systems acquisition plans for surface combatants. It also mandated submission of an update to the 2006 Naval Surface Fires Support report to Congress identifying capability shortfalls. Finally, the language directed the Navy to develop a plan to incorporate new technologies from DDG-1000 and other surface combatant programs into ships constructed after 2011 to avoid redundant development, implement open architecture and foster competition. To date, the Navy has not satisfied these requirements.

The FY10 NDAA contained language that mandated that no funds could be obligated by the Navy for construction or advanced procurement of surface combatants to be constructed after FY11 until several conditions had been met, including verification by an independent review panel that the Navy considered numerous factors as part of establishing their shipbuilding plan and considered new technologies from more recent ship classes than the DDG-51.

Such an independent assessment of needs and options seems particularly germane to our hearing today. Both the FY11 President's budget and 30-year shipbuilding plan you submitted this year is heavily based on DDG-51, one would assume this is a result of the aforementioned analyses, strategies and reviews. When would you expect the Navy to submit the results of this independent assessment that supports the plan you've submitted?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. On February 6, 2010, the Secretary of the Navy submitted to the congressional defense committees a plan for implementing the language contained in Section 125 of Fiscal Year (FY) 2010 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), Public Law 111-84.

In addition, the Navy has completed the following actions:

- Completed the development of the Technology Roadmap for Surface Combatants and Fleet Modernization February 2010 in accordance with Section 125(d) of the FY 2010 NDAA.
- The update to the Naval Surface Fire Support Report to Congress was delivered on March 11, 2010.

As reported in the Navy's implementation plan report to Congress, an independent panel, jointly established by the Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Research, Development and Acquisition (ASN(RD&A)) and the Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Integration of Capabilities and Resources (OPNAV N8) reviewed the Navy's future guided missile destroyer hull and radar study of 2009. This independent panel was comprised of senior subject matter experts with extensive background in policy, acquisition, research and development, radar and ship design, combat systems integration, budget and cost analysis. Results of the Navy study, along with the independent review panel's report, have been briefed to the congressional defense committees' staff; members of the House Armed Services Committee received a brief on March 11, 2010. The full Navy study and independent review panel report will be provided this Spring.

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. THORNBERRY

Mr. THORNBERRY. General Conway, you serve as the DOD Executive Agent for Non-Lethal Weapons. The 2009 Marine Corps S&T Strategic Plan identifies a num-

ber of capabilities required to address irregular warfare needs in the future including interim force capabilities. Yet the budget for these is stale at about \$100 million per year and several promising programs aren't making their way from R&D into the field. What needs to happen to encourage wide-spread adoption of these capabilities across all services? Would legislation empowering your Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Office be useful to you? For example, does the office need to become a joint program office?

General CONWAY. The DOD NLW Executive Agent has an ongoing independent assessment by the Center for Naval Analysis that is researching this question and that is nearing conclusion. Additional time is needed by the DOD NLWEA to review the CNA report, assess its findings and make a recommendation on the way forward.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. AKIN

Mr. AKIN. I have been briefed that the Navy requires a 5-to-1 ratio of non-deployed to deployed ships in order to support its surface combatant mission. Given the added requirement for afloat BMD, how many more BMD-capable ships will the Navy need in order to support this mission without negatively impacting the safety and support of the Carrier Strike Group?

Admiral ROUGHHEAD. In conjunction with the Missile Defense Agency (MDA), we adjusted the Aegis BMD Program of Record (POR) to increase the total number of funded Aegis BMD-capable ships across the FYDP from 21 to 38, of which 27 will be deployable in FY15. Increasing the inventory of Surface Combatants with BMD capability gives the Navy greater flexibility to meet Combatant Commander surge and contingency operations requirements, and to provide an organic BMD capability to our CSGs.

Mr. AKIN. In your testimony you mentioned using SLEP as a primary mitigation strategy for the Strike Fighter Shortfall problem, yet I have been briefed by the Navy that Fleet OPTEMPO is the primary limiting factor for how many jets can undergo SLEP per year. If the Navy has already optimized the number of jets it is able to SLEP annually, how will this measure be able to do in the future what it is apparently unable to do now?

Admiral ROUGHHEAD. According to the current planning schedule, the SLEP window of opportunity for F/A-18A-D does not occur until FY 2012, when modifications to our F/A-18A-D aircraft begin. The Navy is developing a FY 2012 budget request that will include SLEP requirements.

SLEP is only one aspect of the Navy's TACAIR inventory management initiatives targeted at preserving the service life of our existing legacy strike fighter aircraft (F/A-18A-D). The Navy will reduce the number of aircraft available in our squadrons during non-deployed phases to the minimum required. Navy expeditionary squadrons and those supporting the Unit Deployment Program (UDP) will be reduced from 12 aircraft to 10 aircraft per squadron on an as-required basis. These measures reduce the operational demand on legacy F/A-18s, making more aircraft available for induction into life extension events. The Navy is also evaluating depot level efficiency to maximize throughput and return legacy strike fighter aircraft to the Fleet. Collectively, these measures will extend the service life of the legacy aircraft and make the projected inventory decrease manageable. The management initiatives being implemented prudently balance operational risks and requirements today, while seeking to fulfill future projected capacity and capability requirements.

Mr. AKIN. The JSF continues to be plagued by delays. Most recently, it was reported that the IOC date for the Air Force will slide roughly two years to late CY 2015. In the past year the JSF completed only roughly 10% of its planned test flights. Given that the Navy has traditionally been the service with the most stringent OP/EVAL requirements prior to IOC, and given that the Navy is scheduled to receive the carrier variant of the JSF last, how will these delays effect the Navy's IOC date?

Admiral ROUGHHEAD. Based on the SECDEF approved F-35 program restructure and delivery of FY 2011 procured aircraft, the Navy F-35C IOC has been changed to 2016.

The Navy IOC is based on three items: sufficient aircraft quantities, desired capability to conduct all Operational Requirements Document missions, and completion of operational test of delivered capability. The Navy's intent is to stand up squadrons as aircraft become available and declare IOC when sufficient capability is tested and delivered.

Mr. AKIN. Will the Navy accept an inordinate risk by abandoning its long-held standards for thorough test and evaluation in order to IOC the JSF in accordance

with a predetermined timeframe, or will the Navy proceed with its customary diligence, thereby exacerbating the Strike Fighter Gap?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. The Navy will not abandon its long-held standards. Based on the program and test schedule restructure and delivery of FY 2011 procured aircraft, the Navy F-35C IOC has been revised to be in 2016 based on three items: sufficient aircraft quantities; desired capability to conduct all Operational Requirements Document missions; and completion of operational test of delivered capability.

F-35 test program risks will be mitigated through the continuation of a test program assessment and the support and advice of the OSD Director of Operational Test and Evaluation. An Integrated Test Review Team composed of experts in Developmental Test and Operational Test continues to mature test program plans to ensure program technical maturity is aligned with IOC dates; operational assessments are optimized; new opportunities for integrated test are matured; test schedule margins are realistic; and the proposed flow of technical data enables the planned operational test periods.

To mitigate aircraft assets required during testing, the program is adding one carrier variant (CV) aircraft to the SDD program to expand developmental testing capacity; utilization of three Low Rate Initial Production (LRIP) aircraft in support of development testing; and addition of another software development/test capability.

The Navy, in conjunction with OSD and the USAF, is pursuing every opportunity to increase efficiency of test and accelerate delivery of required capability to maximize our strike fighter inventory. We will stand up squadrons as aircraft become available and declare IOC when sufficient capability is tested and delivered.

Mr. AKIN. I have been briefed that the Marine Corps intends to IOC the JSF on time, regardless of where the F-35 stands with respect to test and evaluation. Given the overwhelming delays in test for the F-35, this could potentially require the Marine Corps to IOC a weapons system long before it is fully tested. Is it wise to take assets and resources away from our ongoing operational requirements in order to prematurely force the introduction of an aircraft that is not even optimized for the fight we are currently in today?

General CONWAY. The Marine Corps plans to IOC with a multi-mission capable Block 2B aircraft as described in the JSF Operational Requirements Document (ORD) CN-3. A USMC IOC is projected to be 2012 for the F-35B which is based on operational requirements and the associated metrics that encompass capabilities, equipment, training, and support that will measure the progress of the program to meet the USMC requirements between now and December 2012 and enable the Marine Corps to ensure all the elements required for operational use of the F-35B are ready. An IOC declaration will be dependent upon meeting these requirements.

No assets or resources are being taken away from operational requirements to IOC. The USMC transition to the F-35B is structured and scheduled to meet operational requirements throughout the process without degradation.

Mr. AKIN. Your Harrier squadrons currently have 16 aircraft each. One of the "Management Levers" the DoN has briefed to me as a means of mitigating Strike Fighter Shortfalls is to reduce the number of aircraft in expeditionary F/A-18 squadrons by 2. Yet, they have also informed me that this "management lever" is not possible given existing operational requirements. Knowing that the Marine Corps requires its existing number of jets in order to support its current share of sorties, it seems reasonable to assume that the Marine Corps likewise requires its existing compliment of Harriers as well. Will you be replacing Harrier Squadrons with an equivalent number of F-35's? If not, how will this impact current operational demand?

Will the rate at which you plan to replace Harriers meet current operational requirements?

General CONWAY. The key enabler the AV-8B provides is the ability to deploy as part of a composite Air Combat Element (ACE) within the Marine Expeditionary Units (MEU) as part of our basic Marine Air Ground Task Force maneuver element. An integrated Tactical Aviation capability at this level provides the ability to project, protect, and prosecute combat operations when and wherever required. The F-35B STOVL Joint Strike Fighter leverages off the AV-8B's proven legacy in this environment and adds the multi-mission capabilities of the F/A-18 aircraft that will evolve our MEU's into far more superior force in readiness.

We have seven standing MEU's and the requirement to continue this force in the future has been repeatedly vetted and validated. Replacing the AV-8B's with a similar number F-35B's is the plan to maintain the capabilities to meet our operational requirements. Our procurement plans support the transition of the Harrier squadrons with the Lightning II aircraft, same number of aircraft supporting the same number of MEU's with one noted addition. When a 6 aircraft Detachment deploys

with the ACE as it does today with the Harrier, the remaining combat capability of the F-35B in the ten aircraft left behind has the same resident capabilities of our other fourteen 10 aircraft squadrons that are replacing the Hornets. With this construct of the F-35B squadrons, seven 16 aircraft squadrons and fourteen 10 aircraft squadrons, we take our tactical aviation capabilities into a common single type of aircraft with all the associated synergy and savings while increasing our MAGTF combat capabilities.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. WILSON

Mr. WILSON. Six amphibious ships will be decommissioned within the next three years, bringing the amphibious force to below 30. This brings the risk level to above what Navy and Marine Corps defines as the "limit of acceptable risk." Understanding that the Navy plans to retain these vessels in the inactive fleet, rather than selling or dismantling them, what would be the cost of continuing to operate the vessels? What prevents the Navy from retaining these ships?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. The cost of maintaining ships past their design life is difficult to forecast accurately; however, the table below provides Rough Order of Magnitude (ROM) estimates absent specific ship studies to determine if extending the service lives of these ships through the FYDP is feasible.

Navy retires ships from service when changes in mission or threat environment over the period of a ship's commissioned service, or deterioration in overall seaworthiness, make the ship no longer viable or cost-effective for future service. The LHA 1 Class does not meet the challenges of Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) integration. The LPD 4 Class ships have reached or exceeded their expected service lives of 40 years, and provide limited C5I capability to support USMC current and future missions.

Our 30-year shipbuilding plan provides a projected battle force that balances the anticipated risk across the FYDP with the security uncertainties of the future to achieve the best balance of mission capabilities, resources, and requirements.

Ship	Date of Commission	Age in FY15	Unfunded Costs FY11-15 (\$ Millions/FY11 dollars)			
			Ops and Maint	Manpower*	Training**	Total
USS NASSAU LHA 4	28-Jul-79	36	289	439	55	783
USS PELELIU LHA 5	3-May-80	35	322	250	30	602
USS CLEVELAND LPD 7	21-Apr-67	48	95	151	19	265
USS DUBUQUE LPD 8	1-Sep-67	48	149	151	19	319
USS DENVER LPD 9	26-Oct-68	46	176	87	10	273
USS PONCE LPD 15	10-Jul-71	44	146	120	14	280
TOTAL (FY11-15)			1177	1198	147	2522

* Manpower costs programmed in the year of decommissioning are ½ of a full year requirement; reflects MPN/RPN/DHAN/R and OMN.

** Training reflects MPN/RPN/DHAN/R for Individuals Account for ships listed.
All values are in \$M (FY11).

Mr. WILSON. With the projected fighter shortfall and the further sliding of the JSF, why is the Navy not planning on purchasing additional F/A-18E/F aircraft? Though the JSF will show significant stealth improvements over the E/F, the Super-Hornet has significant improvements in signature improvements over the legacy Hornets. Do you believe that advances in air defense over the next several years will lead to such a tactical risk that it is worth taking the strategic risk of such a substantial force structure gap?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. The F/A-18E/F is a highly capable aircraft designed to meet and defeat today's threats with growth potential for the future; however, it cannot replace the F-35C. I remain committed to the JSF program because of the advanced sensor, precision strike, firepower, and stealth capabilities JSF will bring to our Fleet. We are monitoring the JSF program closely and managing our existing strike fighter capacity to meet power projection demands until JSF is delivered. The management initiatives being implemented prudently balance operational risks and requirements today, while seeking to fulfill future projected capacity and capability requirements.

Mr. WILSON. The increased operational tempo of the past six years has led to much talk about strategies for increasing dwell times for Marines. Many units have been operating on a less than one-to-one dwell-to-deployed time. This has led to a

substantial lack of training time, and hindered readiness. Have you abandoned the two-to-one dwell-to-deployed ideal? What strategies are you pursuing to ensure that Marines will be properly trained for both their primary and contingency missions?
General CONWAY.

- To date, almost 75 percent of the available Marines have deployed in support of Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and ENDURING FREEDOM, or other operational commitments around the globe.
- **Individual Deployment Tempo.** We measure individual deployment tempo on a two-year sliding scale—the number of days deployed out of the previous 730 days. In the last seven years, we have seen a twentyfold increase in the individual deployment tempo of Marines in the active component. In October 2002, the number of Marines who deployed for at least 120 consecutive days in a two-year period was 4,845. As of January 2010, 100,760 Marines had deployed for at least 120 consecutive days.
- **Unit Operational Tempo.** The metric we use to measure unit operational tempo is the ratio of “deployment to dwell”—months deployed to months at home station. We limit the duration of deployments for units and individual Marines to no more than seven months for battalions and squadrons. Higher headquarters units deploy for one year.
- Our goal is to achieve a 1:2 deployment-to-dwell ratio in the active component and a 1:5 ratio in the reserve component. Our reserve units are currently operating at a ratio that more closely approximates a ratio of 1:4, while many of our active component units, on average, are nearing the goal of 1:2 (see Table 1).

Table 1. MAGTF Unit Deployment-to-Dwell Ratios

MAGTF Element	Average Ratio (Months Deployed: Months Home Station)
Command Element	1 : 1.43
Ground Combat Element	1 : 2.08
Aviation Combat Element	1 : 2.11
Logistics Combat Element	1 : 1.79

Note: As of 18 Nov 2009. The subordinate units most frequently deployed are Intelligence Battalions, 1:1.01 (Command Element); Infantry Battalions, 1:1.78 (Ground Combat Element); VMU Squadrons, 1:1.10, and Attack Helicopter Squadrons, 1:1.28 (Aviation Combat Element); and Explosive Ordnance Disposal Companies 1:1.30 (Logistics Combat Element).

Mr. WILSON. Sustained level of combat has led to a large gap between equipment the Marine Corps needs fixed or replaced and what has been fixed or replaced. Additionally the Maritime Prepositioning Ships' inventories have been greatly depleted. Do you have a proposed timeline for getting the Marine Corps back on track with the equipment they need? Is there a move to replenish the Maritime Prepositioning supplies?

General CONWAY.

Maritime Prepositioning Force (MPF)

Our Maritime Prepositioning Ships Squadrons (MPSRONS) will be reset with the most capable equipment possible. We have begun loading them with capabilities that support lower spectrum operations while still maintaining the ability to generate Marine Expeditionary Brigades (MEBs) capable of conducting major combat operations. As we modernize, apply lessons learned, and reset our MPSRONS their readiness will fluctuate. However, our endstate is all three MPSRONS fully reset by 2012 and Marine Corps Prepositioning Program–Norway (MCPN) reset within Marine Corps priorities as assets become available.

The MPSRONS are currently rotating through Maritime Prepositioning Force Maintenance Cycle–9. MPSRON–1 completed MPF Maintenance Cycle–9 in September 2008 and is currently at 83 percent of its full equipment set. As has been addressed in previous reports, equipment from MPSRON–1 was required to outfit new units standing up in Fiscal Year 2007 and Fiscal Year 2008 as part of our end strength increase to 202,000. While the majority of combat systems are loaded, MPSRON–1 is short a portion of its motor transport, communications and bulk fuel/water storage capability. MPSRON–1 is expected to be fully reset at the completion of its next maintenance cycle in 2011.

Equipment from MPSRON–2 was offloaded to support Operation IRAQI FREEDOM II. During its rotation through MPF Maintenance Cycle–9, between August 2008 and July 2009, the readiness of MPSRON–2 was substantially improved from 49 percent to its current readiness of 77 percent. Upon integration of MPSRON–2's fifth ship, a Large, Medium Speed, Roll-on/Roll-off (LMSR) ship in Jan 2011 and

completion of its MPF Maintenance Cycle-10 rotation in fiscal year 2012, MPSRON-2 is expected to be fully reset.

MPSRON-3 was reset to 100 percent of its equipment set during MPF Maintenance Cycle-8 in March 2007. MPSRON-3 is rotating through MPF Maintenance Cycle-9 and currently has three ships of equipment downloaded at Blount Island Command. Two of MPSRON-3's ships were employed in Operation UNIFIED ASSISTANCE in Haiti and provided the Marine Expeditionary Units and Naval Support Elements with the additional equipment and supplies necessary to support immediate relief. The goal is, upon completion of its MPF Maintenance Cycle-9 and backload of all vessels, in July 2010 MPSRON-3 will return to 100 percent.

Marine Corps Prepositioning Program: Norway

The Marine Corps Prepositioning Program-Norway (MCPN) was used to source equipment in support of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, including the recent force increase. MCPN is routinely utilized to support theater security cooperation activities and exercises in the AFRICOM and EUCOM areas of responsibility. The Marine Corps continues to reset MCPN in accordance with our operational priorities while also exploring other locations for geographic prepositioning that will enable combat and theater security cooperation operations in support of forward deployed Naval Forces.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Like many, I am concerned about the lack of number of ships in the Navy. About 100 years ago, Great Britain was a world super power. It was also during this time that Great Britain dominated the sea. Are you concerned that if we don't make it a priority to build ships to maintain our sea dominance that this could weaken our country's super power standing?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. As our security and prosperity are inextricably linked with those of other nations, a global Fleet is essential to deterring aggression, assuring our allies, building partnerships, and protecting our national interests. A Fleet of no less than 313 ships is necessary to meet those operational requirements. Our 30-Year shipbuilding plan grows the capacity of our Fleet to 320 ships by 2024, with the naval capabilities necessary to meet the challenges the nation faces over the next three decades of the 21st century. On balance, I believe the force structure represented by our 30-year shipbuilding plan maintains our ability to project power across the spectrum of challenges we are likely to face throughout the time period of the report, albeit with prudent risk where appropriate.

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Wouldn't you agree that spouses relying on the Military Spouse Career Advancement Account (MyCAA) program to further their academic goals should have been notified prior to the temporary stay in order to make the necessary arrangements with their school?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. I do agree that spouses should have been afforded additional notice in advance of such a significant change in program policies or procedures. The pause was necessitated by an unforeseen, unprecedented spike in enrollments, which not only pushed the program to its budget threshold, but also began to overwhelm the program's support systems. As a senior leader who recognizes the extraordinary role military spouses play in the lives and careers of our uniformed service members, I share the Department's deep regret in reaching the decision to temporarily suspend the program on such short notice.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. The Administration's Phased, Adaptive Approach to BMD drives BMD-capable ships to provide effects at three very different levels of war. First, they must provide theater effects for sea-base defense. They must also provide regional and cross-regional effects to areas like CENTCOM and/or PACOM. Finally they must be able to provide effects for homeland defense (global effects). This is a daunting task. Is the C3 (command, control, communications) architecture in place to enable BMD-capable ships to perform all of these functions? What initiatives are underway to connect the sensors and shooters to provide a layered missile defense that protects not only our forces abroad but the Homeland? Is there a cost to other missions when these ships are conducting their BMD mission? How would you quantify the risk based on this expanded tasking?

Admiral ROUGHEAD. C3 (command, control, communications) architecture is in place to enable BMD-capable ships to perform all three levels of war. The Navy contributes to BMD as part of a Joint and coalition family of systems. As new capabilities are added, the existing Missile Defense Agency managed C3 architecture is up-

dated to ensure interoperability and effectiveness. The key C3 interface between BMD ships and the Ballistic Missile Defense System (BMDS) is in place. In most Combatant Commands (COCOM), the capability exists but requires further upgrades and enhancements. The Navy is currently resourcing Maritime Operations Centers (MOC) with access to the Command and Control Battle Management and Communications (C2BMC) applications to increase Command and Control connectivity with the Global BMDS. The Navy is addressing communication improvements to support seamless BMDS integration across Theater, Regional and Strategic Communications for BMD cueing and track management. A majority of this capability, such as Multi-TADIL-J, exists currently.

Initiatives are being undertaken to connect the sensors and shooters in a layered missile defense that protects not only our forces abroad but also the Homeland. The spiral development of C2BMC includes continuous improvements which will enhance coordination across Navy, Joint and Coalition sensors, contributing to Homeland Defense and theater and regional missions.

Mission prioritization is directed at the highest levels of the DOD and is based on Combatant Commander (CCDR) requirements. Naval operations, to include maritime BMD, are led by Maritime Component Commanders at theater Maritime Operations Centers (MOC), and effectively employ multi-mission Surface Combatants with BMD capability to meet CCDR requirements. Regular CCDR sponsored exercises and test events are used to benchmark and improve coordination among commanders in theater, cross-regional, and Homeland defense operations. Navy has also added BMD scenarios to Fleet battle experiments and exercises to identify and test additional enhancements.

The BMD mission does not represent an increase in overall risk, but rather a reduction in risk to our deployed forces and interests around the globe. That said, the Navy has a finite number of surface combatants to conduct numerous missions. Combatant Commanders balance theater level requirements, forces and risk in carrying out their missions, to include BMD.

Mr. LAMBORN. Our potential adversaries have shown the capability and willingness to deny our forces access to satellite communications either through the use of anti-satellite weapons or communications jamming. While anti-satellite technology is a very real threat, proven by China's January 2007 shoot down of one of their aging satellites, the technology to interfere with satellite communications is simple and readily available worldwide from any local Radio Shack store. What specific measures has the U.S. Navy taken to ensure that it can continue to provide missile defense in a satellite communications denied environment? I understand if this requires a classified response, but I encourage you to share what you can with this committee in both an unclassified and classified response.

Admiral ROUGHHEAD. The Navy currently has a number of mitigation techniques to counter jamming threats available for use in a Satellite Communications (SATCOM) degraded environment. Use of frequency hopping, agile spot beams, and spread spectrum techniques provide low probability of detection and intercept of our SATCOM. The Department of the Navy studies SATCOM degraded environment mitigations through our Range of Warfare Command and Control initiative, better preparing our forces to meet their operational requirements despite others' efforts to disrupt them. The Navy is capable of conducting its missions in this challenging environment, to include missile defense. Through these efforts, and in cooperation with the joint and interagency community on the development of other mitigations, like the Joint Aerial Layer Network, the Navy will be poised to operate in the most challenging electromagnetic environments now and in the years to come.

If you desire further elaboration on the Navy's mitigation techniques and initiatives, I can provide a classified response or have my staff brief you on the issue in more detail.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Secretary Mabus, as you may know, in the FY10 NDAA report language was included regarding the Miramar Air Station Trap and Skeet range. The provision in the NDAA directs the "Secretary to submit a report to the Committee on Armed Services of the Senate and the Committee on Armed Services of the House of Representatives when the PA/SI is complete. The report should include a description of any mitigation measures needed and timeline to complete, and plans and timeline to reopen the range." It is my understanding that the PA/SI was completed in December 2009. Can you please tell me what the status is of your report to both the SASC and HASC as well as when it will be available for our review?

Secretary MABUS. The Preliminary Assessment report is complete. The Site Inspection report was recently revised to reflect regulatory agency comments and was finalized March 18, 2010. Based on the results of these studies, the Report to Congress required by the House Report 2647 of the FY10 NDAA is currently being prepared and will be provided to the Senate and House Armed Services Committees in the next 60 days. Copies of the Preliminary Assessment and the Site Inspection reports will also be made available to the Committees.

Mr. HUNTER. General Conway, it is my understanding that the Marine Corps has developed a roll-on, roll-off technology that expands the capability of the KC-130J. The Harvest Hawk program will enable the KC-130J to fulfill multiple missions individually or simultaneously from refueling missions, including fire support missions and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance (ISR) missions. I am encouraged by the Marine Corps' work with Harvest Hawk and their plan to increase the capability of the KC-130J aircraft in order to take advantage of the extended endurance of the KC-130J. What is the status of the Harvest Hawk developmental effort and when do you expect to be able to field the capability?

General CONWAY. Harvest Hawk is currently in developmental test and is expected to deploy during the summer 2010.

