DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2018

HEARINGS

BEFORE A

SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

KAY GRANGER, Texas, *Chairwoman*

HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky
KEN CALVERT, California
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
STEVE WOMACK, Arkansas
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida
TOM GRAVES, Georgia
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama

PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
BETTY McCOLLUM, Minnesota
TIM RYAN, Ohio
C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas

NOTE: Under committee rules, Mr. Frelinghuysen, as chairman of the full committee, and Mrs. Lowey, as ranking minority member of the full committee, are authorized to sit as members of all subcommittees.

JENNIFER MILLER, WALTER HEARNE, BROOKE BOYER, B G WRIGHT, ADRIENNE RAMSAY, ALLISON DETERS, MEGAN MILAM, CORNELL TEAGUE, COLLIN LEE, MATTHEW BOWER, and SHERRY L. YOUNG
Subcommittee Staff

	Page
Testimony of Members of Congress	**1**
U.S. Central Command	**189**
U.S. European Command	**257**
United States Pacific Command	**281**
National Guard Bureau/Reserve Componets	**319**
Department of Defense	**451**
Public Witness Statements	**529**

U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

WASHINGTON : 2018

28–272

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN, New Jersey, *Chairman*

HAROLD ROGERS, Kentucky[1]
ROBERT B. ADERHOLT, Alabama
KAY GRANGER, Texas
MICHAEL K. SIMPSON, Idaho
JOHN ABNEY CULBERSON, Texas
JOHN R. CARTER, Texas
KEN CALVERT, California
TOM COLE, Oklahoma
MARIO DIAZ-BALART, Florida
CHARLES W. DENT, Pennsylvania
TOM GRAVES, Georgia
KEVIN YODER, Kansas
STEVE WOMACK, Arkansas
JEFF FORTENBERRY, Nebraska
THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida
CHARLES J. FLEISCHMANN, Tennessee
JAIME HERRERA BEUTLER, Washington
DAVID P. JOYCE, Ohio
DAVID G. VALADAO, California
ANDY HARRIS, Maryland
MARTHA ROBY, Alabama
MARK E. AMODEI, Nevada
CHRIS STEWART, Utah
DAVID YOUNG, Iowa
EVAN H. JENKINS, West Virginia
STEVEN M. PALAZZO, Mississippi
DAN NEWHOUSE, Washington
JOHN R. MOOLENAAR, Michigan
SCOTT TAYLOR, Virginia

NITA M. LOWEY, New York
MARCY KAPTUR, Ohio
PETER J. VISCLOSKY, Indiana
JOSÉ E. SERRANO, New York
ROSA L. DELAURO, Connecticut
DAVID E. PRICE, North Carolina
LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, California
SANFORD D. BISHOP, JR., Georgia
BARBARA LEE, California
BETTY MCCOLLUM, Minnesota
TIM RYAN, Ohio
C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER, Maryland
DEBBIE WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Florida
HENRY CUELLAR, Texas
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine
MIKE QUIGLEY, Illinois
DEREK KILMER, Washington
MATT CARTWRIGHT, Pennsylvania
GRACE MENG, New York
MARK POCAN, Wisconsin
KATHERINE M. CLARK, Massachusetts
PETE AGUILAR, California

[1] Chairman Emeritus

NANCY FOX, *Clerk and Staff Director*

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2018

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

TESTIMONY OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GRANGER

Ms. GRANGER. The Subcommittee on Defense will come to order.

Good morning. The subcommittee will hold an open hearing during which Members of the House of Representatives will have the input and the opportunity to provide the subcommittee their input on how to address the challenges and needs facing our military.

At no other time in history have we as a Nation faced such serious, complex, and growing threats to our national security. As Members of the Congress, it is our constitutional responsibility to provide for our Nation's defense. We must ensure that the brave men and women who protect us have the tools, training, and equipment they need.

Mr. Visclosky, the committee's ranking member, and I are here today to hear your thoughts and ideas about how we can make sure the Department has what it needs to meet the challenges. Your input today will be of great benefit to the committee as we draft the fiscal year 2018 defense appropriation bill.

At this time, I would like to recognize Mr. Visclosky, the ranking member, for any opening comments he would like to make.

OPENING REMARKS OF MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chairwoman.

First of all, I want to thank the chair for holding this hearing. I do think it is vitally important at the outset, given the fact that we are going to have a supplemental due shortly, as well as a fiscal year 2018 budget submission in May to hear from our colleagues in advance. I also look forward to the hearing. I also appreciate the fact that I believe this is now the first hearing that I will share with the chairwoman and wish her luck in this endeavor and look forward to hearing from our witnesses throughout the day.

Thank you very much.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Out of respect for members' time, we will strictly adhere to the 5-minute clock. The timer in front of me, this one right here, will change from green to yellow when you have 1 minute remaining to conclude your statement. Your full written statement will be made a part of the record.

The gentlelady from Guam is recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, A DELEGATE FROM THE TERRITORY OF GUAM

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DELEGATE BORDALLO

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you very much, Chairman Granger, and Ranking Member Visclosky, and the members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. And thank you for allowing me the time to address you this morning.

I do very much appreciate the work that this subcommittee made in developing the fiscal year 2017 appropriations bill. And I believe it makes many good investments in the defense of our country. And I thank the subcommittee for their support of some critical programs.

Though it is difficult to make requests without a budget before us, I would like to take a few minutes to outline a few critical capabilities which I hope to see supported as the appropriations process for fiscal year 2018 moves forward.

In particular, I would first like to note my appreciation for your inclusion of $9.5 million in fiscal year 2017 appropriations bill for the reestablishment of drydocking capabilities in the western Pacific. This critical funding, which is a tiny fraction of the Navy ship repair account, will enable our forward deployed forces in the region and reduce our reliance on foreign ship repair. This is particularly important in a contested environment with the potential for limited access, so I very much appreciate the committee's support in appropriating at the authorized level for fiscal year 2017.

Now moving forward, I do hope to continue to work together to ensure that the Navy is adequately resourced to operate and maintain their fleet in the western Pacific, especially given that 60 percent of the fleet is to be operating in the Pacific; 60 percent. And the threat in our region, Madam Chairman and Ranking Member, is very, very real, and it grows more so every day. Funding this capability is essential to having a viable, forward deployed fleet.

The second item I would like to raise is my support for full funding of the B–21 Raider program. This next-generation bomber will replace a sorely aging fleet that has provided us with long-range strike capabilities for generations. With an ability to strike anywhere in the world, it is the most versatile leg of the nuclear triad, and also provides a tested and proven conventional strike capability.

Moving forward, especially at this stage of the acquisition program, it will be important to ensure adequate funding in order to avoid unnecessary and costly delays. On Guam, we recently saw the deployment to the Pacific of all three existing bomber airframes for the first time in history, and the continuous bomber presence at Anderson Air Force Base is a linchpin for America power projection in the region.

And finally, Madam Chairman, I also want to briefly touch on the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration program. I have appreciated very much this committee's long-standing support to find resources to address the unfunded requirements of this program. The REPI program helps to stop encroachment at the U.S. military installations and training ranges across the country. There is a long and a growing list of projects that need funding, so I would ask the subcommittee to continue to address the unfunded requirements to address this backlog.

And again, Madam Chairman and Ranking Member, and other members, I thank you again for your time and your support. I truly appreciate it and the consideration of my testimony here today. And I yield back.

[The written statement of Delegate Bordallo follows:]

TESTIMONY OF

CONGRESSWOMAN MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO

BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

MARCH 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, thank you for allowing me the time to address you this morning. I know you might find it odd to say this but I often find a friendlier audience amongst my friends on the Appropriations Committee than I do with my own authorizing committee. To that end, I do appreciate the work this subcommittee made in developing the FY17 appropriations bill. I believe it makes many good investments in the defense of our country and I thank the subcommittee for their support of some critical programs.

Though it is difficult to make requests without a budget before us, I would like to take just a few minutes to outline a few critical capabilities which I hope to see supported as the appropriations process for Fiscal Year 2018 moves forward.

In particular, I would first like to note my appreciation for your inclusion of $9.5 million in the Fiscal Year 2017 Appropriations bill for the re-establishment of dry docking capabilities in the Western Pacific. This critical funding, which is a tiny fraction of the Navy's ship repair account will enable our forward deployed forces in the region and reduce our reliance on foreign ship repair. This is particularly important in a contested environment with the potential for limited access, so I appreciate the committee's support in appropriating at the authorized level for Fiscal Year 2017. Moving forward, I hope to continue to work together to ensure that the Navy is adequately resourced to operate and maintain their fleet in the Western Pacific especially given that 60 percent of the fleet is to be operating in the Pacific. The threat in our region is very real and grows every day. Funding this capability is essential to having a viable forward deployed fleet.

The second item I would like to raise is my support for full funding of the B-21 Raider program. This next-generation bomber will replace a sorely aging fleet that has provided us with long range strike capabilities for generations. With an ability to strike anywhere in the world, it is the most versatile leg of the nuclear triad, and also provides a tested and proven conventional strike capability. Moving forward, especially at this stage of the acquisition program, it will be important to ensure adequate funding in order to avoid unnecessary and costly delays. On Guam, we recently saw the deployment to the Pacific of all three existing bomber air frames for the first time in history, and the continuous bomber presence at Andersen Air Force Base is a lynchpin for American power projection in the region.

Finally, I also want to briefly touch on the Readiness and Environmental Protection Integration program. I have appreciated this subcommittee's long standing support to find resources to address the unfunded requirements of this program. The REPI program helps to stop encroachment at U.S. military installations and training ranges across the country. There is a long and growing list of projects that need funding so I would ask the subcommittee continue to address the unfunded requirements to address the backlog.

Thank you again for your time, and consideration of my testimony here today.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you for your testimony today and your continuing support. I enjoyed our visit there. Thank you very much.

Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Welcome, and you are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. GLENN THOMPSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN THOMPSON

Mr. THOMPSON. Thank you, Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky. I want to take a couple seconds. I just had the opportunity to spend some time with the gentlelady from Guam and our Natural Resource chairman in Guam. I certainly want to support her request. It is very evident being there how that it really is the tip of the spear for us in terms of our defense. And good morning and thank you for the opportunity to share my priorities for fiscal year 2018 defense appropriations.

As the father of an Army staff sergeant who has received the Purple Heart during combat in Operation Iraqi Freedom and a strong supporter of our Nation's defense programs, I appreciate the subcommittee's willingness to receive testimony from incoming members. This truly is a privilege and an honor to be before you this morning. I recognize the challenges placed before the subcommittee and I appreciate your ongoing commitment to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, Coast Guardsmen, and Reserve forces.

For the first time in years, we have an opportunity to ensure that our military does not face a continued drawdown in force strength. This begins with ensuring that our military continues to have the tools and equipment to get the job done. And for this reason, I will be respectfully requesting funding for the C–130 in-flight propeller balancing system to be increased by $18 million from fiscal year 2017 levels. The system will improve fuel efficiency, increase readiness and mission availability, and reduce maintenance costs for our Nation's C–130 fleet.

I also respectfully request full funding of the *Columbia*-class submarine program. As the *Ohio*-class submarines begin to retire in 2031, it is imperative that we fund their replacement to maintain a presence in the world. Supporting our troops when they return home from the front lines is just as important as providing them the tools that they need to defend our Nation.

As a former healthcare professional with nearly 3 decades of experience, I would like to advocate for expanding telemedicine access for veterans and out Active Duty military. In light of recent technology advances, evolving telemedicine programs and the authority given to the Department of Defense by Congress in support of telemedicine, I respectfully request strong financial support for both the medical information technology development program and the medical technology development program within DOD defense health programs for fiscal year 2018.

It is undeniable that those within the Department of Defense have demonstrated their willingness to improve the lives of the military members and civilians alike. Medical research conducted within the Department has led to lifesaving breakthroughs and the development of effective treatments for numerous conditions. In order for the Department to build on previous discoveries and maintain momentum in medical research fields, it is imperative that we provide adequate funding for vital research programs. These include the multiple sclerosis research program, the ALS research program, the breast cancer research program, the ovarian research program and the Peer Reviewed Orthopaedic Research Program. There is no doubt that making critical investments in medical research at the Federal level will improve the well-being of our Nation as a whole.

Now, while we work to assist our servicemen and -women who are here with us, we must keep in mind the more than 80,000 American citizens who served in the Vietnam war, the Korean war, and World War II who are still missing in action, according to the Department of Defense. For those who made the ultimate sacrifice, their families and loved ones deserve no less than our greatest efforts for their recovery. To continue attempts to recover our fallen heros overseas, diligent work planning and sufficient funding is necessary. To provide grieving families the opportunity for closure, I respectfully request that the subcommittee supports robust funding for the Defense POW/MIA office in the fiscal year 2018.

In tandem with providing adequate support services to all our servicemen and -women, we must also recognize the value of encouraging innovation in the U.S. defense industrial base. The manufacturing technology program, also known as ManTech, is intended to improve the productivity and responsiveness of the U.S. defense industrial base by funding the development optimization and transition of providing manufacturing technologies to key Naval suppliers. And specifically my district, the Pennsylvania State University's Applied Research Laboratory manages two ManTech centers of excellence: The Institute of Manufacturing and Sustainment Technologies and the Electro-Optics Center. The work accomplished by these partnerships includes basic and applied research and technology demonstrations and facilitation of technology commercialization. I respectfully encourage the committee to look favorably at this request.

And finally, I would like to register my support for a diverse energy mix in the American military installations abroad, including energy domestically sourced. If there are viable, cost effective ways to utilize American energy on our bases abroad, I fully recommend that we pursue those avenues. And specifically, I recommend the United States implement strategies to consider that all energy needs acquired by the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany be sourced domestically within the United States.

Really again, once again, it is a privilege and honor to be before you this morning, and thank you for your leadership that you are providing.

[The written statement of Congressman Thompson follows:]

The Honorable Glenn 'GT' Thompson
(PA-05)

Testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense
Member Hearing on Appropriations for Fiscal Year 2018
Tuesday, March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky:

Good morning and thank you for the opportunity to share my priorities for Fiscal Year 2018 Defense appropriations. As the father of an Army Staff Sergeant who has received a Purple Heart during Operation Iraqi Freedom, and a strong supporter of our nation's defense programs, I appreciate the subcommittee's willingness to receive testimony from in-committee members.

I recognize the challenges placed before the Subcommittee and appreciate your ongoing commitment to our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, coast guardsmen and reserve forces.

For the first time in years, we have an opportunity to ensure that our military does not face a continued drawdown in force strength.

This begins with ensuring that our military continues to have the tools and equipment to get the job done. For this reason, I will be respectfully requesting funding for the C-130 In-Flight Propeller Balancing System to be increased by $18 million from FY17 levels. This system will improve fuel efficiency, increase readiness and mission availability, and reduce maintenance costs for our nation's C-130 fleet.

I also respectfully request full funding of the COLUMBIA Class Submarine program. As the OHIO Class submarines begin to retire in 2031, it is imperative that we fund their replacement to maintain a presence around the world.

Supporting our troops when they return home from the front lines is just as important as providing them the tools they need to defend our nation.

As a former healthcare professional, with nearly three decades of experience, I would like to advocate for expanding telemedicine access for veterans. In light of recent technology advances, evolving telemedicine programs, and the authority given to the Department of Defense by Congress in support of telemedicine, I respectfully request strong financial support for both the Medical Information Technology Development Program and the Medical Technology Development Program within DOD Defense Health Programs for Fiscal Year 2018.

It is undeniable that those within the Department of Defense have demonstrated their willingness to improve the lives of military members and civilians alike. Medical research conducted within the department has led to lifesaving breakthroughs and the development of effective treatments for numerous conditions.

In order for the Department to build on previous discoveries and maintain momentum in medical research fields, it is imperative that we provide adequate funding for vital research programs.

These include the Multiple Sclerosis Research Program, the ALS Research Program, the Breast Cancer Research Program, the Ovarian Research Program, and the Peer Reviewed Orthopedic Research Program. There is no doubt that making critical investments in medical research at the federal level will improve the well-bring of our nation as a whole.

While we work to assist our service men and women who are here with us, we must keep in mind that more than 80,000 American Citizens who served in the Vietnam War, Korean War, and World War II are still missing in action, according to the Department of Defense.

For those who made the ultimate sacrifice, their families and loved ones deserve no less than our greatest efforts for recovery. To continue attempts to recover our fallen heroes overseas, diligent work, planning and sufficient funding is necessary. To provide grieving families the opportunity for closure, I respectfully request that the Subcommittee supports robust funding for the Defense POW/MIA Office in Fiscal Year 2018.

In tandem with providing adequate support services to all of our servicemen and women, we must also recognize the value of encouraging innovation in the U.S. defense industrial base. The Manufacturing Technology Program, also known as ManTech, is intended to improve the productivity and responsiveness of the U.S. defense industrial base by funding the development, optimization, and transition of providing manufacturing technologies to key naval suppliers.

Specifically, in my district, The Pennsylvania State University's Applied Research Laboratory manages two ManTech Centers of Excellence, the Institute for Manufacturing and Sustainment Technologies, and the Electro-Optics Center. The work accomplished by these partnerships includes basic and applied research and technology demonstrations and the facilitation of technology commercialization. I respectfully encourage the committee to look favorably upon this request.

Finally, I would like to register my support for a diverse energy mix in American military installations abroad, including energy domestically sourced. If there are viable, cost-effective ways to utilize American energy on our bases abroad, I fully recommend we pursue these avenues.

Specifically, I recommend that the United States implement strategies to consider that all energy needs required by the Kaiserslautern Military Community in the Federal Republic of Germany be sourced domestically within the United States. Supporting our military presence abroad with American energy will not only create jobs at home, but eliminate energy-based conflicts of interest between the US and Russia.

Thank you again for your continued commitment to the issues within the jurisdiction of your Subcommittee and the Committee as a whole. I appreciate your consideration and look forward to working with you to support the needs of our military.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Visclosky.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate the gentleman raising the issue of the industrial base, particularly ManTech. You are not the only member that has certainly brought it to the committee's attention, but appreciate your concern. I also appreciate the fact that we have been joined by four of our colleagues during your testimony. It was compelling. Thank you very much.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Oklahoma. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. JIM BRIDENSTINE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OKLAHOMA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BRIDENSTINE

Mr. BRIDENSTINE. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you ranking member. I have five specific requests that I will get right into.

First, I would request that this subcommittee appropriate $10 million for Air Force weather service or weather system follow-on RDT&E funds to fund the commercial weather data pilot program. Congress formerly established this program in the fiscal year 2017 NDAA. The Appropriations Committee provided $5 million for the program in the fiscal year 2017 defense appropriations bill we just passed yesterday. So thank you for that.

The reason we need, in my estimation, a commercial purchase of data for weather for the Department of Defense is threefold. Number one, it distributes the architecture. Currently, we have massive satellites that could be an easy target for the enemies of the United States. If we start purchasing commercial data, it very quickly distributes the architecture. In other words, there are more satellites that complicate the targeting solution for the enemy.

I am not suggesting that we need to cannibalize any of our existing architecture at all. In fact, the program did continue to go forward, but we need to augment that with additional commercial data simply to distribute the architecture and complicate the targeting solution and lower the orbit for the enemies of the United States. That is number one.

Number two, it also spreads the cost across the private sector. These constellations are launching not because they want to serve the Department of Defense; they are launching because they are serving the agricultural industry, the transportation industry, the entertainment industry, the shipping industry. And so what we ought to do as a government is be one of many customers of this private commercial weather data and feed our numerical weather models.

Finally, when we do this, we get more data, better data, in some cases, more resilient data and, certainly, more rapid refresh of the data, which all improves the weather models for the warfighters in theaters. So I think it is important that we fund $10 million in Air Force weather service or weather system follow-on RDT&E money.

Second, this subcommittee should appropriate at least $50 million in Air Force wide band global SATCOM RDT&E for the Air Force satellite communications pilot program. The fiscal year 2015 NDAA created this pilot program to fund demonstrations of commercial SATCOM services which offer order of magnitude increases in capability. The Defense Authorization and Appropriations Committee have strongly supported this program. This Appropriations Committee included $10 million for it within the fiscal year 2017 bill.

The reason this is important, as a warfighter we have bifurcated architectures. We lease commercial SATCOM capabilities from the private sector at the same time that we are building our own government owned and operated systems. Government systems use X-band, Ka-band upper. Commercial systems use C-band, Ka-band lower, as well as Ku-band. The challenge here is they don't work together. We need a single integrated system. We have an analysis of alternatives that is currently being prioritized right now by the Department of Defense to bring these architectures together. And we need order of magnitude, generational leaps, and capability that commercial can bring to the table.

That brings me to my third request, which is protected tactical service. In this bifurcated environment that we live in, commercial SATCOM is not as resilient as it otherwise could be. It brings a tremendous amount of capability in throughput and data, hundreds of gigabits per second of throughput, but it is not protected. It is not frequency hopping for antijam capabilities. In many cases, it is not encrypted. So what we have to do to bring the architectures together is fund the protected tactical service so we get the wave forms and the modems necessary for commercial operators to be able to provide the warfighters some level of protection. So sticking with this, we need to fund the protected tactical service.

Fourth, this subcommittee should support the President's likely budget request—I say likely because it is not guaranteed—for enterprise ground services. We need to make sure that our systems are not bifurcated. So when you think of communications, GPS, missile warning and weather, these ground systems are not able to receive and transmit each other's data. What this means is that everything is stovepiped and it prevents us from being able to create a single integrated operating picture for the combatant commanders in theater. So we need to fund the enterprise ground services program that I hope will be in the President's budget request.

Finally, this subcommittee should appropriate at least $30 million in Air Force RDT&E money for the space test program to fund responsive launch operational demonstrations and missions. The Appropriations Committee included $15 million in the fiscal year 2017 appropriations for this purpose. The reason this is important, constellations are growing, electronics are getting smaller, we are seeing a whole lot more activity being launched into low Earth orbit. We are talking about launch manifest growing exponentially and these launches are going overseas. The Department of Defense is now dependent on commercial satellites, commercial capabilities, and these are growing rapidly. And our launches now are going overseas because we don't have the infrastructure here. So that would be my final request.

[The written statement of Congressman Bridenstine follows:]

CONGRESSMAN JIM BRIDENSTINE
STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD
FY 2018 DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS - MEMBERS DAY
HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE
THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017

Introduction

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky and distinguished members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify on fiscal year 2018 national security appropriations.

During the Cold War, outer space was a relative sanctuary from military conflict. Two big players – the United States and the Soviet Union – shared the "ultimate high ground" with each possessing a small number of high-value satellite systems. Now, space is an increasingly congested and contested theater of operations for the United States, our allies and partners, and commercial operators. From GPS-guided munitions, to mobile communications, to high-fidelity imagery, the American Way of War relies upon space-based capabilities.

In the space domain, the Department of Defense (DOD) must develop, acquire, operate, and sustain space capabilities in fundamentally new ways. Our current space systems are **stovepiped, vulnerable, and expensive**. Our next-generation space systems must be **integrated, resilient, and affordable**. My five requests help move DOD toward these objectives.

Commercial Weather Data Pilot Program

First, this Subcommittee should appropriate $10.0 million in Air Force Weather Service or Weather System Follow-On RDT&E to fund the Commercial Weather Data Pilot Program. Congress formally established this Pilot Program in the FY17 NDAA. The Appropriations Committee provided $5.0 million for the program in the FY17 Defense Appropriations bill we passed yesterday. Multiple companies are launching constellations of small weather satellites to serve customers ranging from agriculture, to transportation, to energy, to insurance.

The pilot program will test, validate, and hopefully purchase commercial weather data and services to improve DOD weather models and forecasts. Buying data and services from commercial operators distributes our space-based weather data architecture and complicates the targeting picture for our enemies. Commercial weather data also improves DOD weather models through providing more data, more recent data, and in some cases, better data. Planners and operational forces get more accurate and timely forecasts. Since the U.S. government is one of many customers, the cost to the taxpayer would be shared and correspondingly reduced. I urge the Subcommittee to continue its forward-thinking support for this innovative program.

Satellite Communications Pilot Program

Secondly, this Subcommittee should appropriate at least $50.0 million in Air Force Wideband Global SATCOM RDT&E for the Air Force Satellite Communications (SATCOM) Pilot Program. The FY15 NDAA created this Pilot Program to fund demonstrations of commercial SATCOM services which offer order-of-magnitude increases in capability. The defense authorization and appropriations committees have strongly supported the program. This Appropriations Committee included $10.0 million for it within the FY17 bill.

The DOD relies heavily on both commercial and military systems to deliver communications capability – voice, video, and data – to the warfighter. In fact, commercial operators provide 80% of SATCOM, but the Department buys commercial in the most inefficient way possible – annual spot market leases.

In the face of surging demand and growing adversary threats (such as jammers), DOD is currently conducting an Analysis of Alternatives to help determine the follow-on architecture for the legacy Wideband Global SATCOM or WGS system. Will DOD replace one stovepiped, vulnerable, and expensive architecture with another? Or will DOD open the aperture and consider integrated, resilient, and affordable alternatives? This AoA will shape the answer and the SATCOM Pilot Program will inform the process. Dedicated funding is needed to demonstrate promising technologies and commercial business models such as managed services.

Protected Tactical Service

Sticking with SATCOM, this Subcommittee should support the President's likely budget request for Protected Tactical Service (PTS). In truth, we really need to accelerate this program. As I mentioned earlier, our current SATCOM architecture is stovepiped and imposes a choice between protection and throughput. Protection stops jamming, cyber attacks, and other attempts to degrade or deny the signal. Throughput delivers the "bits" – voice, video, and other data – to the warfighter. Commercial SATCOM systems – the kinds that deliver DirecTV and internet from space – have a massive throughput advantage over government systems, but generally lack the most robust military-grade protection. Protected Tactical Service helps "level the playing field" by developing standardized protected waveforms and modems usable on both government and commercial systems. Bringing commercial up to military-grade protection moves us closer to a unified SATCOM architecture.

Enterprise Ground Services

Fourth, this Subcommittee should support the President's likely budget request for Enterprise Ground Services (EGS). Ground stations process and transmit data and command the satellite. Today's ground stations, however, are custom-built which prevents automated and efficient data sharing between them. For example, a GPS ground station cannot "talk" to a missile warning ground station. Walled off ground systems prevent national and operational commanders from getting a common operating picture. We link together systems in the air, maritime, and land domains. Let's do the same for the space domain.

EGS will develop common standards and interfaces for ground systems for protected communications, GPS, missile warning, and weather. Eventually, EGS will insert a common operating system which increases automation and data sharing across the enterprise. Commonality and automation will dramatically reduce the sustainment costs and produce a common operating picture that is essential for exercising command of forces in a contested environment. I urge the Subcommittee to continue its support for EGS.

Responsive Space Launch

Finally, this Subcommittee should appropriate at least $30.0 million in Air Force RDT&E for the Space Test Program to fund responsive launch operational demonstrations and missions. The Appropriations Committee included $15.0 million in FY17 Appropriations for this purpose. In the space business, launch is rightly considered the "long pole in the tent". The dearth of U.S. launch capacity is forcing our most innovative space companies to launch overseas on foreign rockets. Recently, the U.S. remote sensing company Planet sent 88 next-generation imagery satellites to space on an Indian rocket. It's truly disgraceful when U.S. companies – and U.S. astronauts – must hitch a ride on Russian rockets only to see Moscow use the fare to fund its military space programs.

This problem is about to get much worse. OneWeb, SpaceX, Boeing and others are planning multi-thousand satellite constellations in Low-Earth Orbit. The only question is will they launch American? The military also needs responsive launch capabilities as much as commercial operators. An army of inexpensive, responsive rockets could rapidly populate and reconstitute military satellites. Responsive launch facilitates rapid technology refresh and deters adversaries from attacking on-orbit assets.

NASA's Venture Class Launch Services program is fostering the burgeoning small launch vehicle market through dedicated cubesat launches. DOD's Space Test Program has the experience and expertise to do the same for expendable, partially reusable, and reusable vehicles launching payloads of all sizes.

Conclusion

The Subcommittee has already helped DOD begin to adapt to the fundamentally new space domain. The FY17 defense appropriations bill we passed yesterday is testament to this Subcommittee's forward-thinking. I urge the Subcommittee to continue its work through supporting the five innovative initiatives which I have discussed. I thank the Subcommittee for the opportunity to testify this morning.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much. Thank you for your information.

Each person has 5 minutes to speak. At the 4-minute time, your yellow light will come on, that gives you one more minute. However, we have your written testimony. So if you are not able to testify and finish that in 5 minutes, we have it written here.

Mr. Visclosky, did you have something?

Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Pennsylvania. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. BRIAN K. FITZPATRICK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN FITZPATRICK

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Good morning. I would like to start by thanking Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and members of the subcommittee for holding this hearing. And I am here today on behalf of Pennsylvania's Eighth Congressional District in their support for Department of Defense funds be allocated to a comprehensive health study and remediation effort of public and private wells contaminated by perflourinated compounds, namely PFOA and PFOS.

Nearly 70,000 Pennsylvanians may have been exposed to levels of PFOA and PFOS exceeding the lifetime health advisory level set by the EPA. These chemicals have been reported in public and private drinking wells at and around the former Naval Air Warfare Center in Warminster and former Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base in Horsham, as well as the Horsham Air Guard Station. These contaminants have also been found in communities surrounding over 600 military installations nationwide. PFOA has heavily impacted communities such as Hoosick Falls, New York, as well.

PFOS, PFOA, and other emerging contaminants are unregulated compounds being sampled for the first time in public water systems. The EPA uses unregulated contaminant monitoring rule to collect data for contaminates suspected to be present in drinking water. In the summer of 2014, as a result of the EPA effort to test for emerging contaminants, concentrations of PFOS and PFOA were found to exceed the EPA's provisional health advisory levels of 400 parts per trillion in several onsite monitoring wells. The U.S. Navy and Air National Guard, in conjunction with the EPA, expanded groundwater sampling in my district to include private wells and public offsite wells. In May of 2016, the EPA released a lifetime health advisory of 70 parts per trillion on the chemicals. Since then, 22 public wells and over 140 private wells have been shut down due to high levels of PFOS and PFOAs.

The military does not dispute its responsibility for the well contamination in Horsham, Warrington, and Warminster. And it is suspected that high levels of PFOS and PFOA originated from firefighting foams used in the Naval and Air National Guard bases in the 1970s. The Navy has spent at least $19 million and the Air Na-

tional Guard has spent at least $8.3 million in remediation efforts, which includes the installation of granular activated carbon filtration systems in public wells, bottled water for residents with private wells, pump connection to public water systems, and paying for replacement water from neighboring public water systems. That said, the Department of Defense should work with Centers for Disease Control and the Pennsylvania Department of Health to conduct a comprehensive study related to the long-term health impacts of both PFOA and PFOS. My constituents have a right to safe, clean drinking water and they deserve to know if PFOS and PFOA have compromised their long-term health.

I urge you to include funding for the Department of Defense to conduct long-term health study on the impacts of these two chemicals, PFOS and PFOA. These studies will aid the Federal Government, in conjunction with State and local agencies, to reverse the contamination and protect the health and welfare of residents. Additionally, I urge the committee to appropriate funding that allows the Department of Defense to fund cleanup and remediation of PFOS and PFOA.

While the U.S. Navy and Air National Guard have worked in conjunction with affected municipalities in supplying clean drinking water to residents, the decision for public water suppliers to purchase uncontaminated water from the surrounding communities resulted in the water customer bearing the cost.

Again, I would like to thank you for your time and consideration. A low cost, common-sense study will go a long way in providing Americans critical information about the impact that these unregulated chemicals may have on our health, and we look forward to working with you and this committee in accomplishing that goal. And I thank you for your time.

[The written statement of Congressman Fitzpatrick follows:]

STATEMENT OF
REPRESENTATIVE BRIAN FITZPATRICK OF PENNSYLVANIA'S EIGHTH DISTRICT
BEFORE THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
MARCH 2, 2017

I would like to start off by thanking Chairman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and members of this subcommittee for holding this hearing. I am here today on behalf of Pennsylvania's eighth congressional district and their support for Department of Defense (DoD) funds to be allocated to a comprehensive health study and remediation effort of public and private wells contaminated by perfluorinated compounds, namely perfluorooctanoic acid (PFOA) and perfluorooctanesulfonic acid (PFOS).

Nearly 70,000 Pennsylvanians may have been exposed to levels of PFOA and PFOS exceeding the Lifetime Health Advisory levels set by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). These chemicals have been reported in public and private drinking wells at and around the former Naval Air Warfare Center in Warminster and former Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base in Horsham, as well as the Horsham Air Guard Station. These contaminants have also been found in communities surrounding over 600 military installations nationwide. PFOA has heavily impacted communities such as Hoosick Falls, New York.

PFOS, PFOA, and other emerging contaminants are unregulated compounds being sampled for the first time in public water systems. The EPA uses the Unregulated Contaminant Monitoring Rule to collect data for contaminants suspected to be present in the drinking water. In the summer of 2014 as a result of an EPA effort to test for emerging contaminants, concentrations of PFOS and PFOA were found to exceed the EPA's Provisional Health Advisory levels (400 ppt) in several onsite monitoring wells. The U.S. Navy and Air National Guard in conjunction with the EPA expanded groundwater sampling in my district to include private and public offsite wells. In May 2016, the EPA released a Lifetime Health Advisory (70 ppt) on the chemicals. Since then, 22 public wells and over 140 private wells have been shut down due to high levels of PFOS and PFOA.

The military does not dispute its responsibility for the well contamination in Horsham, Warrington, and Warminster areas of my district. It is suspected that high levels of PFOS and PFOA originated from firefighting foams used on the Naval and Air National Guard bases since the 1970s. The Navy has spent at least $19 million and the Air National Guard has spent at least $8.3 million in remediation efforts, which included the installation of Granular Activated Carbon filtration systems on public wells, bottled water for residents with private wells, home connections to public water systems, and paying for replacement water from neighboring public water systems.

That said, the Department of Defense should work with Centers for Disease Control (CDC) and the Pennsylvania Department of Health to conduct a comprehensive study related to the long term health impacts of PFOA and PFOS. My constituents have a right to safe, clean drinking water and they deserve to know if PFOS and PFOA have compromised their long-term health. I urge you to include funding for the Department of Defense to conduct a long-term health study on the impacts of PFOS and PFOA. These studies will aid the federal government in

conjunction with state and local agencies to reverse the contamination and protect the health and welfare of our residents.

Additionally, I urge the committee to appropriate funding that allows the Department of Defense to fund the cleanup and remediation of PFOS and PFOA. While the U.S. Navy and Air National Guard have worked in conjunction with the affected municipalities in supplying clean water to residents, the decision for public water suppliers to purchase uncontaminated water from the surrounding communities resulted in the water customer bearing the cost. [1]

Again, thank you for your time and consideration. A low-cost, commonsense study will go a long way in providing Americans critical information about the impact these unregulated chemicals may have on their health. We look forward to working with you to accomplish this goal.

[1] http://www.theintell.com/news/horsham-pfos/blood-boiling-over-warminster-water-rate-hike/article_3aa72666-708e-11e6-b579-7fc763886913.html

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much. And thank you for your testimony.

We have two others that signed up for this time who are not here right now, they haven't come in yet. So we will give a few minutes to see about that.

Are there any questions on this testimony?

Thank you very much.

The gentleman from Texas, welcome. We will take you now, Roger Williams.

I recognize the gentleman from Texas. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. ROGER WILLIAMS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF TEXAS

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILLIAMS

Mr. WILLIAMS. Thank you, Madam Chairman, and Ranking Member Visclosky, members of the subcommittee. I thank you for allowing me to testify before you today about some of my priorities for the fiscal year 2018 Department of Defense appropriations bill.

But first, Madam Chair, I would like to congratulate you on the chairmanship of this prestigious subcommittee. I think the funding of our Nation's military and national security could not be in better hands or more capable hands, and I am proud to call you my friend. So congratulations.

The single most important duty for Congress is to provide for our national defense. Our troops deserve to have the resources they need to be the very best in the world and to protect our country and our way of life. As a Member of Congress whose district includes Fort Hood, I know that the great place is the gold standard for the Army, the Department of Defense, and our Nation's overall national security posture.

It is my hope that this subcommittee will aggressively fund our military personnel and pay to cover the base requirements, as well as overseas contingency operations and global war on terror requirements. I oppose any troop reductions and fully support an additional pay raise also for our troops.

I want to express my support for the F–35. As the only fifth generation aircraft in production, I would urge the subcommittee to support an investment in F–35 production tooling to ensure that the program can support full rate production of 80 F–35As, 36 F–35Bs and 30 F–35Cs in 2021.

In order to help address the critical need to maintain air superiority and support a ramp up to full rate production, I urge the committee to support a production ramp of 60 F–35As, 24 F–35Bs and 12 F–35Cs in fiscal year 2018. This production ramp would continue to restore the previously planned F–35 procurement to address readiness of the fleet and ensure as more aircraft become operational that the correct spares are available. And I encourage an investment of spares that would support $272 million to im-

prove spares performance and another $562 million for additional spares procurement in the fiscal year 2018 budget.

Readiness investment in spares is required to ensure that we can keep these fifth generation aircraft flying. The program supports more than 1,400 suppliers, more than 45,000 direct jobs, and another 125,000 indirect jobs in the United States.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also support the third multiyear procurement for the F-22 Osprey. It is my hope that the committee consider the $1.25 billion already saved by the first two multiyear procurements over year-to-year procurement pricing.

Identified requirements for additional aircraft by all of the services should be incorporated into this multiyear procurement plan to the maximum extent possible so that aircraft's unit cost is the lowest possible. Not only does this contribute to further savings for the U.S. taxpayer, but also makes the aircraft more affordable to our foreign partners that is helping sustain our critically important aerospace industrial base and U.S. jobs.

Madam Chair, our country is facing unprecedented threats here at home and abroad from radical Islamic terrorists, Russia, North Korea, and China, to name a few. As you make the difficult funding decisions for fiscal year 2018 Department of Defense appropriations bill, it is my hope that you ensure we have the strongest and most effective military to keep our country safe.

Thank you again for allowing me to testify before you. May God bless you, may God bless the United States of America and our military. Thank you.

[The written statement of Congressman Williams follows:]

Rep. Roger Williams
Member Day Testimony
House Appropriations Committee
Subcommittee on Defense
March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, Members of the Subcommittee, I thank you for allowing me to testify before you today about some of my priorities for the FY'18 Department of Defense Appropriations bill.

But first, Madam Chair, I would like to congratulate you on your chairmanship of this prestigious subcommittee. The funding of our nation's military and national security could not be in better or more capable hands – I am proud to call you my friend.

The single most important duty for Congress is to provide for our national defense. Our troops deserve to have the resources they need to be the very best in the world and to protect our country and our way of life. As a Member of Congress whose district includes Ft. Hood, I know that "The Great Place" is the gold standard for the Army, the Department of Defense and our nation's overall national security posture. It is my hope that this subcommittee will aggressively fund our military personnel and pay account to cover the base requirements as well as OCO/GWOT requirements. I oppose any troop reductions and fully support an additional pay raise for our troops.

I want to express my support for the F-35. As the only 5th generation aircraft in production I would urge this subcommittee to support an investment in F-35 production tooling to ensure that the program can support full rate production of 80 F-35As, 36 F-35Bs and 30 F-35Cs in 2021. The investment required is $16.4 million per jet. In order to help address the critical need to maintain air superiority and support a ramp up to full rate production, I urge the committee to support a production ramp of 60 F-35As, 24 F-35Bs, and 12 F-35Cs in FY18. This production ramp would continue to restore the previously planned F-35 procurement. To address readiness of the fleet and ensure as more aircraft become operational that the correct spares are available, I encourage an investment in spares that would support $272 million to improve spares performance, and another $562 million for additional spares procurement in the FY18 budget. Readiness investment in spares is required to ensure that we can keep these 5th generation aircraft flying. More than 200 aircraft are flying today. The program supports more than 1,400, suppliers, more than 45,000 direct jobs and another 125,000 indirect jobs in the US.

I also support the third multi-year procurement for the V-22 Osprey. It is my hope that the committee consider the $1.25 billion dollars already saved by the

first two multi-year procurements over year-to-year procurement pricing. Identified requirements for additional aircraft by all of the services should be incorporated into this multi-year procurement plan to the maximum extent possible so that aircraft's unit cost is the lowest possible. Not only does this contribute to further savings for the US taxpayer, but also makes the aircraft more affordable to our foreign partners, thus helping sustain our critically important aerospace industrial base.

Madam Chair, our country is facing unprecedented threats here at home and abroad from radical Islamic terrorists, Russia, North Korea and China to name a few. As you make the difficult funding decisions for the FY'18 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, it is my hope that you ensure we have the strongest and most effective military to keep our country safe. Thank you again for allowing me to testify before you today. God bless you and God bless the United States of America.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. JOE WILSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF SOUTH CAROLINA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WILSON

Mr. WILSON. Fellow Members of Congress, what an honor to be here. This is a pleasant surprise, Madam Chair, for you to be here and equally to see what a stellar bipartisan membership you have. So I am just very honored to be in everyone's presence today.

I am grateful for the opportunity to meet with you. First, I would like to thank Chairwoman Kay Granger for her leadership as chairwoman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. As we face limited resources, I am especially grateful to the chairwoman, ranking member, members of the subcommittee for advocating on behalf of our national security.

I am speaking today as both a Member of Congress from South Carolina's Second Congressional District and also as chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness. The Second Congressional District is home to Fort Jackson, the largest initial entry training facility of the U.S. Army. Fort Jackson expertly trains tens of thousands of soldiers each year, approximately 53 percent of the Army's basic combat training load and 56 percent of women entering the Army.

The base also trains thousands of soldiers in their adjutant general, finance, postal, and chaplain schools. Additionally, Fort Jackson supports thousands of Active Duty military, civilian employees, military family members, and veteran services. And I know personally as a former member of the Guard I trained at Fort Jackson. I have three sons in the Army Guard who have trained at Fort Jackson. And so it is a facility that I know firsthand how important it is.

There is no question that the Second Congressional District is possibly impacted by servicemembers stationed at Fort Jackson, just as there is no question we uphold our reputation as a strong military friendly community. I encourage you to continue your support of the unique missions at Fort Jackson and across South Carolina.

As chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness, I am grateful for the opportunity to ensure our soldiers, sailors, and airmen and marines have the training, equipment, and resources they need to complete their mission. That means, hopefully, appropriating the Thornberry-McCain proposal of $640 billion to defense spending so we can begin the much needed resourcing of our troops.

As chairman of Readiness, I have heard testimony from each branch outlining the negative impacts of sequestration and the material effect it has had on each branch. We currently have the smallest Air Force since it was created in 1947, the smallest Navy since 1917, and the smallest Army since before World War II. Yet today, we are facing growing threats or capabilities from Iran, North Korea, China, Russia, and Islamic terrorists. The facts are clear, for too long we have asked our military to do too much with

too few resources, forcing difficult decisions and delaying critical maintenance priorities. This is not sustainable and directly limits our military's ability in current and future conflicts.

I appreciate the President's promotion of additional personnel. I respectfully urge the chairwoman and committee to support a level of funding that will adequately provide for our military and national defense. Threats around the world are increasing, sadly, as our military funding has degraded through the harmful policy of defense sequestration. We must change course to promote peace through strength.

The first priority of the Federal Government is to do and provide for common defense, to do for us what we cannot do for ourselves. The government I urge, therefore, support for the Armed Services Committee Chairman Mack Thornberry and also Senate Chairman John McCain's call for the defense budget of $640 billion for fiscal year 2018.

I would like to thank everyone here for your attention and your service on behalf of the American people. I have actually seen it firsthand visiting with our personnel in Jordan with Congressman Cuellar. And I know what extraordinary people there are here. So thank you for your service.

[The written statement of Congressman Wilson follows:]

Defense Appropriations Testimony
Congressman Joe Wilson (SC-02)
March 9, 2017

I am grateful for the opportunity to meet with you today. First, I would like to thank Chairwoman Kay Granger for her leadership as Chairwoman of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. As we face limited resources, I am especially grateful to the Chairwoman, Ranking Member, and Members of the Subcommittee for advocating on behalf of our national security.

I am speaking to you today as both the Congressman from South Carolina's Second Congressional District, and also as the Chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness.

The Second Congressional District is home to Fort Jackson, the largest initial entry training facility in the U.S. Army. Fort Jackson expertly trains tens of thousands of soldiers each year, approximately 53 percent of the Army's Basic Combat Training load, and 56 percent of women entering the Army. The base also trains thousands of soldiers in their Adjutant General, finance, postal, and chaplain schools. Additionally, Fort Jackson supports thousands of active duty military, civilian employees, military family members, and veteran's services.

There is no question that the Second Congressional District is positively impacted by service members stationed here, just as there is no question we hold up to our reputation as a strong, military-friendly community.

I encourage you to continue your support of the unique missions at Fort Jackson and across South Carolina.

As Chairman of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness, I am tasked with the responsibility of ensuring our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and Marines have the training, equipment, and resources they need to complete their mission. That means appropriating $640 billion to defense spending so that we can begin the much needed process of resourcing our troops.

As Chairman of Readiness, I have heard testimony from each service branch outlining the negative impacts of defense sequestration and the material effect it has had on each branch. We currently have the smallest Air Force since 1947, the smallest Navy since 1917, and smallest Army since before World War II. Yet, today, our troops are deployed in more than 150 countries around the world.

Defense Appropriations Testimony
Congressman Joe Wilson (SC-02)
March 9, 2017

The facts are clear. For too long, we've asked our military to do too much with too few resources—forcing difficult decisions and delaying critical maintenance priorities. This is not sustainable and directly limits our military's ability in current and future conflicts.

I respectfully urge the Chairwoman and the committee to support a level of funding that will adequately provide for our military and national defense. Threats around the world are increasing as our military funding has degraded through the harmful policy of defense sequestration. We must change course to promote peace through strength.

The first priority of the federal government is to provide for the common defense, and I support Armed Services Chairmen Mac Thornberry and John McCain in calling for a defense budget of $640 billion for fiscal year 2018.

Thank you.

The subcommittee welcomes the gentlewoman from Arizona. You are recognized for 5 minutes. The lights in front of us will show, when it goes from green to yellow, that means you have 1 more minute.

Ms.MCSALLY. Great. Thank you.

Ms.GRANGER. Thank you so much.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. MARTHA McSALLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN MCSALLY

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you Chairman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky and members of the committee. Thanks for inviting me here today.

I would like to open by asking for your continued support for the A–10 Warthog. I was an A–10 pilot and I commanded the 354th Fighter Squadron at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson, Arizona. I have flown 325 combat missions myself in the A–10. I can tell you firsthand when the American troops are on the ground, under fire, on the move, often in very complex circumstances, the sound of the A–10 overhead is a sound of them being able to live to fight for another day and get home to their families. It is a very important asset for our troops, and we have got to keep it flying until we have a proven tested replacement for it. And I appreciate this committee's support in the past and in the bill that we passed yesterday for this critical asset.

Only the A–10 has the lethality, the loiter time, the survivability to provide closer support and combat search and rescue. It is another important mission that often gets overlooked. If a pilot has been shot down or we have somebody isolated, it is the A–10 that shows up to provide locating the individual, communicating, protecting them, running the entire search and rescue operation, to include escorting the helicopters in to pick them up. And that often gets overlooked to the closer support mission. There is no other asset in our inventory in any of the services that provide this capability, which is a strategic capability to keep our covenant that we are going to bring our troops home if they are ever shot down in harm's way.

So again, we have got to keep this asset flying. We have already put the equivalent of four A–10 squadrons in the boneyard over the last several years. We are down to only nine remaining, which is four Active Duty and five in the Guard and Reserves. And these squadrons are smaller than the ones we have had before. The squadron I commanded had 24 A–10s. The current squadrons, most of them have 18. So we just have a smaller capability, and we are really at the floor with 283 airplanes in the inventory and we believe that that is where it needs to stay.

Right now, we have got the A–10s. The squadron I commanded is over in Turkey and is kicking butt in the fight against ISIS. They are going to be exceeding all records from the history of that squadron in weapons employment in that critical counterterrorism

fight. They are in South Korea providing critical anti-armor capability, right there south of the DMZ. They were deployed for the European Reassurance Initiative last year. Again, first time since we have had the A–10, and we have no A–10s in the European theater. So now, they are deploying back to work with our allies in the face of Russian aggression. And last year, they were also deployed to the Philippines. So that's four different unique theaters. And again, with only 4, 8, 10 Active Duty squadrons left that are operational, and we really are at the absolute minimum capability and we would like to keep it there.

The fiscal year 2017—fiscal year 2016 and fiscal year 2017 NDAA and DOD appropriations keeps a minimum of 283 A–10s flying, which includes 171 operational. That then adds training and test requirements and, again, this is really a minimum capability.

In the fiscal year 2017 NDAA, we also require a side-by-side comparative test between the A–10 and the F–35. In close air support and combat search and rescue, and say we can't retire one more A–10 until we are done with that and we get a full report to Congress. Now, let me say I am a strong advocate of F–35, I love the F–35. We need a fifth generation fighter with that capability. As an airman, I understand what it is going to bring to air superiority. But I believe we need both of these capabilities, this high end F–35, fifth generation fighter, plus the ability of an attack airplane like the A–10, and we shouldn't have to choose between the two.

So the support that we have gotten from this committee in the past includes also a very critical requirement for upgrading the wings of the A–10. In order to keep it flying, we have got to rebuild some of the wings structurally so they can keep flying well into the 2030s, which the Air Force has finally agreed that they want to keep it flying into the 2030s. Only 173 of the 283 have had their wings rebuilt. So there is 110 left in the fleet that haven't been rewinged. And if we do nothing, they are going to start being grounded in static displays. So we have got to get that going again.

Now, the bill we passed last night has $20 million in it to plant the seed for us to continue with this rewinging. We had $100 million in the original bill, it was $20 million yesterday, but I think that is a good start to show, hey, we are serious about keeping this asset flying and so we have got to continue to invest in that. And I appreciate this committee's support so that we can rewing the remainder of the 110.

I know I am running out of time, but I would also like to share my support for the Tomahawk, the AMRAAM, the SM-3 missiles. These missiles are developed in my district at Raytheon. They are critical for our homeland defense. Tomahawk is often the first missiles we fire into combat zones. And when I was running counterterrorism operations in Africa, often it was our weapon of choice to be able to—when Intel came together for us to be able to take out the bad guys. So continued funding for those critical missile programs is something I would really appreciate.

Also important for our troops and all our services is the electronic warfare. The electronic proving grounds is at Fort Huachuca—and I know I am running out of time—so please continue your support for EW and also remotely piloted aircraft. So

thanks for the opportunity to testify before you today and for all the work you do. And thanks for hearing my considerations.

[The written statement of Congresswoman McSally follows:]

Statement of Rep. Martha McSally (AZ-02)

Before the House Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Defense

March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, Members of the Committee: Thank you for inviting me here today.

I would like to open by asking for your continued support for the A-10 Warthog. I was an A-10 pilot and commanded the 354th Fighter Squadron at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Tucson, Arizona. I flew over 300 combat hours in the A-10, and I can tell you firsthand that when American troops are in complex firefights in close proximity to the enemy, or if a pilot needs to be rescued behind enemy lines, there is no better sound overhead than the A-10.

Only the A-10 has the lethality, loiter time, and survivability to provide premier Close Air Support, Combat Search and Rescue support, and Forward Air Control-Airborne capabilities for the Air Force. We have already put the equivalent of 4 squadrons in the boneyard over the last few years, and we should not retire one more A-10 until we have a legitimate replacement.

There are only four active duty and five guard/reserve A-10 units left in the Air Force inventory, and each squadron has fewer airplanes than before. A-10s remain stationed in S. Korea ready to provide critical anti-armor capability and they are currently kicking ass against ISIS in Iraq and Syria. For the first time since the A-10 was created, we have no assets stationed in NATO's theater, so they are also rotationally deploying as a key part of the European Reassurance Initiative during a time of increased Russian aggression. Last year, A-10s also deployed to the Philippines to enhance U.S. military assets in the region performing operations such as air and maritime domain awareness, personnel recovery, combating piracy, and assuring that all nations have freedom of navigation and flight. Due to the Warthog's unique criticality in all these theaters, the FY16 and FY17 NDAA and DoD appropriations bills kept the fleet at 283 aircraft minimum.

The FY17 NDAA also required a side by side comparative test of the F-35 and the A-10 in Close Air Support and Combat Search and Rescue. Now let me be clear, as an Airman, I am a strong advocate of the F-35 and the crucial 5th generation fighter capabilities it brings to our military and Allies. But I believe we should not require the F-35 to replace the niche capabilities of the A-10. Our Air Force desperately needs both. Until we have a tested replacement for all of the A-10's unique capabilities without increasing risk to our troops, I request full funding for the A-10 fleet.

This support includes finishing the wing enhancements. We have purchased 173 Enhanced Wing Assemblies for the fleet of 283 aircraft, and are on track to complete the installation this year. My amendment passed in the original House version of the DoD appropriations bill for $100m to begin re-winging the remaining 110 aircraft in the fleet. The FY17 defense appropriations bill we passed out of the House yesterday contains $20 million for this purpose, which I think is a good step towards preserving the fleet. I ask your support to finish re-winging the fleet, which allows the entire A-10 fleet to fly well into the 2030s. That would also give the Air Force time to present Congress with a long-term plan for its attack mission, whether that's to sustain and continually modernize the current fleet or to field a next-generation replacement.

I would also like to share my support for Tomahawk, AMRAAM, and SM-3 missiles. These missiles are developed in my district and are critical for national and homeland defense. When I was running counter terrorism ops in Africa, Tomahawk missiles were our most flexible responsive option for attacks where intelligence often comes together in a fleeting window. They are also typically the first weapon fired in major combat operations. Our Tomahawk stockpiles are running low in the continuing battle against ISIS, and we must plan ahead to make sure we have these missiles when we need them. Our inventory of AMRAAM, our premier air-to-air missile, is short of the Department's inventory objective. The SM-3 is the most tested, and most successful, missile defense system we have. The Tomahawk, AMRAAM, and SM-

3 are critical to our national security in an uncertain time, whether attacking ISIS or providing state-of-the-art missile defense. I ask that you fully fund these important missile systems.

I'd like to address electronic warfare, or EW. Every combatant commander and service chief has told us they need to continue to grow their EW capability and capacity. I ask for your support as the services work together in this area. Our near-peer competitors have also been investing in EW, and we must keep our advantage by investing in more electronic capabilities like improved airborne electronic attack, avionics, and radar. Fort Huachuca, in my district, has taken proactive steps at the state and federal level to ensure pristine EW testing and training conditions to further our EW capabilities and speed fielding of new technology and equipment. I ask your support for all necessary research-and-development, testing, and procurement of advanced electronic warfare capabilities.

Finally, I want to address opportunities to grow the nation's capability and capacity with Remotely Piloted Aircraft, or RPAs. RPAs have value both at home and abroad. Domestic agencies use them to fight fires, patrol our borders, and catch human and drug traffickers. The nation uses RPAs abroad for Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance, and in the fight against violent extremists. Fort Huachuca is the largest trainer of RPA pilots in the world, and boasts a strong working relationship with other federal partners, such as Customs and Border Protection. We must continue to develop RPA capability and capacity to meet the growing global need. I ask for you to fully fund the RPA missions and allow us to leverage a national security asset like Fort Huachuca.

Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony to the Subcommittee today. These issues are very important to myself and my district, and I appreciate your attention to these requests.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you so much. Thank you for your service, first of all. Thank you for the good job you are doing here in Congress. And we have your written testimony also for the record as we move through the bill. Thank you.

Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Pennsylvania. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes. Appreciate your being here.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. PATRICK MEEHAN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MEEHAN

Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky. That is a tough act to follow, as you all know that. We have great respect for my colleague and her service. And I thank you for the work that you are doing on this committee along with your colleagues.

I came before the subcommittee to discuss two particular rotocraft programs that are critical to our warfighters and to maintaining the strength of the American defense industrial base. The V–22 Osprey is the expeditionary platform of choice for the Marine Corps and continues to be a workhorse for our Air Force Special Operations Command.

The V–22's one-of-a-kind capability allows for mission flexibility and enable our warfighters to operate safely in the most austere and dangerous environments. I am pleased the Navy will join the ranks of V–22 operators as it begins procurement of CMV–22s this year for its carrier on board delivery mission.

It has come to my attention that the fiscal year 2018 budget will request a third multiyear procurement contracting authority. And as you well know, these longer contracts allow for stable—proven programs like the V–22 to promote supplier and manufacturing efficiency and take advantage of economies of scale and encourage investment and cost saving initiatives.

The previous 2 multiyear contracts with the V–22 program saved taxpayers over $1 billion. And while protecting taxpayer dollars, these contracts have also ensured that our warfighters have the resources necessary to carry—to protect our Nation's interests. It is for these reasons why I encourage the Air Force to take advantage of the multiyear procurement contract to procure additional CV–22s for its long-range personnel recovery mission. The Air Force leadership has suggested that CV–22s make sense for the mission because of the superior range in speed, and adding them to the multiyear contract will save taxpayers tens of millions of dollars.

The budget should also reflect the development efforts to create a common configuration for the diverse MV–22 models. The fiscal year 2018 program will improve fleet readiness and insert technology as M–22s upgrade from block B configuration to a block C configuration.

And as the subcommittee considers the totality of the V–22 Osprey program, I would ask that you support the multiyear procure-

ment and common configuration effort and encourage the Air Force to add CV–22s in its multiyear procurement contract.

I would also like to discuss the Army's CH–47 Chinook and the U.S. Special Operations Command MH–47 variant. Both the CH–47 and the MH–47 aircraft continue to perform well in combat theaters. They fly over three times the normal peacetime operating tempo, while maintaining readiness rates that are above the Army standard. And fiscal year 2017 is the last year of the current 5-year procurement contract for the Chinook, which has saved U.S. Taxpayers another nearly $1 billion. And due to budget constraints, only 22 aircraft were requested in the President's fiscal year 2017 budget. This is five fewer aircraft than were called for in the multiyear. And while I am grateful for the subcommittee generously adding five Chinooks to restore cuts in the fiscal year 2017 budget, unfortunately they are not in the fiscal year 2017 appropriations bill that was filed on March 2nd. And I would respectfully request the subcommittee consider adding them in 2018.

And while we do no have the President's 2018 defense budget yet, it is anticipated that we will request 13 aircraft: Nine CH–47s for the Army and four MH–47s for SOCOM. The Army's invested funding in a block II modernization plan to improve capability and increase commonality between variants.

As the committee considers the Chinook program, I encourage you to support the budget request for the procurement of the additional 13 aircraft as well as block H modernization efforts. These two priorities, the V–22 Osprey and the CH–47 Chinook will help the warfighter as well as workers that supply the manpower, parts, and expertise to build such capable aircraft. I will support a fiscal year 2018 budget that reflects the importance to our Armed Forces that these priorities can provide.

I thank you very much again for the opportunity to testify.

[The written statement of Congressman Meehan follows:]

Testimony to the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee (HAC-D)
Representative Patrick Meehan (PA-07)
March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Subcommittee, I want to begin by thanking you for offering Members this opportunity to discuss national security priorities through this Member Day hearing. Formerly, under the leadership of now full Committee Chairman Frelinghuysen, this Subcommittee has a history of putting our Nation's security first. I personally appreciate the opportunity to weigh in on issues for the upcoming budget and look forward to working with you Chairwoman Granger in your new role. It would appear that the Subcommittee is off to a great start.

Without having the details of the FY2018 budget, I come before the Subcommittee to discuss two particular rotorcraft programs that are critical to our warfighters and to maintaining the strength of the American defense industrial base.

The V-22 Osprey is the expeditionary platform of choice for the Marine Corps, and continues to be a workhorse for our Air Force Special Operations Command. The V-22's one-of-a-kind capabilities allow for mission flexibility and enable our warfighters to operate safely in the most austere and dangerous environments. I am pleased that the Navy will join the ranks of V-22 operators as it begins procurement of CMV-22s this year for its carrier onboard delivery (COD) mission. Serving as a logistics hub for aircraft carriers, the CMV-22 will transform deck operations and support for the carrier strike fleet in the COD mission.

It has come to my attention that the FY2018 budget will request a third multiyear procurement contracting authority. These longer contracts for stable and proven programs like the V-22 promote supplier and manufacturing efficiency, take advantage of economies of scale and encourage investment in cost savings initiatives. The previous two multiyear contracts for the V-22 program saved taxpayers over $1 billion. While protecting taxpayer dollars, these contracts have also ensured that our warfighters have the resources necessary to protect our nation's interests here and abroad. It's for these reasons why I'd encourage the Air Force to take advantage of the multiyear procurement contract to procure additional CV-22s for its Long Range Personnel Recovery Mission. Air Force leadership have suggested that CV-22s make sense for the mission because of superior range and speed. The Air Force needs to be decisive to add them to the multiyear procurement contract, which will save taxpayers tens of millions in procurement costs.

The budget should also reflect the development efforts to create a common configuration of the diverse MV-22 models. The FY2018 program will improve fleet readiness and insert technology as MV-22s upgrade from a Block B configuration to a Block C configuration. As the Subcommittee considers the totality of the V-22 Osprey program, I'd ask that you support the multiyear procurement and common configuration effort, and encourage the Air Force to add CV-22s in the multiyear procurement contract for the Long Range Personnel Recovery Mission.

I'd also like to discuss the CH-47 Chinook, the Army's only heavy lift helicopter which performs a wide range of combat, logistical and humanitarian missions. The MH-47 variant provides key capabilities to the U.S. Special Operations Command. Both the CH-47 and the MH-47 aircraft continue to perform well in combat theaters. They fly over three times the normal peacetime operating tempo while maintaining readiness rates above the Army standard.

FY2017 happens to be the last year of the current five-year procurement contract for the Chinook. Much like the Osprey, this multi-year contract saved U.S. taxpayers nearly $1 billion when compared with

single-year contracts. Due to budget constraints in the Army, only 22 aircraft were requested in the President's FY 2017 budget. This is five fewer aircraft than were called for in the multiyear. I am grateful that the Subcommittee generously added five Chinooks to restore aircraft cuts in the FY2017 budget. Unfortunately, they are not in the FY2017 Defense Appropriations bill that was filed on March 2, 2017. I would respectfully request that the Subcommittee consider adding them in FY2018.

While we do not have the President's FY2018 defense budget yet, it's anticipated that it will request 13 aircraft: nine CH-47s for the Army and four MH-47s for SOCOM. The Army is in a year of transition for the Chinook program. It has invested funding in a Block II modernization plan to improve the payload capability, increase commonality between SOCOM and conventional forces and establish a baseline configuration for future system upgrades. As the Subcommittee considers the Chinook program, I encourage you to support the Budget Request for the procurement of the additional 13 aircraft as well as research for the Block II modernization effort.

These two priorities, the V-22 Osprey and the CH-47 Chinook, will help the warfighter as well as the workers that supply the manpower, parts and expertise to build such capable aircraft. I will support a Fiscal Year 2018 budget that reflects the importance to our armed forces that these priorities can provide. Thank you very much again for the opportunity to testify.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you, Congressman. Thank you very much for your testimony. We have written as well as what you said today.

Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from California. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. JIMMY PANETTA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN PANETTA

Mr. PANETTA. Thank you very much, Chairman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky. Good morning. I hope I don't disappoint you this morning. I am not actually talking about hardware, military hardware, but I am talking about something that I feel is just as important, and that is the education of our military members.

I represent the central coast of California. You may know it for its beautiful environment or its bountiful agriculture, but also it actually has a booming defense presence as well. Although for most of the 20th century, that area was known for Fort Ord and its fighting 7th Infantry. But now, rather than being known for training, how to drive a tank or fly a plane or shoot a gun, which we still do at Fort Hunter Liggett and Camp Roberts there, but we are known for our military training and how to speak a foreign language, cyber warfare, fly a drone, and to be leaders in the 21st century of warfare.

We are known for our military institutions, like the Navy postgraduate school, which I will here on out refer to as NPS, and the Defense Language Institute, which I will also refer to from now on as DLI in my comments. These are part of 13 Defense equities that are located in my district. And it is an industry that leads to an employment of over 15,000 people and generates more than $1.3 billion for the local economy.

So today, that is why I am here, to respectfully ask all of you to include report language to ensure that any new BRAC round captures the intellectual capacity of installations in my district, like NPS and DOI.

Previously, my predecessor, Congressman Sam Farr, made these same types of requests that are consistent with Representative Adam Smith's bill H.R. 753. That is a bill that is cosponsored by Ranking Member Visclosky. In that bill, I would like to highlight section 6, which defines military value criteria as "the ability to support educational requirements that enhance the success of members of the Armed Forces in their military career fields and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department, including the impact on joint warfighting, training, and readiness."

As you know, the COBRA models give weight to bases that have traditional military assets, like runaways and hangars. But there is not any established criteria on how to quantify intellectual capacity. Today, the 21st century military force must focus on DOD educational institutions because it is that type of education and

training that I believe are integral to our Nation's security and our Nation's military readiness.

The Navy postgraduate school is a prime example of that type of education to prepare our future leaders. It has a foreign affairs graduate school, it provides training in cyber warfare and how to fly drones and about satellites as well. It is clear that when those students graduate, they are prepared to lead in the future of warfare.

Another critical part of the NPS education is the center for civil missile relations. That is a place where the focus is on relationships with other nations, including enhancing democratic civil-military relations, supporting defense reform, and teaching institution building, peace building operations, and how to combat terrorism. I have no doubt that an investment in the NPS and similar types of institutions is a prime investment, not only in our military, but in our civil military relations around the world.

Having served with the Special Forces unit in Afghanistan as a Naval intelligence officer, I know how important advanced education and foreign language training is to doing our duties and carrying out our mission. Students at the Defense Language Institute, DLI, are not only taught how to be proficient in a number of languages, but the school teaches them to understand the cultural and regional nuances of a duty assignment.

Two weeks ago, I had the fortunate opportunity to visit DLI and was given my first command briefing. But I have to say that the highlight of that visit was the time I spent in a classroom with six students in their Farsi language class. And it was unbelievable that in the short period of time that these six students, who they did not look Middle Eastern, they were from Ohio and Florida and California, but what was amazing to see is how comfortable they were in speaking that language. It was unbelievable, and it actually gave me a lot of hope. And I hope it gives you hope in our military personnel and their ability to carry out their mission.

Now, on a separate topic, I know how difficult military service can be, not only to a servicemember but on his family. As I said, I served in Afghanistan, but I was a reservist who was mobilized and deployed for a yearlong assignment, and it is nothing compared to the soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen that I saw and met who were on multiple deployments and separated from their family multiple times for multiple months at a time. That is why I will be submitting to you bill language that expands the pool of qualified marriage and family therapists in order to increase access to mental health providers for our Active Duty military personnel.

As you know, a great deal of education and training goes into getting our servicemembers ready to serve and deploy anywhere in the world. Based on education and training that takes place at installations like the NPS and the DLI, I am confident, and you should be confident, that investments not only in our military hardware and training but in the education of our military members can only make us more prepared and ultimately more safe.

Thank you, and I look forward to working with you as we develop the fiscal year 2018 defense appropriations bill.

[The written statement of Congressman Panetta follows:]

JIMMY PANETTA
20TH DISTRICT, CALIFORNIA

COMMITTEE ON
AGRICULTURE

COMMITTEE ON
NATURAL RESOURCES

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–0520

228 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE
BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-2861

100 WEST ALISAL
SALINAS, CA 93901
(831) 424-2229

701 OCEAN STREET
ROOM 318
SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060
(831) 429-1976

Testimony before the House Appropriations Committee

Subcommittee on Defense

Honorable Jimmy Panetta CA-20

March 6, 2017

Though I am a new member of Congress, I fully understand the responsibility faced by the Appropriations Committee and its critical role in the functioning of the United States government. I proudly represent a region along the central coast of California that has a robust defense presence. While we are best known for the Naval Postgraduate School and the Defense Language Institute, there are 13 other defense equities located in Monterey County, CA that have a combined workforce of over 15,000 and $1.4 billion in budget authority.

I urge my colleagues to include report language, as they have in the past at the request of my predecessor, Rep. Sam Farr, to ensure that any new BRAC round captures the intellectual capacity of installations like NPS and DLI. This request is consistent with Rep. Adam Smith's bill, HR753, that is cosponsored by the Ranking Member, Mr. Visclosky. Section 6 of the bill defines military value criteria as "the ability to support educational requirements that enhance the success of members of the Armed Forces in their military career fields, and the impact on operational readiness of the total force of the Department, including the impact on joint warfighting, training and readiness."

PRINTED ON RECYCLED PAPER

The reason this language is so important is that the previous COBRA models give weight to bases that have traditional military assets like runways or hangers, but there has not been established criteria to quantify intellectual capacity. If we intend to have a world class military force for the 21st Century, we need to invest in our Department of Defense educational institutions. Both DLI and NPS have been on previous BRAC rounds, so I know firsthand the impact of the process – on the schools, the community and the military mission. First and foremost is the importance of the military mission. And I firmly believe education and training are integral to our nation's national security and readiness.

I believe we have a solemn obligation to ensure our military personnel have greater access to mental health services. My predecessor, Sam Farr, secured bill language in the FY17 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs Bill for VA to accept additional accreditation programs for Marriage and Family Therapists (MFTs) if they meet rigorous requirements established in the bill. It is my understanding the Department recognizes the same limited MFT programs as the VA did before the Farr fix. I will be submitting the same bill language to the Committee to expand the pool of qualified MFTs to increase access to mental health providers for our military personnel and I ask for your support.

For the remainder of my testimony, I would like to refer to the Op-Ed that appeared in the March 3 Washington Post by Michelle Flournoy, who was the former Undersecretary of Defense for Policy from 2009 to 2012, and ask that it be submitted for the record.

She cogently lays out five reasons that a $56 billion increase in defense spending could make sense, if it is spent wisely. The prism for evaluating that increase is readiness, force structure and modernization. She questions whether deterrence and alliance capabilities are being strengthened. She states that "Critical to the United States' ability to deter aggression and prevent conflict in regions where we have vital interests is deploying U.S. military forces forward and helping allies and partners build their own defense capacity."

I am proud to say that helping our allies and partners build their own defense capacity is a core mission of the Center for Civil Military Relations (CCMR), located within NPS. CCMR builds partner capacity, improves interagency and international coordination, and increases cooperation by providing Allies and Partners with the educational tools necessary to meet the challenges of the future. These challenges include: enhancing democratic civil-military relations, supporting defense reform and institution building, improving peacekeeping and peacebuilding operations, and combating terrorism. She goes on to state that these types of investments are relatively small in dollars, but "are disproportionately important to reducing the risk of more costs U.S. military engagements." I encourage the Committee to invest wisely in capabilities that strengthen democratic civil-military relations around the world.

Her third prism of evaluation questions whether the budget keeps faith with our military personnel. She asks whether "it improves education and professional development?" Having been a Navy Reserve Intelligence Officer in Afghanistan, I'm here to tell you that advanced education in regional issues and foreign language training would have helped me do my job better. Understanding the cultural and regional nuances of your duty assignment and having a

basic understanding of the spoken language can mean the difference between life and death on the battlefield.

Thank you for allowing me to testify today. I look forward to working with you as you develop the FY18 Defense Appropriations bill.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you so much. Thanks for testifying today and thank you for your service. It is very helpful that we have so many who have served, and so they can speak from experience about what is needed now. Thank you very much.

Mr. PANETTA. Understood, ma'am. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Rhode Island. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. JAMES R. LANGEVIN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF RHODE ISLAND

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LANGEVIN

Mr. LANGEVIN. Thank you, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky and members for the committee, for providing me this opportunity to testify before you on matters of importance and priority to Rhode Island and the Nation as a whole. I serve as a senior member of the House Armed Services Committee, so I wish to bring several matters before you today as you formulate the fiscal year 2018 defense appropriation bill.

First, one of my highest priorities is ensuring robust funding for several programs under the Defense health program, specifically Spinal Cord Injury Research Program, or SCIRP as it is known. SCIRP was established by Congress under the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program to advance research innovative technologies to regenerate and repair damaged spinal cords, as well as improve rehabilitative therapies. Studies have identified a marked increase in the rate of combat related spine trauma among casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq, and the incidents of spinal injuries among combat casualties in the global war on terrorism are among the highest in American military medical history.

Research into spinal cord injury treatment is producing a wealth of discoveries that are making the repair and regeneration of nerves in the spinal cord in particular a potentially not only likely but attainable goal. Major improvements in emergency and acute care have improved overall survival rates. However, the devastating nature of these injuries imparts substantial disability, borne by wounded servicemembers, their families, and the American healthcare system.

Remarkable advancements in treatment are now ripe for further development, including clinical trials, but these next steps will only be achieved if we continue our support for the program through robust funding and larger individual research grant awards.

Second, we must ensure, on another topic, that we continue to support vital submarine programs at the highest levels possible, particularly the Virginia class, Virginia payload module, moored training ship, and Columbia class programs, all of which maintain our dominance in the undersea domain and provide the day-to-day nuclear deterrent as part of the triad.

As you know, the Columbia class SSBN program is the Navy's highest acquisition priority and is being designed by our Nation's best and brightest to have a longer service life, better operational

availability, and better survivability than its predecessors, all at a reasonable cost and with the most advanced capabilities available.

The need is urgent, members of the committee. The current Ohio class force will begin retirement in 2027 and must be replaced. The Columbia class program is out of margin in its timeline, and we must continue to support this program at the highest levels possible lest we fall behind schedule and suffer cost overruns.

For this reason, it is vital the committee support advanced procurement funds for these programs to support acquisition of long lead time material and advance manufacturing efforts so that we can maintain the on-time deliveries of our submarines to support our Navy's operational needs and minimize the projected shortfalls of fast attack submarines starting in the mid-2020s.

Third, I urge your support for the rapid development, prototyping, and fielding of new and advanced technologies. New tools are being deployed at record speed, on a larger scale, and with a cost-effectiveness that will exploit our enduring advantages over our competitors. We never want to send our warfighters into a fair fight, and it is these advanced technologies that make sure that our warfighters continue to be effective and save.

Technologies such as directed energy, hypersonics, electronic warfare, and autonomous systems are truly game-changing tools for our arsenal. And these technologies are at the forefront of the third offset strategy. Too often, capable improvement directed energy weapon systems languish in perpetual research and development. As these systems reach their maturity and risk mitigation techniques are applied, we must provide our military with tactical and strategic advantages wherever and whenever possible.

Finally, as we have seen over the past decade, cyber intrusions into American networks and systems have become more prevalent and more deleterious than ever before. I have been encouraged by the Department of Defense's efforts to develop a unified cybersecurity strategy and solidify cyberspace doctrine in order to protect our Nation against the many threats that we face today. The Department is well positioned to capitalize on these activities, thanks to the recent elevation of U.S. Cyber Command to its own combatant command as well as its Cyber Mission Force development. Great strides have been made to strengthen their persistent training environment for our service branches so that they have more opportunities to put fingers to keyboard in realistic conflict scenarios, but we must continue to fund this effort.

While joint exercises such as cyber guard and cyber flag are critical in training our cyber warriors, we must ensure there are more opportunities to train for the missions yet to come. These investments deserve our continued support and we must work tirelessly to ensure that the Department of Defense resourced appropriately to defend against adversarial threats.

So let me close by saying, I want to thank you very much for receiving my testimony and taking my request into consideration for fiscal year 2018 defense appropriations bill. These investments are critical in providing for our collective national security and I encourage their inclusion.

[The written statement of Congressman Langevin follows:]

House Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Defense

Rep. James R. Langevin (RI-02)

Testimony – March 9, 2016

Thank you, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky, for allowing Members outside the Appropriations Committee to testify on matters of importance and priority. I serve on the House Armed Services Committee, and I wish to bring several matters before you for consideration as the Fiscal Year 2018 Defense Appropriations bill is formulated.

First, one of my highest priorities is ensuring robust funding for several programs under the Defense Health Program, specifically, the Spinal Cord Injury Research Program (SCIRP). SCIRP was established by Congress under the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program to advance research and innovative technologies to regenerate and repair damaged spinal cords, as well as improve rehabilitation therapies.

Studies have identified a marked increase in the rate of combat-related spine trauma among casualties in Afghanistan and Iraq. According to a study published in the September 2012 issue of The Journal of Bone and Joint Surgery, the incidence of spinal injuries among combat casualties in the Global War on Terrorism are among the highest in American military medical history.

Research into spinal cord injury treatment is producing a wealth of discoveries that are making the repair and regeneration of the spinal cord a potentially attainable goal. Major improvements in emergency and acute care have improved overall survival rates; however, the

devastating nature of these injuries imparts substantial disability, borne by wounded service members, their families, and the American health care system.

The societal costs of spinal cord injuries in terms of health care utilization, disability payments, and lost income are disproportionately high for this particular patient population compared to those suffering from other medical conditions. According to information published by the Reeve Foundation, developing therapies for individuals with a spinal cord injury and preventing new cases would save the United States as much as $400 billion on future direct and indirect lifetime costs. Remarkable advancements in treatment are now ripe for further development, including clinical trials, but these next steps will only be achieved if we continue robust investment in the Spinal Cord Injury Research program and larger individual grant awards.

Additionally, I hope you will provide ample support for the various additional Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs (CDMRP) programs, all of which provide critical care through the Department of Defense to our men and women in uniform, as well as our citizens across the country. Such programs include the (1) Trauma Clinical Research Program; (2) Multiple Sclerosis Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program; (3) Tuberous Sclerosis Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program; (4) Ovarian Cancer Research Program; (5) ALS Research Program; (6) Breast Cancer in Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program; and (7) Pediatric Brain Tumor Research.

Second, we must ensure that we continue to support our vital submarine programs at the highest levels possible, particularly the (1) VIRGINIA class; (2) Virginia Payload Module; (3) Moored Training Ship; and (4) COLUMBIA class programs, all of which maintain our

dominance in the undersea domain and provide the day-to-day nuclear deterrent as part of the triad.

As you know, the COLUMBIA class SSBN program is the Navy's highest acquisition priority and is being designed by our nation's best and brightest to have a longer service life, better operational availability, and improved survivability than its predecessors – all at a reasonable cost and with the most advanced capabilities available. The need is urgent: the current OHIO class force will begin retirement in 2027 and must be replaced. The COLUMBIA class program is out of margin in its timeline, and we must continue to support this program at the highest levels possible lest we fall behind schedule and suffer cost overruns.

For this reason, it is also vital the Committee support Advanced Procurement funds for these programs to support procurement of long lead time material and advanced manufacturing efforts, so that we can maintain the on-time deliveries of our submarines to support our Navy's operational needs and ~~to~~ minimize the projected shortfall of fast attack submarines starting in the mid-2020s.

Third, I urge your support for the rapid development, prototyping, and fielding and integration of new and advanced technologies. New tools are being at record speed, on a larger scale, and with a cost-effectiveness that will exploit our enduring advantages over our competitors. Technologies such as directed energy and hypersonics are truly game-changing tools for our arsenal, and these technologies are at the forefront of the Third Offset Strategy.

Each military department has a marquee program in this area demonstrating military utility that must be supported, including (1) the Air Force's Counter-electronics High Power Microwave Advanced Missile Project (CHAMP); (2) the Army's High Energy Laser Mobile Demonstrator (HELMD); and (3) the Navy's Laser Weapon System (LaWS) that is currently

deployed aboard the USS PONCE in the Persian Gulf. Furthermore, the Department of Defense's Non-Lethal Weapons Program, housed at the Joint Non-Lethal Weapons Directorate at MCB Quantico, continues to provide vital escalation-of-force options in order to minimize civilian casualties and reduce collateral damage in places of interest across the world.

Too often, capable and proven directed energy weapon systems languish in perpetual research and development. As these systems reach their maturity and risk-mitigation techniques are applied, we must provide our military with tactical and strategic advantages wherever and whenever appropriate.

Next-generation weapon capabilities like directed energy are needed now and in the future to address the rising number of threats facing our country. I therefore urge this Committee to dedicate sufficient resources for developing physical prototypes of directed energy weapon systems to enable those men and women in the fight to fully explore the doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leader development, personnel, facilities, and policy (DOTMLPF-P) necessary for the eventual use of matured directed energy weapon systems.

Finally, as we have seen over the past decade, cyber intrusions into American networks and systems have become more prevalent and more deleterious than ever before. I have been encouraged by the Department of Defense's efforts to develop a unified cybersecurity strategy and solidify cyberspace doctrine in order to protect our nation against the many threats we face today. The Department is well positioned to capitalize on these activities thanks to the recent elevation of U.S. Cyber Command to its own combatant command, as well as its Cyber Mission Force development. Great strides have been made to strengthen the Persistent Training Environment (PTE) for our service branches so that they have more opportunities to put fingers to keyboard in realistic conflict scenarios, but we must continue to fund this effort. While joint

exercises such as Cyber Guard and Cyber Flag are critical in training our cyber warriors, we must ensure there are more opportunities to train for the missions yet to come. These investments deserve our continued support, and we must work tirelessly to ensure that the Department of Defense is resourced appropriately to defend against adversarial threats.

I want to thank you once again for receiving my testimony and taking my requests into consideration for the Fiscal Year 2018 Defense Appropriations bill. These investments are critical in providing for our collective national security, and I encourage their inclusion.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you for being with us and thank you for your words. We have a written copy of your testimony. Thank you.

Ms. Hanabusa.

Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentlelady from Hawaii. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes. It will show on this light green meaning speak. When it goes to yellow it means you have got one more minute. Glad to have you here. Thank you.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. COLLEEN HANABUSA, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF HAWAII

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN HANABUSA

Ms. HANABUSA. Thank you very much.

Chairwoman Granger—I don't see our ranking member—and distinguished members of the subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to testify before you today. I assume that my written testimony will be part of the record and for your consideration.

As you know, I am the Congresswoman for the Congressional District 1 from the State of Hawaii, which means all the services are located in my district. It is an amazing situation, 17 miles will have everything in one place.

One of the interesting things that has happened since the releasing of our statement is the fact that the President has now said that he is calling for an increase of $54 billion, albeit unspecified at this time, in defense spending. Everyone agrees, especially those of us in Hawaii, that the increase is needed; however, the question is how.

One of the most critical points for myself is that the pivot to Asia Pacific continues to remain foremost and a concern of all of us and one that we would put our money where our mouth is. There is no question whether people are willing to say it openly or not, Russia, China, North Korea are major concerns and they are all in the Asia Pacific.

One of, I believe, our commitments in terms of the FSA, which the Department of the Navy has conducted, is the fact that we are in the need of building a fleet. However, one of the things that we all tend to forget is that in building the fleet, we must have people who can maintain it. So it is paramount for us to look at the health, welfare of our public shipyards. I don't think there is any question that the public shipyards and our employees there, we must covet them and we must always have them ready so that we don't have the ups and downs that we face with the budgetary constraints. They are the backbone for all of us so we must remain committed to them.

We know that the plan is that 60 percent of our maritime force will be in Asia Pacific. I have said it constantly: Asia Pacific is an air and seapower. I think that, with all due respect for those on the East Coast, you don't quite understand how large the Pacific is. The AOR of the PACOM is 55 percent of the Earth's surface. You have the three greatest economies of the world, and almost 50

percent of the population is in that area of the world. That is why we must remain focused on the Asia Pacific pivot.

We must keep healthy the PACOM headquarters, which is located also in my district. And we ask that consideration be given for the USARPAC 4-star command, because it is a great statement for our allies in the region that we in fact are committed to that. USARPAC is U.S. Army Pacific.

We must also be very receptive and able to respond to our allies' issues. One of the most successful and coveted roles that we play in Asia Pacific is in the area of HADR, and we must also continue to remain committed to do that. That is where we are welcome in all regions of the Pacific.

We also have to, basically, stay very true to our environmental remediation and protection. You may be aware of this, but one of the things that we face in Hawaii is that we have had the fuel tanks, which have kept the Pacific since World War II, we have had leaks. Luckily, so far, it hasn't been into our water system, which as you can imagine is islands. They must be protected. But we ask continued support in ensuring that the remediation will continue.

It is so important that we remain committed to this region. The threats that our country will face will come from this region as well. So we ask that you give serious consideration and with more details in our written submittal that the Asia Pacific remain our primary concern and also, also that we continue with the pivot to that region, because when you look at the statistics is where the economies are, where the people are, and where our threats are, it is in the Asia-Pacific region.

Thank you very much. I stand for any questions, and Mr. Ranking Member, nice to see you.

[The written statement of Congresswoman Hanabusa follows:]

Written Testimony
The Honorable Colleen Hanabusa (HI-01)
U.S. House of Representatives
House Committee on Appropriations
Subcommittee on Defense
March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and distinguished Members of the subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before you today. My testimony highlights several Defense programs and initiatives that are vital to our military readiness and continued engagement with the Asia-Pacific region.

Last week, the Administration released a budget blueprint calling for $54 billion in unspecified increases to defense spending. While there are areas in the Department of Defense (DOD) where investment is needed, the key is to invest wisely to maintain our global operational presence and technological advantage, counteract Russia's and China's growing maritime forces and confront increasingly complex threats including, but not limited to, North Korea, Iran, Iraq and Syria.

Our first priority should be to end the federal hiring freeze on the DOD civilian workforce. Our DOD civilians are critical to our warfighting efforts and our military readiness depends on them.

DOD civilians play an especially critical role in our four public shipyards, where significant investments are needed. The Navy's proposed fleet buildup to 355 ships will likely generate a healthy debate in this subcommittee and in the House Committee on Armed Services (HASC). However, it does us no good to have more ships if the fleet cannot be properly serviced and maintained according to schedule. If our shipyards are not fully staffed, equipped and functioning, our fleet readiness will suffer and our ability to restore and improve our operational readiness around the world will be compromised.

As important as our investments in shipbuilding will be, they must be matched by commensurate investments in our shipyards and maintenance facilities. New technologies present new opportunities to reduce costs (material and labor) and respond more quickly to operational needs on a 24/7 basis. For example, additive manufacturing, commonly known as 3-D printing, is changing the way industry thinks about manufacturing, with alternatives to traditional casting and machining on the horizon. These new technologies should be explored and, where appropriate, incorporated into our shipyards and bases for depot-level maintenance and repair. Thus, I request this committee allocate robust funding to Shipbuilding and Conversion, Navy, as well as Operations and Maintenance, Navy, at a level sufficient to meet the full operational needs of our four public shipyards: Pearl Harbor, Puget Sound, Portsmouth, and Norfolk. I would also like to restate the importance of lifting the federal hiring freeze for all civilians at our four public shipyards. Finally, I would urge this subcommittee to leverage federal funds by strongly considering public-private partnerships that would achieve the operational needs of our shipyards in a manner that is responsive and fiscally prudent. For example, public-private partnerships could be used to construct and operate shipyard dry docks for submarines and other surface ships, including those dry docks with forward deployment capabilities.

Consistent with the Navy's most recent Force Structure Assessment, maintaining a maritime focus on the Asia-Pacific region should continue to be a top priority. Currently, sixty percent (60%) of the Navy's fleet is assigned to the Pacific and a similar or greater proportion of new ships should be assigned to the Pacific as well. I respectfully urge this subcommittee to support keeping the Pacific Fleet's Budget Support Office separate and apart from the Fleet Forces Command Budget Support Office, so the Pacific Fleet retains the flexibility to respond

rapidly to changing events in the Asia-Pacific region. This high level of readiness will enable the Pacific Fleet to project force in support of our many allies in the region and maintain the free flow of commerce in Southeast Asia and the freedom of navigation in the South China Sea.

As we continue our diplomatic, economic and military rebalance in the Asia-Pacific, our military partners are anticipating that additional investments will be needed to maximize troop readiness and to help counter the regional threats posed by China and North Korea. Pacific Command, which is headquartered in my district, has highlighted several priority areas. These include procurement of advanced munitions to make up for critical shortfalls; maintaining air superiority through Fourth Generation and Fifth Generation fighter integration and advanced missile defense capabilities; continuing to upgrade and harden our cybersecurity investments; improving the digital communications capabilities of our allies and partners; and upgrading our fleet of attack submarines to further our undersea dominance and improve Anti-Access/Area Denial strategies. We must also continue to develop and integrate new technologies so that the advantage over our adversaries remains qualitative as well as quantitative. One of the best ways to do this is to maintain our commitment to the Pacific Missile Range Facility (PMRF), the world's largest instrumented multi-environmental range capable of supported surface, subsurface, air and space operations on a simultaneous basis. The training, test and evaluation missions that take place at PMRF are critical to our worldwide missile defense efforts, from the Korean Peninsula to Eastern Europe.

In order to continue developing our partnerships in the Pacific, we also need to increase investments in joint and multi-national interoperability efforts and systems. We should also increase cross-cultural educational opportunities for our officers in all services. I urge this subcommittee to continue to support U.S. Army Pacific (USARPAC)'s Pacific Pathways

program, in which Army, Army Reserve and Army National Guard soldiers conduct training exercises with military partners from across Southeast Asia. A similar program, Pacific Partnership--a multilateral, multi-service mission--, focuses on humanitarian assistance and disaster relief (HADR). Born out of the aftermath of the 2004 tsunami that devastated Southeast Asia, Pacific Partnership both builds local capacity in the region and improves PACOM's readiness and HADR expertise.

I also highlight the importance of maintaining U.S. Army Pacific Headquarters at the 4 Star Level. In order for the rebalance to be successful, our partners must know we are committed to the future of the region. In a region where rank and prestige are culturally significant, changing USARPAC from a 4 Star Command to a 3 Star Command would send the wrong signal. Similarly, we must be responsive to our allies' concerns and help share responsibilities wherever we can. In response to Okinawan protests against Marine Corps Air Station Futenma, the U.S. and Japan reached an agreement to relocate the base to the less-populated Henoko area. The Marine Corps also plans to move 4,000 marines from Okinawa to Guam, to move 2,700 marines from Okinawa to Hawaii and to move 2,500 marines to Darwin, Australia, by 2020. This rotational force structure, which I strongly urge this subcommittee to support, both broadens our presence in the Pacific and strengthens our relationship with two of our key treaty allies.

Additionally, I support robust defense funding for much-needed environmental remediation projects. In January 2014, Oahu experienced a fuel leak at the Red Hill Bulk Fuel Storage Facility, which has a capacity of 250 million gallons of fuel and serves as the "last gas station" for Army, Air Force, Navy, Marine Corps and Coast Guard operations in the Western Pacific. According to the Navy, approximately 27,000 gallons of jet fuel was released from one

of the underground tanks, in close proximity to local aquifers used by both the civilian and military communities. Thankfully, vigorous testing continues to show that drinking water remains safe. However, this incident demonstrates the need for extreme environmental vigilance around our national strategic assets, especially those that date from the World War II era and before, like Red Hill. While the cost of upgrading and modernizing the Red Hill facility will be high, it pales in comparison to the cost of a catastrophic fuel leak into Oahu's water supply. Our Navy partners are committed to ensuring the best practicable solution that keeps our drinking water safe, our environment protected and our armed forces ready to fight.

I similarly urge this subcommittee to continue supporting the Readiness and Environmental Protection Initiative (REPI). Encroachment on military installations, ranges, and airspace as a result of urban growth and loss of habitat continues to be a major and growing threat to military readiness. REPI funding, combined with funding from state and NGO partners, prevents this encroachment through acquisition of interests in real property from willing landowners, thereby ensuring the continued viability of key installations and training operations while also conserving important habitat. By supporting this initiative, we can empower our Armed Forces to continue to be good stewards of the land and good neighbors to local communities.

In conclusion, the resources allocated by this subcommittee will be vital to ensuring the readiness of our military, to defending our national interests and to promoting regional and global stability. Thank you again for the opportunity to submit testimony and I look forward to working with you in support of our nation's defense priorities.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much. Mr. Visclosky has a question.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Thank you very much. I do appreciate your testimony. And often, we rightly are focused on those in military uniform, but I do appreciate you bringing up the contribution that DOD civilian employees play as well. Thank you so much.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Ms. HANABUSA. Madam Chair, any other questions for me?

Ms. GRANGER. No questions. Thank you very much.

Ms. HANABUSA. Thank you very much.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from New York. You will have 5 minutes. The lights in front of me will show green to speak. When it turns to yellow, it means you have got 1 minute left. Thank you, and welcome for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2016.

WITNESS

HON. THOMAS R. SUOZZI, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN SUOZZI

Mr. SUOZZI. Thank you so much. It is the first time I have done this. I am excited to be here.

Good morning, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky and the members of the subcommittee. Thank you for this opportunity and the time to request funding to help facilitate the cleanup of the Bethpage Plume, a significant contamination of our drinking water that was discovered over 40 years ago but has not been properly contained or treated.

The U.S. Navy and Northrop Grumman are the responsible parties, and we are asking them to do their part to help clean up this plume, which is the result of their activities. It is currently in my district, but it is moving, the plume is moving south into our colleague Peter King's district. We need to take immediate action because Long Island relies on a sole source aquifer for our drinking water. Put simply, this is the only source of drinking water for our constituents.

Prior to World War II and in the postwar era, Bethpage was the military and defense industry hub of Long Island. Long Island has produced the aircraft that helped carry the Allies to victory during World War II and developed the technology that ushered in the jet era, and they helped to win the war and put a man on the moon.

The Navy, Northrop Grumman, and the people of Long Island are proud of this legacy, but this is also a legacy of pollution. My constituents are concerned that those who have profited the most, as well as their own government, are failing to properly mitigate and clean up the environmental impacts of manufacturing, modern aviation, and aerospace technology.

I represent the Third Congressional District of New York, which stretches from northeastern Queens, along Long Island's North Shore, and throughout Nassau County into Suffolk County. I am a lifelong resident of the district, and along with my family and friends and neighbors, we have waited for a long time for the re-

sponsible parties to step up and assume responsibility and truly address the issue.

Instead, we have received studies, reports, and remedial efforts while responsibility is litigated and liability is shielded. Meanwhile, the plume spreads, now covering an area 2 miles wide and 3 miles long, and as mentioned earlier, it is travelling south to the neighborhoods and towns on Long Island's South Shore, where Peter King represents.

The Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations may seem like an odd place to speak about environmental issues, but the funding to help clean up the plume is subject to the annual appropriations of the Defense Environmental Restoration Account of the Navy. Congressional funding is currently insufficient to address the Bethpage Plume, let alone thousands of sites and hundreds of locations scattered across the country that are the Navy's responsibility to lead the cleanup efforts.

Representatives from the Navy have told me it would take an estimated $4 billion to clean up every site, but Congress continually authorizes and appropriates only pennies on the dollar. Furthermore, the Navy cannot prioritize the sites and must spread funding across sites and locations.

On its face this may seem like a good idea, but this approach forces the Navy to engage in remedial efforts instead of comprehensively addressing projects with high cleanup costs. Engaging in these smaller efforts without addressing the issue, as occurs in Bethpage, will cost the taxpayers more in the long run because it fails to address the underlying issue.

We have a responsibility from the Federal Government to our local water authorities to work with all stakeholders to ensure clean drinking water and where appropriate hold those accountable for contaminating the water supply. Nowhere is this truer than when contaminants in the water stem from government-related activity.

In this case, the U.S. Navy and Northrop Grumman are the responsible parties. The Navy must have the necessary funding to lead the cleanup efforts, and we must hold Northrop Grumman accountable and require them to fully contribute their share.

And I request that the committee fully appropriate authorized amounts and look forward to working with you and other colleagues to address this and similar issues with necessary and appropriate funding measures.

Thank you so much. I really do appreciate it. I can't believe you have to do all these different hearings. It is really amazing. So thank you so much for the good work.

[The written statement of Congressman Suozzi follows:]

Congressman Thomas R. Suozzi

Prepared Remarks:

House Appropriations Defense Subcommittee Member Day

Thursday, March 9th 2017

Good morning Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky and Members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity, and the time, to discuss a critical issue to many of my constituents, as well as some of yours, and an issue many of our colleagues are dealing with in their districts across the country.

Americans deserve and must have access to clean, safe drinking water. In the wake of Flint, Michigan, and other similar incidents across the country, our constituents are rightfully concerned about their local water supply. From local newspapers to national television, they learn lead that lead has been found in a school's drinking fountains, a new carcinogen was discovered downstream from a chemical plant or, as is the case on Long Island, contaminated drinking water stemming from government and defense contractor activity. I'm referring to the Bethpage Plume, a toxic plume, which originated at former U.S. Navy and Northrop Grumman manufacturing sites, and has contaminated an aquifer that is the sole source of drinking water for millions of people on Long Island.

During World War II, and in the post war era, Long Island was a military and defense industry hub. Long Islanders produced the aircraft that helped lead the Allies to victory and worked on the technology that ushered in the jet era and sent Americans into space. We are proud of our contributions to the nation's defense and exploration, from the Revolutionary

War, through World War II to the present day. But, my constituents are also concerned that those that have profited the most, as well as their own government, are failing to properly mitigate and clean up the environmental impacts of manufacturing sophisticated weapons systems and modern aviation technology.

I represent New York's third Congressional district, which stretches from northeastern Queens, along Long Island's north shore, through Nassau County and into Suffolk County. I am also a lifelong resident of the district and, along with my family, friends and neighbors, we have waited over forty years for the responsible parties to step up, assume responsibility and truly address the issue. Instead we've received studies, reports and remedial efforts while responsibility is litigated and liability is shielded. Meanwhile, the plume spreads - now covering an area 2 miles wide and 3 miles long - and is traveling south into our colleague Peter King's district on Long Island's south shore.

The Defense subcommittee on appropriations may seem like an odd place to speak about environmental issues, but the funding to help clean up the plume is subject to annual appropriations to the Defense Environmental Restoration Account of the Navy. Congressional funding is currently insufficient to address the Bethpage plume, let alone the thousand plus sites, at hundreds of locations scattered around the country. Representatives from the Navy have told me it would take an estimated $4 billion dollars to clean up every site, but Congress continually authorizes and appropriates pennies on the dollar. Furthermore, the Navy cannot prioritize sites and must spread funding across sites and locations. On its face, this may seem like a good idea, but this approach forces the Navy to engage in remedial efforts instead of

comprehensively addressing project with high cleanup costs. Engaging in remedial efforts, without fully addressing the issue, will cost taxpayers more in the long run.

We have a responsibility, from the federal government to local water authorities, to work with all stakeholders to ensure access to clean drinking water and, where appropriate, hold those accountable for contaminating the water supply. Nowhere is this truer than when contaminants in the water stem from government related activity. I request that the committee fully appropriate authorized amounts and I look forward to working with you and our colleagues to fully address this and similar issues with necessary and appropriate funding levels.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you so much. Mr. Visclosky has some comments to make.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Just a comment. Representing Gary, Indiana, East Chicago, Indiana, and other industrial areas, we suffer from the same problem of a 100-, 120-year industrial legacy. It is not odd that you brought this problem up. We have not done a good enough job as a Nation, and certainly I look forward to working with you. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mr. SUOZZI. Thank you so much for that comment. I appreciate that help. Thank you.

Mr. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. SUOZZI. Thank you so much, Madam Chairman.

Thank you, other members of the committee.

Thank you so much, Ms. Roby.

Mr. Carter, thank you so much.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Florida. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. MATT GAETZ, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GAETZ

Mr. GAETZ. Thank you, Madam Chair and Ranking Member Visclosky. I bring you good tidings from the Budget Committee, and I thank you for loaning the incredible talents of Mr. Womack to us on occasion. I want to thank you for providing me and other Members of the House with the opportunity to testify to the subcommittee on issues we believe to be critical to our Nation's security.

I am referring to the U.S. Special Operations Command's basic research into warfighter performance and resilience in extreme environments. I feel strongly that to enable the continued supremacy of U.S. Special Forces in the 21st century, our warriors need to be the most physically fit, optimally performing, and resilient to extreme environments of any force ever assembled.

SOCOM has repeatedly recognized these requirements through programmatic documentation and broad agency announcements for research areas of interest. But an extremely austere budget environment has prevented full funding of these critical requirements. When viewed across the Future Years Defense Plan, the SOF Technology Development PE has been underfunded over the past 3 years by an average of more than $6 million per year.

In its 2017 President's budget request to Congress, Special Operations Command estimated needing $34.5 million in fiscal year 2018 for SOF Technology Development. That is almost $10 million less than was programmed in fiscal year 2016. According to the 2017 budget request, this project provides an investment strategy for SOCOM to link technology opportunities with capability deficiencies and objectives in technology that thrust into areas including human performance around endurance.

Proposed research areas in support of those SOCOM requirements include sustaining optimal human performance in austere training and operational environments, identifying meaningful interactions between pharmaceutical and nutritional supplements, and establishing heart rate variability for potential measuring of psychological and physical readiness and stress. Also, researching and applying methods to accurately measure nutritional status, and finally, developing technologies that enhance physiological performance, including greater mental acuity, increased strength and endurance, and tolerance to extreme environments.

This research is of particular interest to me beyond its impact on warfighting capability and doing what is right for national security. As you know, I have several military communities within my district that will benefit directly from this research. I also feel strongly that the health benefits of this research in my district, it is a large retired military community, and to the American civilian population at large, will ultimately be very significant.

Additional funding is urgently needed in fiscal year 2018 for competitively bid research to augment Special Operations Forces' training and performance. As you begin work on fiscal year 2018 defense appropriations, I respectfully request that your committee appropriate $39 million for the Special Operations Forces Technology Development line, a generic program increase of $4.5 million for competitively bid research to develop and transition technologies that provide asymmetric training and performance advantage to our most elite special operators.

This funding will guarantee the development of important technologies and research capabilities to address the existing SOCOM requirements. Let me reiterate, if appropriated by Congress, this additional funding will be competitively awarded and address requirements currently established by the Department of Defense.

I commend you, Madam Chair, for having this hearing, and I urge you and the subcommittee to look closely at this issue as you develop the Defense Appropriations bill for the upcoming year. Thank you so much for your time, and I appreciate the opportunity to address your subcommittee.

[The written statement of Congressman Gaetz follows:]

STATEMENT OF

MATT GAETZ (FL-01)

MEMBER OF CONGRESS

BEFORE THE

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

ON

MARCH 9, 2017

Good morning, Chairwoman Granger and Members of the Subcommittee. Thank you for providing me and other Members of the House with the opportunity to testify to the Subcommittee on issues we believe to be critical to our national security.

I'm referring to the U. S. Special Operations Command's basic research into warfighter performance and resilience in extreme environments as planned for fiscal year 2018 as shown in the President's fiscal year 2017 budget request to Congress within the Special Operations Forces Technology Development line. This important research conducted in the USSOCOM Science and Technology, Human Performance Office is aimed at providing greater asymmetric advantage for our Nation's most elite Special Operations Forces.

I feel strongly that to enable the continued supremacy of U.S. Special Operations Forces in the 21st century our warriors need to be the most physically fit, optimally performing and resilient to extreme environments of any force ever assembled. USSOCOM has repeatedly recognized these requirements through programmatic documentation and broad agency announcements for research areas of interest, but an extremely austere budget environment has prevented full funding of these critical requirements. When viewed across the FYDP (Future Years Defense Plan – pronounced f-eye'dip), the SOF Technology Development PE has been underfunded over the past three years by an average of more than $6m per year. In its 2017 President's budget request to Congress, Special Operations Command estimated needing $34.5 million in fiscal year 2018 for SOF Technology Development; that's almost $10m less than was programmed in FY16.

According to the 2017 budget request, this project provides an investment strategy for USSOCOM to link technology opportunities with capability deficiencies and objectives in technology thrust areas that include human performance and endurance. Proposed research areas in support of these SOCOM requirements include:

- Sustaining optimal human performance in austere training and operational environments;
- Identifying meaningful interactions between pharmaceutical and nutritional supplements;
- Establishing heart rate variability's potential for measuring psychological and physical readiness and stress;

- Researching and applying methods to accurately measure nutritional status; and
- Developing technologies that enhance physiological performance, including greater mental acuity, increased strength and endurance, and tolerance to environmental extremes.

This research is of particular interest to me – beyond the future of this critical warfighting capability and doing what is right for our national security. As you know I have several military communities within my district that will benefit directly from this research. I also feel strongly that the health benefits of this research to my district's large retired military community, and to America's civilian population at large, will ultimately be significant.

We haven't yet seen the FY18 President's budget request, but if funded to existing, FY17 request levels, it will limit the development and transition of these technologies that will provide advantages for our Nation's Special Operations Forces.

Additional funding is urgently needed in fiscal year 2018 for competitively bid research to augment Special Operations Forces' training and performance. As you begin work on the fiscal year 2018 Defense Appropriations bill, I respectfully request that your committee appropriate $39m for the Special Operations Forces Technology Development line, a generic program increase of $4.5m, for competitively bid research to develop and transition technologies that provide asymmetric training and performance advantage to our most elite special operators.

This funding will help guarantee the development of important technologies and research capabilities to address existing SOCOM requirements. Let me reiterate: if appropriated by Congress, this additional funding will be competitively awarded and address requirements currently established by the Department of Defense.

I commend you, Chairwoman Granger for having this hearing and I urge you and the Subcommittee to look closely at this issue as you develop the Defense Appropriations bill this year. Thank you very much for your time today, and I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts on this important research with the Subcommittee.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you for your testimony. We appreciate your taking the time to do this.

Mr. GAETZ. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Missouri. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. WM. LACY CLAY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CLAY

Mr. CLAY. Thank you, Madam Chair and Ranking Member Visclosky, as well as the other members of the committee. It is an honor to be with you today offering support for the men and women in our Armed Forces. This is the third year in a row that I have testified, and I appreciate the opportunity to let my voice and that of my constituents be heard. Even without the benefit of the fiscal year 2018 budget yet, it is important to let you know our priorities.

Last year I testified in front of the subcommittee about the Navy's tactical aviation shortfall and supported the chief of naval operations' call for more strike fighters to fill that requirement. This subcommittee responded by adding both F/A–18E/F Super Hornets and F–35Cs in its markup. Since then it has become well known that the Navy and Marine Corps are facing readiness challenges to more than half of its aviation fleet. Significant delays in maintenance and sustainment of legacy aircraft have created a readiness crisis. On top of that, higher than expected utilization rates of the Super Hornets has only exacerbated the strike fighter shortfall. This trend needs to be reversed quickly.

The near-term solution to this challenge is twofold. First, procure additional F/A18–E/F Super Hornets with upgraded capabilities to meet the threats we face in the 2020s and beyond. The Block III Super Hornet will complement the F–35C by bringing enhanced networking capability, extended range, and increased number of weapons into battle. I believe that the Navy's budget will show an investment in these modernized aircraft and how they can support carrier operations for decades to come.

Second, the Navy should invest in sustainment of the existing fleet of Super Hornets, a plan that the service has worked on but will finally implement in the upcoming budget. Extending the life and capabilities of these older aircraft, paired with new Super Hornets, will immediately help fill the strike fighter gap.

After several years of congressional support, I expect the Navy to take action to budget for these solutions. Congress has provided a life preserver to the Navy, but it is time for the Navy to step up.

St. Louis, my home town, is one of the Nation's premier homes for tactical aviation, an area of expertise that I know the chairwoman knows a great deal about in her own district. I am proud that my district is the home of the Super Hornet, and the men and women that work on the aircraft are proud for what they do for the warfighter. Their efforts are in service to the Navy and to their country. They also understand the critical role that Congress plays

in ensuring that the Navy has the most capable and cost-effective fleet of aircraft.

I hope that the fiscal year 2018 budget submission includes the procurement of at least 24 new Super Hornets and that the subcommittee can support them in your markup. The strike fighter shortfall is a serious issue that can and should be addressed, and I look forward to working with you throughout the year, and I have been a strong vote yes for the work that this subcommittee has done each year.

Thank you for offering me this opportunity to discuss our security priorities.

[The written statement of Congressman Clay follows:]

Representative Wm. Lacy Clay - Missouri, 1st District

Testimony to the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee (HACD)

Thursday, March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky, it is an honor to be with you today offering support for the men and women in our armed forces. This is the third year in a row that I have testified, and I appreciate the opportunity to let my voice and that of my constituents be heard. Even without the benefit of the Fiscal Year 2018 budget yet, it is important to let you know my priorities.

Last year, I testified in front of this Subcommittee about the Navy's tactical aviation shortfall, and supported the Chief of Naval Operations call for more strike fighters to fill that requirement. This Subcommittee responded by adding both F/A-18E/F Super Hornets and F-35Cs in its markup. Since then, it has become well known that the Navy and Marine Corps are facing readiness challenges to more than half of its aviation fleet. Significant delays in maintenance and sustainment of legacy aircraft have created a readiness crisis. On top of that, higher than expected utilization rates of the Super Hornet has only exacerbated the strike fighter shortfall. This trend needs to be reversed quickly.

The near-term solution to this challenge is twofold. First, procure additional F/A-18E/F Super Hornets with upgraded capabilities to meet the threats we face in the 2020s and beyond. The Block III Super Hornet will complement the F-35C by bringing enhanced networking capability, extended range and increased number of weapons into battle. I believe that the Navy's budget will show an investment in these modernized aircraft and how they can support carrier operations for decades to come. Second, the Navy should invest in sustainment of the

existing fleet of Super Hornets, a plan that the service has worked on, but will finally implement in the upcoming budget. Extending the life and capabilities of these older aircraft, paired with new Super Hornets, will immediately help fill the strike fighter gap.

After several years of congressional support, I expect the Navy to take action to budget for these solutions. Congress has provided a life preserver to the Navy, but it is time for the Navy to step up.

St. Louis is one of the Nation's premier homes for tactical aviation, an area of expertise that I know the Chairwoman knows a great deal about in her own district. I'm proud that my district is the home of the Super Hornet, and the men and women that work on the aircraft are proud for what they do for the warfighter. Their efforts are in service to the Navy and to their country. They also understand the critical role that Congress plays in ensuring that the Navy has the most capable and cost effective fleet of aircraft.

I hope that the Fiscal Year 2018 budget submission includes the procurement of at least 24 new Super Hornets, and that the Subcommittee can support them in your markup. The strike fighter shortfall is a serious issue that can and should be addressed. I look forward to working with you throughout the year, and I have been a strong vote yes for the work that this subcommittee has done each year.

Thank you for offering this opportunity to discuss my national security priorities.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you so much for appearing and, for the third time, reminding us of what we need to do with our military and our equipment. Thank you very much.

Mr. CLAY. Thanks Madam Chair.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentlewoman from New Mexico. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW MEXICO

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN LUJAN GRISHAM

Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM. Good morning, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky and of course members of the subcommittee. I am also delighted to be here and appreciate the opportunity to speak with you today about the Army's AN/PDR–75A Personal Dosimeter Radiac Set. These measure and collect radiation exposure data in order to reduce health risks for the brave men and women who put themselves in harm's way.

This program is critical to the security, safety, and well-being of American servicemembers who are exposed to radioactive weapons systems, devices, and materials on a daily basis. It also ensures that we are prepared for a broad range of contingencies that could expose our soldiers to potentially high levels of radiation, including the use of a dirty bomb. Without accurate data, we have no way of assessing and reducing radiation exposure health risks, including acute radiation sickness and cancer.

The new Radiac set replaces old, obsolete systems being used by the Army since the 1960s. The outdated systems cannot measure the range of dose presented by current scenarios or provide a legal dose of record capability, or, frankly, what is occurring over the lifetime of exposures.

The new system meets the Department of Defense standards and includes a personal dosimeter, which resembles a wristwatch, that a soldier wears and a small, 5-pound reader that provides a legal record of radiation exposure for each soldier. Now, this recorded information is kept as part of the soldier's medical record and provides the soldier with a comprehensive record of radiation exposure over his or her entire career.

And while not part of my remarks, radiation exposure also causes a change in DNA which actually gets passed on to future generations. It is critical that we provide our men and women with not only the information related to these exposures, but the opportunity to mitigate those and deal with issues for their entire families.

This detail is extremely helpful to both the soldier and the Department of Veterans Affairs once the soldier seeks medical care upon leaving the service because cancer risks, of course, increase as one's total lifetime dose increases. Recent news reports have highlighted current problems facing soldiers and veterans seeking

treatment at the VA whose radiation exposure was not recorded or tracked.

Unfortunately, this spans across exposures at Pacific island nuclear test sites in the 1950s, in Desert Shield and Desert Storm, around the Fukushima nuclear disaster, and via depleted uranium use in current operations. These examples demonstrate that the need and application for these Radiac sets is wide ranging, and the AN/PDR–75A device removes any doubt and provides a legal record of all exposure during a soldier's career of service to our Nation.

Now, the Army began purchasing new Radiac sets in 2012 with procurement dollars, but due largely to budgetary constraints, decided to pause production and fielding until 2020. Prudently, the Army Reserve and Army National Guard use National Guard and Reserve equipment account funds to field Radiac sets to 100 percent of their soldiers and are 100 percent mission ready. The bad news: Unfortunately, that is not the case with the active Army, which has since placed the shortfall of Radiac sets on its unfunded requirement list and remains only 50 percent mission ready.

The current active Army shortfall stands at 2,323 Radiac sets, which of course places these soldiers at risk. The active Army needs an estimated 26 million over the next 2 years to complete fielding the newest, most capable systems to our Nation's soldiers.

One further point of consideration, Madam Chairwoman, the Army-proposed pause in production will have a profound negative impact on the industrial base for this central piece of equipment. Shutting down and then restarting the production lines increases future production costs and, of course, jeopardizes the development of the state-of-the-art technology and leads to the loss of a highly skilled and proficient workforce.

We can't wait, quite frankly, until 2020 to resume production of these items. Funding and fielding the items in fiscal year 2018 improves Army readiness, stabilizes the industrial base, and most importantly, protects the safety and welfare of our Nation's soldiers.

I thank the committee for inviting me to appear today and of course for your consideration of providing support and funding for this vital Army program in fiscal year 2018 and beyond. Thank you very much.

[The written statement of Congresswoman Lujan Grisham follows:]

Congresswoman Michelle Lujan Grisham (NM-01) Statement, House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Defense Member's Day Hearing, March 9th, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Defense Subcommittee, I appreciate the opportunity to speak to you today about the Army's AN/PDR-75A Personal Dosimeter Radiac Set, which measures radiation exposure in order to reduce health risks for the brave men and women who put themselves in harm's way. This program is critical to the security, safety, and well-being of American service members who are exposed to radioactive weapon systems, devices, and material on a daily basis. It also ensures that we are prepared for a broad range of contingencies that could expose our soldiers to potentially high levels of radiation, including the use of a "dirty" bomb. Without accurate data, we will have no way of assessing and reducing radiation exposure health risks, including acute radiation sickness and cancer.

The AN/PDR-75A Radiac set replaces old, obsolete systems being used by the Army since the 1960s. The outdated systems could not measure the range of dose presented by current scenarios or provide a legal dose of record capability. The new system meets DOD standards and includes a personal dosimeter, which resembles a wristwatch that a soldier wears and a small, five pound reader that provides a legal record of radiation exposure for each soldier. This recorded information is kept as part of the soldier's medical record and provides a soldier with a comprehensive record of radiation exposure over his or her entire career. This detail is extremely helpful to both the soldier and the Department of Veterans Affairs once the soldier seeks medical care upon leaving the service, because cancer risk increases as one's total lifetime doses

increase. Recent news reports have highlighted current problems facing soldiers and veterans seeking treatment at the VA whose radiation exposure was not recorded or tracked. Unfortunately this spans across exposure at Pacific island nuclear test sites in the 1950's, in Desert Shield and Desert Storm, around the Fukushima nuclear disaster and via depleted Uranium use in current operations. These examples demonstrate that the need and application for these Radiac Sets is wide ranging. The AN/PDR-75A removes any doubt and provides a legal record of all exposure during a soldier's career of service to our nation.

The Army began purchasing new Radiac Sets in 2012 with procurement dollars, but due largely to budgetary constraints, decided to pause production and fielding until 2020. Prudently, the Army Reserve and Army National Guard used National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account (NGREA) funds to field Radiac sets to 100% of their soldiers and are 100% mission ready. Unfortunately, that is not the case with the Active Army, which has since placed the shortfall of Radiac Sets on its Unfunded Requirements List and remains only 50% mission ready.

The current Active Army shortfall stands at 2,323 AN/PDR-75A Radiac Sets (Personal Dosimeters), which places soldiers at risk. The Active Army needs an estimated $26M over the next two years to complete fielding the newest, most capable systems to our nation's soldiers.
One further point of consideration, the Army's proposed pause in production will have a profound negative impact on the industrial base for this critical piece of equipment. Shutting down and then restarting the production line increases future production costs, jeopardizes the development of state-of-the-art technology, and leads to the loss of a highly skilled and proficient workforce.

We cannot wait until 2020 to resume production of these critical items. Funding and fielding these items in FY18 improves Army readiness, stabilizes the industrial base, and most importantly protects the safety and welfare of our nation's soldiers. I thank the Committee for inviting me to appear here today and for your consideration of providing support and funding for this vital Army program in FY2018 and beyond.

Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you so much for being with us, and thank you for your remarks.

Ms. LUJAN GRISHAM. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from California. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. DUNCAN HUNTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN HUNTER

Mr. HUNTER. Good morning, Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, members of the subcommittee. I am here before you to talk about one thing first and a couple of other things that are near and dear to my heart.

The first one is the Army has got four divisions of Gray Eagles. Gray Eagles is the MQ–9 Reaper. That is what the Army calls it. They call it Gray Eagle instead of the MQ–9 Reaper, which is the armed predator that can carry 500-pound bombs, Hellfires, and do ISR. They are 3 airplanes short per four divisions, for a total of 12 planes short.

The shortfall in division-level intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance assets impacts the training and the readiness of both the deploying unit, as well as the units that are forced to surrender aircraft to fill the resourcing shortfall. So what you have is you have units that aren't going to be deploying borrowing planes from the units that just got back. So the units that just got back can't even train up on their planes because they don't have them because they had to give them to the guys that are going overseas.

So what I am requesting right now in the fiscal year 2018 Department of Defense Appropriations Act is an acquisition of 12, and, again, 12 is 3 airplanes per division for the four divisions in the Army that do this. It is $195 million in the Aircraft Procurement, Army appropriation account so that all Army companies have their full allowance of Gray Eagle systems and related ground support equipment.

That is the first thing. And I think this is one of those things that I think, when it comes to Predators, whether it is the Navy, Army, Marine Corps, they always want more, but in this case, they are not at what they are supposed to have in the first place. So they are not asking for extra. They just want to be at their full complement.

Number two, things that I would just like to say that aren't specific things that I am requesting that you take a look at, somebody smart said if you control the ocean, you control the world. And nowadays if you control space, you control the ocean. I think we need to look at you, the Appropriations Committee—and, by the way, it is interesting coming here as opposed to talking to each of you begging for things as us authorizers do on the Armed Services Committee.

Two things. The Coast Guard-Navy matrix needs to be fixed. I know Coast Guard isn't Navy, but the fact that we have so few

Navy ships, and you have Coast Guard now doing Navy things because the Coast Guard is a U.S. military service with dual roles, I think that is really important for the Nation. I think if you look at, like, the top three things we should do as a Nation defense-wise, Navy and Coast Guard are one of those things.

The second thing are out-of-the-box ways to look at missile defense—out-of-the-box ways. We have THAAD. We have all these different intercept things. We are able to shoot down multiple projectiles coming in from space that we have to track. The time to hit missiles is when they are taking off, nuclear missiles. You are going to have North Korea, the Iranians now.

Nuclear ICBMs will become ubiquitous, I think, in 25 or 30 years, and short-range a lot sooner than that. The time to hit them is when they are slow, when there are big plumes of fire and they are taking off to go into space, that is when you do that.

There are ways to do this that are not billion-dollar programs, line item by the Army or the Air Force. There are out-of-the-box ways to do it. And I would beg of you to look at these different ways that we can shoot down our enemies' missiles as they launch when it is the easiest time to hit them, because, again, they are going slow, they are taking off, and it is not that hard to hit one and blow it up when they are taking off.

With that, thank you for all that you do, and I look forward to having a more robust defense budget this year. Thank you all.

[The written statement of Congressman Hunter follows:]

STATEMENT OF

REPRESENTATIVE DUNCAN HUNTER (CA-50)

MEMBER OF CONGRESS

BEFORE THE

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

MARCH 9, 2017

Good morning Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Defense Subcommittee. Thank you for providing me with the opportunity to testify to the Subcommittee on issues that are important to our national security.

Account: **Aircraft Procurement, Army**

Line Item: **MQ-1 UAV**

P-1 Line 3

I would like to bring to your attention the U.S. Army Gray Eagle, which is a medium-altitude, long endurance unmanned aerial vehicle. Currently, Gray Eagle Companies are authorized 12 MQ-1C Gray Eagle aircraft per Company. Due to resourcing limitations, only 9 aircraft per company have been fielded. To achieve full operational capability, units must borrow 3 aircraft from non-deploying units to bring them to the full U.S Forces Command Table of Organization and Equipment (TO&E) Authorization for deployment. This shortfall in Division-level Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) assets impacts the training and readiness of both a deploying unit as well as units that are forced to surrender aircraft to fill the resourcing shortfall.

DOD assessments determined that Gray Eagle units at Division level required 12 aircraft to adequately meet operational requirements, supported in the Consolidated Programming Document. Due to limited funding, the Army was forced to either fully field fewer units or partially field each Company. This strategy supported Division requirements to integrate and train Maneuver and Intelligence units with organic assets, although with a limited number of aircraft. Risk was accepted to both the organizational training base and to the "train as you fight" philosophy.

The high demand for Gray Eagle units to support ISR missions in multiple theaters has driven unit deployments to a high operational tempo. Commanders have demanded full equipment allowance for deployed units, while units not deploying supply three aircraft from their already reduced assets to ensure deployed Companies have the full complement of aircraft. As more units are deployed and combat losses are experienced, additional aircraft must be taken from non-deployed units.

This places increased stress on non-deployed units to meet both individual and collective training requirements. Non-deployed units are likely to experience a lack of adequate resources to conduct 100% of their maintenance and flight operations training mandates.

Gray Eagle units must have their full authorization of equipment to build the skills needed to support full spectrum operations upon deployment. Partially fielded units with full TO&E Authorizations have additional concerns beyond current operations. For example, Non Commissioned Officers, leaders and staff are not adequately challenged if they do not have to account for, sustain, and repair a full complement of aircraft. If this situation continues, it will affect the long-term quality of Army Unmanned Aerial Systems units, as well their ability to train, maintain and operate at the levels expected of all Army Aviation units.

To fully equip Gray Eagle Companies to their full TO&E for Aircraft, Ground Support Equipment, Ground Data Terminals and Ground Control Systems, three additional Gray Eagle Extended Range (GE-ER) aircraft are needed per division. The additional acquisition of 12 improved Gray Eagle aircraft in fiscal year 2018 also supports the industrial based through 2021.

I recognize that your Subcommittee has a tough job to balance many urgent requirements with very limited funding resources. I urge your Subcommittee, as you mark up the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2018 to look at this very important requirement and provide

$195 million in the Aircraft Procurement, Army appropriation account so that all Army companies have their full allowance of Gray Eagle systems and related ground support equipment.

I would like to bring another important issue to your attention, long range acoustic hailing devices, which allow service members to effectively determine the intent of a person, crowd or vehicle at a safe distance and attempt to deter them before escalating to the use of lethal force and keeping the warfighter out of harm's way. These hailing devices are a proven non-lethal deterrent and are already in use in the Navy, Marine Corps, Coast Guard, Reserves, and National Guard. In 2009, the Army validated a requirement for 6,350 units but a Program of Record wasn't established until 2015. The overall requirement has been reduced to 3,773 as the size of the Army has been reduced but to date, the Army has procured less than 50 of these potentially life-saving devices via the Program of Record even though the cost to buy out the entire requirement would only be $80M. Funding for this was included in the FY17 President's budget request in Other Procurement, Army, and I thank the Committee for their strong support of that request. The FY17 President's Budget request also indicated planned funding in FY18 but, inexplicably, at a lower rate of procurement quantities than planned for FY17. I request the support of the Committee for expediting the procurement and fielding of this critical capability.

Thank you again for the opportunity for me to bring these important issues to the Subcommittee's attention.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you for coming. Thank you for your words. We appreciate it very much.

Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Ohio. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. STEVE STIVERS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN STIVERS

Mr. STIVERS. Good morning, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky and all the members of the subcommittee. I am here to testify today about the Technology Transition Program, that during fiscal year 2018 the Air Force has requested $497.7 million.

And only $87.4 million of that, 18 percent, is set aside for technologies other than advanced engine development; $410 million is exclusively ramped off, 82 percent, roped off for engine development. That is an insufficient amount for all the other things that need to happen. It will cause some critical Air Force technology development needs.

And in addition, there are now opportunities for the Air Force to partner with State universities, national laboratories, medium and small businesses, to identify novel technologies and concepts on 100 percent cost-shared basis, which could leverage dollars better. And the Air Force's 2018 budget estimate does not allow for the service to take advantage of these opportunities. And I think that we should change that and allow that to happen.

I strongly urge the subcommittee to provide a program increase of $15 million for fiscal year 2018 for the Technology Transition Program when it marks up the Defense Appropriations Act of 2018 and specifically allow cost-match technology transition to be fully competitively awarded by the Air Force, so it would be on a competitive basis.

I think this will fund a diverse portfolio of capabilities to enable multiple combinations of air-to-space to cyberspace operations in all environments, even in highly contested as well as permissive environments. It will ensure that new concepts and capabilities to counter increasing technology and proliferation of anti-access and area denial threats, and to include multidomain approaches and systems that can be rapidly modified when adversaries adapt their defenses. It will also ensure tailored forward presence from small, resilient bases, and it will algorithm as opposed to hardware-based human-computer interface systems that will work with humans to provide predictive analysis and assist in rapid multidomain courses of action. It will allow big data analytics and testing that will help improve our Nation's defense and allow the Air Force to see the entire operating picture.

I thank you for the opportunity, and I hope you will consider increasing the TTP by $15 million, which is a mere 3 percent, and ensuring specific language that allows cost-matched technology

transition to be fully awarded competitively by the Air Force. Thank you very much.

[The written statement of Congressman Stivers follows:]

Testimony by Representative Steve Stivers (OH-15)
Before the House Subcommittee on Defense House Committee on Appropriations
March 9, 2017

Good morning Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Defense Subcommittee. Thank you for providing me and other Members of the House with the opportunity to testify to the Subcommittee on issues that are important to our national security.

The Air Force estimated needing $497.7 million for its Technology Transition Program (TTP) during fiscal year 2018, in its fiscal year 2017 RDT&E President's budget request to Congress. This program is in the Advanced Component Development and Prototypes budget activity for efforts to evaluate integrated technologies, representative modes or prototype systems in a high fidelity and realistic operating environment. Of this amount, **Only $87.4 million (a mere 18 percent) is set aside for all other technologies relevant to the diverse Air Force mission set,** while the vast majority, $410.3 million (82 percent) is dedicated for advanced engine development.

The Technology Transition Program (TTP) in the Air Force's budget provides funding to demonstrate and/or experiment with technologies and concepts to enable or accelerate their transition to acquisition programs of record and operational use. It addresses the gap that exists between when a technology or concept is first developed and demonstrated to when it can be successfully acquired and implemented as an operational capability. TTP bridges that gap by providing funding and enabling integration and demonstration to continue beyond the laboratory. It also allows acquisition program managers and warfighters to prototype, integrate, demonstrate, and experiment with candidate technologies and assess them in an operational environment in partnership with PEOs, schools, simulation facilities, and development planning organizations.

TTP includes research and development funds for the following transition activities:

(1) experimentation campaigns to support Air Superiority 2030+ promising, high-priority concepts and technologies in an operational environment,

(2) prototyping to lower acquisition risk by raising the technology readiness level and assessing implications to CONOPS, tactics, techniques, and procedures;

(3) performing pre-acquisition systems engineering to facilitate transition of concepts and technologies from a demonstration program into acquisition programs of record;

(4) assessing external interface requirements of candidate concepts, technologies, and demonstration projects to better understand true engineering costs resulting from insertion of new technologies into the AF enterprise architecture; and

(5) capturing data through information technology tools and databases to help formulate technology transition acquisition strategies and gather proposals for technology and prototype development that have the potential for application to the performance of Department of Defense missions.

The $87.4 million estimated for technology transition of non-engine technologies during fiscal year 2018 is insufficient to address critical Air Force technology development and insertion needs.

In addition, there are now opportunities emerging for the Air Force to team with states, universities, national laboratories, and small and medium businesses to identify novel technologies and concepts on a **100 percent cost-shared basis**. The Air Force's FY 2018 budget estimate does not allow the service to take advantage of these opportunities, particularly due to the skew towards aircraft engine development.

The Air Force is particularly interested in new systems-of-systems research, mixing low-tech and high-tech assets into a synergistic and more combat-effective framework. Additional funds are urgently needed in FY18 to rapidly evaluate new system-of-system solutions and develop the trust methodologies required to provide rapid, cost effective, flight qualified, and reliable mission solutions for a wide range of DOD high/low mission operations. The focus of this effort would be on scalable and modular technologies using additive manufacturing solutions which could be deployed in multiple defense applications across a variety of platforms, technologies, and varying terrain and weather conditions.

Critical to these flexible systems-of-systems solutions are the capabilities to facilitate **manned-unmanned teaming**. These concepts can have the added benefit of extending the useful life of existing fleets of fourth generation fighters and weapons. The exponential growth of the commercial unmanned aerial vehicle sector is facilitating the creation of novel, low-cost concepts of employment that create new opportunities for current Air Force aerospace systems. Commercial interests and a large and active open source community have enabled rapid improvement of unmanned capabilities in general, which should be properly integrated and could rapidly enhance U.S. warfighter effectiveness and increase cost effectively enhance. These emerging systems will enhance operational flexibility in multiple mission environments to include ISR, electronic warfare, kinetic and cyber weapon delivery.

I strongly urge the Subcommittee to provide a generic program increase of $15.0 million to the Air Force's fiscal year 2018 budget request for the Technology Transition Program when it marks up its Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2018 -- specifically for cost-matched technology transition that can be fully competitively awarded by the Air Force. This funding will support research, development, system performance

modeling and simulation, additive manufacturing, demonstrations and rapid evaluation of system-of-systems prototypes and would allow fully cost-matched investments in:

- **A diverse portfolio of capabilities that enable multiple combinations of air-to-space to- cyberspace operations in all environmental conditions and in highly-contested and permissive environments.**
- **New concepts and capabilities to counter the increasing technology and proliferation of anti-access and area denial threats, to include multi-domain approaches and systems that can be rapidly modified when adversaries adapt their defenses.**
- **Tailored forward presence from small, resilient bases, using dispersal, warning, active and passive defenses, rapid repair capabilities, and streamlined logistics through the use of additive manufacturing.**
- **Algorithm-based (as opposed to hardware-based) human-computer interface systems that work with humans to provide predictive analysis, and assist in rapid, multi-domain course of action development by providing Big Data analytics, emulation, and testing, as well as present easily visualized information through a tailorable, user-defined operating picture.**

Thank you again for the opportunity for me to bring this important issue to the Subcommittee's attention today.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you for being here, and thank you for your remarks. I just returned from a short trip to California looking at some of those exact issues. Thank you.

Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Alabama. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes. The lights in front of you show when you can start. When it hits yellow, it means you have got 1 minute. Thank you so much.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. BRADLEY BYRNE, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ALABAMA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BYRNE

Mr. BYRNE. Thank you, Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and distinguished members of this committee. It is my pleasure to appear before this committee once again to testify on two issues important to our national security: the Littoral Combat Ship and the Expeditionary Fast Transport, or EPF, which was formerly known as the Joint High Speed Vessel.

I would be remiss if I did not begin by thanking the committee for its support for three LCS's in the 2017 Defense Appropriations bill that passed the House yesterday. Continuing to fund three LCS's in fiscal year 2018 is important to the Navy, the program, the industrial base, and American taxpayers.

Because of concentrated efforts by the Navy and the shipyards, construction deficiencies have been identified and implemented, reducing each ship by almost a half million man-hours. This, as I am sure the committee knows, equates to a significant cost savings of somewhere between 15 and 20 percent. The shipyards in Marinette, Wisconsin, and Mobile, Alabama, have been extremely clear, these savings can only be achieved by continuing a hot production line and maintaining a skilled workforce.

The Trump administration is faced with overcoming some significant hurts. Decisions were made in the past administration which puts the future of our Naval fleet at risk. For example, the Navy has been and continues to be steadfast that their requirement for small surface combatants is still 52 ships. Despite the Navy leadership's articulation of this need, former Secretary of Defense Ash Carter attempted to decrease the number of LCS's from 52 total ships down to 40 and required down select to a single shipyard in fiscal year 2019.

The Navy's Force Structure Analysis, which was completed just this last year, articulates the need for a 355-ship Navy and maintains the requirement for 52 Littoral Combat Ships. The only means to produce the desired number of small surface combatants is to continue building at least three LCS's per year.

The Navy is advancing strategic concepts to maintain of sea lanes by using distributed lethality. The USS *Coronado* is currently outfitted with an antiship missile defense system and an over-the-horizon missile system. These added capabilities, combined with the speed of the LCS, enables the Navy at low cost to reshape the

Russian and Chinese calculus of our forces in places such as the South China Sea.

I was fortunate to attend the 2016 Rim of the Pacific Exercise, which is the world's largest naval exercise, with participants from over 25 nations, including the Chinese. The USS *Coronado* conducted exercises at RIMPAC that demonstrated to the world the capabilities of the LCS, and I can tell you for a fact our adversaries were present and were closely watching the capabilities of that ship.

Following RIMPAC, the Coronado replaced the USS *Fort Worth* on a rotational deployment to Singapore. I visited Singapore just 2 weeks ago and met with the admiral that employs these ships, and he stressed to me that the requests from our partner nations to work with the LCS are in higher demand than we have ships available. He indicated to me that he needs more LCS's in theater as soon as possible.

Next, I would like to share my support for the Expeditionary Fast Transport, commonly known as the EPF. The EPF is a shallow-draft, high-speed catamaran, which is a small amphibious vessel used for intra-theater support of personnel, equipment, and supplies.

I have talked to combatant commanders, the Marine Corps, and the Military Sealift Command about the EPF, and each has stressed its important and unique capabilities. These ships are making an impact around the world. They have operated in PACOM for humanitarian assistance and disaster relief, SOUTHCOM for counterdrug missions, and EUCOM for antipiracy missions.

As we meet, the USNS *Trenton* is forward deployed to Naval Forces Europe-Africa Command's area of operation, performing intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance missions. The EPF is currently in serial production with a stable and highly trained workforce. We are benefitting from the efficiencies gained through the construction of the initial eight vessels.

At roughly $225 million per ship, the EPF is a fraction of what other shipbuilding programs cost. In order to ensure the capability to build these ships and maintain such an affordable price, we need to keep the production line open and meet the stated requirements of a total of 18 vessels. Unfortunately, without further procurement in fiscal year 2018, this line will close.

Thank you very much for your time today. I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts on these two valuable ships and the state of shipbuilding with the subcommittee. I am happy to answer any questions.

[The written statement of Congressman Byrne follows:]

Appropriations Member Day Statement
Defense Subcommittee
Representative Bradley Byrne
Alabama's First District
March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, distinguished members of the committee; it is my pleasure to appear before this Committee once again this year to testify on two issues important to our national security: the Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) program and the Expeditionary Fast Transport (EPF) formerly known as the Joint High Speed Vessel program.

I would be remiss if I did not begin by thanking the Committee for its support of a third LCS in the Fiscal Year 2017 Defense Appropriations bill we are considering this week.

I am here to articulate why funding three LCS in Fiscal Year 2018 is so important to the Navy, the program, the industrial base, and American tax payers.

Three LCS is the minimum sustainable number required to produce these ships and achieve a 40% reduction in man-hours. Because of concentrated efforts by the Navy and the shipyards, construction efficiencies have been identified and

implemented reducing each ship by almost a half million man-hours. This, as I am sure the Committee knows, equates to a significant cost savings of 15-20%. These savings can only be achieved by continuing a hot production line and maintaining a skilled workforce. The shipyards in Marinette, Wisconsin and Mobile, Alabama have been extremely clear that three ships is the minimum number to create cost and time savings to complete each ship.

The Trump Administration is faced with overcoming significant hurdles set in place by the Obama Administration. Decisions were made which put the future of our naval fleet at risk. For example the Navy has been and continues to be steadfast that their requirement for small surface combatants is still 52 ships. Despite the Navy Leadership's articulation of this need, former Secretary of Defense Ash Carter attempted to decrease the number of LCS from 52 total ships down to 40 and require a down select to a single shipyard in Fiscal Year 2019.

The Navy's Force Structure Analysis, which was completed late last year, articulates the need for a 355 ship Navy and maintains the requirement for 52 Littoral Combat Ships. Furthermore, three separate alternative studies aimed at reconstituting our Navy with an optimized fleet have been completed over the past few weeks. Each one of these studies identifies the need for a larger naval fleet

and call for an increase in small surface combatants over the current 30-year shipbuilding plan. The only means to produce the desired number of small surface combatants is to continue building at least 3 LCS per year.

The Navy is advancing strategic concepts to maintain control of sea lanes by using distributed lethality and flexibility. The LCS, specifically the USS Coronado, is outfitted with an anti-ship missile defense system and over-the-horizon missile systems. These added capabilities now require our adversaries to pay much closer attention to the location of the LCS. The combined speed and lethality of LCS enables the Navy, at a low cost, to reshape the Russian and Chinese calculus of our forces in places such as the South China Sea.

The USS Coronado participated in the 2016 Rim of the Pacific Exercise, the world's largest naval exercise with participants from over 25 nations including the Chinese. I was fortunate to attend RIMPAC and go aboard the USS Coronado as she conducted exercises that demonstrated to the world just how capable the LCS. The sailors and officers of Coronado were proud of their ship and confident in the capabilities LCS brings to the fight – and trust me our adversaries were watching.

Following RIMPAC, the Coronado replaced the USS Forth Worth on a rotational deployment to Singapore. The LCS are perfect for the Asia-Pacific region because these are shallow draft vessels capable of can get to places larger surface ships often cannot get to in that very important part of the world. I visited Singapore just two weeks ago and met with the Admiral that employs these ships, and he stressed to me that the requests from our partner nations to work with the LCS are in higher demand than we have ships available. He indicated that he needs more LCS in theater as soon as possible.

Just last month, in testimony before the Armed Services Committee, Admiral Moran, the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, stated "The Navy is smaller today than it has been in the last 99 years." This is at a time when our adversaries have been investing in their navies for the past few decades. I urge this committee to fund a 355 ship Navy and to recognize that the LCS is an essential component of our future fleet and critical to the success of Navy.

Next, I'd like to share my support for the Expeditionary Fast Transport commonly known as the EPF. The EPF is a shallow draft, high-speed catamaran small amphibious vessel used for the intra-theater support of personnel, equipment and supplies. I've talked to Combatant Commanders, the Marine Corps, and the

Military Sealift Command about the EPF, and each have stressed its importance and unique capabilities.

These ships are making an impact around the world. They have participated in humanitarian assistance and disaster relief following the tsunamis in India and Japan. They have operated in SOUTHCOM for the counter-drug mission, in EUCOM for anti-piracy missions, and in PACOM for theater security operations. As we meet, the USNS Trenton is forward deployed to Naval Forces Europe-Africa Command's area of operation, performing intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance missions. Last month, USNS Spearhead deployed with an embarked medical team to conduct civil-military operations where a variety of medical services will be provided to over 15,000 people.

Clearly, these vessels are effectively filling critical roles for all Combatant Commanders. The stated requirement for the number of these ships is 18, but to this point 8 have been delivered and another 4 are under contract. The Department of Defense places a premium on the ability of U.S. military forces to deploy quickly to a full spectrum of engagements. The EPF has demonstrated the ability to effectively support these needs and more.

The EPF is currently in serial production with a stable and highly trained work force. We are benefiting from the efficiencies gained through the construction of the initial eight vessels. In order to ensure the capability to build these ships, and maintain such an affordable price, we need to keep the production line open. Unfortunately, without further procurement in Fiscal Year 2018, this line will close.

The EPF program provides the Navy with a very affordable and capable ship. At roughly $225 million per ship, the EPF is a fraction of what other shipbuilding programs cost. The program has clearly matured into what can only be considered efficient, serial production. As we work toward a Navy of 355 ships, we must capitalize on low-cost, high production product lines.

As a member of the Armed Services Committee, I have had multiple opportunities to go aboard both classes of vessels. I have been able to follow these vessels from construction to commissioning ceremonies to training exercises to day-to-day operations. I have seen them as they operate forward deployed in South East Asia. I have talked to the fine sailors who operate these vessels and the Navy Operators that utilize these assets for strategic purposes. The feedback I get from the fleet

has consistently been that they need more Littoral Combat Ships and more Expeditionary Fast Transports.

Thank you very much for your time today. I appreciate the opportunity to share my thoughts on these two valuable ships and the state of shipbuilding with the Subcommittee.

Ms. GRANGER. I have no questions, but I share your appreciation for Littoral Combat Ships. I am the sponsor of the USS *Fort Worth* and watched that competition. There is more to go with that. So thank you for your testimony.

Mr. BYRNE. Thank you. Good to be with you.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from California. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. PAUL COOK, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN COOK

Mr. COOK. Good morning, Madam Chair, Ranking Member Visclosky, members of the Defense Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning to testify on an issue important to our national security.

Many, many years ago I was a platoon commander. I was the most dangerous weapon in the world, a second lieutenant with a map and a compass and a radio man who followed behind me, you know, usually trying to keep me out of trouble.

Today's warfighter tracks his mission enemy using radio and digital communications on multiple platforms. We expect them to bear this burden, the weight of the equipment, while still becoming a faster, more agile, and more lethal fighting force than ever before. We owe these combat leaders and their troops a simpler system to make the best use of all this information that they are receiving.

The Army Geospatial Center is the office responsible for the development of the system that I am talking about. They create standards shared by all Army platforms to provide a single operating picture for the commander. By combining multiple intelligence sources on one device, a commander can spend more time making combat decisions and less time sorting through data and trying to figure out what to do when there are mortars, machine gun fire, everything going on at once.

An additional $4 million is needed in fiscal year 2018 to finish development efforts and get the software to the troops. These funds would provide necessary hardware, software, personnel to ensure the technology is combat ready. This program can be found under Army's Technical Information Activities in R-1, Romeo-1, line 155.

The modern battlefield can change quickly, and our troops need access to the most accurate, up-to-date information to make informed tactical decisions. It is essential that our intelligence provide a clear, concise picture to the commander and the warfighter.

Our troops have always been leaders in battlefield management, but we cannot assume that this will always be the case. This program will enhance our troops' ability to locate, close with, and destroy the enemy. Timely access to accurate information will help our commanders to bring our troops home safely.

If somebody that existed in the world of Jurassic Park where the systems we had were crude, to say the least, and which was 1967, 1968, the times have changed, but the basic mission is the same:

carry out what we are supposed to do and make sure that we take care of the troops once again and bring them all back home alive.

Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

[The written statement of Congressman Cook follows:]

The Honorable Paul Cook (CA-08)

Good morning Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Defense Subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning to testify on an issue important to our national security.

In today's Digital Age, our troops have access to more information than ever before. Intelligence can be sent into the field by radio, cell phone, e-mail, data link, or satellite. The problem becomes how our service members can organize and make use of this information before going into battle. Multiple communications devices and an increasing need for power to operate those devices are weighing down our troops and slowing down our missions. Centralizing all of this information and making it useable to the warfighter will mean shorter, safer, successful missions and more soldiers coming home alive.

The Army Geospatial Center is the office responsible for all geospatial intelligence mapping. They are creating standards, common across all Army platforms that will receive intelligence feeds, to create a single, standardized operating picture for a commander, free from conflicting information. With

one common overlay, a commander can spend more time making decisions and less time de-conflicting data.

An additional $4 million is needed in fiscal year 2018 to finish development efforts and push this product into the field. These funds would provide necessary hardware, software, and personnel to complete this critical technology. This program can be found under "Army's Technical Information Activities" in R-1, line 155. My request would bring the appropriation to a total of $36.7 million.

Close air support, or a moving battalion of tanks can and re-shape the battlefield in a matter of minutes. It is essential that our intelligence tools provide one common picture to the commander and the soldiers in the field, allowing our troops to share intelligence in real time. This competitively-awarded program will provide the Army a tool that visualizes all critical intelligence in overlay and allows commanders to make informed decision before they send our troops into harm's way.

I thank this subcommittee for its time, its hard work on this year's appropriations bill, and for your consideration of my request to help protect our troops.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you for appearing, and thank you for your remarks. We appreciate it very much.

Mr. COOK. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentlelady from American Samoa. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. AUMUA AMATA COLEMAN RADEWAGEN, A DELEGATE IN CONGRESS FROM THE TERRITORY OF AMERICAN SAMOA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF DELEGATE RADEWAGEN

Mrs. RADEWAGEN. Talofa, taeoa manuia. Good morning, Chairman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky. Thank you for allowing me to testify before you today. I come to support additional funds for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation, NGREA, so that the Reserve can purchase Modular Small Arms Ranges, MSARs.

American Samoa is the only U.S. Soil in the Southern Hemisphere, lying approximately 2,500 miles south of Hawaii. We may be far from the mainland, but we love the United States, as demonstrated by the rate our sons and daughters enlist in the military, the highest in the United States, a fact that we are proud of. The U.S. Army Reserve website states: "The Army recruiting station in Pago Pago is ranked number one in recruitment out of the 885 Army recruiting stations and centers under the U.S. Army Recruiting Command."

American Samoa has been and continues to be an important strategic location for the United States for 117 years now, providing the only U.S. deep seaport in that part of the world, and is home to a U.S. Army Reserve unit.

Currently stationed in American Samoa, we have two infantry companies of 200-plus soldiers that belong to the 100th Battalion of the 442nd Infantry, the most decorated unit of its size in the entire Army. They are warriors, knowledgeable professionals, tactically and technically proficient soldiers, and they are great role models for our community. Even our late member, my predecessor, Representative Eni Faleomavaega, served with this unit in Vietnam and as a reservist.

Most families back home have many members that are serving or have served in the Army Reserve in the Pacific, and many community leaders are current or former members as well. These soldiers have and will continue to be called upon to perform dangerous missions in remote locations around the globe, and we want to provide the best possible training and equipment to ensure that they return home safely to their families and community.

I am here today as their voice in Congress to solicit your support in making sure our soldiers are provided the best equipment and training tools to allow them to be trained and ready to deploy into harm's way when called upon to protect our way of life.

The Army Reserve Command is asking us in Congress for funding for a containerized small arms range for their units. To this end, both General Brown, commanding general for the U.S. Army

Pacific, and Brigadier General Curda, commanding general, 9th Mission Support Command, have called on Congress for additional funds to purchase Modular Small Arms Ranges for Reserve units.

The Modular Small Arms Range is a containerized facility and not an open or outdoor live fire range. There is no live fire range on American Samoa because Army safety standards for live fire ranges prohibit the construction of an open air live fire range. This is largely due to our islands' terrain and population density. It is next to impossible to conduct live fire and ensure public safety on an open air range. The closest small arms range is in Hawaii, 2,500 miles away.

As it stands, in order for our Army Reserve units to be combat ready, they must fly to Hawaii, 5 hours away, to train and qualify on their individually assigned weapons. The cost to send 200-plus soldiers to Hawaii and the logistics to support them is upwards of $1.2 million annually. Modular Small Arms Range will save the Army and our taxpayers millions of dollars in the future while allowing our soldiers to be trained at home.

As you know, marksmanship is a perishable skill, and our soldiers' lives and the lives of their fellow soldiers depend on their ability to properly engage a target. Simple functions such as changing a magazine or sighting in a target can become monumental when the stress and frustration of combat is added. Live fire training and consistent weapons training ensure that the soldier has the muscle memory to perform these critical functions when under stressful combat situations.

Ensuring that our soldiers are ready to fight is one of my top priorities, and I urge you to consider this request for a Modular Small Arms Range for our Army Reserve units.

Thank you for your time. Fa'afetai tele lava. I yield back the balance of my time.

[The written statement of Delegate Radewagen follows:]

Testimony in Support of Additional Funds for the Army Reserves

Rep. Aumua Amata Radewagen (AS – At Large)
Subcommittee on Defense, H-140, March 9, 2017, 11:20 am

Talofa, taeoa manuia; Good morning Chairman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky; and thank you for allowing me to testify before you today. I come to support additional funds for the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA), so that the Reserve can purchase Modular Small Arms Ranges (MSARs).

American Samoa is the only U.S. soil in the Southern Hemisphere, lying approximately 2,500 miles south of Hawaii. We may be far from the mainland but we love the U.S., as demonstrated by the rate our sons and daughters enlist in the military, the highest in the United States, a fact that we are very proud of. The U.S. Army Reserve website states "The Army Recruiting Station in Pago Pago is ranked #1 in recruitment out of the 885 Army recruiting stations and centers under the U.S. Army Recruiting Command."

American Samoa has been and continues to be an important strategic location for the United States for 117 years now, providing the only U.S. deep sea port in that part of the world; and is home to a U.S. Army Reserve unit.

Currently stationed in American Samoa, we have two Infantry companies of 200+ Soldiers that belong to the 100th Battalion of the 442nd Infantry, the most decorated unit of its size in the entire Army. They are warriors, knowledgeable professionals, tactically and technically proficient Soldiers and they are great role models for our community; even our late member, Rep. Eni Faleomavaega served with this unit, in Vietnam and as a reservist. Most families back home have many members that are serving or have served in the Army Reserves in the Pacific, and many community leaders are current or former members as well. These citizen Soldiers have and will continue to be called upon to perform dangerous missions in remote locations around the globe, and we want to provide the best possible training and equipment to ensure that they return home safely to their families and community.

I am here today as their voice in Congress to solicit your support in making sure our Soldiers are provided the best equipment and training tools, to allow them to

be trained and ready to deploy into harm's way when called upon to protect our way of life.

The Army Reserve Command is asking us in Congress for funding for a containerized small arms range for their units. To this end, both **Gen. Brown, Commanding General for U.S. Army Pacific, and BGen. Curda, Commanding General, 9th Mission Support Command**; have called on Congress for additional funds to purchase Modular Small Arms Ranges for Reserve units.

The Modular Small Arms Range is a containerized facility and not an open or outdoor live fire range. There is no live fire range on American Samoa because Army safety standards for live fire ranges prohibit the construction of an open air live fire range. This is largely due to our island's terrain and population density, it is next to impossible to conduct live fire and ensure public safety on an open air range. The closest small arms range is in Hawaii.

As it stands, in order for our Army Reserve units to be combat ready, they must fly to Hawaii, 5 hours away, to train and qualify on their individually assigned weapons. The cost to send 200 plus Soldiers to Hawaii and the logistics to support them is upwards of 1.2 million dollars annually. Modular Small Arms Range will save the Army and our taxpayers millions of dollars in the future while allowing our Soldiers to be trained at home.

Marksmanship is a perishable skill and our Soldiers' lives and the lives of their fellow soldiers depend on their ability to properly engage a target. Simple functions such as changing a magazine or sighting in a target can become monumental when the stress and frustration of combat is added. Live-fire training and consistent weapons training ensure that the Soldier has the muscle-memory to perform these critical functions when under stressful combat situations.

Ensuring that our Soldiers are ready to fight is one of my top priorities and I urge you to consider this request for a modular small arms range for our Army Reserve units. Thank you for your time.

Fa'afetai tele lava, I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you so much for being with us, and thank you for your remarks.

Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from California. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. TED LIEU, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN LIEU

Mr. LIEU. Thank you, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky, as well as the members of the subcommittee and your staff, for the hard work you do to help protect America.

I served on Active Duty, and I fully support giving our armed services the resources they need to execute their missions. But as this subcommittee knows, the Navy has had a strike fighter shortfall for a number of years. And, in fact, it was this subcommittee that led on this issue for the last 2 years.

You have generously funded additional tactical aviation, both F–18 Super Hornets and F–35s, that address one of the Navy's biggest challenges. However, the magnitude of the Navy's shortfall is so large that single-year solutions are not the ultimate answer, instead requiring ongoing, long-term procurement and modernization of the current fleet. I am hopeful that the fiscal year 2018 budget request will demonstrate our sustained commitment to addressing this shortfall.

The Super Hornet is the Navy's workhorse for its aircraft carriers throughout the world. However, even though it has been operational since the early 2000s, the aircraft was originally designed with the foresight to upgrade its capabilities to meet emerging requirements and threats.

The fiscal year 2018 budget should support the introduction of the Block III Super Hornet to the fleet. The Block III Super Hornet will be based on the same air frame as the current Block II aircraft that is the Navy's most lethal strike fighter. But the new features of Block III will make it relevant well into the 2040s. Those capabilities include increased range, networking capability with other Navy aircraft, longer-range sensors that identify the enemy from farther away, new cockpits, and improved stealth.

Block III Super Hornets offer cost-effective ways to complement the F–35, EA–18G, and E–2D as they operate together in the air wing.

As you may know, California's 33rd District is a critical hub for aerospace design, engineering, and manufacturing. I work in both military and civilian capacities with Los Angeles Air Force Base, which is surrounded by a unique and incredible array of institutions and companies focused on space and aerospace ranging from the federally funded research and development center, the Aerospace Corporation, to world-class universities.

Nearby the base, some of the largest components of the Super Hornet are built by the hardworking men and women of the district, including the fuselage and components of the radars. The con-

tinuation of Super Hornet production is not only vital for the warfighter, but it sustains manufacturing for a proud and incredibly skilled American workforce.

I understand you have a number of interests to consider as you review the fiscal year 2018 budget. I believe, however, that the Super Hornet is vital to addressing the Navy's strike fighter shortfall.

Thank you very much for your past support and for the work that you are doing for the men and women in uniform. I appreciate you letting me testify.

[The written statement of Congressman Lieu follows:]

Representative Ted Lieu (CA-33)
Testimony to the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee (HAC-D)
March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Subcommittee and staff, thank you for having me here today to talk about the Navy's strike fighter shortfall.

As this Subcommittee knows, the Navy's strike fighter shortfall is an issue that Congress has taken the lead on for the last two years. You have generously funded additional tactical aviation – both F/A-18 Super Hornets and F-35s – that address one of the service's biggest challenges. However, the magnitude of the Navy's shortfall is so large that single-year solutions are not the ultimate answer, instead requiring ongoing, long-term procurement and modernization of the current fleet. I'm hopeful that the Fiscal Year 2018 budget request will demonstrate the Navy's sustained commitment to addressing tactical aviation.

The Super Hornet is the Navy's workhorse off its aircraft carriers throughout the world. However, even though it has been operational since the early 2000s, the aircraft was originally designed with the foresight to upgrade its capabilities to meet emerging requirements and threats. The Fiscal Year 2018 budget should support the introduction of the Block III Super Hornet to the fleet. The Block III Super Hornet will be based on the same airframe as the current Block II aircraft that is the Navy's most lethal strike fighter. But the new features will make it relevant well into the 2040s. Those capabilities include increased range, networking capability with other Navy aircraft, longer-range sensors to identify the enemy from farther away, new cockpits, and improved stealth. Block III Super Hornets offer cost effective ways to complement F-35, EA-18G and E-2D as they operate together in the air wing.

As you may know, California's 33rd District is a critical hub for aerospace design, engineering and manufacturing. I work in both military and civilian capacities with Los Angeles Air Force Base, which is surrounded by a unique and incredible array of institutions and companies focused on space and aerospace, ranging from the federally-funded research and development center Aerospace Corporation to world-class universities. Nearby the base, some of the largest components of the Super Hornet are built by the hard working men and women of my district, including the fuselage and components of the radars. So the continuation of Super Hornet production is not only vital for the warfighter, but it sustains manufacturing for a proud and incredibly skilled workforce.

I understand that you have a number of interests to consider as you review the Fiscal Year 2018 budget. I believe, however, that the Super Hornet is vital to addressing the Navy's strike fighter shortfall. The Navy's request should include these aircraft, and I ask that the Subcommittee support them in its markup.

Thank you very much for your past support, and for the work that you are doing for the men and women in uniform. Your work is critical to our national security.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you for your service, and thank you for your remarks here today. Your experience is very helpful.

Mr. LIEU. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Oregon. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017

WITNESS

HON. EARL BLUMENAUER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OREGON

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN BLUMENAUER

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you, Madam Chair, Mr. Visclosky, members of the committee. I appreciate the opportunity to spend a couple moments with you this morning.

You folks have one of the most difficult tasks in Congress. We have talked about it before. Other people can conjure things up and be aspirational, but you folks have to allocate the dollars.

And there is a seemingly inexhaustible reservoir of opportunities to deal with our military. We struggle to maintain entitlement benefits for military personnel. We need to invest in safety improvements, command and control structure. There is a danger of hollowing out conventional forces.

And against all these requirements, there are some things that loom large that I hope the committee can help. First and foremost, I think it is past time to take a hard look at the trillion-dollar commitment that is made for enhancing our nuclear commitment over the next several decades. It will inevitably crowd out other Air Force and Navy conventional priorities for instance. You can't wish this away.

We have an administration that is seeking to prioritize the fight against the Islamic State and terrorism, and this trillion dollars is not going to help us at all.

We have an administration that is looking to reset relationships, evidently, with Russia. Well, here is an opportunity to maintain our philosophy in terms of trying to reduce and scale down nuclear weapons.

The New START treaty level of 1,550 weapons is far in excess of what our experts say we need for deterrence, at least one-third more, according to the 2013 President's military advisers. And this isn't theoretical. I mean, these are expensive, and they commit us to long-term expenses.

And, unfortunately, we have a terrible record of tracking what the actual cost is as opposed to estimates. Last month, the CBO released its latest report projecting the cost of our nuclear forces for the next 10 years. The cost estimate for the next decade is $400 billion, which is 15 percent higher than the previous year's estimate.

My hope is that the committee, given your responsibilities, can help us push for looking at some alternatives, scaling some things down, having new weapon systems, the new nuclear-armed cruise missile, the B61, the weapons in design and production that are going to push those estimates even further in the future.

I think it is past time to evaluate the need to replace our land-based missiles. Thanks to New START we are down to 440, but the replacement project for Minuteman III ICBMs is as much as $100 billion. Do we really need that scale for the triad? It goes with the bombers. It goes with the nuclear-armed submarines.

And I think that there is an opportunity for us to actually deal with the communities where they are located. And I know there is a pushback for people who have those facilities, and they don't want to lose economic activity. But we could allocate a significant amount of the savings back to those communities. They would be better off. There would be more jobs, there would be more economic activity, and there would be long-term savings for the country, and we would be safer.

I hope that you give us an opportunity to know what we are getting into. The committee is uniquely positioned to at least insist that there be real cost estimates. You deserve no less as you are making these difficult allocation problems because they are going to haunt the people who are in your position in 2 years and in 4 years if we don't do a good job of knowing what we are getting into.

Again, I know you have got a difficult task. There are many things we all want to do for our military, for our veterans, and we are trying to deal with budget deficits and long-term activities. But I hope looking carefully at these items will give us all the tools we need as Members of Congress, and especially you on this committee, to know what we are getting into and to be able to meet those commitments in the long-term.

I really appreciate your courtesy. I appreciate what you are doing, listening to some of us with our ideas about how to do the job, and wish you the best in being able to balance those going forward.

[The written statement of Congressman Blumenauer follows:]

To: Earl
From: Kelsey
RE: Testifying at Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense
Date: Thursday, March 9, 2017
Time: 11:35am-11:45am
Location: H-140, Capitol

The Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense has scheduled a hearing to take Member testimony on the Defense Appropriations bill for Fiscal Year 2018. Each Member will have 5 minutes for oral remarks. You are on the schedule to begin speaking at 11:35AM.

Word Count: 592

Talking Points:

- **I have always acknowledged that your job – deciding how exactly to fund national security -- is one of the most difficult tasks in Congress. This year, in particular, I can imagine the job will be all the more difficult.**

- **As you know, the new Administration has pledged to increase defense spending with a $30 billion defense supplemental request for this Fiscal Year, and most concerning, with a $54 billion boost above budget caps for next year offset by cuts to discretionary spending.**

- **In contrast, a majority of Americans do not support increased defense spending.**

- **And, many of my Republican colleagues share my concerns with slashing funding to the State Department and our foreign assistance programs. They too understand that American diplomacy and soft power is critical to our national security.**

- **The President has called our military, "badly depleted." Well, the U.S. has the largest military in the world and spends more on defense than the next seven countries combined.**

- **But I do fear that his claim will become ever more substantiated as we continue the escalation of nuclear weapons proliferation and maintenance spending.**

- **There simply isn't enough money to pursue this modernization while providing our conventional forces and personnel with what they need.**

- **The Administration is pushing for this dramatic increase without a clear strategy. They say they prioritize the fight against the Islamic State and terrorism, but how are nuclear weapons going to help us with that?**

- **We have far more of these weapons than we need for deterrence. They won't help us deal with the strategic challenges we face and their price tag keeps going up.**

- **Just last month, CBO came out with their latest report projecting the costs of U.S. nuclear forces for the next ten years. The cost estimate is now $400 billion – 15% higher than CBO's 2015 estimate.**

- **Beyond that timeframe, we're still going to spend over a trillion dollars in the next 30 years on this nuclear escalation.**

- **I truly think there are opportunities here for rational reevaluation, with the new nuclear-armed cruise missile, or with the plan to replace our land-based missiles.**

- **An independent Pentagon cost estimate prepared by the Office of Cost Assessment & Program Evaluation has valued the replacement project for the Minuteman III ICBMs at as much as $100 billion.**

- **This is a huge increase from the $61 billion estimate the Department of Defense offered last summer for the replacement project.**

- **Meanwhile, experts argue that it is possible to extend the life of the Minuteman III beyond 2030, and at less cost than the replacement program.**

- **How many ICBMs do we actually need? Let's start a real conversation about this.**

- **The U.S. has moved from 454 to 440, in part thanks to the New START limits. Let's accelerate.**

- **Let's get rid of a squadron, close a base, and look at allocating some of these savings back to the communities that have lost these facilities.**

- **We're going to have to prioritize here.**

- **We need to maintain entitlement benefits for military personnel. We need money for force readiness and training. We need to invest in safety improvements and in a robust command-and-control infrastructure.**

- **We do not need more than 4,000 nuclear weapons for deterrence purposes.**

- **Again, I appreciate the tough job you have. As you work with your colleagues on Armed Services and the Energy and Water Subcommittee to oversee proposals on nuclear weapons from the Administration, I hope you will help us have an honest conversation about fiscal responsibility.**

- **We must maintain appropriate priorities for the military strength and defense of our country.**

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you. Mr. Visclosky.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Thank you very much.

I believe your testimony really evidences why I want to thank the Chairwoman again for holding this hearing. You talked about our difficult task. You had a very difficult night, and you still saw fit to show up today. Given your commitment, I appreciate it.

The area you talk about is very difficult, and I am very concerned about the impact kinetic weapons, speed of some of our weapons, and other issues have on that nuclear enterprise. I also have emphasized to the administration that because there is a change, this is a perfect opportunity to assess the triad because too often both parties have been very reflexive that, no, we need three. And maybe we do. But we ought to have a serious examination about that issue, I would absolutely agree with you.

The final thing I would point out is on the cost of this endeavor, and, unfortunately, our difficult task is there are other bulges coming up here on the budget with other systems, is Mr. Smith, who is ranking on Armed Services, and I sent a letter to the Congressional Budget Office this week asking for them to do a study and examination of what the 30-year cost is going to be.

I am very proud that this subcommittee in report language for our bill 417, and the conference report was passed by the House yesterday, asked DOD for a similar assessment as far as what the costs were going forward.

So you do raise a very significant and important issue as far as policy, but also the cost impact for the subcommittee to consider. I appreciate it very much.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. You are the only thing that could get me going this morning.

Ms. GRANGER. We have one more witness, Mr. Franks, and he is on his way here.

This concludes the morning portion of the subcommittee's Member Hearing Day. We appreciate our—well, sorry. We had some misinformation, and we are really glad to see you standing up.

Mr. FRANKS. Madam Chair, will you forgive me?

Ms. GRANGER. Next, the subcommittee welcomes the gentleman from Arizona. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes. And this light will show green, which means you can start. When it goes to yellow, it means you have got 1 more minute. And we are anxious to hear what you have got to say.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. TRENT FRANKS, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF ARIZONA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN FRANKS

Mr. FRANKS. Well, thank you. And I apologize, Madam Chair, for the lateness. They had to drag me out of a classified briefing. So I am sorry.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. FRANKS. But I would first like to thank you, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky, for the opportunity to add my voice to those of the many others concerned about the crisis facing our military.

Madam Chairwoman, you are no doubt aware that our guardian class has consistently set before us the devastation that sequestration has wrought upon our military and the doubt it has cast upon our ability to defeat existing and emerging threats, let alone deter them.

For my part, I am here to try to alert you today to the dangerous state of our Nation's missile defense capabilities and what the Obama years have done to our ability to deter and defeat the deadliest weapons known to mankind.

North Korea has evolved from an eccentric regional problem with a nuclear weapons issue into an extremely dangerous nuclear threat to America. They are very close to mastering the physics required to range the entire continental United States, and they are able to threaten our forces in the Pacific. And just yesterday, the Strategic Forces Subcommittee held a briefing which laid bare the nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities of the Kim dynasty.

I cannot discuss, of course, the details of what we learned in this open forum, but the growing threat posed by North Korea is shocking, and I urge you, Madam Chairwoman, to bring the Missile Defense Agency and the CIA to brief you and the members of this committee on the nature of this growing threat.

Furthermore, President Obama's policies placed Iran, the world's largest financier and enabler of terrorism, on track to legally build a nuclear weapons capability within the confines of the JCPOA. Unlike the Soviet threat, nuclear jihad cannot be deterred by the fear of retaliation. It is an existential threat to the peace and security of the entire human family.

While the Obama administration debated whether or not we should develop and maintain missile defense against such threats, our near-peer adversaries, who never had such qualms, were working tirelessly to exploit weaknesses in our missile defense architecture.

Under President Obama, the MDA's budget was cut drastically below the Bush administration's planned $9 billion-plus budget, even as China and Russia were rapidly developing and testing high-flying, high-speed maneuvering weapons, including hypersonic glide vehicles, Madam Chairwoman.

These weapons present an entirely new capability we must counter, as they are specifically designed to exploit the gaps and the seams in our existing missile defense architecture, thus defeating the systems we currently have in place. These new weapons are capable of travelling more than a mile per second and fly at flat or nonballistic trajectories to prevent our missile defense systems from tracking them. The threat has outpaced us, and we must invest the appropriate resources to defend against the new threats or lose our ability to deter potential adversaries.

There are a number of specific measures which Congress must pursue if we are able to remain capable of defeating, let alone deterring, our near-peer adversaries. To this end, I urge the com-

mittee to support the development and deployment of a multimission space sensor layer. This capability is a massive force multiplier for our entire missile defense architecture and is absolutely essential to allow us to accurately identify and target the newest and most advanced missile threats.

In recent years, directed-energy technology has matured to such a degree that were this committee able to invest in some of the most promising directed-energy programs, especially boost-phase defense, we would see some game-changing capability developed in the next few years.

Thus, directed-energy programs will allow us to complete what the Reagan administration began and allow the United States to leapfrog the missile defense threat.

I hope this committee will continue to fund the RKV and also provide resources requested by the MDA for the MOKV, which will ensure our midcourse defense is capable of meeting the most advanced nuclear threat.

And finally, I would urge the members of the committee to not cut the MDA budget item Special Programs—MDA Technology. This program is critical to our homeland defense. But given the nature of the program, I cannot get into greater specifics in an open forum. I would encourage all of you to receive a brief from the Missile Defense Agency on the program before any decision is made to cut funding below the requested amount.

The threats to our homeland and our deployed forces from irrational regimes armed with nuclear weapons are real and growing, and we must respond by investing the resources in our missile defense architecture to ensure we are capable of mitigating these threats.

In order to revitalize our military to build a missile defense architecture capable of meeting identified emerging threats, we require a budget top line of $640 billion.

Madam Chair, I am out of time, so may history judge that this Congress was one that did all that it could to protect the innocent in our own generation and to further ensure that American generations yet unborn will continue to walk in the sunlight of freedom. Thank you, and God bless you.

[The written statement of Congressman Franks follows:]

Testimony to Appropriations Cmt by Congressman Trent Franks 3/9/2017

I would first like to thank Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky for the opportunity to add my voice to those of many others concerned about the crisis facing our military.

Mme. Chairwoman, as you are no doubt aware, our guardian class has consistently set before us the devastation Sequestration has wrought upon our military, and the doubt it has cast upon our ability to defeat existing and emerging threats, let alone deter them.

For my part, I am here today to alert you to the dangerous state of our nation's missile defense capabilities, and what the Obama years have done to our ability to deter and defeat the deadliest weapons known to humanity.

North Korea has evolved from an eccentric regional problem with nuclear weapons, into an extremely dangerous nuclear threat to America. They are very close to mastering the physics required to range the entire continental United States and are able to threaten our forces in the Pacific. Just yesterday, the Strategic Forces Subcommittee held a briefing which laid bare the nuclear and ballistic missile capabilities of the Kim Dynasty: I cannot discuss the details of what we learned in an open forum, but the growing threat posed by North Korea is shocking and I urge you, Mme. Chairwoman, to bring in the Missile Defense Agency and the CIA to brief you and the Members of this Committee on the nature of this growing threat.

Furthermore, President Obama's policies placed Iran, the world's largest financier and enabler of terrorism, on track to *legally* build a nuclear weapons capability within the confines of the JCPOA. Unlike the Soviet threat, nuclear Jihad cannot be deterred by fear of retaliation. It is an existential threat to the peace and security of the entire human family.

While the Obama administration debated whether or not we should develop and maintain a missile defense against such threats, our near-peer adversaries – who never had any such qualms – were working tirelessly to exploit weaknesses in our missile defense architecture.

Under President Obama, the MDA's budget was cut drastically below the Bush Administration's planned $9 Billion+ budget even as China and Russia were rapidly developing and test-flying High-Speed Maneuvering Weapons (HSMWs) including hypersonic glide vehicles. These

weapons present an entirely new capability we must counter as they are specifically designed to exploit the "gaps" and "seams" in our existing missile defense architecture, thus defeating the systems we currently have in place.

These new weapons are capable of traveling more than 1 mile per second, and fly at a flat (non-ballistic) trajectory to prevent our missile defense systems from tracking them. The threat has out-paced us and we must invest the appropriate resources to defend against the new threats or lose our ability to deter potential adversaries.

There are a number of specific measures which Congress must pursue if we are to remain capable of defeating, let alone deterring, our near-peer adversaries. To this end, I urge this Committee to support the development and deployment of a multi-mission space sensor layer. This capability is a massive force multiplier for our entire missile defense architecture and is absolutely essential to allow us to accurately identify and target the newest and most advanced missile threats.

In recent years Directed Energy technology has matured to such a degree that were this Committee were to invest in some of the most promising Directed Energy programs – especially Boost-Phase defense – we would see some game-changing capabilities developed in the next few years. These Directed Energy programs will allows us to complete what the Reagan Administration began and allow the United States to "leapfrog" the missile threat.

I hope this Committee will continue funding of the RKV and also provide resources requested by the MDA for the MOKV, which will ensure our Mid-Course Defense is capable of meeting the most advanced nuclear threats.

Finally, I urge the Members of the Committee to not cut the MDA budget item "Special Programs – MDA Technology." This program is critical to our Homeland defense, but given the nature of the program I cannot get into greater specifics in an open forum. I encourage all of you to receive a brief from the Missile Defense Agency on the program before any decision is made to cut funding below the requested amount.

The threats to our Homeland and our deployed forces from irrational regimes armed with nuclear weapons are real and growing, and we must respond by investing the resources in our missile defense architecture to ensure we are capable of mitigating these threats.

In order to revitalize our military – to build a missile defense architecture capable of meeting identified emerging threats – we require a defense budget topline of $640 Billion.

The $603 Billion topline, visits a modest 3% increase above Mr. Obama's projected FY18 defense budget of $584 Billion, and, if we intend solve our readiness crisis, a budget of this size it will force us to underfund key strategic capabilities. If we are to Make America Safe Again, a 3% increase will not suffice. Furthermore, an MDA budget of anything less than $8 Billion flies in face of the increasingly dangerous threat environment we are facing, and I implore the Members of this Committee to fund our missile defense programs commensurate to this growing threat.

May history judge that this Congress was one that did all that could be done protect the innocent in our own generation and to further ensure that American generations yet unborn will continue to walk in the sunlight of freedom. Thank you and God bless you all.

IJN...

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you, Mr. Franks, and thank you for your continuing concern. You have been there since you came to Congress, and we take it very seriously.

Mr. FRANKS. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you all.

Ms. GRANGER. This concludes the morning portion of the subcommittee's Members Hearing Day. We appreciate our colleagues' testimony here today. The subcommittee will reconvene at 1 o'clock today to complete the hearing. The subcommittee stands in recess until 1 o'clock.

[Recess.]

AFTERNOON SESSION

Mr. CALVERT [presiding]. The subcommittee will come to order.

The subcommittee is continuing in open hearing, allowing Members of the House to provide the subcommittee with their input on how to address the challenges and needs facing our military.

This morning—or this afternoon, we were fortunate to hear from 2 dozen colleagues we listened to this morning, and we look forward to hearing from more of our colleagues now.

At this time, I would like to recognize Mr. Visclosky, the ranking member, for any comments he would like to make.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Thank you for holding the hearing. I appreciate hearing from our colleagues, and want their input before we start down with the supplemental in fiscal year 2018. So again, I appreciate very much you calling this to order.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you. And out of respect for members' time, we will strictly adhere to the 5-minute clock. The timer in front of you will change from green to yellow when you have 1 minute remaining to conclude your statement. Your full written statement will be made part of the record.

And at this time, we welcome the gentleman from Louisiana, Mike Johnson, for your testimony. You are recognized.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. MIKE JOHNSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN JOHNSON

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member Visclosky and members of the committee. I appreciate you giving me the opportunity today to provide input for the fiscal year 2018 defense appropriations.

I am excited to advocate today about maintaining a strategic edge in reinforcing our national defense needs within the Defense appropriations budget, and I will speak fast.

I have the high honor of representing the Fourth Congressional District of Louisiana, which we are proud to say is home of Fort Polk and the Barksdale Air Force Base, two major military installations. As I am sure you know, Fort Polk is home to the Joint Readiness Training Center and Barksdale is home to our Global

Strike Command. These are two vital installations to our Nation and our national security interests around the world.

I am extremely pleased that President Trump has promised to ensure our brave men and women in uniform have all the resources they need to accomplish their mission. As we begin to rebuild our military strength, I will work vigorously to protect these missions and ensure our national security is fully maintained, as I know you will as well.

The role of nuclear weapons continues to play an integral role in the strategies of Russia, North Korea, Pakistan, India, and China. In fact, according to many reports, these countries are increasing their reliance on and modernizing their capabilities: Land, air, and sea-based nuclear forces. At the same time, it is clear that Iran has not given up its nuclear ambitions, to say the least.

Furthermore, there is open evidence that Russia's doctrine contemplates the use of nuclear weapons to gain advantage in crisis. Consequently, the need for a strong, capable U.S. nuclear umbrella is growing. But over the course of only 4 years, from 2010 to 2014, the military budget was cut 21 percent. This happened despite the fact that the world was growing more dangerous and the stage was set for a number of Russian and Chinese aggressions against neighbors and the U.S. through cyber attacks, information warfare, and kinetic actions.

Due to today's time constraints, I will focus primarily on two areas that I think are in desperate need of attention within the fiscal year 2018 Defense appropriations budget: Our U.S. Air Force and our Army components.

First, the nuclear enterprise. I would like to offer my support for the President's stated plan to prioritize our nuclear enterprise through modernizing our deterrent capabilities in the upcoming Defense budget. Thankfully, despite ideological differences, Congress has taken a clear stand on expressing support to the long-term commitment of Barksdale Air Force Base, which is home to the U.S. Global Strike Command, and responsible for the majority of the nuclear triad and enterprise.

I want to highlight the important and good work being carried out by the Air Force. This includes the decision to elevate Global Strike Command to a 4-star command, an effort that has already begun to demonstrate important rewards. Unfortunately, I was discouraged to see that some recent budgets fell short of fully addressing items for specific Air Force needs related to improvements at Global Strike Command. That is why I asked it in the budget before us today, the committee strongly consider working to fund advancements absolutely necessary to upgrade and maintain the technological edge over America's adversaries.

A few areas in critical need of funding are upgrading nuclear communications facilities, addressing the challenges of a B–52 reengine, and the future of the B–21, among others. Specifically, today, I would like to highlight three important areas related to ensuring our nuclear enterprise receives the necessary attention in the upcoming budget. Moving forward, I look forward to working with you, the committee and its members, to address these items.

Number one, ongoing challenges with our Nation's aging fleets, including a B–52 reengine. Earlier this year, debate over whether

to replace the TF33 engine reignited, pardon the pun there, after a B–52 from Minot Air Force Base lost an engine during training. Former Air Force Secretary Deborah Lee James characterized the mishap as, quote, "a catastrophic engine failure," unquote, and it was. The challenges in maintaining the aging weapons and a robust nuclear enterprise infrastructure is the second thing, and the needs related to developing critical weapon storage and maintenance facility areas.

There are ongoing much needed upgrades to our nuclear command, control, and communications, the NC3, something I am thankful the Air Force has begun working on and which I know this committee has engaged in as well.

And lastly, improving to fund a robust set of capabilities and options. As you know, the top requirement for nuclear forces is to maintain a survivable and ready nuclear force that is capable of deterring our enemy, and if necessary, surviving a surprise attack. Given today's foreign climate, the need to keep a close watch on this is as important as ever in order to assure our allies and maintain our own defense against hostile nations.

Members of this committee are well aware of the activity Global Strike Command overseas in its involvement in a wide array of strategic deterrence, global strike, and combat support in a direct fashion. The Bomber Command, eighth Air Force, is in charge of our aging fleet, and Missile Command, 20th Air Force, is in charge of the U.S. intercontinental ballistic missiles, ICBMs, which are critical to our deterrence and global strategy. As Secretary of Defense James Mattis recently stated when speaking about maintaining a safe and secure nuclear deterrent, quote, "We must ensure a war that can never be won will never be fought," unquote.

In the event that maintaining a capable and robust nuclear option would not suffice enough to justify attention, these assets also play a major role in our ongoing fight as the terrorist states continue to grow and expand beyond the threats to Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and Nigeria. Global Strike Command has played an important role in our national security strategy to address new and emerging kinds of threats.

Mr. CALVERT. The gentleman will timely conclude your remarks.

Mr. JOHNSON. Am I out of time? Well, I will submit the written remarks to the record, as you mentioned. And a lot of that is about Fort Polk Army Base and our needs there, the Joint Readiness Training Center and their ongoing growth and opportunity.

[The written statement of Congressman Johnson follows:]

Testimony of Congressman Mike Johnson (LA-04)
Submitted to the Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense
March 8, 2017

Thank you, Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and members of the committee, I appreciate you giving me this opportunity today to provide input for the fiscal year 2018 Defense Appropriations. I am excited to advocate today about maintaining a strategic edge and reinforcing our national defense needs.

I have the high honor representing the 4th Congressional District of Louisiana, which is home to Ft. Polk and Barksdale Air Force Base. As I'm sure you know, Fort Polk is home to the Joint Readiness Training Center and Barksdale is home to the Global Strike Command - two vital military installations to our nation and our national security interests around the world.

I am extremely pleased, that President Trump has promised to ensure our brave men and women in uniform have the resources they need to accomplish their mission. As we begin to rebuild our military strength, I hope to work vigorously to protect these missions to ensure our national security is fully maintained.

The role of nuclear weapons continues to play a role in the strategies of Russia, North Korea, Pakistan, India, and China – in fact according to may reports, these countries are increasing their reliance on and modernizing their capabilities (land, air, and sea-based nuclear forces). At the same time, it is clear that Iran has not given up its nuclear ambitions.

In fact, there is open evidence that Russia doctrine contemplates the use of nuclear weapons to gain advantage in crisis. Therefore, not surprisingly the need for a strong, capable, U.S. nuclear umbrella is growing. Despite the fact, over the course of four years, 2010 to 2014, the military

budget was cut 21% while the world grew more dangerous and set the stage for a number of Russian and Chinese aggressions against neighbors and the United States both through cyber, information, and kinetic methods. Due to today's time constrains, I will focus primarily on two areas that I think are in continued need of attention. Our United States Air Force and Army components.

Nuclear Enterprise —

I would like to offer my support for the President's stated plan to prioritize our nuclear enterprise though modernizing our deterrent capabilities in the upcoming defense budget. Thankfully, despite ideologically different positions, Congress has taken clear stand on expressing its support to the long-term commitment of Barksdale Air Force Base, which is home to U.S. Global Strike Command and is responsible for the majority of the Nuclear Triad and Enterprise.

First, I want to recognize the important and good work being carried out by the Air Force, including the decision to elevate Global Strike Command to a four-star Command, an effort that has already begun to demonstrate important rewards. Unfortunately, I was discouraged to see that some recent budgets, fell short of fully addressing items for specific Air Force needs related to improvements at Global Strike Command. However, In the budget before us today, I would ask that the committee strongly consider working to fund advancements necessary to upgrade and maintain a technological edge over America's adversaries.

A few examples of areas the Air Force needs additional funding in order to have maintain a strategic edge in its robust capabilities include upgrading nuclear communications facilities, addressing the challenges of a B-52 Re-engine, and the future of the B-21, among others. Specifically, today I would like to highlight three important areas related to ensuring our nuclear

enterprise receives the necessary attention in this upcoming Fiscal Year's budget. Moving forward I look forward to working with the Committee and its members to address:

1. Address ongoing challenges with our nations Aging Fleets, which includes a B-52 Re-engine/ and challenges in maintaining aging weapons and a robust Nuclear Enterprise Infrastructure, including needs related to developing critical Weapons Storage and Maintenance Facility areas.

2. Much needed upgrades to our Nuclear Command, Control & Communication's (NC3), something the Air Force has begun working on and which I know this committee has already begun to engage in.
3. Lastly, is improving robust capabilities. The top requirement for nuclear forces is to maintain survivable, and ready nuclear force that is capable of deterring our enemy and if necessary surviving a surprise attack. Given today's foreign climate, the need to keep our eye on this is as present as ever for both assuring our allies as well as maintaining our own defense, against hostile nations.

As members of this committee you are well aware of the activity Global Strike Command oversees providing a wide array of strategic deterrence, global strike and direct combat support. The Bomber Command, 8th AF in charge of our aging fleet, and Missile Command, 20thAF in charge of the United States Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBM's), are critical to our deterrence and global strategy. Given their importance, it is vital to ensure that needs are being met appropriately in order to adequately achieve mission requirements and ensure robust capabilities are maintained.

As Secretary of Defense James Mattis recently stated when speaking about maintaining a safe and secure nuclear deterrent, "we must ensure a war that can never be won will never be fought…" In the event that maintaining a capable and robust nuclear option was not suffice enough to justify attention, these assets also play a major role in our ongoing fight as terror states continue to grow and expand beyond threats to Iraq, Syria, Yemen, and Nigera – Global Strike Command has played an important role in our national security strategy to address new and emerging kinds of threats.

A few short examples of why these should be prioritized, specifically, Global Strike Command is supporting missions around the world using B-1's B-52's and B-2's to support international missions including:

1. Operation Inherent Resolve for U.S. Central Command, Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF South) (counter-trafficking) for U.S. Southern Command;

2. Operation Odyssey Lightning Exercises such as JUST HAMMER for U.S. Africa Command;

3. In addition to the above, Global Strike Command is responsible for daily Bomber Assurance and Deterrence Missions in U.S. European Command; and Continuous Bomber Presence Exercises in U.S. Pacific Command.

Army

Lastly I would also like to speak briefly about the needs of our U.S. Army. In the past two months, I have held a number of meetings with corresponded with to top Army officials,

Previous budget plans were forcing the Army to shrink at an unrealistic pace, to the lowest levels in 50 years, and are threatening to seriously impact our nations long term ability to carry the fight forward. These changes were not only impacting the top-line end-strength numbers but were also impacting the Army's ability to meet the demands placed on them.

I am proud to represent Fort Polk, Army base which has continued to solidify its footprint as a multi-pronged home for military affairs with vitally important state of the art Joint Reserve Training Center (JRTC), and contains units that serve invaluable training for Advise and Assist roles as well. The JRTC provides soldiers the training and flexibility necessary to carry out the demands placed on them, and win. The exercise scenarios learned here replicate many of the unique situations and challenges a unit may face while deployed. However, in addition, Fort Polk is the only Combat Training Center that also trains and deploys combat units, making it uniquely suited for a number of upcoming Army plans.

I hope to work with members of this committee to ensure that as we and the Army reverse recent misguided force structure cuts that it is done with the right information and uses the proper methodology to maximize existing resources and appropriate facilities, including existing training units and facilities related to Brigade Combat Team (BCT) activities, before any decisions on changes are made.

Moving forward, I hope the members here today will agree to work allow me to work alongside you to address the challenges facing our nation. I look forward to continuing to do everything I can support these critical items in terms of military construction needs and force structure.

Again Madam Chair, I appreciate this opportunity to show my support for our men and women in uniform, and I yield back.

Mr. CALVERT. Without objection, your full remarks will be entered into the record. And we have a copy of those remarks and we will be looking at that. I certainly appreciate your testimony here.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Next, Claudia Tenney from New York.

Good afternoon.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. CLAUDIA TENNEY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF NEW YORK

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN TENNEY

Ms. TENNEY. Thank you Mr. Calvert, Ranking Member Visclosky, and other members of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee. I thank you for providing me with this important opportunity to testify.

As the mother of an Active Duty marine officer and a Member of Congress representing New York's 22nd Congressional District, I take my constitutional responsibility to provide for our common defense very seriously. I thank you for your support, for your ongoing support of our servicemen and -women, and I am deeply appreciative of your steadfast commitment to a strong and robust national defense.

As this subcommittee begins consideration of the fiscal year 2018 Department of Defense appropriations bill, it is my distinct honor to testify in support of the Air Force Research Laboratory Information Directorate in Rome, New York, also known as Rome Lab. Rome Lab has for decades stood at the forefront of advanced cyber research and development projects within the Air Force. Today, Rome Lab leads a wide range of critical missions that are vital to deploying a 21st century force. Ensuring that our military has the tools and resources to dominate in cyberspace is among Rome Lab's chief missions.

On today's high-tech battlefields, our country's superiority in cyberspace is critical. Rome Lab provides full spectrum support for cyberspace operations, equipping our operators with the agility to disrupt and deny cyber attacks and the resiliency to fight through and recover from intrusions.

Rome Lab is also leading the fight to maintain command and control superiority both to the battlefield and in cyberspace. Rome Lab continues to push the boundaries in developing sophisticated technologies that effectively integrate resilient and robust commanding control systems. The advancements made by Rome Lab have provided our military with greater situational awareness through improved unified planning systems and enhanced mission focus autonomy. Ensuring secure and effective communications and reliable connectivity are also vital components of Rome Lab's mission.

In battle stations that are increasingly congested, Rome Lab provides the warfighter with mobile and secure communications. On the ground, Rome Lab facilitates the deployment of technologies that allow our servicemen and -women to securely share informa-

tion. In the air, Rome Lab has pioneered technologies to provide mission responsive battle space communication abilities across multiple domains.

Perhaps most impressive is Rome Lab's ability to adapt to emerging challenges. For example, in the arena of unmanned aerial systems, UAS, Rome Lab is poised for significant contributions. As this committee knows, the threat posed by the proliferation of UAS is growing and varied. There are countless examples of small UAS posing serious threats to our servicemen and -women in Iraq, with ISIS increasingly relying on these relatively inexpensive tools. With expertise in cyberspace, command and control, communications and connectivity, and with the continued support of this subcommittee, Rome Lab will lead the charge to find innovative ways of detecting, identifying, and disabling potentially hostile UASs.

Rome Lab's advancements extend well beyond the Air Force. In fiscal year 2015, Rome Lab leveraged more than $1 billion in funding from its non-Air Force defense partners. This additional funding has helped Rome Lab serve the critical and otherwise unmet research needs of the Department of Defense. Ultimately, the stronger Rome Lab's foundation is, the stronger our national defense will be.

This subcommittee has recognized the vital importance of Rome Lab providing increased funding over the last several fiscal years. In the fiscal year 2017 bill passed just this week, the House provided Rome Lab $5 million more in funding than was requested by the President, which marked a 4 percent increase over fiscal year 2016. This work, supported by the funding, is vital to maintaining Rome Lab's dynamic set of research and development capabilities. I strongly encourage this subcommittee to maintain the funding or to increase it accordingly to reflect new and evolving missions.

I would again like to express my appreciation for the opportunity to provide my testimony this afternoon. I look forward to working with you and other members of this subcommittee to ensure that our Nation's military remains ready to confront the challenges of the 21st century. Thank you so much. I appreciate it.

[The written statement of Congresswoman Tenney follows:]

CLAUDIA TENNEY
22ND DISTRICT, NEW YORK

WEBSITE:
Tenney.House.Gov

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC

HOUSE FINANCIAL SERVICES COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
MONETARY POLICY AND TRADE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS
AND CONSUMER CREDIT
SUBCOMMITTEE ON
OVERSIGHT AND INVESTIGATION

March 6, 2017

The Honorable Kay Granger
Chairwoman
Subcommittee on Defense
House Committee on Appropriations
H-405, the U.S. Capitol
Washington, D.C. 20515

The Honorable Peter Visclosky
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Defense
House Committee on Appropriations
1016 Longworth House Office Building
Washington D.C. 20515

Dear Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky,

I would first like to thank you and the members of the Defense Subcommittee on Appropriations for the opportunity to share my priorities. I am deeply appreciative of all that you do for our servicemen and women and for your commitment to providing robust funding to our armed forces.

As this subcommittee begins consideration of the Fiscal Year 2018 Department of Defense Appropriations bill, it is my distinct honor to write in support of the Air Force Research Laboratory Information Directorate in Rome, New York (AFRL-Rome). This installation has for decades stood at the forefront of advanced cyber research and development projects within the Air Force. Today, AFRL-Rome leads a wide range of critical Command, Control, Communications, Computing, Cyber, and Intelligence (C4I) missions that are vital to supporting our warfighters and ensuring that a force capable of confronting 21st century challenges is deployed across the globe.

Ensuring that our warfighters have the tools and resources to dominate in cyberspace is among the core missions of AFRL-Rome. On today's high-tech battlefields, our country's superiority in cyberspace is critical. AFRL-Rome provides full spectrum support for cyberspace operations, equipping our operators with the agility to disrupt and deny adversary attacks and the resiliency to fight through and recover from successful intrusions. The premier set of technical competencies that AFRL-Rome brings to bear in cyberspace are truly world-class and the installation's breakthroughs in this area serve our warfighters each day in an untold number of ways.

AFRL-Rome is also leading the fight to maintain command and control superiority, both on the battlefield and in cyberspace. AFRL-Rome continues to push the boundaries in developing sophisticated technologies that effectively integrate resilient and robust command and control systems. The advancements made by AFRL-Rome have provided our warfighters with improved situational awareness through resilient unified planning systems, robust tools for the continuous

WASHINGTON, DC:
512 CANNON HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-3665
FAX: (202) 225-1891

NEW HARTFORD:
555 FRENCH ROAD, SUITE 101
NEW HARTFORD, NY 13413
(315) 732-0713
FAX: (315) 732-0988

BINGHAMTON:
49 COURT STREET
METRO CENTER, SUITE 210
BINGHAMTON, NY 13901
(607) 926-8002

assessment of the battlespace, and enhanced mission focused autonomy. For example, the Air Space Cyber-User Defined Operational Picture (ASC-UDOP) was developed by AFRL-Rome. This visual tool allows users to graphically configure and manipulate data streams from a variety of sources while operating in the air, space, and cyber domains. AFRL-Rome also led the way in developing the Joint Targeting Toolbox (JTT), which enhances the targeting capabilities of our warfighters at the national, theater, and operational levels. The JTT's suite of battle-tested web-based tools allows for decisive action, providing unparalleled insight at all operational stages.

Ensuring secure and effective communications and reliable connectivity are also vital components of AFRL-Rome's mission. In battlespaces that are increasingly congested and contested, AFRL-Rome provides the warfighter with agile and secure communications. On the ground, AFRL-Rome facilitates the deployment of technologies that allow our servicemen and women to securely share information via text, voice, and video and to maintain reliable and constant connectivity at all levels of command. In the air, AFRL-Rome has pioneered technologies to provide mission-responsive battlespace communication abilities across domains, agencies, and networks.

AFRL-Rome also has the capacity to grow and confront emerging challenges head on. For example, in the arena of unmanned aerial systems (UAS), AFRL-Rome is poised for significant contributions. As this committee surely knows, the threat posed by the proliferation of UAS is growing and varied. Recently, the Army released an unclassified report highlighting the threats posed by small UAS and identifying the need for advancements in counter-UAS technologies. There are countless examples of small UAS posing serious threats to our servicemen and women in Iraq, with ISIS increasingly relying on these relatively inexpensive tools. With expertise in cyberspace, command and control, and communications and connectivity, AFRL-Rome is leading the charge to find innovative ways of detecting, identifying, and disabling potentially hostile UAS.

It should be noted that AFRL-Rome's successes reverberate well beyond the Air Force. AFRL-Rome serves a range of clients other than the Air Force, including the Army, Navy and several affiliated defense agencies. In 2014 and 2015, AFRL-Rome leveraged more than $1 billion in funding from these entities, in addition to funds appropriated by this subcommittee. This additional funding helps AFRL-Rome serve the vital and unmet research needs of the Department of Defense. Ultimately, the stronger ARFL-Rome's foundation is, the stronger our national defense will be.

AFRL-Rome also plays an outsized role in the local economy of my district. In Fiscal Year 2015, AFRL-Rome had an estimated local economic impact of $300 million, which marked a 7 percent increase over the previous year. The installations workforce topped out at 789 personnel, with 732 classified as civilians and 57 as military personnel. AFRL-Rome anchors my district's burgeoning high-tech sector and has fast-become a critical engine of growth in our region.

This subcommittee has recognized the vital importance of AFRL-Rome in recent years, providing increased funding for AFRL-Rome's two budget lines, Cyber Battlespace Knowledge Development and Demonstration (PE: 0603788F) and Dominant Information Sciences and Methods (PE: 0602788F). The work supported by this funding is vital to maintaining AFRL-Rome's robust and effective set of research and development capabilities. Seeing as the President's Budget Request for Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) has yet to be delivered to Congress, I request that

funding for these two programs in FY18 be maintained or increased to reflect new and evolving missions. Below is a table outlining recent funding approved by Congress in millions of dollars.

	FY14	FY15	FY16	FY17
PE: 0602788F	$136.9	$147.0	$169.2	$161.7
PE: 0603788F	$48.1	$34.3	$46.2	$58.1

I would be remiss if I did not also request that the members of this subcommittee continue to prioritize funding for our national defense, generally. As the mother of an active duty Marine, I want nothing more than for my son and his fellow service members to have the tools, resources, and training to effectively and safely carry out their mission. As a Member of Congress tasked with safeguarding our country, I remain a steadfast advocate for robust defense funding.

I thank you again for considering my requests and am grateful for the opportunity to submit this written testimony. If I can answer any additional questions, please do not hesitate to call upon me.

Sincerely,

Claudia Tenney

Claudia Tenney
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you. Thank you for your testimony.
Any questions?
Mr. VISCLOSKY. No.
Mr. CALVERT. Seeing none, thank you again, appreciate it.
Next, Mr. Trent Kelly.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. TRENT KELLY, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN KELLY

Mr. KELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ranking Member Visclosky.

I have served in the Mississippi National Guard for 31 years. I mobilized in 1990. I have twice deployed, once commanding over 670 troops in Iraq, and I represent the First District of Mississippi, which also was home of Columbus Air Force Base, which trains one half of the Air Force pilots. I am not someone who needs to be convinced that national defense should be a priority or that the significant work you have before you in deciding how to fund the military is important. I believe in that already.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee and also as a serving colonel in the Mississippi Army National Guard, I know firsthand from listening to our military leaders and our national security experts regarding the threats we are facing around the globe at how well equipped we are to address them. And I am greatly concerned about the readiness crisis facing our Armed Services across the board.

General Daniel Allyn, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, testified this month—or last month, regarding this issue stating that the Army can no longer afford the most modern equipment, and we risk falling behind our near-peers in critical capabilities, and we risk losing overmatch in every domain. General Allyn is not alone in this assessment. General Stephen Wilson, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, testified that, "Today we find ourselves less than 50 percent ready across the Air Force and we have pockets that are below that." Readiness of our military must be addressed. My priority reflects the importance of rebuilding our Armed Forces to ensure that we can defend ourselves.

I think it is important to note by portraying and having strength in our military, it preserves peace and prevents wars, which is much more costly to fight a war than it is to preserve peace.

We need to make sure that we are manned, equipped, and trained at the proper levels. I truly believe that the President's $603 billion mark is not enough. I truly believe that number should be 640 and not 603, which is really a modest increase when you add in OCO. From last year's spending, it is only a 3 percent increase. And I think to do it right and to make sure we do that, we need to be at 640.

At all times, but especially under the current conditions, the contributions of the National Guard cannot be overlooked. The guardsmen that I have served with, both in peacetime and in wartime,

are dedicated, capable, trained, and professionals. I will put their experience and their skill levels up against anybody in the world.

I urge the committee to ensure that they have the same equipment and the same training opportunities, CTC rotations, the combat training center rotations, to train as one Army. Those men and women need to look and smell exactly like their Active Duty counterparts, especially when we are talking about our heavy brigade combat teams or we are talking about our fighter pilots and the equipment that they use in both the Guard and Reserves and on the active components.

Additionally, those serving in the National Guard bring experience from a wide range of backgrounds, occupations, skill sets that are invaluable contributions to our current military readiness. As you consider the funding and policies for this year's Defense appropriations bill, I encourage you not to overlook the vital impact we have as the Guard being an operational reserve and making sure that they are trained, equipped, and manned to meet those obligations that this Nation requires of them.

I am committed to working with you as you ensure our military is the strongest fighting force in the world. And I look forward to working with you to continue to support our Armed Forces. Through our strength in the military we preserve the peace. And we cannot afford to be at war because we did not have the capable military force to deter all foreign forces which would do that.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Ranking Member, and any questions you have.

[The written statement of Congressman Kelly follows:]

Testimony of Rep. Trent Kelly (MS-01) before the House Committee on Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense

March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Defense Subcommittee, thank you for the time to share with you my priorities for the Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) defense appropriations bill. I have served in the Mississippi National Guard for the past 31 years. In 1990 I mobilized for Desert Storm as an Engineer Second Lieutenant. In 2005 I deployed as a Major to Iraq with the 155th Brigade as the Operations Officer of the 150th Engineer Battalion. From 2009 to 2010, I deployed as a Lieutenant Colonel to Iraq as the Battalion Commander of Task Force Knight of the 155th Brigade Combat Team and commanded over 670 troops. I represent Columbus Air Force Base, where half of all Air Force pilots are trained. I am not someone who needs to be convinced of the unsurpassed importance of our national defense or the significant work you have before you in deciding how to best fund our military.

As a member of the House Armed Services Committee, I have heard firsthand from our military leaders and national security experts regarding the threats we are facing around the globe and how well equipped we are to address them. I am greatly concerned about the readiness crisis facing our armed forces. General Daniel Allyn, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, testified last month regarding this issue:

> *"An unintended consequence of current fiscal constraints is that the Army can no longer afford the most modern equipment, and we risk falling behind near-peers in critical capabilities. Decreases to the Army budget over the past several years significantly impacted Army modernization. Given these trends, and to preserve readiness in the short term, the Army has been forced to selectively modernize equipment to counter our adversary's most pressing technological advances and capabilities. At the same time, we have not modernized for warfare against peer competitors, and today we risk losing overmatch in every domain."*

General Allyn is not alone in this assessment. General Stephen Wilson, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, testified that, "Today we find ourselves less than 50 percent ready across our Air Force and we have pockets that are below that." Readiness of our military must be addressed. My priorities reflect the importance of rebuilding our armed forces to ensure we can defend ourselves.

At all times, but especially under current conditions, the contributions of the National Guard cannot be overlooked. These men and women train and stand ready to defend our nation at a moment's call. In my district, the Mississippi National Guard has an Apache company based in Tupelo. The 1st Battalion, 149th Aviation Regiment has Apaches in both Houston, TX, and Tupelo, MS. Due to the Army Restructuring Initiative (ARI), Tupelo may lose its Apache

company over the objections of both the Mississippi and Texas National Guards. The Guardsmen in Tupelo are dedicated, capable, trained, and professional. I would put their expertise and skill up against any other company in the military. If the Army chooses to move these Apaches, they have admitted the loss of readiness would take up to five years to regain. In our current climate, I do not think anyone here would say that is acceptable. With the threats we are facing now, we cannot afford to make decisions that will only make matters worse.

Instead, I urge the Committee to take action to ensure that combat units have access to the equipment they need, and that National Guard Apache battalions remain equipped with 24 helicopters and that number not be reduced.

I am committed to working with you to ensure our military is the strongest fighting force in the world, and I am happy to provide you with any additional information you may need.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for his testimony. We are going to have a supplemental here pretty soon and we will be reviewing that. Most of that is going to go toward readiness and getting the military back up to par here pretty quickly. We look forward to your support on that supplemental. And we are going to need everybody to support——

Mr. KELLY. You can count on it.

Mr. CALVERT. And we certainly thank you for your service.

Any questions, Mr. Visclosky.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. No.

Mr. KELLY. Thank you.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you.

Mr. Knight, Steve Knight from the great State of California.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. STEVE KNIGHT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN KNIGHT

Mr. KNIGHT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I come to you from the 25th Congressional District in California where we have built, tested, thought of, and drawn the last bombers of the generation, the B–1s, the B–2s, and the B–21s that are coming up.

To say that our bomber fleet is old is an understatement to mammoth proportions. We have pilots today flying tail numbers that their grandfathers flew from B–52s. We have B–1s that were built back in the early 1980s, and we are projecting to fly them for another 30 years. So I am here to speak about the importance of Air Force's new long-range strike bomber, the B–21 Raider.

The ability to project power anywhere in the world is a cornerstone of our national security strategy. For decades, our militaries enjoyed this advantage. However, as potential adversaries rapidly improve their military forces, we must modernize our military technology to maintain our strength.

Most of our current fleet of long-range strike bombers are over 50 years old and cannot penetrate advanced defenses. About 18 of our bombers can penetrate into the maintained airspace that we need them to get into. Unfortunately, we only have 18 of those that are flying.

Thankfully, work is underway to build a new bomber. The Air Force's B–21 Raider will be the world's most advanced, long-range strike bomber when it fields in the mid-2020s. It also offers noteworthy cost-effective advantages over older fighter aircraft and bomber aircraft. It carries larger payloads, requires fewer aircraft, and puts fewer men and women in harm's way to accomplish the mission.

As Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Goldfein expressed the need for the B–21 when he stated, "In the short term, we prefer to have more penetrating long-range capacity to ensure persistent air operations in long-range scenarios. For this reason, the B–21 is an operational imperative, and we must ensure it remains an af-

fordable program in order to augment and eventually replace our legacy bomber fleet."

I could not agree with the general's comments, and it is apparent that many of my colleagues here in the House feel the same way.

As you might recall, last year, a bipartisan group of 28 members wrote to this committee to voice support of the B–21 program and encouraged the committee to provide sufficient funding to keep the program on track so it is ready when we need it. It is also in my opinion for Congress to keep this on budget on time, because that is the only way that the American people are going to see that programs work, they come to fruition, we get them to the pilots faster, and there to the warfighter in a much better manner.

I am encouraged by the committee's support for modernizing our nuclear deterrence capability, including the B–21. As you well know, we must ensure our military is never in a fair fight, and the B–21 will do that by enabling our military leaders to strike anywhere at any time.

I thank you very much for your time, and I will take any questions.

[The written statement of Congressman Knight follows:]

Testimony of Congressman Steve Knight
California's 25th Congressional District
Before the
Subcommittee on Defense
House Committee on Appropriations
March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky – thank you for the opportunity to speak today.

I am here to speak about the importance of the Air Force's new long-range strike bomber, the B-21 Raider.

The ability to project power anywhere in the world is a cornerstone of our national security strategy. For decades, our military has enjoyed this advantage. However, as our potential adversaries rapidly improve their military forces, we must modernize our military technology to maintain our strength.

Most of our current fleet of long-range strike bombers are over 50 years old and cannot penetrate advanced defenses. Thankfully, work is underway to build a new bomber. The Air Force's B-21 Raider will be the world's most advanced long-range strike bomber when it fields in the mid-2020s. It also offers noteworthy cost-effective advantages over older fighter aircraft: it carries larger payloads, requires fewer aircraft, and puts fewer men and women in harm's way to accomplish a mission.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Goldfein expressed the need for the B-21 when he stated "In the short term, we prefer to have more penetrating long range capacity to ensure persistent air operations in long range scenarios. For this reason, the B-21 is an operational imperative, and we must ensure it remains an affordable program in order to augment and eventually replace our legacy bomber fleet."

I could not agree more with the General's comments and it is apparent that may of my colleagues here in the House feel the same way.

As you might recall, last year a bipartisan group of 28 Members wrote to this committee to voice support for the B-21 program and encourage the committee to provide sufficient funding to keep the program on track so it is ready when we need it. With your permission, I ask that letter be placed in the record.

I am encouraged by the committee's support for modernizing our nuclear deterrence capability, including the B-21. As you well know, we must ensure our military is never in a fair fight, and the B-21 will do that by enabling our military leaders to strike anywhere, at any time.

Thank you again for the opportunity to speak today and I hope you will continue to support this important program and ensure it remains on track.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you for your testimony. We are looking forward to that new bomber being built in the great State of California, so keep doing the good work.

Any questions?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. No questions.

Mr. CALVERT. Okay.

Mr. KNIGHT. Thank you very much.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you.

Next, Mr. McGovern.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. JAMES P. MCGOVERN, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MASSACHUSETTS

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN MCGOVERN

Mr. MCGOVERN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member. And thank you for your patience in listening to all us members. It is like the Rules Committee. So I also want to thank you for giving me the opportunity to testify in support of funding a competitive grant program for nonprofits that trains service dogs for our veterans.

Specifically, I ask the committee to support a minimum of $5 million for the Wounded Warriors service dog grant program. Obviously, if it could be more, I would be thrilled because the need out there is so great.

In addition, I request that the committee insert language addressing the benefits of K9 therapy for treatment of PTSD and TBI symptoms. And I will include this language with my official statement.

I also want to express my gratitude to the subcommittee for their assistance in securing funding for the program in fiscal year 2015 and fiscal year 2016. Already we have seen so many incredible success stories in which these dogs have helped veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress or physical limitations to reintegrate into the social framework of their families and communities and often reduce their reliance on prescription drugs.

Continuing to fund this program at at least $5 million a year would allow awardees to continue this all important work. That being said, even with this grant program, many nonprofits continue to have waiting lists of veterans in need of service dogs. And given that fiscal year 2018 will likely see an increase in defense spending, my hope is that this subcommittee will consider appropriating more than $5 million to grow this already successful program.

Mr. Chair, with so many of our veterans returning from war, bearing both physical and emotional scars, we must ensure that they have access to treatments that work. Service dogs have been shown to have a positive effect on the treatment of PTSD and TBI symptoms, and it is not a coincidence that we have seen a significant growth in the demand for these service dogs as more of our veterans are returning home in need of this assistance.

Last Congress, I had the opportunity to visit the National Education for Assistance Dog Services, or NEADS, located in Princeton,

Massachusetts. I heard amazing stories about how service dogs are helping to treat veterans with physical disabilities, as well as those suffering from post-traumatic stress. This nonprofit organization has connected many deserving veterans with service dogs over the past few years with incredible results. Like other similar nonprofits, NEADS customizes the training of each dog to serve its future owner. Depending on the owner's needs, these dogs can be trained to retrieve medicine from a refrigerator, turn the lights on and scan an empty house before the owner enters, guard an owner's back in a public setting, and even wake up an owner from a nightmare.

In the last few years, NEADS, like many other nonprofits providing this crucial service, have struggled to meet these growing levels of demand. Many nonprofits that train dogs for use by veterans are underfunded. The cost of training a service dog varies, but estimates range between $15,000 to $60,000 per dog, and training can take up to 2 years. Too often, a veteran's need for a service dog goes unmet due to financial constraints. This competitive grant awarded only to organizations that meet the standards of either the International Guide Dog Federation or Assistance Dogs International will allow nonprofits to help more veterans.

Congress first directed the VA to research the effect of service dogs on veterans with PTSD in 2010. This study was suspended in 2012. In 2015, the VA launched a new version of the study that will conclude in 2018. Meanwhile, the demand amongst veterans for service dogs continues to grow as research conducted by private institutions such as Perdue University increasingly demonstrates that service dogs can help treat symptoms of PTSD. In addition to these studies, I guarantee that if you sit down with a veteran who has received a service dog for PTSD, it will be perfectly clear how helpful these dogs are.

So, Mr. Chair, with so many of our veterans coming home from war suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder and other physical disabilities, it is critical that we offer them multiple treatment options. And while the VA continues its exhaustive research on the topic, we have wounded veterans who attribute their recoveries to service dogs and other veterans for whom a service dog could be key. So rather than relegating these veterans to a waiting list, let's continue to support these highly technical nonprofits so that they can continue to do what they do best: Help our veterans.

So I ask this committee and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to fund this competitive grant program. And with that, I appreciate your time.

[The written statement of Congressman McGovern follows:]

TESTIMONY OF
U.S. REPRESENTATIVE JAMES P. McGOVERN (MA-02)

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE
HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

FISCAL YEAR 2018 APPROPRIATIONS
DEFENSE HEALTH PROGRAMS

I want to thank Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky for allowing me this opportunity to testify today in support of funding a competitive grant program for nonprofits that train service dogs for our veterans. Specifically, I ask the Committee to support a $5 million request for the Wounded Warriors Service Dog grant program.

In addition, I request that the Committee insert language addressing the benefits of canine therapy for the treatment of PTSD and TBI symptoms. I will include this language with my official statement.

I also want to express my gratitude to the Subcommittee for their assistance in securing funding for this program in FY15 and FY16. Already, we have seen so many incredible success stories in which these dogs have helped veterans suffering from post-traumatic stress or physical limitations to reintegrate into the social framework of their families and communities and often reduce their reliance on prescription drugs. Continuing to fund this program at $5 million a year would allow awardees to continue this all-important work. That being said, even with this grant program, many nonprofits continue to have waiting lists of veterans in need of service dogs. Given that FY18 will likely see an increase in defense spending, my hope is that this

Subcommittee will consider appropriating more than $5 million to grow this already-successful program.

Madam Chair, with so many of our veterans returning from war bearing both physical and emotional scars, we must ensure that they have access to treatments that work. Service dogs have been shown to have a positive effect on the treatment of PTSD and TBI symptoms, and it is not a coincidence that we have seen a significant growth in demand for the service dogs as more of our veterans are returning home in need of this assistance.

Last Congress, I had the opportunity to visit the National Education for Assistance Dog Services – or NEADS – located in Princeton, Massachusetts. I heard amazing stories about how service dogs are helping to treat veterans with physical disabilities, as well as those suffering from post-traumatic stress. This nonprofit organization has connected many deserving veterans with service dogs over the past few years with incredible results. Like other similar non-profits, NEADS customizes the training of each dog to serve its future owner. Depending on the owner's needs, these dogs can be trained to retrieve medicine from a refrigerator, turn the lights on and scan an empty house before the owner enters, guard an owner's back in a public setting, and even wake an owner up from a nightmare.

In the last few years, NEADS, like many of the other nonprofits providing this crucial service, have struggled to meet these growing levels of demand. Many nonprofits that train dogs for use by veterans are underfunded. The cost of training a service dog varies, but estimates range between $15,000 and $60,000 per dog, and training can take up to two years. Too often, a

veteran's need for a service dog goes unmet due to financial constraints. This competitive grant, awarded only to organizations that meet the standards of either the International Guide Dog Federation or Assistance Dogs International, will allow nonprofits to help more veterans.

Congress first directed the VA to research the effect of service dogs on veterans with PTSD in 2010. This study was suspended in 2012 due to complications. In 2015, the VA launched a new version of the study that will conclude in 2018. Meanwhile, the demand amongst veterans for service dogs continues to grow as research conducted by private institutions such as Purdue University increasingly demonstrates that service dogs can help treat symptoms of PTSD. In addition to these studies, I guarantee that if you sit down with a veteran who has received a service dog for PTSD, it will become perfectly clear how helpful these dogs are.

Madam Chair, with so many of our are veterans coming home from war suffering from post-traumatic stress disorder and other physical disabilities, it is critical that we offer them multiple treatment options. While the VA continues its exhaustive research on the topic, we have wounded veterans who attribute their recoveries to service dogs and other veterans for whom a service dog could be the key. Rather than relegating these veterans to a waiting list, let's continue to support these highly technical non-profits so that they can continue to do what they do best – help our veterans.

I ask this Committee and my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to fund this competitive grant program at the levels requested for FY 2018 so that our veterans can receive the treatment they deserve.

Language Request for FY 18 Defense Appropriations

"The committee is aware that canine therapy for treatment of PTSD and TBI symptoms is a promising alternative or adjunct to pharmaceutical treatment, which can have harmful side-effects. In testimony before Congress, witnesses from the Services were positive about the potential for this treatment, calling canine therapy for PTSD "an emerging area of alternative therapy" that is "beneficial in the support of people with either physical or mental health diagnoses," and that can "help reduce anxiety, lower emotional reactivity, and provide a sense of security." While still experimental, canine therapy has shown effectiveness in treating PTSD and other psychological disorders, from hospitalized psychiatric patients to children with developmental disorders, patients with substance abuse problems, and victims of trauma. The Services' report that service members who participate in their canine programs for PTSD and TBI show more positive social interactions, a decrease in suicidal thoughts, an increased sense of safety, independence, motivation, and self-efficacy. The committee notes that canine therapy is a promising area for further research as a complementary or alternative treatment for the signature wounds of the ongoing conflict. Therefore, the committee provides funds and continues to encourage the Services to initiate or expand their research into canine therapy to validate its therapeutic effectiveness in the treatment of PTSD and TBI."

Mr. CALVERT. I thank you for your testimony.

Mr. Visclosky.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. McGovern, I appreciate you testifying on behalf of those who have been injured in defense of this country, but also want to thank you very much for your continued advocacy asking that Congress be involved as far as a new authorization for the use of military force.

I appreciated your comments in the Rules Committee on Tuesday. I know you are joined by colleagues such as Mr. Cole and others. I understand you addressed the issue again yesterday on the floor, as well as Ms. Lee, and certainly hope, particularly with the new administration, that we come together and we have a role to play here as well as the change rule. So I appreciate your advocacy very much.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Well, I appreciate your comments. Thank you.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you. Thank you for your testimony.

Mrs. Hartzler, you are now recognized.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you.

Mr. CALVERT. Good afternoon.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Good afternoon. I found a new room in the Capitol.

Mr. CALVERT. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. VICKY HARTZLER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN HARTZLER

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you so much.

I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you as a member of the House Armed Services Committee and to share with you some priorities that I believe is very, very vital as we move forward in this year's budget.

Recent reports have indicated that the Trump administration intends to submit a budget with a defense top line of $603 billion for fiscal year 2018. While I applaud the President's intention to increase our military funding with a, quote, $54 billion increase, this assertion does not tell the whole story.

The $603 billion number is actually only an increase from the sequestration limits that have wreaked havoc on our military for the past 7 years. It is only a 3 percent increase from President Obama's administration proposal in the Future Years Defense Program, or FYDP, and $58 billion less than Secretary Gates' budget, which is what is really, really needed. And this chart shows that, that the Trump proposal of $603 billion is the orange star there. And you see that the Gates' budget, which was the last time that we really had a budget aligned with our defense objectives, shows that we should be getting far more at this point.

So our military today is facing a severe crisis. We expect our men and women in uniform and the equipment they deploy to be able to decisively win a current conflict and posture our forces so an-

other enemy doesn't even think they can challenge the United States if they tried. Yet this ability is in jeopardy.

According to the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, and this is shocking, less than 50 percent of the Air Forces's fire and bomber force are able to fight and decisively win a highly contested fight against a near-peer such as Russia or China. In fact, an engine literally fell off of a B–52 bomber while training in North Dakota recently.

According to the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, of the 58 brigade combat teams that our Nation depends on to deploy overseas and to defend our freedoms we comfortably enjoy here, only three could be called upon to fight tonight, three out of 58.

Based on current readiness levels, the Army can only accomplish defense requirements at a high military risk. As General Allyn stated in his testimony last month before the Armed Services Committee, if we continue down this path, quote, "the end result is excessive casualties, both to innocent civilians and to our forces," end quote. We cannot allow this to happen.

According to the Vice Chief of Naval operations, two-thirds, 67 percent, of our Navy strike fighters, the planes that are launching entirety of the Navy's attacks against ISIS, cannot fly. Sixty-seven percent of the Naval aircraft cannot fly. And sadly, in 2015, the Marine Corps aviation deaths hit a 5-year high as aircraft failed or pilots lacked adequate training hours. This is unacceptable.

Regardless of your budgetary priorities, I call on each of you to recognize that it is our responsibility in Congress to provide support for our men and women in uniform while they selflessly serve our Nation. House Armed Services Chairman Thornberry and Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman McCain have both laid out what the Department of Defense needs to begin buying back the readiness that has left our force hollow. Our military needs $640 billion to begin the restoration of its forces that the American people expect and need in today's world, not $603 billion.

If we do not meet the budget of $640 billion for the Department of Defense, we will be shortchanging our military in capabilities they need to fulfill their mission. We will impose too great of risk in air dominance, Naval presence, ship recovery, facilities maintenance, ground forces, medical readiness, nuclear deterrent requirements, national security space defense, ballistic missile defense, and cyber capabilities. Each of these requirements is crucial to our national security, and we would not be able to have those met without it.

Our men and women in the military must stand ready and actively fight a resurgent Russia, an emergent China, an unstable North Korea, an unpredictable Iran, and widespread violent extremism. The demand for our forces has never been so high and our readiness has never been so low.

It is within our power to reverse this. I ask you to work with me and others in the Armed Services Committee to give our servicemen and -women the resources they need to build our military and to keep our Nation safe.

Thank you.

[The written statement of Congresswoman Hartzler follows:]

Rep. Vicky Hartzler (MO-04) | March 9, 2017

Testimony before the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense

Members of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense, I sit before you today as a proud Member and authorizing counterpart from the House Armed Services Committee. I am here to reiterate testimony that I gave to the House Budget Committee last week because I believe so deeply in what I'm here to tell you today.

Recent reports have indicated that the Trump Administration intends to submit a budget with a defense topline of $603 billion dollars for Fiscal Year 2018. While I applaud the President's intention to increase our military funding with a quote "$54 billion dollar increase," **this assertion does not tell the whole story.**

The $603 billion number is actually only an increase from the **sequestration limits** that have wreaked havoc on our military for the past seven years. **It is only a three percent increase** from President Obama's Administration proposal in the Future Years Defense Program, or FYDP, and $58 Billion less than Secretary Gates Budget for what we really need. We need more.

You can see where on here the Trump Budget proposal is, compared to the green line which was the Gates Budget before we had the Budget Control Act passed. You can see it is behind what was projected to be needed years ago.

Our military today is facing a severe crisis. We expect our men and women in uniform, and the equipment they deploy, to be able to decisively win a current conflict and posture our forces so another enemy doesn't even think they could challenge the United States if they tried.

Yet this ability is in jeopardy:

- According to the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, less than 50% of the Air Force's fighter and bomber force are able to fight and decisively win a highly contested fight against a near peer such as Russia or China. In fact, an engine **literally fell off** a B-52 bomber while training in North Dakota recently.
- According to the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, of the **fifty eight** Brigade Combat Teams that our nation depends on to deploy overseas

and defend our freedoms we comfortably enjoy here, **only three** could be called upon to fight tonight. Based on current readiness levels, the Army can only accomplish defense requirements **at a high military risk**. As General Allyn stated in his testimony last month before the Armed Services Committee, if we continue down this path, "The end result is excessive casualties, both to innocent civilians and to our forces." **We cannot allow this to happen.**

- According to the Vice Chief of Naval Operations, two thirds – sixty seven percent – of our Navy's strike fighters, the planes that are launching the entirety of the Navy's attacks against ISIS, **cannot fly.** Sixty-seven percent.

- And, sadly, in 2015, the Marine Corps aviation deaths hit a five-year high as aircraft failed or pilots lacked adequate training hours. This is unacceptable.

Regardless of your budgetary priorities, I call on each of you to recognize that it is OUR responsibility in Congress to provide support for our men and women in uniform while **they** selflessly serve our nation.

House Armed Services Committee Chairman Thornberry and Senate Armed Services Committee Chairman McCain have both laid out what the Department of Defense needs to begin "buying back" the readiness that has left our force hollow. Our military needs $640 billion dollars to **begin** the restoration of its forces that the American people expect and need in today's world.

If we do not meet the budget of $640 billion for the Department of Defense, we will be short-changing our military in capabilities they need to fulfill their mission. We will impose too great of risk in air dominance, naval presence, ship recovery, facilities maintenance, ground forces, medical readiness, nuclear deterrent requirements, national security space defense, ballistic missile defense, and cyber capabilities. Each of these requirements crucial to our national security would not be met.

Our men and women in the military must stand ready to and actively fight a resurgent Russia, an emergent China, an unstable North Korea, an

unpredictable Iran, and widespread violent extremism. **The demand for our forces has never been so high, and our readiness has never been so low.**

It is within our power to reverse this. I ask you to work with me and others on the Armed Services Committee to give our servicemen and women the resources they need to build our military and keep our nation safe.

Thank you.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you. Thank you for testifying. As you know, we are going to have a supplemental coming here pretty soon to address some of those readiness issues, and we look forward to your support with that. And obviously, we have some great needs for our United States military. So we appreciate your testimony.

Next, Mr. Wenstrup.

Mr. WENSTRUP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Good to see you. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. BRAD WENSTRUP, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WENSTRUP

Mr. WENSTRUP. I appear before you today in strong support of a robust defense budget for fiscal year 2018. It is an honor to testify before this committee, and my colleagues and I in the Armed Services Committee look forward to continuing our partnership with you to support and equip the men and women of our Armed Forces.

In recent years, the U.S. military has faced years of devastating cuts, leaving us with the smallest Army since before World War II, a Navy fleet among the smallest since World War I, and an Air Force whose top general has said it may not be able to control the skies in a future conflict.

President Trump has repeatedly expressed his support for rebuilding our military, and I also applaud his commitment to cutting waste and eliminating unnecessary spending. However, I am concerned that the 2018 defense budget previewed by the White House, even with the intent of cuts from within, it is not sufficient to fully resource the bold agenda to rebuild our military both in capabilities and deterrents that the President has set for this administration.

I would like to highlight three particular areas that demonstrate the impossible tradeoffs being forced on our military, tradeoffs that we can avoid by properly resourcing our national defense. Recently, the largest deployment of U.S. Troops arrived in Europe since the end of the Cold War. They are on a mission to reassure our European allies and deter further Russian aggression on the continent. However, over the past few years, Russia has made major investments in modernizing its equipment and tactics.

In response, the U.S. Army in Europe declared an urgent operational need for defensive and offensive upgrades to its Stryker vehicles. While the single Stryker Brigade Combat Team deployed to Europe is receiving these upgrades, limited resources will prevent the Army from quickly upgrading the rest of our Stryker BCTs. In fact, the production rate is at risk of falling as low as one brigade every 3 years, a lethargic pace for critical upgrades to an essential combat capability.

If we want our forces in Europe to serve as an effective deterrent to Russian aggression, we must fully fund the Stryker upgrades necessary to ensure that we pose a credible threat to our adversary forces.

Another challenge for our military is maintaining the golden hour standard for trauma care in future conflicts. The golden hour refers to the fact that wounded servicemembers have over a 90 percent survival rate when they reach role 2 medical care within the first hour of being injured. This standard has been a major contributor to the United States suffering far fewer combat related deaths in the wars of the last 15 years than in any previous conflicts. However, maintaining the golden hour when we do not have uncontested control of the air and sea domains, as would be the case in a potential conflict with Russia or China, requires developing a new set of battlefield capabilities. We shouldn't accept a lower standard of care and a higher fatality rate for our troops just because the fights of the future may pose new challenges. Instead, we must fully fund capabilities to maintain the golden hour in both today's conflicts and those of the future.

The final priority I would like to discuss is growing our Army. In 2016, the Army reached the lowest level of Active Duty troops since 1940. The 2017 National Defense Authorization Act prevented even further cuts, but the Army is still too small to meet our national security requirements.

Quantity has a quality of its own and we will need more troops if we are to simultaneously destroy ISIS, support the Afghan Government against the Taliban, serve as an effective deterrent to Russian and Chinese aggression, and be prepared to respond to unexpected contingencies across the globe or even at home. Rebuilding the Army's end strength is a complex, decades long process, but we must begin making this long-term investment today in order to realize the goal of an Army prepared for the conflicts of the current decade as well as the threats of tomorrow.

Just as with any Federal agency, the Department of Defense has to prioritize, make strategic choices, cut waste and inefficiency, and operate within budgetary realities. But resourcing these urgent needs of our Armed Forces is not optional. A failure to do so will result in a continued readiness crisis, weakened national security, and ultimately, the loss of American lives.

However, the good news is that we do not have to force these impossible choices on our military. A defense budget that is in line with the House Armed Services Committee's proposal will fulfill our constitutional obligation to provide President Trump and Secretary Mattis with the force they need to deter threats and keep our Nation secure. Most importantly, it will ensure our men and women in uniform have the resources, training, and equipment they need to keep us safe and come home safe themselves.

With that, I yield back.

[The written statement of Congressman Wenstrup follows:]

Rep. Brad Wenstrup (OH-02) HAC-D FY18 Member Day Testimony

Mr. Chairman,

I appear before you today in support of a robust defense budget for Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) that fully funds our military's urgent needs and ensures our national security for the long term. It is an honor to testify before this committee, which contributes so much to Congress's constitutional obligation to provide for the national defense. My colleagues and I on the Armed Services Committee look forward to continuing our partnership with you in providing the men and women of our Armed Forces everything they need to complete their mission of keeping America safe, and maintaining peace and stability around the globe.

During the presidential campaign and since assuming office, President Trump has repeatedly expressed his support for rebuilding our military. He has called for a renewed commitment to destroying ISIS; a Navy of 350 ships; an Air Force of at least 1,200 fighters; an Army of 540,000 soldiers; and major investment in our ballistic missile defenses. Crucially, he has also stated that he is determined to end the defense sequester, which will finally allow us to return to budgets based on long-term planning, rather than yearly crisis. These proposals make clear that the President understands the dire straits in which our military finds itself today, after years of conflict and insufficient funding, and with new challenges from Russia, China, and others on the horizon. I also applaud the President's commitment to reducing waste, eliminating unnecessary spending, and finally auditing the Department of Defense, as every dollar saved is one we can use to bolster spending toward our modern day warfighting needs. However, I am concerned that the FY18 defense budget previewed by the White House will not be enough to accomplish the goals that President Trump has set for his administration.

Rep. Brad Wenstrup (OH-02) HAC-D FY18 Member Day Testimony

Today, our military faces an urgent readiness crisis, and none of the services are spared. In testimony before the Armed Services Committee last year, Army Chief of Staff General Mark Milley noted that, "Right now the readiness of the United States Army, all components of the United States Army, is not at a level that is appropriate for what the American people would expect to defend them."[1] Just one month ago, General Glenn Walters, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps for Aviation, remarked that in the Marine Corps, "We simply do not have the available aircraft assigned to our fighter-attack and heavy lift squadrons."[2] Likewise, General Stephen Wilson of the Air Force testified that "Today we find ourselves less than 50 percent ready across our Air Force and we have pockets that are below that."[3] And finally, Admiral William Moran, Vice Chief of Naval Operation, stated that "It has become clear to me that the Navy's overall readiness has reached its lowest level in many years."[4]

At the same time, we have not provided our military with the funding necessary to enable it to modernize for future challenges. Lieutenant General H.R. McMaster, now President Trump's National Security Advisor, told the Senate Armed Services Committee last year that "We are outranged and outgunned by many potential adversaries, and our Army in the future risks being too small to secure the nation."[5] As technological advances in space, cyber, and other domains continue to progress, we must not lose the competitive edge that we have spent decades working

---

[1] Testimony of General Mark A. Milley, USA, Chief of Staff of the Army, before the House Armed Services Committee, "The Fiscal Year 2017 National Defense Authorization Budget Request from the Military Departments," March 16, 2016.
[2] Testimony of General Glenn Walters, USMC, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps, before the House Armed Services Committee, "State of the Military," February 7, 2017.
[3] Testimony of General Stephen W. Wilson, USAF, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force, before the House Armed Services Committee, "State of the Military," February 7, 2017.
[4] Testimony of Admiral William F. Moran, USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, before the House Armed Services Committee, "State of the Military," February 7, 2017.
[5] Freedberg Jr., Sydney J. "McMaster: Army May Be Outnumbered AND Outgunned In Next War," *Breaking Defense*, 4/6/16.

hard to maintain. American troops should never be sent into a fair fight; the enemy must always be at a disadvantage.

I would like to highlight three particular areas that demonstrate the impossible tradeoffs being forced on our military, tradeoffs that we can avoid by properly funding our national defense.

Recently, the largest deployment of U.S. troops arrived in Europe since the end of the Cold War. They are on a mission to reassure our European allies and deter further Russian aggression on the continent. However, over the past few years, Russia has made major investments in modernizing its combat vehicle fleet and honing its tactics during its invasion of Ukraine. To counter this greatly improved adversary capability, the U.S. Army in Europe declared an urgent operational need for defensive and offensive upgrades to its Stryker vehicles, including by adding a "double-V hull" that reduces vulnerability to land mines and improvised explosive devices (IED), as well as a 30 millimeter cannon to increase their firepower. However, while the single Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT) deployed to Europe is receiving those upgrades, limited resources will prevent the Army from quickly upgrading the rest of our SBCT's, even though they may be required to deploy to Europe or elsewhere, should conflict arise. In fact, the production rate is at risk of falling as low as one brigade every three years, a lethargic pace for critical upgrades to an essential combat capability. If we want our forces in Europe to serve as an effective deterrent to Russian aggression, we must fully fund the Stryker upgrades necessary to ensure that we pose a credible threat to our adversary's forces.

Another challenge our military is facing is maintaining the "Golden Hour" standard for trauma care in a potential conflict with a "near-peer" adversary. The "Golden Hour" refers to the fact that wounded service members have over a 90 percent survival rate when they reach role 2

medical care within the first hour of being injured. This standard has become an expectation of service members and the American public alike, and has been a major contributor to the United States suffering far fewer combat related deaths in the wars of the last 15 years than in any previous conflicts. In fact, one study credited former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates's order to maintain the "Golden Hour" in Afghanistan despite the vast distances and difficult terrain of that country with saving 359 lives.[6]

However, maintaining the "Golden Hour" when we do not have uncontested control of the air and sea domains, as would be the case in a potential conflict with Russia or China, requires developing a new set of capabilities to address the difficulty of quickly moving casualties to advanced care facilities. These capabilities include organic medical equipment sets, deployable infrastructure, and medical and support personnel trained to provide sustained care in the field. We should not accept a lower standard of care – and a higher fatality rate – for our troops, just because the fights of the future may pose new challenges. Instead, we must fully fund the costs of maintaining the "Golden Hour" capabilities in both today's conflicts and those of the future.

The final priority I would like to discuss is growing our Army. In 2016, the Army reached the lowest level of Active Duty troops since 1940.[7] The FY17 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) stopped even further cuts and mandated an end strength of 476,000 troops, but this number is still insufficient to meet our national defense needs. Quantity has a quality of its own, and we will need more troops if we are to simultaneously combat ISIS, support the Afghan government against the Taliban, deter Russia, and still be prepared to respond to unexpected contingencies elsewhere in the world, or even at home. Rebuilding the Army's end strength is a

---

[6] Shanker, Thom, "Study Says Faster Medical Evacuation Was Lifesaver for U.S. Troops," *The New York Times*, 9/30/15.
[7] Tice, Jim, "Army shrinks to smallest level since before World War II," *Army Times*, 5/7/16.

long, complex process that could take a decade, but we must begin making the investment today to realize the goal of an Army big enough to accomplish its mission in the future.

Mr. Chairman, military leaders are used to making difficult choices. Just like any other federal agency, the Defense Department will never get everything it wants in the budget, and we must not tolerate waste or inefficiency in its operations. But, like a number of other items highlighted by the House Armed Services Committee, these three urgent needs – modernizing our Stryker vehicles, maintaining the "Golden Hour", and growing our Army – are not optional. A failure to fully fund them will result in the loss of American lives and a weaker national defense. The good news is that we do not have to force these impossible choices on our military. By writing a bill that provides an adequate topline number for the Defense Department, and that addresses both the military's urgent readiness needs and longer term modernization, we can fulfill our constitutional obligation to provide President Trump and Secretary Mattis with the force they need to keep us safe, secure, and to deter aggression.

Thank you.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you. Thank you for your testimony, and thank you for your service. We certainly appreciate that.

Any additional questions?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. No.

Mr. CALVERT. Next, Mr. Cartwright of Pennsylvania. Welcome. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF PENNSYLVANIA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN CARTWRIGHT

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Thank you, Chairman Calvert, and Ranking Member Visclosky. It is an honor for me to join you both on the House Appropriations Committee, and I thank you for allowing this testimony today.

The United States military is the greatest military in the world, and it can only stay that way if we provide our ongoing support. I want to specifically address a few defense spending matters of the utmost importance. These issues affect both my constituents and the security of the whole country.

Robust military manufacturing is necessary for the sustained strength of our Armed Forces. I am proud to say that Tobyhanna Army Depot in my district has contributed admirably to that effort. This facility has been able to efficiently compete with their private sector competitors for many years. For this quality of manufacturing support the U.S. military to continue, we must provide consistent and sustain funding.

Every job at the Tobyhanna Army Depot, the Army's only command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnoissance depot generates 2½ jobs in the larger local community. And what these men and women do at Tobyhanna is that they refurbish used electronic equipment. It is a great way to save money in our defense. This Depot provides our troops with state-of-the-art technology, delivers a healthy return on investment to the taxpayer, and serves as a vital hub of commerce in the community.

As such, I urge continued funding to support the operations and maintenance budget of depots, which are an essential component of our national security.

Additionally, I want to reiterate the opposition I expressed last Congress to any implementation of new A–76 studies by the Department of Defense. The A–76 process uses faulty, antiquated methodology to determine whether Federal civilian jobs should be outsourced, a matter we simply cannot simply approach so haphazardly. Both the GAO and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense concluded the process could not demonstrate any savings for the taxpayer.

And so using an arbitrary 12 percent overhead factor cost for Federal employees versus contractors, the A–76 process is simply not anchored in the facts. And we have to work with the facts. We have to act sensibly with taxpayer dollars by basing our decisions

on the facts. A–76 has faced bipartisan opposition and has been subject to congressional moratoriums since 2010, and I urge the committee to ensure that it stays that way.

I would also like to stress the importance of several programs that affect the general dynamics Scranton operation plant located in my district. Specifically, I hope that funding can be maintained for two artillery ammunition programs. First, the Navy 5/54 ammunition, which is fired from cruiser and destroyer types of combatant ships. Second, the 155 millimeter M795, which is state-of-the-art, multipurpose, high fragmentation, high explosive projectile fired from 155 millimeter howitzers.

Lastly, I want to express my support for the sustained funding for two larger programs that impact the general dynamic Scranton operation plant as well. First, the Abrams tank improvement program, which applies modifications to the currently deployed Abrams family of vehicles. The second program involves upgrades to the Stryker vehicle, which improved the protective hull of the vehicle, ensuring that our troops remain as safe as possible when carrying out their missions.

All of these programs improve the capabilities of our Armed Forces, function as a worthwhile investment for the general American taxpayer, and play a major economic role in the community surrounding the plant. So for these reasons I do urge the committee's continued support.

Thank you again, Chairman Calvert, for having this meeting and allowing me the opportunity to speak at it.

[The written statement of Congressman Cartwright follows:]

Statement of Congressman Matt Cartwright

Committee on Appropriations

Subcommittee on Defense

Member Day Hearing on Department of Defense Appropriations Act

March 9, 2017

Mr. Chairman, I'd like to thank you for holding this Members Day hearing on defense appropriations and for the opportunity to talk about some of our priorities.

The United States military is the greatest military in the world. It can only stay that way, however, with our ongoing support. I want to specifically address a few defense spending matters of the utmost importance. These issues affect both my constituents and the security of the entire country.

Robust military manufacturing is necessary for the sustained strength of our armed forces. I am proud to say that Tobyhanna Army Depot, in my district, has contributed admirably to this effort. This facility has been able to efficiently compete with their private sector competitors.

For this quality of manufacturing support for the U.S. military to continue, we must provide consistent and sustained funding. Every job at the Tobyhanna Army Depot, the army's only Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance depot, generates two and half jobs in the larger local community.

Every dollar invested at Tobyhanna generates $1.68 in economic activity. This depot provides our troops with state of the art technology, delivers a healthy return on investment to the taxpayer, and serves as a vital hub of commerce in its community. I urge funding support for this essential component of our national security.

Additionally, I want to reiterate the opposition I expressed last Congress to any implementation of new A-76 studies by the Department of Defense. The A-76

process uses faulty, antiquated methodology to determine whether federal civilian jobs should be outsourced – a matter we simply cannot approach so haphazardly. Both the GAO and the Inspector General of the Department of Defense concluded the process could not demonstrate any savings for the tax payer. Using an arbitrary 12% overhead factor cost for federal employees versus contractors, the A-76 process is simply not anchored in reality. We must act sensibly with taxpayer dollars by basing our decisions on fact, not fiction. A-76 has faced bipartisan opposition and been subject to Congressional moratorium since 2010, and I urge the Committee to ensure it stays that way.

I'd also like to stress the importance of several programs that affect the General Dynamics Scranton Operation plant located in my District. Specifically, I hope that funding can be maintained for two artillery ammunition programs. First, the Navy 5/54 gun ammunition, which is fired from cruiser and destroyer types of combatant ships. Second, the 155 millimeter M795, which is the state of the art multi-purpose high fragmentation high explosive projectile fired from 155mm howitzers.

Lastly, I want express my support for sustained funding for two larger programs that impact the General Dynamics Scranton Operation plant as well. First, the Abrams Tank Improvement Program, which applies modifications to the currently deployed Abrams Family of Vehicles to sustain the Abrams fleet by addressing a number of existing performance shortfalls. Second, the upgrades to the Stryker vehicle, which improve the protective hull of the vehicle and improve its lethality by adding a 30 millimeter cannon. All of these programs improve the capabilities of our armed forces, function as a worthwhile investment for the general American taxpayer, and play a major economic role in the communities surrounding the plant. For these reasons, I urge the Committee's continued support.

Thank you again, Mr. Chairman, for having this meeting and allowing me to the opportunity to speak about these important issues.

Mr. CALVERT. I thank the gentleman for his testimony.

Any questions?

No questions. Have a nice day. Thank you so much for your excellent testimony.

Next, Mrs. Wagner.

Good afternoon.

Mrs. WAGNER. Good afternoon, Chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. You are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. ANN WAGNER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF MISSOURI

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSWOMAN WAGNER

Mrs. WAGNER. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, ranking member. Thank you for the opportunity to share my support for a matter important to the United States Navy and our national security.

Ensuring the success of our missions and the safety of our troops is close to my heart, not only as a Member of Congress, but also as a mother. My son, a West Point graduate, is an Army ranger currently serving as an Active Duty captain in the 3rd Infantry Division at Fort Stewart.

As I testify before you today, the USS *Carl Vinson* is on deployment in the Western Pacific with three squadrons of F/A–18 Super Hornets, ensuring our Nation's security and providing the needed presence and deterrence that only United States aircraft carrier and its embarked air wing can.

These Super Hornets have seen their share of combat operations over the past 10 years conducting strikes in the fight against ISIS and providing air support to our troops on the ground in Afghanistan. We have heard from past year's testimonies by the Chief of Naval Operations that this unrelentingly high operational tempo of F/A–18s on the carrier decks and the delays in maintenance and sustainment of legacy fighter aircraft have resulted in a significant shortfall in tactical aircraft needed to remain mission capable.

I appreciate the response by this committee in its fiscal year 2017 markup to address this shortfall with new F/A–18s and F–35Cs. However, this readiness challenge is far from solved. And I support the Navy's call for additional Super Hornets and for a robust sustainment plan to keep Super Hornets flying into the 2040s as a needed fix to this shortfall.

The men and women building the F/A–18s in Missouri's Second Congressional District are ready to deliver the solution. My constituents are patriotic and dedicated heros who work hard to develop amazing systems that make American leadership and global missions possible. They continue to advance the capabilities of this aircraft to combat future threats, developing a Block III Super Hornet that will compliment the F–35's capabilities in the air wing of the future. They have also prepared a comprehensive Super Hornet service life modification plan to address the readiness of the strike fighter fleet.

I hope that this committee will continue to support my fiscal year 2018 request from the Navy for additional Super Hornets, as well as investments to Super Hornet readiness in your markup. The men and the women of the Navy have answered our call, and I look forward to working with you this year to be sure that the men and women of Missouri can help answer theirs.

I thank you for the opportunity to do so, and I appreciate your time today, Mr. Chairman.

[The written statement of Congresswoman Wagner follows:]

Representative Ann Wagner (R-MO-02)
Testimony to the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee (HACD)
Thursday, March 9, 2017, at 1:45 p.m.

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, thank you for the opportunity to share my support for a matter important to the U.S. Navy and national security. Ensuring the success of our missions and the safety of our troops is close to my heart as a mother. My son, a West Point graduate, is an army ranger currently serving as a captain in the third infantry division.

As I testify before you today, the USS Carl Vinson is on deployment in the Western Pacific with three squadrons of F/A-18 Super Hornets, ensuring our nation's security and providing the needed presence and deterrence that only a United States aircraft carrier and its embarked air wing can. These Super Hornets have seen their share of combat operations over the past ten years, conducting strikes in the fight against ISIS and providing air support to our troops on the ground in Afghanistan.

We have heard from past years' testimony by the Chief of Naval Operations that this unrelentingly high operational tempo of F/A-18s on the carrier desks and the delays in maintenance and sustainment of legacy fighter aircraft have resulted in a significant shortfall in tactical aircraft needed to remain mission capable. I appreciate the response by this committee in its FY17 markup to address this shortfall with new F/A-18s and F-35Cs. However this readiness challenge is far from solved, and I support the Navy's call for additional Super Hornets and for a robust sustainment plan to keep Super Hornets flying into the 2040s as a needed fix to this shortfall.

The men and women building the F/A-18 in Missouri's 2nd district are ready to deliver this solution. My constituents are fantastic and dedicated heroes who work hard to develop amazing systems that make American leadership in global missions possible. They continue to

advance the capabilities of this aircraft to combat future threats, developing a Block III Super Hornet that will complement the F-35 capabilities in the air wing of the future. They've also prepared a comprehensive Super Hornet service life modification plan to address the readiness of the strike fighter fleet.

I hope that this committee will support any FY18 request from the Navy for additional Super Hornets as well as investments in Super Hornet readiness in their markup. The men and women of the Navy have answered our call—I look forward to working with you this year to be sure that the men and women of Missouri can help answer theirs. Thank you for the opportunity to do so.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you for the gentlelady's testimony.

Mr. Visclosky.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate the gentlelady's testimony as well. And I do not want to be insensitive, but I realize that there are three purple ties and white shirts. What did I miss today?

Mrs. WAGNER. I don't know.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Is this just an incredible coincidence? I have been sitting here all morning.

Mrs. WAGNER. I wore red yesterday for International Women's Day apparently.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I have been sitting here all morning and I am thinking, did I miss——

Mrs. WAGNER. I am not aware, but I have told my scheduler that it is important you let me know what the color of the day is——

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I will simply remember this for our markup.

Mrs. WAGNER [continuing]. For our nation, internationally, nationally, and in Congress.

I thank the gentleman for his question.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you very much for your testimony.

Mrs. WAGNER. My pleasure. Thank you so much.

Mr. CALVERT. Next, is Mr. Davidson.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CALVERT. Good afternoon, and you are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. WARREN DAVIDSON, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF OHIO

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN DAVIDSON

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you. It is an honor to come before your subcommittee. Thanks for the work you are doing to help get our Defense Department on a path to a stronger capability.

And I just recognize that there are so many priorities competing for scarce dollars. And all these things have a big implication. As a former Army ranger, I was blessed to serve with some of those who serve near the tip of the spear in our country in earlier days. But all these macro decisions are made up of many small things.

And so I wanted to come before you and highlight one such small detail that could escape notice, and it is a small $5 million program. And as you consider the fiscal year 2018 DOD Appropriations Act, I am asking the subcommittee to provide a generic increase of $5 million in the Air Force base procured equipment for the purchase of civil engineering construction, surveying, and mapping equipment. This will upgrade the surveying equipment throughout the Air Force's engineering units.

These units perform rapid response and often critical construction, surveying, and mapping in garrison or in deployed theaters of operation. They provide the needed support and heavy damage repair of beddown weapon systems and bare-base, high-threat environments. However, existing Air Force civil engineering equipment is over 15 years old, much of which was discontinued over 7 years

ago. Those maintenance costs are prohibitive and some equipment in the Air Force is no longer being maintained. This has adversely affected the civil engineers' readiness and ability to conduct critical missions and imposed additional maintenance requirements on aircraft because of maintenance capability being degraded.

I am hopeful that the committee will make sure that our engineers have the support they need to provide the reliable runways and facilities from meeting the mission and supporting the other investments we make in modernized aircraft.

Thank you again for this opportunity to testify before the committee. Thanks for the work you are doing. And on behalf of the airmen at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, Springfield Air National Guard Base, thanks for the support you lend them.

[The written statement of Congressman Davidson follows:]

STATEMENT OF

REPRESENTATIVE WARREN DAVIDSON

MEMBER OF CONGRESS

BEFORE THE

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

ON

MARCH 9, 2017

Good morning Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and Members of the Defense Subcommittee. Thank you for providing me and other Members of the House with the opportunity to testify to the Subcommittee on issues that are important to our national security.

I strongly urge the Members of this Subcommittee to provide a generic program increase of $5.0 million in Air Force Base Support Equipment for competitively procured Civil Engineers Construction, Surveying, and Mapping equipment when you develop the Department of Defense Appropriations Act, 2018. This will upgrade the surveying equipment at RED HORSE and other Air Force civil engineering units throughout the country.

Existing US Air Force civil engineer equipment is over fifteen years old, much of which was discontinued over seven years ago. Thus maintenance is cost prohibitive and some equipment in the Air Force inventory is no longer being maintained or repaired. The age of mission critical hardware components also makes them incompatible with existing US Air Force Civil Engineer equipment. The US Air Force Civil Engineer School currently trains on modern equipment and software not yet fielded.

The Air Force's Equipment Modernization and Technology Refresh program replaces aging and significantly outdated land surveying equipment, mapping/ GIS systems and grade control equipment across the Air Force's Base Civil Engineer Units, USAF Prime Beef Teams and RED HORSE Squadrons. These engineers are currently unable to efficiently perform urgent and often critical construction, surveying and mapping in-garrison or in deployed theaters of operation due to outdated equipment. This has adversely affected the Air Force's civil engineers' readiness and ability to effectively conduct critical missions, and their ability to respond to homeland natural disasters.

An additional $5.0 million is urgently needed in fiscal year 2018 to competitively provide commercial off-the-shelf equipment and technologies commonly used in U.S. commercial construction and other industries. The benefits to Air Force Civil Engineers include:

- Productivity increases of new survey and mapping equipment:
- Productivity increases of new grade/position on heavy equipment
- Improved workflows for US Air Force civil engineer missions
- Enhanced capabilities between US Air Force Base Civil Engineers, Base master planners and RED HORSE Commanders
- Rapid data collection, analysis and mission decision making

- Comprehensive, integrated and unified Base master plans

The Air Force estimated needing $6.9 million during fiscal year 2018 for Based Procured Equipment, in its fiscal year 2017 President's budget request to Congress. This budget line is for organizations throughout the Air Force to acquire authorized equipment from the General Services Administration, the Defense Logistics Agency, and commercial sources when these items are unavailable through Air Force central procurement or exceed the unit cost of what may be purchased using O&M funds.

Rapid Engineer Deployable Heavy Operational Repair Squadron Engineer (RED HORSE) squadrons are the United States Air Force's heavy-construction units. Their capabilities are similar to those of the U.S. Navy Seabees and U.S. Army heavy-construction organizations. RED HORSE units are self-sufficient, 404-person mobile squadrons, capable of rapid response and independent operations in remote, high-threat environments worldwide. Air Force RED HORSE Units possess special capabilities, such as water-well drilling, explosive demolition, aircraft arresting system installation, quarry operations, concrete mobile operations, material testing, expedient facility erection, and concrete and asphalt paving. RED HORSE squadrons provide the Air Force with a highly mobile civil engineering response force to support contingency and special operations worldwide.

RED HORSE's major wartime responsibility is to provide a highly mobile, rapidly deployable, civil engineering and construction response force that is self-sufficient to perform heavy damage repair required for recovery of critical Air Force facilities and utility systems, and aircraft launch and recovery. In addition, it accomplishes engineer support for beddown of weapon systems required to initiate and sustain operations in an austere bare-base environment, including remote hostile locations, or locations in a chemical, biological, radiological, nuclear and high-yield explosives-prone environment.

Other Air Force Civil Engineering Units also provide heavy-repair capability and construction support when requirements exceed normal base civil engineer capabilities and where U.S. Army engineer support is not readily available.

The primary US Air Force Civil Engineering tasking in peacetime is to train for contingency and wartime operations. It participates regularly in Joint Chiefs of Staff and major command exercises, military operations other than war, and civic action programs. These units perform training projects that assist base construction efforts while, at the same time, greatly improving readiness while honing wartime skills.

The increase to this account will go a long way to rebuilding our military's readiness and getting back on track to ensure the Air Force has the advanced technology these units need. Thank you again for the opportunity for me to bring this important issue to the Subcommittee's attention today.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you. And thank you for your service. And you have a great base there at Wright-Pat. It is the oldest air base in the United States, I believe.

Mr. DAVIDSON. It is.

Mr. CALVERT. Is this your 100th anniversary this year?

Mr. DAVIDSON. It is the 100th anniversary this year.

Mr. CALVERT. That is right. Because March Air Force Base is on the West Coast and we have ours next year or the year after, so pretty close.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Very good.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you for your testimony.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Thank you.

Mr. CALVERT. Any other questions?

Next is Mr. Gallagher.

Welcome, and you are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

WITNESS

HON. MIKE GALLAGHER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF WISCONSIN

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN GALLAGHER

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and distinguished colleagues.

As a Marine Corps veteran and a member of the House Armed Services Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, I look forward to working with you to fulfill our first and foremost responsibility of keeping the country safe. To do that, we need to be able to project power throughout the world, which in turn depends in large part on our willingness here in Congress to provide and maintain a robust naval fleet as duty dictates according to Article I, section 8, clause 13 of the Constitution. Thanks to mindless defense sequestration, however, we have been derelict in that duty. And as a result, the Navy is the smallest it has been in 99 years, currently satisfying only 40 percent of the demand from regional commanders.

But we now have an opportunity to turn all of that around. We now have an opportunity to answer the Navy's own call for a 355 ship fleet. In support of this effort, it is my honor as a Member of Congress to represent the highly skilled American workers who build the Freedom class littoral combat ship at Fincantieri Marinette Marine in the Eighth District of the great State of Wisconsin.

Every day, 2,200 workers pass through the shipyard's gates. They don their hardhats and they go to work building American warships that allow the Navy to conduct critical missions such as antisubmarine warfare, mine countermeasures, ISR, and surface warfare. The construction of these ships in turn provides much needed local high-skill, high-paid jobs for the shipyard and over 200 contributing subcomponent producers.

Continuing down the path of sequester or even embarking on a decades long development of a new small surface combatant would result in the loss of some of the most highly skilled workers in the

world. Reconstituting this workforce would be tremendously difficult if not impossible. It would also do enormous damage to our naval capabilities.

My point here, Mr. Chairman, is not simply parochial. It is simply this: When we talk about big words, like our defense industrial base, this is exactly what we are talking about. Behind such buzz words lie real people, patriotic Americans who take pride in working hard and giving our warfighters what they need to keep us safe. Our shipbuilding program thus lies at the intersection of our national security and our economic security.

With that in mind, Mr. Chairman, I thank you, and I applaud the committee for the inclusion of three LCSs in your fiscal year 2017 defense appropriations bill. And I ask you to continue your efforts to return to or plus up the Navy's 52 ship program of record in your fiscal year 2018 budget submission. This will be pivotal as the Navy transitions its small service combatant from LCS to a multimission frigate. The Navy's small surface combatant task force concluded that building a frigate on a modified LCS hull offers the best path to affordably deliver distributed lethality to the fleet in a reasonable timeframe.

At a broader level, Mr. Chairman, I respectfully remind the committee that the 52-ship requirement represents the bare minimum needed to meet naval requirements for projection of force. This 52-ship requirement was validated by the Chief of Naval Operations several months ago in his force structure assessment. The acting Secretary of the Navy, Sean Stackley, has testified that the previous plan to truncate the program to 40 ships was and is a result solely of budgetary decisions, in other words not strategic demands based on what the Navy actually needs.

This previous construct recklessly held the defense of our Nation hostage to domestic political demands. This previous construct offered us a false choice between posture and presence. And so I would submit that we must reject this false and dangerous choice and provide the Navy with what it needs to get the job done and put this country back on a path to peace through strength.

And so on behalf of the dedicated workers in northeast Wisconsin, I thank you for your support. Today, those workers will walk through the gate of Marinette to build some of the best in our Navy, constantly improving their craft every single day to deliver a better product for less money, to give our warfighters what they need to keep us safe. They are doing their jobs and so we in Congress must do ours.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The written statement of Congressman Gallagher follows:]

Congressman Mike Gallagher (WI-08)
Testimony Before the House Defense Appropriations Subcommittee on Thursday, March 9, 2017

Madame Chairwoman and distinguished colleagues, as a Marine Corps veteran, I am keenly aware that in order to ensure the Federal government fulfills its first duty of keeping the nation safe, military modernization is critical. As a member of the House Armed Services Seapower and Projection Forces Subcommittee, I look forward to working with all of you toward a more robust, lethal, and modern military.

A critical component of our national security is our ability to project strength throughout the world with a robust naval fleet, and I am encouraged by the Navy's call for a 355-ship fleet in its recent Force Structure Assessment.

In support of this effort, it is my honor as a Member of Congress to represent the highly skilled American workers who build the Freedom-class Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) at Marinette Marine, in my District, in the great State of Wisconsin.

As you are aware, the Freedom-class Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) is built in partnership between Lockheed Martin and Fincantieri Marinette Marine (FMM). Marinette Marine was founded in 1942 along the Menominee River in Marinette, Wisconsin to meet America's growing demand for naval construction. As part of a huge private investment project by its parent company, FMM has grown from humble beginnings with a contract to build five wooden barges, to a world-class shipbuilder who is dedicated to building the Unites States Navy's most affordable, flexible and fastest warship. FMM has indeed brought naval shipbuilding back to the Great Lakes to a level not seen since the Emergency Shipbuilding Program of World War II. FMM is

not only one of the largest manufacturers in Wisconsin but is indeed the largest employer in the local Marinette, Wisconsin area as well as across the river in Menomonie, Michigan.

Every day, 2,200 workers pass through the shipyard's gates, don their hard hats, and build American warships. That's over 2,000 workers largely residing in two counties with a combined population of less than 20,000 individuals. The second order impacts of this yard to the local region are staggering, with over 200 suppliers, and contributing more than 7,000 direct and indirect jobs to the surrounding area. Marinette Marine also conducts vigorous outreach into vocational training through local high schools - spotting talent and growing it - to enable these students to move directly into high-skilled jobs after graduation.

U.S. Navy shipbuilding is tremendously important to the future of Wisconsin and the region. Most importantly though, this region is critical to the U.S. Navy, our defense industrial base, and our nation.

The commissioning of the USS Milwaukee on November 21, 2015, a Littoral Combat Ship (LCS) built in Marinette, was an especially proud day for the State of Wisconsin, yet it brought into sharp relief an ongoing debate about America's role in the world and the true breadth and depth of the national security challenges facing our nation.

For national leaders, a new ship provides another weaponized gray hull capable of deterring aggression and protecting America's vital national interests around the globe. Given the shrinking size of the fleet—now down to a battle force of less than 300 deployable ships from its

post-World War II average of 700—this is not a small task. We can all agree that devastating defense cuts have increasingly stretched the Navy to the limits of its readiness just as threats to our country are rapidly expanding.

Construction of the Littoral Combat Ship Freedom variant provides much needed local high-skill, high-pay jobs for the shipyard and contributing sub-component producers. LCS manufacturers make critical investments in our communities and fund vocational training around the Great Lakes. These are good paying jobs that often don't require college degrees. This is a critical aspect of rebuilding the middle class, expanding a modernized defense industrial base, and potentially sparking an industrial renaissance throughout the Great Lakes region. In this sense, the LCS program is more than just a component of foreign and defense policy—it is integral to our national economic security.

Yet the future of the LCS program has been in jeopardy. Former Secretary of Defense Ashton Carter, a PhD theoretical physicist who has served the country in a series of technical positions including a stint as the Undersecretary of Acquisitions, Technology and Logistics, issued a memo cutting the total number of planned LCS from 52 ships to 40. Citing "Navy warfighting" analysis, Carter directed the Navy to prioritize "posture" over "presence." In other words, Carter wanted the Navy to build fewer ships, but to equip these ships with more (and highly expensive) hi-tech capabilities.

Ships like the USS Milwaukee and the USS Detroit, which was commissioned in October of 2016, strengthen the nation on the high seas and here at home. They are needed now more than

ever. In every region of the world threats to the United States and its allies are growing. Near-peer competitors like Russia and China are increasingly challenging our global leadership and the international order it protects, one of free navigation, free trade, and self-determination. Now is not the time to shrink the fleet. The nation's interests require at least 350 ships to meet its national security needs, and the LCS costs a quarter of what the Navy spends on its larger destroyers, allowing the fleet to grow in an effective and balanced manner.

Former Secretary of Defense Carter offered a false choice between posture and presence—and at a broader level between winning wars and preventing them in the first place—when the reality is the Navy and the nation need both. We must reject this choice, and begin the urgent task of rebuilding our military and restoring our leadership.

The FY18 budget will be pivotal to this effort as the Navy transitions its small surface combatant from LCS to a multi-mission frigate. The preservation of a skilled manufacturing labor force and industrial shipyard capacity in Wisconsin will be critical to affordably and quickly rebuilding our nation's Navy to the numbers required by the Navy's force structure requirements.

To date, 26 small surface combatants have been built, or are in construction, at two shipyards in order to meet a national security requirement for 52 ships. This 52-ship requirement was validated by the Chief of Naval Operations several months ago in his Force Structure Assessment. The Navy, including now Acting Secretary of the Navy Sean Stackley, has testified that then Secretary of Defense Carter's 2015 plan to truncate the program to 40 ships, was and is, a result solely of the budgetary decisions made by the previous Administration.

Some have suggested continuation of this truncation plan, but such an effort would have grievous impacts both to our national security and to the defense industrial base. Development of a new SSC would take over a decade and hundreds of millions of dollars in design. At the shipyard, immediate layoffs of some of the most highly skilled workers would occur. Reconstituting this skilled workforce would be tremendously difficult if not impossible, expensive to taxpayers, and detrimental to our naval capabilities.

I agree with the analysis of the Navy's Small Surface Combatant Task Force that came to the conclusion that building a frigate on a modified LCS hull offers the best path to affordability deliver additional lethality to the fleet in a reasonable time frame. Delivering these ships to the Navy is critical to meeting the goal of a 355-ship Navy.

Madame Chairwoman, I applaud the inclusion of three LCS in your FY17 Defense Appropriations bill, and ask you to continue your efforts to return to, or plus up the Navy's 52-ship program of record by supporting three Littoral Combat Ships/frigates in your FY18 budget submission. I respectfully remind the Committee that the 52-ship requirement represents the bare minimum needed to meet naval requirements for projection of force.

Thank you again for the opportunity to testify here today in support of our naval force structure requirements, and on behalf of the dedicated workers in Northeast Wisconsin who stand ready to build our Navy's future frigate and any small surface combatant to build in support of a robust projection posture – now and into the future. Semper Fi.

Mr. CALVERT. And thank you for your testimony. You are absolutely right, the number of ships that we have today is totally inadequate and we need to rebuild our United States Navy. And I believe that we are going to be on the path to do that at this point.

So, Mr. Visclosky.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Chairman, just briefly.

Welcome to the United States Congress. Is Eagle River in your district or the seventh district?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Seventh.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Seventh district. My mother was born and raised there. Sorry about that.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Are you a Packers fan, sir?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I am sorry?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Are you a Packers fan, sir?

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I have to tell you that she ended up moving to Lake County, Indiana, and I grew up with the Bears. But actually, the—this is another story, we are on the record. I will talk to you later.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Packers football is part of our national security as well.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Good luck to you.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. CALVERT. We are going to wait a minute. We are waiting on Mr. Webster. I think he is coming in here.

Mr. WEBSTER. Am I next or last?

Mr. CALVERT. You are next and last. So we appreciate your coming in, and you are recognized for 5 minutes.

THURSDAY, MARCH 9, 2017.

HON. DANIEL WEBSTER, A REPRESENTATIVE IN CONGRESS FROM THE STATE OF FLORIDA

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF CONGRESSMAN WEBSTER

Mr. WEBSTER. Fantastic. Thank you for letting me be here today. I appreciate the opportunity. Thank you for having these listening sessions. They are good for the peons like me. We really appreciate it.

I have two requests. One of them is for the Civil Air Patrol, for them to be the auxiliary of the United States Air Force. I would request that they would get $43.1 million. That would be a $3.1 million increase over current funding. That would be for upgrades that they are going to have to do based on the FAA. All U.S.-based aircraft have to have avionics improvements. They are going to have to do the same. They don't have the money to do that.

It is about half of that request. A couple other things dealing with cybersecurity and communication equipment, which also is a requirement they are going to have to do, would be included in that request.

And my second would be the Navy has had in the Defense Review, they initially recommended in 2010 that a carrier be based in Mayport, in Jacksonville. That has not changed. The Navy secretary, chief of naval operations have repeatedly asked for that to take place. At present, our Nation only has one carrier based in the

Eastern Seaboard, at Norfolk. And I would say I would be speaking for the entire Florida delegation to say we would like to see that take place.

Both of those requests would be for fiscal year 2018.

That is it.

[The written statement of Congressman Webster follows:]

DANIEL WEBSTER
11TH DISTRICT, FLORIDA

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–0911

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1210 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-1002
(202) 225-6559 (FAX)

MINNEOLA OFFICE:
800 NORTH US HIGHWAY 27
MINNEOLA, FL 34715
(352) 241-8220
(352) 241-8181 (FAX)

March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Kay Granger
Defense Appropriations Subcommittee
H-405 U.S. Capitol

Dear Chairwoman Granger,

To properly serve as our nation's Air Force Auxiliary, I respectfully request that this Subcommittee provide $43.1 million for the Civil Air Patrol in the FY2018 Defense Appropriations bill.

CAP is in need of funds to comply with FAA mandates and needed technological upgrades to their air fleet, such as avionic, cybersecurity and communications equipment. These upgrades are necessary to allow CAP to fulfill its congressional mandate, performing such roles as: search and rescue, disaster relief, and homeland security support.

I ask the Subcommittee to appropriate a total of $43.1 million to the Civil Air Patrol, with $30,8 million going to the Operations and Maintenance Account, $10.6 million going for aircraft, and $1.7 million for vehicles.

Sincerely,

Daniel Webster

Daniel Webster

DANIEL WEBSTER
11TH DISTRICT, FLORIDA

COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE

COMMITTEE ON SCIENCE, SPACE, AND TECHNOLOGY

COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515–0911

WASHINGTON OFFICE:
1210 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515
(202) 225-1002
(202) 225-6559 (FAX)

MINNEOLA OFFICE:
800 NORTH US HIGHWAY 27
MINNEOLA, FL 34715
(352) 241-9220
(352) 241-9181 (FAX)

March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Kay Granger
Defense Appropriations Subcommittee
H-405 U.S. Capitol

Dear Chairwoman Granger,

As this Subcommittee considers spending priorities for the FY2018 Defense Appropriations bill, I ask that Members consider the strategic posture of our naval nuclear-powered aircraft carrier fleet. The 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review initially recommended construction of the proper facilities to house a carrier group at Mayport, FL and each subsequent Navy Secretary and Chief of Naval Operations has repeatedly validated this decision. At present, our nation has only one carrier based on the eastern seaboard, at Norfolk, VA, which presents numerous operational limitations and heightens the risk posed to some of our nation's most precious assets.

I respectfully request that the FY2018 Defense Appropriations bill include the necessary funding to bring Mayport up to readiness to homeport a nuclear-powered aircraft carrier.

Sincerely,

Daniel Webster

Daniel Webster

Mr. CALVERT. Well, you are carrying on the tradition of Ander Crenshaw, who was always asking for a carrier to be based in Florida. So we will certainly take that into consideration, and we appreciate your testimony. And being a former pilot, I understand the importance of the Civil Patrol. So it is a great request.

Mr. WEBSTER. That is my only two requests.

Mr. CALVERT. Any questions?

Thank you for your testimony.

This concludes the subcommittee's Members' Day hearing. We appreciate our colleagues' testimony here today. The subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Written testimony from Congressman Arrington submitted for the record follows:]

Testimony
Of
Congressman Jodey C. Arrington
Before
The Defense Appropriations Subcommittee
House Committee on Appropriations

Testimony from Members on their National Defense Priorities for the FY 2018 Appropriations Bill

March 9, 2017

Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky, thank you for this opportunity to testify before you today on the national defense priorities of Texas' 19th Congressional District. We are the proud home of Dyess Air Force Base, located in the City of Abilene. The base has 5,100 dedicated military and civilian personnel and is under Global Strike Command. Dyess serves as the home for the Air Force's 7th Bomb Wing, which has 33 of our Nation's 62 B-1 bombers. Dyess is the B-1 Training Base and has a B-1 Operational Squadron, a B-1 Training Squadron, and a new B-1 Classic Associate Reserve Unit. Dyess's missions also include two Active Duty C-130J squadrons with a total of 27 of these new, highly-capable aircraft.

Since 2001, the B-1 has been playing a major role in Afghanistan and Iraq and, more recently, in the fight against ISIS. The B-1 has been able to do this because Congress provided funding in prior years that improved the aircraft's capabilities to drop a variety of weapons with increasing accuracy. The new Integrated Battle Station is the latest enhancement that will ensure that the B-1 will be even more effective in meeting its mission requirements. In recognition of the B-1's overall capabilities, the B-1 was selected, along with the F/A-18 E/F, to be the initial aircraft to carry the new Long Range Anti-Ship Missile, which is a joint Navy/DARPA project.

Although we do not have a detailed FY 2018 budget request from the Administration, the Air Force has an ongoing program that will continue to improve the B-1's capabilities.

Chairwoman and Ranking Member, I appreciate the Subcommittee's longstanding support and funding for B-1 Research, Development, Test & Evaluation and B-1 Procurement and I request the Subcommittee's continued support for these essential B-1 programs as it considers the FY 2018 Defense Appropriations Bill.

I also understand that the Air Force's Unfunded Priorities List includes a service life extension program for the B-1 engines. Since the B-1 has a service life beyond 2040, this would seem to be a prudent investment to ensure the efficient operation of the aircraft in the years ahead. As the Subcommittee considers FY 2018 funding or even an FY 2017 Supplemental Appropriations Bill, I request that this important B-1 engine program receive the necessary funding.

In addition to improving the B-1's capabilities, the Air Force is proceeding with the development a new long-range strike aircraft, the B-21 Raider. I appreciate that the Subcommittee has been supportive of this important program and request continued support for the funding needed to keep the program on track.

Given the Air Force's goal of having the B-21 become operational in the mid-2020s, I would expect that the Air Force will begin to consider basing opportunities in the next several years. I would like to note that Dyess has successfully operated as a long-range strike aircraft base since it opened in 1956, more than 60 years ago. The base has served as a home for B-47s and B-52s and has been the Air Force's main B-1 base for more than 30 years. Importantly, Dyess has been the Nation's B-1 training base, is close to training ranges and training routes, and has a new B-1 Classic Associate Reserve Unit. All of this adds up to Dyess being an exceptional base for the B-21 and an outstanding location for B-21 training activities. And in closing, I'd add that Dyess is in fact such an exceptional base and community that the Air Mobility Command Community Support Award now even bears the community's name, as "The Abilene Trophy."

I would like to thank you again, Chairwoman Granger and Ranking Member Visclosky, for the opportunity to testify before you today.

TUESDAY, MARCH 28, 2017.

UNITED STATES CENTRAL COMMAND

WITNESS

GENERAL JAMES VOTEL, COMMANDER, U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GRANGER

Ms. GRANGER. The Subcommittee on Defense will come to order. This morning the subcommittee will hold a hearing on the posture of the United States Central Command. First, I want to recognize the ranking member, Mr. Visclosky, for a motion.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chairwoman, pursuant to the provisions of clause D of section 4 of the rules of the committee, I move that today's markup be held in executive session because of the classification of the material to be discussed.

Ms. GRANGER. So ordered. Thank you, Mr. Visclosky.

Our witness this morning is General Joseph Votel, commander of United States Central Command. We appreciate so much your being with us, what you do, the importance of what you do in a very dangerous world and a very dangerous part. So, General, welcome back to the subcommittee, and thank you.

We understand Central Command is a complex and volatile area of responsibility that is filled with instability and turmoil. Right now, our forces are fighting pure evil in the form of ISIS in Iraq and Syria; As if that isn't hard enough, they have to deal with Russia and Iran transferring with the fight. However, the war in Iraq and Syria is only one of the challenges. Afghanistan faces a resurgent Taliban, the conflict in Yemen is escalating, Egypt is engaged in fighting ISIS affiliates in the Sinai, and Al Qaeda continues to persist. General, given the challenges your command faces, we must ensure you do not lack the support you need to accomplish your mission.

As we watch events unfold, we are concerned by Russian and Iranian efforts to spread their influence throughout the region. Additionally, we are equally troubled by the continued presence of violent extremism from ISIS, Al Qaeda, and the Taliban.

Our adversaries only understand one thing, and that is strength. They must know the United States will stand with our allies and respond decisively to their aggression.

As chairwoman of the subcommittee, I believe our decisions should be guided by experts in uniform like you. There are limited resources and significant needs. We should not make decisions in a vacuum. We will rely on your best military advice.

We look forward to your testimony and your insight, but first, I would like to call on the ranking member, my friend, Pete Visclosky, for his comments.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, thank you very much. I simply want to thank you for holding the hearing, General, for your service, and look forward to the testimony and the questions of my colleagues. Thank you so much.

Ms. GRANGER. General, please proceed with your testimony. Your full written testimony will be placed in the record. Feel free to summarize your oral statements so we can leave enough time to get to everyone's questions. Thank you.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF GENERAL VOTEL

General VOTEL. Thank you. Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, distinguished members of the subcommittee, good morning, and thank you for the opportunity to appear here today to discuss the current posture and state of readiness of the United States Central Command. I come before you today on behalf of the outstanding men and women of the command, military, civilians, and contractors, along with our coalition partners, representing nearly 60 nations. Our people are the very best in the world at what they do, and I could not be more proud of them and their families. Without question, they are the strength of the Central Command team.

[The written statement of General Votel follows:]

STATEMENT OF

GENERAL JOSEPH L. VOTEL

COMMANDER

U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

BEFORE THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

ON

THE POSTURE OF U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND

28 MARCH 2017

Introduction. The outstanding men and women who make up the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) Team are the very best in the world at what they do. The incredibly dynamic, volatile and tumultuous Central Region presents a complex convergence of compounding multi-faceted security challenges. Such an environment generates near continuous crisis action planning and response. These conditions demand a highly capable, vigilant capability at USCENTCOM Headquarters and our Service Component Headquarters, as well as forward throughout our area of responsibility (AOR). The exceptional individuals on the USCENTCOM Team expertly navigate this challenging environment. In doing so, they effectively protect and promote our Nation's interests and they represent our values wherever they go around the world. They work selflessly each day in support of our mission and the exceptional men and women serving in harm's way around the globe. We could not be more proud of them and proud of their families. They truly are the strength of our USCENTCOM Team.

The Central Region is a **fascinating area of the world**. Spanning over four million square miles it is populated by 550+ million people from more than 20 ethnic groups representing multiple religions and speaking eighteen languages with hundreds of dialects. The region lies at the intersection of three continents and important commercial sea lanes, flight corridors, pipelines, and overland routes run across it supporting regional and global economic networks.

It is also a **highly-complex area**, widely characterized by pervasive instability and conflict. The 20 nations that make up the Central Region have various forms of government, ranging from absolute and constitutional monarchies to theocratic, parliamentary, and presidential republics. The economic and social-political landscape is diverse, volatile at times, and rivalries often

create tensions that affect security and stability. Violent extremist organizations (VEOs), such as the terrorist organizations al Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and al-Sham (ISIS), exploit these conditions to foment unrest, challenge or destabilize governments, and threaten the global economy and U.S. national interests.

The turbulence across the region reflects a number of contributing factors or **"drivers of instability,"** including ethnic and sectarian hostilities between Shia and Sunnis, and Arabs and Persians; economic uncertainty and sustained low oil prices that severely strain energy-based economies across the region, contributing to reduced government services and weakened prospects for economic growth; a disproportionately large youth population facing increasing poverty and unemployment, which may make them susceptible to unrest, radical ideologies, and VEO recruitment; expanding ungoverned or under-governed spaces, exploited by VEOs; civil wars, which are "engines of instability" all by themselves; worsening humanitarian crises, contributing to growing refugee and internally displaced person (IDP) populations; and, competition among outside actors, including Russia and China, seeking to promote their interests and supplant U.S. influence in the region. While we must take the necessary actions to counter immediate threats, such as ISIS in Iraq and Syria, we also need to find ways to address these and other root causes of instability if we hope to achieve lasting positive effects in that part of the world. This cannot be accomplished solely through military means. The military can help to create the necessary conditions; however, there must be concomitant progress in other complementary areas (e.g., reconstruction, humanitarian aid, stabilization, political reconciliation). There are a variety of interagency programs and efforts underway that are

essential to translating military gains into actual achievement of stated goals and objectives. Support for these endeavors is vital to our success.

The current evolving security environment in the Central Region is further complicated by the fact that **most challenges transcend borders**; they are **trans-regional** (cutting across multiple combatant commands (CCMD)), **all-domain** (land, sea, air, space, cyberspace), and **multi-functional** (e.g., conventional, special operations, ballistic missile defense, cyber). Of note, the Middle East remains the global epicenter for terrorism and violent Islamist extremism. According to the Institute for Economics and Peace's 2016 Global Terrorism Index, the U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) AOR accounted for 78% of all terrorism incidents worldwide, and the turmoil stretches across CCMD seams into Africa, Europe, South Asia, and beyond.

The security environment is further challenged by the emergence of a **"virtual caliphate"** and increased access and activity in the cyber domain. Ready access to the Internet, social media, and other messaging platforms has enabled a new generation of extremists to spread their radical Islamist views, incite widespread violence, and recruit new followers to their cause. As we have seen with the ongoing campaign to defeat ISIS, diminishment of the physical organization does not equate to the dismantlement of their virtual presence. To the contrary, terrorist organizations' activities in cyberspace enable them to remain relevant despite setbacks on the battlefield, while reaching out to direct, enable, and/or inspire audiences well beyond the region's geographic borders. Countering the "virtual caliphate" will require a concerted 'whole

of government' effort led by the people of the region. We can support our partners' activities, but their voices and influence will be required to achieve enduring positive results.

We also acknowledge, particularly in the current **resource-constrained environment**, the need to find additional means for countering existing and emerging threats and deterring potential adversaries. No other country in the world has a military with a greater ability than the U.S. to achieve kinetic and non-kinetic effects and sustain those effects. Through the application of "hard" and "soft" power capabilities, including kinetic strikes, raids, and information operations, we have been very effective at degrading and disrupting violent extremist networks in the USCENTCOM AOR and elsewhere around the world. It is an important and a necessary competency. However, a solely military response is not sufficient. We must continue to look for ways to further enhance our effectiveness through the application of military and non-military activities. Ultimately, we want to increasingly involve other elements of the U.S. Government and the International Community, recognizing that it is only through a **combination of capabilities** that we will achieve and sustain our strongest deterrence posture.

This is especially true today given the **changing character of warfare**. For much of the past 15+ years our Nation has increasingly operated in the "gray zone" of military confrontation—that range of activities short of conventional conflict; a dangerous space in which miscalculation can easily occur, leading to escalatory conflict and misunderstanding. In the "gray zone," adversaries employ unconventional methods that include cyber warfare, propaganda, and support to proxy elements in an effort to achieve their objectives while minimizing the scope and scale of actual fighting. At the same time, **these unconventional methods increase tensions between**

partners by emphasizing competing priorities that detract from support for our common objectives (e.g., Turks and Syrian Kurds). To be successful in this ambiguous environment, we must find alternate ways to compete against our adversaries in the "gray zone" short of conflict, while collaborating with our partners to achieve our desired end-states.

We must – *and will* – continue to pursue the many **opportunities** that exist today throughout the Central Region, recognizing that by pursuing these opportunities we will achieve improved stability and security in that challenged part of the world. As Sir Winston Churchill wisely stated, ***"Difficulties mastered are opportunities won."*** The key to success is ensuring that we remain ready and capable of effectively countering all threats. We need to make sure that we have an accurate understanding of the situation. We must take care to build and cultivate strong **relationships**, here at home and abroad. We need to be **responsive** to our partners and always listen and strive to understand their points of view and priorities. We also need to be properly **postured** with the necessary capabilities, resources, and appropriate authorities to protect and promote U.S. and partner nations' interests.

In recent years, we have been encouraged to see many of our regional partners take a more active role in providing for the security of their sovereign spaces. Ultimately, we want to **empower our partners and allies** by helping them build additional capability and capacity while strengthening relationships and improving cooperation and interoperability among nations. This is – *and will remain* – a top priority for the USCENTCOM Team at our headquarters in Tampa, Florida, as well as among our Component Commands, combined/joint task forces, and forward in the region.

U.S. Central Command's Mission. *"USCENTCOM directs and enables military operations and activities with allies and partners to increase regional security and stability in support of enduring U.S. interests."*

Our Strategic Approach. Our strategic approach is focused on protecting our national interests and those of our partners. It is designed to reflect our values, align our behaviors, and support the National Military Strategy. It is proactive in nature and endeavors to set in motion tangible actions in a purposeful, consistent, and continuous manner. Each aspect of our approach – ***Prepare – Pursue – Prevail*** – enables the next and collectively contributes to the successful achievement of our goals, objectives, and overall mission.

Prepare the Environment – The volatile nature of the Central Region requires that we be well-postured to protect our enduring national interests. "Well-postured" means that we are ready to execute military tasks; physically and virtually present in the AOR; integrated in all our actions; responsive to the needs of our partners; and, able to provide options for our leadership. Proper preparation in advance of crises creates decision space for leaders and allows for the responsible and effective employment of available resources and forces. Well-prepared and motivated personnel with shared values provide a comparative advantage over our adversaries and competitors. Preparation of the environment – including agreements for assured access, basing, and overflight and the ability to adapt our expeditionary and enduring footprint – ultimately ensures a high level of readiness, increased responsiveness, and strong and productive relationships with partners and allies, all of which serve to enable our success in our various endeavors.

Pursue Opportunities – In a region beset by myriad challenges we must always be on the look-out for opportunities to seize the initiative to support our objectives and goals. Pursuing opportunities means that we are proactive – we don't wait for problems to be presented; we look for ways to get ahead of them. It also means that we have to become comfortable with transparency and flat communications – our ability to understand our AOR better than anyone else gives us the advantage of knowing where opportunities exist. Pursuing opportunities also means we have to take risk – by delegating authority and responsibility to the right level, by trusting our partners, and being willing to trust our best instincts in order to move faster than our adversaries.

Prevail in Conflict – There are no easy victories or quick wins in the USCENTCOM AOR – ours is an area of protracted struggles and conflicts. Our overriding objective, despite these challenges, is to prevail. Prevailing means winning; coming out on top of our adversaries. We prevail when our national interests and objectives are preserved; when we maintain decision space for our leaders; and, when we maintain and sustain our access, posture, and relationships with our vital partners. We choose to prevail "by, with, and through" our partners. Prevailing in this AOR requires resolve and resiliency – and continued momentum.

U.S. Central Command Priorities.

Ensure an Effective Posture – An effective posture with trained and ready forward-stationed forces and equipment demonstrates our tremendous capability and enduring commitment to our partners and allies in the region. It reassures them; it enables access and influence; and, it positions us to secure our enduring national interests. An effective posture also optimizes

freedom of movement, deters state aggressors, and provides decision space and flexible response options for national-level decision makers.

Strengthen Allies and Partnerships – A coalition approach – at home and abroad – expands our ability to operate on multiple fronts. Strong relationships based upon shared values create greater cohesion and enhance the effectiveness of available resources and capabilities. Integration with partners, within the region and beyond, enriches the benefit of our presence, mitigates resource constraints, and expands the reach of the force. By building the capacity of regional partners, we enable them to assume a larger share of the responsibility for securing their sovereign spaces.

Deter and Counter State Aggressors – Effectively posturing to maintain freedom of movement, freedom of action, and freedom of navigation is essential to securing our enduring national interests and the interests of our partners and allies. We must also actively counter malign influence, and be prepared to confront aggression, while reducing the freedom of action of surrogates and proxies operating in the region.

Disrupt and Counter Violent Extremist Organizations and their Networks – We must protect our Homeland from terrorist threats that emanate from the Central Region. We will accomplish this by degrading and defeating VEOs and their networks, including ISIS and al Qaeda and their associated forces, and by preventing the further spread of sectarian-fueled conflict and VEOs.

Ultimately, our goal is to achieve a Central Region where improved security leads to greater stability, and where regional cooperation counters actors that threaten U.S. interests.

Desired End States. Our efforts in support of partners throughout the USCENTCOM AOR are designed to achieve our desired end states. **These end states include**: USCENTCOM properly postured to protect U.S. interests; free flow of commerce and access to areas in accordance with international law; strong and supportive allies and partners; state aggressors deterred or countered; WMD safeguarded and use prevented; VEOs degraded and their influence eroded; and, lasting increased regional stability and security. **The key to achieving these ends is the effective use of available ways and means to address challenges and pursue opportunities in the region.**

Challenges and Opportunities in the Central Region. Many conditions exist in the strategically-important Central Region that threaten stability, access to the region, and transit via maritime chokepoints. The resulting challenges – to include the ongoing conflicts in Iraq and Syria, Afghanistan, and Yemen, rising tensions with Iran, and increased provocative behavior by Iranian-backed elements in and around the Bab al Mandeb (BAM) Strait – clearly demand our attention and directed efforts. Among the dynamics contributing to the complexity of the current security environment are the same socio-political factors that caused the Arab Awakening, fomenting social unrest and creating conditions for sectarianism, violence, and extremism. In parts of the region, reforms have fallen short, politics remain exclusive, economic growth stagnates, education systems under-deliver, and/or social contracts are falling out of balance. Opportunities for youth remain limited. Concurrently, large-scale displaced populations stress

already fragile economies, social welfare systems and security architectures. The resulting instability provides opportunities for VEOs and insurgents and those who actively provide support and sanctuary to them. Competition for water, oil, and other natural resources are other drivers of instability and conflict. **Resurgent geopolitics and the continuation of national rivalries fuels inter-state hostility and may potentially hasten the pursuit of nuclear weapons.** As we look to address the multitude of challenges present today across the USCENTCOM AOR, it is absolutely essential that we understand the conditions and root causes of the instability and turmoil. If not, our efforts are likely to be insufficient or even misdirected and any gains achieved, temporary.

In addition to addressing challenges, **we must pursue the many opportunities present today throughout the Central Region.** Doing so will enable us, working together with our partners, to shape the security environment and increase stability across our AOR. Opportunities manifest in a variety of ways, including bi-lateral and multi-lateral exercises and training programs, Foreign Military Sales (FMS) cases, Foreign Military Financing (FMF) assistance, information operations and messaging, and other cooperative endeavors in support of common objectives. **Most notably, by supporting and enabling partner-led operations we achieve shared goals while limiting U.S. investment and troop presence and increasing regional partners' capability, confidence, and overall stake in providing for the security of their sovereign spaces.** For example, we continue to support the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF) and the Syrian Democratic Forces in their efforts to counter ISIS in Iraq and Syria. Also, in recent months we supported successful United Arab Emirates (UAE)-led operations in Yemen against the al Qaeda affiliate, al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP). In terms of future opportunities, we need

to find ways to increase information sharing with key partners, like the UAE, to further enable their efforts. Enhanced information sharing with regional partners can also advance efforts against ISIS and other terrorist facilitation networks. We should pursue increasing our support for the Lebanese Armed Forces (LAF), which have demonstrated tremendous return on investment in recent years. The need for improved communication between and among elements, particularly regarding common regional disputes (e.g., Sunni-Shia tensions, Kurdish expansionism) also presents opportunities and should be pursued by relevant elements of the U.S. Government (USG). **The key outcomes achieved through the pursuit of these and other opportunities present in the Central Region are improved awareness and information-sharing, enhanced capability, and increased trust and confidence among partner nations,** all of which are key components underpinning our mission in pursuit of our national interests. Thus, it is essential that we view all challenges with an eye for corresponding opportunities that provide the best means for addressing those challenges and achieving desired end-states.

Given the trans-regional nature of the current security environment coupled with the competing demands for limited resources and capabilities, it is essential that we find efficiencies and alternative means for accomplishing stated objectives. This includes **building and enabling coalitions comprised of willing partners**, recognizing that collaboration enhances overall capability while providing a stronger, united front against potential adversaries; the sum of the parts is greater than the whole. The **initial building blocks for strong coalitions are relationships**. The **cornerstone for effective enduring collaboration among coalition members is information-sharing** which enables **coalition compliant planning**, resulting in successful execution of campaign goals and objectives. One quick-yield way to enhance the

capability and effectiveness of our partners is by **expanding our intelligence sharing** with them. To date, we have seen significant return on investment each time we have made such allowances in support of our partners.

Key Focus Areas. While the USCENTCOM Team manages a broad range of difficult challenges on a daily basis, **a significant portion of our efforts and resources are necessarily focused in five priority areas. These five areas are: Operation INHERENT RESOLVE (Iraq and Syria), Operation FREEDOM'S SENTINEL and Resolute Support Mission (Afghanistan), Iran, Yemen, and Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism.** Below are summaries, highlighting substantial challenges and efforts underway aimed at improving stability and security in each of these critical areas.

Operation INHERENT RESOLVE (Iraq and Syria). The Counter-ISIS (C-ISIS) Campaign has entered its third year and we are on track with the military plan to defeat the terrorist organization in Iraq and Syria. Our "by, with, and through" approach and operational level simultaneity strategy are working, and our partner forces **continue to build momentum across the battlespace** as we **pressure the enemy on multiple fronts and across all domains.** Together we are **forcing the enemy to deal with multiple simultaneous dilemmas** (e.g., ground operations, airstrikes, cyber activities, information operations, and discrete interdictions of resource flows). This is putting increased pressure on their operations and command and control capability while stretching their limited resources.

The strength of the C-ISIS Campaign is the C-ISIS Coalition consisting of all branches of service and our Interagency and international partners, and the many contributions they willingly make to the fight against our common enemy—*"The whole is greater than the sum of its parts."* Without the support of the Coalition, our "by, with, and through" approach would not be doable.

Our stand-off fires, including **Coalition air and artillery, remain another lynchpin of the C-ISIS Campaign**. Improved intelligence has enabled the Combined Air Operations Center (CAOC) to increase the number of deliberate strikes conducted in recent months, targeting ISIS's infrastructure, oil revenue sources, etc. **Over the past year, the Coalition's precision effects campaign has removed dozens more ISIS senior leaders from the battlefield, attrited large portions of the organization's forces, further disrupted its command and control capability, and greatly degraded its pool of resources and access to replacements and personnel reinforcements.** As the campaign progresses, and as ISIS shifts actions and behaves increasingly like a terrorist organization, hiding amongst civilians as a force protection measure, we will continue to make the necessary adjustments to our air operations. We want to target the enemy effectively, while also ensuring that we minimize collateral damage. International law requires it; and, **when America's sons and daughters go to war, they go with our values. Thus, it is imperative that when we conduct operations we do so in such a way that we limit the loss of innocent lives.**

Over the past year, **ISIS lost a significant amount of capability and large swaths of territory**. The Iraqis are now in control of eastern Mosul, although clearing operations continue in several areas. In Syria, operations are ongoing in three key geographic areas—Raqqa, Manbij, and al

Bab; it remains a very complex fight given multiple simultaneous activities and the management of partners and battlefield effects. In Iraq, in the coming weeks and months we will continue to support the Iraqi Security Forces as they complete the seizure of western Mosul. After Mosul operations are complete, we expect the Government of Iraq to prioritize military operations to recapture Tal Afar, Sinjar, and Hawija, and to secure the border in order to diminish ISIS' freedom of movement and ability to target major population centers. In Syria, the Syrian Democratic Forces have almost completed the isolation phase of Raqqa operations and will, in the coming months, begin operations to seize Raqqa, dismantling a key node in ISIS' external operations network. Additionally, we would look to continue our security operations along the Jordanian border to prevent re-infiltration of ISIS remnants.

The cumulative effect of operations in Iraq and Syria has **cut off key lines of communication** for ISIS, while restricting their ability to bring in additional fighters and **curbing their flow of financial resources**. The terrorist organization is struggling financially and is experiencing low morale in its ranks and steady leadership attrition due to coalition airstrikes. There has also been a nearly 75 percent decline in ISIS's media and propaganda as compared to a year ago.

Our efforts, in conjunction with our interagency and international partners' efforts, to **stem the flow of foreign terrorist fighters** – both into Syria and Iraq and also those attempting to return to their countries of origin – continue to bear fruit. The U.S. and Coalition member nations are highly concerned about the threat these experienced fighters present to our respective homelands. We have made considerable progress identifying and targeting fighters and insurgent networks, principally through our Joint and Interagency targeting processes, and this will remain a priority.

These processes will also help to combat the evolving hybrid threat (conventional and irregular warfare). U.S. Special Operations Command has been designated lead for external operations (EXOPs) for the U.S. military efforts and this has contributed greatly to organizing the broader efforts against this threat. Whole of government efforts and collaboration with partners have also played a key role in stemming the flow of foreign terrorist fighters (FTF). Spurred by the adoption of UN Security Council Resolution 2178 in September 2014, more than 60 nations have enacted laws to restrict FTF travel. The U.S. now collaborates through information-sharing agreements with 59 international partners to identify and track travel of suspected terrorists in real time.

While we continue to make great strides towards countering ISIS trans-regionally, we recognize that **we are dealing with a highly adaptive enemy.** In particular, ISIS' use of chemical weapons and its evolving application of available off-the-shelf technologies that include unmanned aerial systems now used for both observation and to achieve lethal effects, poses a growing threat. For example, ISIS has reportedly used chemicals, including sulfur mustard and toxic industrial chemicals, in attacks more than 50 times in Iraq and Syria since 2014. Although the threat of chemical weapons has not slowed the Counter-ISIS Campaign, ISIS could further develop its chemical weapons capability. We are committed to working with partners to locate, secure, render harmless, eliminate or destroy any chemical and biological weapon materials found during the course of operations in Iraq and Syria, and to effectively remove this threat from our troops and civilian populations.

We will defeat ISIS militarily; however, **a lasting defeat of this enemy will not be achieved unless similar progress is made on the political front**. Instability all but guarantees a resurgence of ISIS or the emergence of other terrorist groups seeking to exploit conditions to advance their own aims. We remain fully committed to the "whole of government" approach and continue to ensure our actions are synchronized with and supportive of the efforts of our partners across the Interagency and the International Community.

This also holds true on the humanitarian front. UN-led efforts to date are having positive impacts and thousands of internally displaced persons (IDPs) have already returned to their homes. However, tough work remains, given the enormity of the **humanitarian crises in Iraq and Syria and in neighboring countries**. The growing number of displaced persons presents a unique set of challenges that include protection and assistance to civilians caught in the various conflicts, as well as assistance to those seeking asylum in neighboring countries.

Regional actors – There is a significant number of players currently operating in Iraq and Syria with both common and competing interests. While they have been present for many years, several of them have become emboldened and have taken a more active role in addressing regional issues.

In Iraq, we have seen encouraging progress made in the relationship between the leadership of the **Government of Iraq (GoI) and the Kurdish Regional Government (KRG)**. This past year, for the first time since 2013, Prime Minister al-Abadi met with President Barzani in Baghdad to discuss expanded cooperation between the ISF and the Kurdish Peshmerga. We also

see increased collaboration between the ISF and elements of the Popular Mobilization Forces (PMF). In November 2016, Iraq's parliament voted to fully legalize elements of the PMF, including but not limited to Shia militias. While they are achieving some positive effects, their participation does present challenges, particularly post-Mosul offensive, as Iranian-backed elements of the PMF seek to increase their influence in the country through both military and political channels.

Turkey remains an important NATO ally and Counter-ISIS Coalition member that supports the campaign through its operations and by providing access, basing, and overflight permissions. Some Turkish activities and rhetoric, however, have the potential to impact campaign momentum. Turkey's actions in northern Iraq continue to strain relations between the GoI and the KRG, which serves to further complicate the C-ISIS Campaign. Likewise, in Syria, Turkey has helped clear ISIS from its border, but Turkish-backed forces have also clashed with the Syrian Democratic Forces near Manbij and al Bab and we continue efforts to resolve tensions.

Since Russia's entry into the Syrian conflict *en masse* in 2015, they have negatively impacted the regional balance of power. Russia's primary goal is to maintain Syria as a client state in the future and they have propped up the Assad Regime to support this overarching objective. Also very concerning is the fact that Russia's air operations have targeted civilians and U.S.-supported opposition groups. Without effective de-confliction measures, we see increasing opportunity for miscalculation and potential for unintended, counter-productive engagement between nation states. We are not currently coordinating or cooperating with the

Russians; we are simply de-conflicting our air operations. This has become increasingly difficult in the crowded airspace as our operations come into closer proximity. In recent months, the Russians also introduced a number of new surface-to-air systems which can be employed to impact our freedom of maneuver. While our de-confliction efforts have been effective to date, as the fight expands in northern Syria and the battlespace becomes more congested, we should consider enhancing our de-confliction mechanisms with the Russians.

We continue to see **Iranian malign influence across Iraq and Syria**. While they currently are focused on countering ISIS in Iraq, we remain concerned about Iran's efforts to prop up the Syrian regime against the opposition and its desire to exploit Shia population centers to increase their malign influence, not just in Syria, but also in Arab states across the region. This supports their long-term aspiration to achieve regional hegemony. Moreover, we are watching closely for indications and warnings of decreasing Iranian concern regarding the threat posed by ISIS, leading to a potential shift to targeting U.S. and coalition personnel and infrastructure in an effort to influence a potential long-term U.S. security presence. Furthermore, we must take care to ensure that our actions do not unintentionally strengthen the Iranian position within the region.

The military campaign plan to defeat ISIS is on track in both Iraq and Syria. The coalition's "by, with and through" approach is proving effective. Recognizing that ISIS will be defeated militarily, **we want to ensure that we have an enduring posture in the region to support and enable partners' efforts to preserve security and stability**. Iraq remains an anchor in the region and we would be wise to continue to support their efforts going forward. We have a willing partner in Iraq and Prime Minister al-Abadi has clearly articulated a desire for

continued U.S. support post-ISIS. We are working with the GoI to finalize a Five-Year Plan to ensure enhanced cooperation. This presents an opportunity to preserve gains achieved to date, while strengthening key relationships and countering malign influence in the region.

Operation FREEDOM'S SENTINEL and Resolute Support Mission (Afghanistan). The Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) are beginning their third year with full responsibility for security with limited U.S. or coalition support. They continue to take the fight to the Taliban and, despite some territorial losses, have retained control of major population areas and key lines of communication. While the Taliban made gains in 2016, namely in the north and south, in most cases, the ANDSF quickly responded to and reversed some of those gains over the past year. While the balance of power favors the government, neither side is currently able to achieve its stated objectives. Looking ahead, it is **essential that we continue to assist the ANDSF in addressing their capability gaps, particularly in the areas of aviation, casualty evacuation (CASEVAC), personnel management and development, logistics, and sustainment.** Our sustained force presence, over 8,400 U.S. military personnel, will allow us to conduct counter-terrorism operations and meet our requirements for staffing the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led Resolute Support (RS) Mission. However, the RS Mission still has **a shortfall of a few thousand personnel needed to conduct the complementary mission of training, advising, and assisting the ANDSF.**

In 2015, U.S. Forces-Afghanistan (USFOR-A) worked with the Afghans to develop a **Sustainable Security Strategy based upon three key tenets: "Fight, Hold, Disrupt."** The strategy identifies areas the Afghans will hold, areas they will fight to retain, and areas where

they will conduct an economy of force effort and disrupt the enemy if they appear, Afghan resources permitting. The ANDSF continues to make progress in implementing this strategy, thereby assuming a more proactive stance in addressing multiple threats while securing the population and denying terrorist safe havens. As General Nicholson, the commander of the RS Mission and USFOR-A stated, "[The Afghans'] ability to deal with simultaneous crises ... is a sign of an army that's growing in capability, [and] that's maturing in terms of its ability to handle simultaneity and complexity on the battlefield."

While the ANDSF continues to make progress, they do face a number of significant challenges. Poor leadership and corruption are two key factors that need further improvement and President Ashraf Ghani has made addressing these issues a top priority for the Government of the Islamic Republic of Afghanistan (GIRoA). The GIRoA established the Anti-Corruption Justice Center in 2016 with the help of the international community and has already tried, convicted, and sentenced senior Afghan officials for corruption. Below are other challenges and critical capability gaps must be addressed.

ANDSF casualty rates – High ANDSF casualties remain a concern. This can be attributed to several factors, including poor leadership, corruption, tactics, and training. Deficiencies in ANDSF leadership occur primarily because of patronage vice merit-based appointments. The extensive use of static checkpoints and the lack of training on how to defend them, as well as a more aggressive posture – which has resulted in the ANDSF more frequently taking the lead and actively taking the fight to the enemy – have also contributed to an increased number of casualties. The ANDSF also experienced an increase in the number of insurgent attacks on

inadequately protected fixed positions, and poor and corrupt leadership also may have contributed to higher casualty rates. The ANDSF lacked an operational readiness cycle (ORC) to ensure forces are well-rested and well-trained before returning to the fight. During the Winter Campaign this year, many ANDSF units successfully established ORCs, and our advisors have fostered an increased focus on company-level training and leadership development.

Afghan Air Force – The Afghan Air Force (AAF) and Special Mission Wing (SMW) continue to build capability. Their ability to provide airlift, casualty evacuation, and aerial fires has steadily improved as the U.S. provides more aircraft to the AAF and as its pilots and crew gain additional operational experience. The Afghans are proving effective at integrating their AAF aviation assets as evidenced by a number of successful operations conducted over the past year. However, **significant capability gaps remain. The current rotary wing fleet consisting primarily of the Russian-made Mi-17 is both undersized and proving to be more expensive and difficult to sustain than originally envisioned and is experiencing a higher than expected attrition rate.** Going forward, transitioning from Russian to U.S. airframes will ensure Afghan forces have a more sustainable fleet that is interoperable with U.S. forces and will enhance the Afghans' ability to operate independently of coalition forces. The U.S. government is considering a critical AAF initiative to replace the unsustainable Russian-manufactured aircraft fleet and make up for combat losses in Afghan transport helicopters by providing U.S. UH-60s. The DoD-request of $814.5M for FY17 for the first year of our plan to recapitalize the Afghan fleet provides funding to procure 53 UH-60s, with refurbishment and modification of the first 18; 30 additional armed MD-530F helicopters; 6 additional A-29 attack aircraft; and five AC-208s. The requested FY2017 Afghan Security Forces Fund (ASFF) budget, including the

additional funds for the first year of this proposed aviation initiative, went to Congress on 10 Nov 2016. The FY17 proposal is pending approval and we appreciate your support in reaching resolution as soon as possible to mitigate the gaps in Afghan aerial fires and lift capabilities. Transition from Mi-17 to UH-60 airframes will eventually eliminate reliance on Russian sourced parts for maintenance requirements. With our support, we can expect the AAF will continue to build needed capability over the next few years and into the future.

Influence of external actors – Stability in Afghanistan is further challenged by the malign influence of external actors. The enablement of violent extremist groups operating inside of Afghanistan and along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region, receiving sanctuary or support from outside governments, is of particular concern. **So long as these elements remain, they will threaten our hard-earned gains and regional stability writ large.**

Pakistan's shared border with Afghanistan remains a safe haven for terrorist and violent extremist elements. There are 20 U.S.-designated terrorist organizations present today in Afghanistan and Pakistan. The Taliban serves as a facilitator to some of these groups' operations. The death of Taliban Supreme Leader Mullah Akhtar Mansour in a U.S. strike on 21 May 2016 had a disruptive impact on the Taliban and gave a psychological boost to the Afghans. However, the group still presents a formidable threat to stability in the Afghanistan-Pakistan (Af-Pak) sub-region. The convergence of these groups and, in particular, the convergence of the Afghan Taliban and its component, the Haqqani Network, and Lashkar-e-Tayyiba, is of particular concern given the direct threat posed to U.S. and Coalition personnel and the Afghan government. Key to improving the security environment in Afghanistan is eliminating sanctuary

of militant groups in Pakistan's territory. The U.S. maintains consistent diplomatic pressure on Pakistan to take appropriate steps to deny safe haven and work to improve the security of the tumultuous Af-Pak border region.

Illicit narcotics production and trafficking – Illicit narcotics production and trafficking continue to flourish in Afghanistan, particularly in areas where state institutions are weak. The United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime estimated 2016 Afghanistan poppy cultivation to be 201,000 hectares with a net opium yield of 4,800 metric tons and a farm gate value of $900M, which is a 57 percent increase in revenue generated from the opium trade. In Afghanistan, a symbiotic relationship exists between the insurgency and narcotics trafficking where traffickers provide weapons, funding, and material support to the insurgency in exchange for protection. Additionally, some insurgent commanders traffic drugs to finance operations. However, trafficking is not limited to insurgent-controlled areas. The narcotics trade undermines governance and rule of law throughout Afghanistan and plays a critical role in underwriting corruption and a loss of confidence by the Afghan people in the GIRoA.

Regionally, USCENTCOM supports law enforcement counterdrug and border security training, equipping of regional partners, construction activities, and information sharing initiatives to build the capacity of our security force partners that aid in the regional response to illicit drugs trafficking. Counterdrug activities are a critical component of USCENTCOM's theater security cooperation strategy; provide for regional engagement and comprise a significant source of security assistance funding in Central Asia. These efforts

improve regional illicit drug detection and interdiction and improve overall border security for the detection of other forms of contraband, including weapons and IED materials.

Amidst the challenges confronting Afghanistan today are many **opportunities**. Most notably, **we have willing partners in the GIRoA and ANDSF and our collaboration in support of common objectives continues to pay significant dividends**. Following are three areas in particular where potential "game-changing" opportunities exist and merit our sustained commitment.

Government of National Unity – The Government of National Unity (GNU) survived several political crises in 2016. President Ashraf Ghani and Chief Executive Officer Abdullah Abdullah provided the leadership that has enabled progress to be made in a number of areas, as well as the development of the framework for enduring partnerships with NATO and the United States. Nevertheless, significant challenges still exist and must be addressed. While the NUG provides needed structure and a source of stability for Afghanistan, it remains fragile. Although the ANDSF has remained apolitical so far, failure of the NUG could threaten ANDSF cohesion and the progress achieved throughout the country. Our message to the political elites of Afghanistan has been that "we respect your political progress, but please do not allow political tensions to undo the hard fought gains you have made."

The International Community's Demonstrated Commitment to Afghanistan – Thirty-nine NATO allies and partner nations committed more than 13,500 troops to sustain the Resolute Support Mission beyond 2016. **Thirty nations have also pledged more than $800 million**

annually to sustain Afghan security forces through 2020. Combined with the requested U.S. commitment of $3.5 billion for FY2017 and additional funding from Afghanistan, a total of more than $4.3 billion has been pledged for the ANDSF for 2017. Additionally, **seventy-five countries and 26 international organizations confirmed their intention in 2016 at the Brussels Conference on Afghanistan to provide $15.2B for Afghan development during the 2017-2020 period.** The International Community's strong showing, coupled with the continued commitment of U.S. troops in Afghanistan beyond 2016, has bolstered Afghan confidence and resolve and will surely pay dividends going forward.

Counter-terrorism (CT) Platform – The existence of violent extremist groups in Afghanistan requires a U.S. presence in the region that can monitor and address threats, even as the United States helps to build the Afghans' capability to deter terrorist exploitation of Afghan territory. As we adjust the U.S. CT mission, our support to the NATO TAA mission will also evolve in the coming year. Currently, advisory efforts are at four of the six corps and police zone levels, in addition to the Afghan Special Security Forces (ASSF) and the AAF. In 2017, we will advise all six corps and police zones to provide critical support where needed to capitalize on the success and continued implementation of the sustainable security strategy.

Although we see encouraging progress being made in Afghanistan, it remains a very challenging environment. While the ANDSF confronts difficulties in a number of areas, they are providing for the security of their country, achieving good effects against the Taliban, and building much-needed capacity and momentum while gaining increasing confidence in what is still a tough fight. Additionally, although it does face significant challenges, the GIRoA, under the leadership

of President Ashraf Ghani and Chief Executive Abdullah Abdullah, has proven to be a reliable and willing partner. **The U.S. and our coalition partners have invested greatly in Afghanistan over the last 15+ years. The country merits our continued demonstrated commitment given our national security interests in the sub-region, namely protection of the U.S. Homeland.** By strengthening our partners and weakening our enemies we will achieve increased stability in that strategically important part of the world.

Iran. Iran poses the most significant threat to the Central Region and to our national interests and the interests of our partners and allies. We have not seen any improvement in Iran's behavior since the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA), addressing Iran's nuclear program, was finalized in July 2015. **Iran aspires to be a regional hegemon** and its forces and proxies oppose U.S. interests in Iraq, Yemen, Lebanon, Gaza, and Syria, and seek to hinder achievement of U.S. objectives in Afghanistan and some Central Asian States. They also are working to subvert the GoI by establishing a long-term presence within Iraq's security forces. Of note, Iran exerts influence and a degree of control over the majority of the nearly 100,000 Shia militias within the PMF. Furthermore, **Iran has expanded cooperation with Russia in Syria** in ways that threaten U.S. interests in the region.

The JCPOA removed a key threat posed by Iran for at least a number of years. Unfortunately, the agreement has led some to believe that we have largely addressed the Iranian problem set and that is not the case. **In addition to its nuclear weapons potential, Iran presents several credible threats.** They have a robust theater ballistic missile program, and we remain concerned

about their cyber and maritime activities, as well as the activities of Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps – Qods Forces (IRGC-QF) and their network of affiliates.

Iran implements its strategy primarily within the "gray zone," the space short of conventional conflict where miscalculation can easily occur, leading to escalatory conflict and misunderstanding. Iran fosters instability by funding and promoting a threat network that employs provocation, violence, and covert arms transfers that serve as the stimulants for a range of conflicts across the region. It complements this subversive arm with conventional military provocation and overt threats to close key maritime sea lanes, especially at critical international economic chokepoints, namely the Strait of Hormuz and the BAM Strait, which puts global political stability and economic prosperity at risk.

Recognizing that **Iran poses the greatest long-term threat to U.S. interests in the Central Region**, we must seize opportunities to both reassure our allies and shape Iran's behavior. In order to contain Iranian expansion, roll back its malign influence, and blunt its asymmetric advantages, we must engage them more effectively in the "gray zone" through means that include a strong deterrence posture, targeted counter-messaging activities, and by building partner nations' capacity. Through both messaging and actions, **we must also be clear in our communications and ensure the credibility of U.S. intentions**. Iran must believe there will be prohibitive consequences if it chooses to continue its malign activities designed to foment instability in the region. The U.S. Government should also consider communicating directly with Iran's leadership to improve transparency and lessen the potential for miscalculation.

To further strengthen deterrence against Iran, we must also take the necessary proactive measures to build the capacity of partners and allies in the region. Ideally we want to improve interoperability, expand communication, and enhance security mechanisms. **Stronger, more capable partners, able and willing to assume a greater role in countering Iran, will serve to further enhance deterrence and improve stability in the region.**

In addition to ready military actions, we must support the broader USG strategy with regard to Iran which should include new diplomatic initiatives that provide Iran with viable alternatives to its present course. While Iran continues to pose the most significant threat to regional security, we remain optimistic and believe that by taking proactive measures and reinforcing our resolve we can lessen Iran's ability to negatively influence outcomes in the future.

Yemen. Yemen remains a critically unstable state engrossed in a civil war that has produced a significant humanitarian crisis and growing instability ripe for exploitation by VEOs, most notably al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula (AQAP) and the ISIS affiliate, IS-Yemen. The lack of a comprehensive peace agreement that leads to a durable resolution of the conflict under a unified Yemeni government further contributes to continued uncertainty in the country.

The civil war between the Republic of Yemen Government (RoYG) and the alliance of Former President of Yemen Ali Abdullah Saleh- and Huthis has entered its third year with little progress made towards achieving an enduring resolution despite concerted efforts by the United Nations, the broader International Community, and regional stakeholders. **While the United States is not directly involved in the civil war, we are providing limited assistance to the Kingdom of**

Saudi Arabia (KSA)-led coalition in an effort to help protect their territorial integrity and sovereign borders. Huthi forces have seized and attacked military border outposts inside KSA territory and continue to occupy Saudi lands. Ballistic missile attacks launched from Yemen have struck deep into the country causing casualties and potentially threatening the Islamic holy sites in Mecca. We will continue to work to resolve the conflict as an ending to the war through a comprehensive political agreement provides the surest security of Saudi's Arabia's border and territorial integrity , enables us to conduct counter-terrorism operations, allows the population to receive food and medicine, and blocks Iranian malign activities. Until the war is over, we will assist Saudi Arabia in its efforts to defend against these attacks and restore the territorial integrity of their country.

Our primary focus in Yemen remains protecting the U.S. homeland from threats posed by VEOs operating within Yemen's ungoverned spaces, while **ensuring freedom of navigation and commerce** through the southern Red Sea and the Bab al Mandeb (BAM) Strait. Al Qaeda in the Arabian Peninsula has indicated clear desire and ability to conduct attacks on the U.S. Homeland. Ongoing U.S. unilateral counter-terrorism operations and determined efforts by UAE in leading RoYG and Yemeni tribal forces, as demonstrated during the Mukalla offensive in April 2016, have degraded and disrupted AQAP's operational networks and reduced their access to sources of financial support. Despite the complexity of the environment, our efforts aimed at degrading AQAP remain critical to protecting our national security interests in the region and must continue.

In October 2016, **the Iranian-supported BAM Maritime Threat Network (BMTN)** demonstrated the ability to threaten freedom of navigation by successfully attacking a UAE vessel and a Saudi warship, and attempting to attack U.S. Navy warships in the southern Red Sea. We responded swiftly and decisively, destroying several Huthi coastal defense radar sites. While the origin of these attacks is found in the ROYG-Huthi conflict, the threats posed by the BMTN to the safe passage of vessels, either through deliberate action or unintentional acts, has the potential for significant strategic and economic impacts throughout the region. We continue to closely monitor the BMTN and remain prepared to promptly and decisively respond to any threats.

Going forward, our efforts against violent, non-state actors and support for similar efforts by our regional partners will remain our primary focus in Yemen. At the same time, we continue to do what we can to enable ongoing diplomatic efforts aimed at achieving a resolution to the hostilities that pose an enduring threat to stability in the country and the region writ large.

Countering Terrorism and Violent Extremism. The Central Region remains the global epicenter for terrorism and violent Islamist extremism and the resulting turmoil continues to bleed across geographic combatant command "seams." **Terrorism and violent extremism represent trans-regional threats, where malign actors seek to exploit ungoverned and under-governed spaces and vulnerable, disenfranchised populations worldwide.**

One aspect of this threat that makes it particularly challenging is the **terrorists' and VEOs' ability to operate across multiple domains and in both physical and virtual spaces.** Today,

the unprecedented global access achieved through the use of the Internet and various social media platforms enables terrorist and violent extremist groups to promulgate their radicalized ideologies while reaching a vast pool of potential recruits, many willing to conduct lone wolf-style attacks on behalf of these groups. Also, as we have seen with ISIS, the ability of violent extremist groups to **operate effectively in the virtual battlespace, makes them more challenging to defeat due to the nature of that domain**. As we degrade their physical capability, groups often shift focus to the virtual battlespace while their forces consolidate and regroup. We must continue to identify attributable and non-attributable methods and techniques for combatting groups in the virtual domain.

We must also find ways to address the drivers of instability that create the conditions that allow these groups to flourish. The root causes of instability must be dealt with if we hope to achieve a lasting defeat of terrorist and violent extremist groups operating in the USCENTCOM AOR. **The people of the region must lead this effort; we cannot do it for them**. However, we can and will continue to support and promote their efforts wherever possible.

We cannot allow terrorist groups and violent extremist organizations to operate uncontested, enabling them to grow stronger and expand their global reach. **By working together with our Interagency Partners and the International Community, operating from multiple strategic platforms around the globe and across all domains, we will reduce the gaps and "seams" exploited by these groups and better protect our interests against this common threat.**

Our Partner Nations in the Central Region. Below are synopses of the current state of affairs, including challenges, opportunities, and status of our military-to-military (mil-to-mil) relationships with partner nations, except Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, Iran, and Yemen which were addressed in the previous section, "Key Focus Areas" (see pages 13-31).

The Gulf States – The Gulf States are among our best partners in the region. The Gulf Cooperation Council's (GCC) willingness to provide basing and access for U.S. forces is crucial to our ability to operate militarily in the USCENTCOM AOR. The GCC countries provide critical nodes for achieving operational objectives and continued success against ISIS. Their troops and aircraft continue to play a key role in the ongoing fight against this terrorist organization. At leader-level summits in 2015 and 2015, the GCC countries committed to pursue collective defense initiatives, including joint counter-terrorism and ballistic missile defense; however, progress towards those ends has been relatively slow. Nevertheless, the GCC's desire to create a unified military command and more closely coordinated economic policy could create opportunities for greater interoperability between GCC and coalition forces over the medium- to long-term. While individual GCC nations' sometimes divergent foreign policies present an obstacle to achieving a unified defense posture, we remain committed to helping them achieve this desired end state through senior leader engagements, combined exercises, and more standardized equipment and training. As agreed upon at the May 2015 Camp David Summit, we have increased cooperation on maritime security, military preparedness, arms transfers, cybersecurity, counter-terrorism, and logistics interoperability. Our total GCC FMS open case portfolio is valued at over $150B and continues to help our partners defend their sovereignty and economic interests against emerging threats. As Gulf countries look to the United States for

military equipment, training, and assistance, it is essential that we reinforce efforts to include them in our joint endeavors to defeat regional threats posed by violent extremism and Iran's malign influence. Through our continued support for and collaboration with our GCC partners we will positively impact stability and security in the strategically important Central Region.

Bahrain is an important partner in the region, hosting USCENTCOM's naval component, U.S. Navy Central Command (NAVCENT) and U.S. Fifth Fleet Headquarters and Combined Maritime Forces in Manama at the Naval Support Activity Bahrain and Isa Air Base, respectively. The Bahrainis have actively supported coalition operations against ISIS in Syria since the start of the C-ISIS Campaign in September 2014, primarily by allowing us continued use and access to these facilities. They also continue to support Saudi-led operations in Yemen. We are making strides in our collaborative efforts to enhance the Bahraini Coast Guard's capacity, which aim to enable Bahrain to expand its role in countering piracy and violent extremism in the region's maritime domain. Internally, the Bahrainis are dealing with a tough domestic economic hit by low oil prices and a persistent, low-level threat from Iranian-backed militant groups, and we continue to provide appropriate assistance to help them address the security threat. While we have historically enjoyed a strong mil-to-mil relationship with our Bahraini counterparts, the slow progress on key FMS cases, specifically additional F-16 aircraft and upgrades to Bahrain's existing F-16 fleet, due to concerns of potential human rights abuses in the country, continues to strain our relationship. We continue to urge the Government of Bahrain to reverse steps it has taken over the past year to reduce the space for peaceful political expression in its Shia population and have encouraged the Bahrainis to implement needed

political reforms in the country while reassuring them of our strong commitment to our valued partnership.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia (KSA) is undertaking potentially far-reaching economic and related reforms under the banner of Vision 2030 and the National Transformation Plan. The goal of these measures is to diversify the Saudi economy and generate increased economic growth in the wake of low oil prices, as well as expanded opportunities for the nation's burgeoning youth population. The Kingdom is a key regional leader, calling upon partner nations to join them in addressing regional challenges, including Iranian malign influence. Having actively supported the fight against ISIS in the early stages of the campaign, KSA shifted its priority of effort to Yemen in 2015 where it leads the coalition against the Saleh- and Iranian-backed Huthis, who continue to pose a threat to Yemen's internal stability, security in KSA's southern border region, and the flow of commerce through the Bab al Mandeb Strait. The Saudis also are concerned about the threat posed by VEOs operating in Yemen, including the al Qaeda affiliate, AQAP, and the ISIS affiliate, IS-Y. We are principally focused on helping KSA to improve its target development and accountability processes in order to reduce incidence of civilian casualties, while also providing them with focused logistics and intelligence sharing support. Our long-standing partnership with KSA remains critical to maintaining stability in the region given their influence in the GCC and among many Muslim-majority countries. Our mil-to-mil relationship represents the strongest component of that partnership and continues to serve as the foundation for productive collaboration. By continuing to provide opportunities for the Saudis to enhance their defense capabilities, mainly through our substantive training and exercise program and

robust FMS valued at $109B in open cases, we aim to improve interoperability while effectively addressing challenges in pursuit of our shared security goals and objectives.

Kuwait continues to be one of our strongest allies in the Central Region. Owing to the generous provisions of the Defense Cooperation Agreement, the Kuwaitis provide one of the most permissive environments in the USCENTCOM AOR with respect to access, basing, and overflight in support of U.S. and coalition presence in theater. Kuwait hosts the forward headquarters of USCENTCOM's army component, U.S. Army Central Command (ARCENT). Kuwait is also the most active combat support logistics hub globally and plays a critical role in support of ongoing operations in Iraq, Syria, and Yemen. Kuwait utilizes its leadership role in the GCC to help mediate internal GCC rifts while promoting a regional response to crises. Kuwait has also led the GCC in helping to address the regional refugee crisis emanating from Syria and been an invaluable partner in supporting the Iraqi government's C-ISIS efforts. Our mil-to-mil relationship with the Kuwaitis remains strong. Going forward we will look to pursue additional opportunities for joint training and further collaboration in support of common objectives.

The relationship between the United States and **Oman** remains strong, strengthened by our shared interests in the region and expanding access to Omani bases and ports. Oman is consistently viewed as a source of stability in the Gulf Region, and its neutral stance has enabled it to serve as a key interlocutor, most notably with Yemen and Iran. Of note, in October 2016, Oman's leadership facilitated the release of two U.S. citizens held by the Huthis in Sanaa, Yemen. Additionally, Oman's strategic location on the Arabian Sea, outside of the Bab el

Mandeb Strait and the Strait of Hormuz provides USCENTCOM with access to key logistical, operational, and contingency capabilities that are crucial to maintaining open sea lines of communication. While Oman does face significant challenges, namely a growing threat from VEOs in neighboring Yemen and a declining economy that could potentially impact its youth population, the leadership of the country is taking appropriate steps to address these and other issues. We enjoy a good relationship with the Omani military and will continue to work closely with them in support of shared interests.

Qatar remains a highly valued partner, providing critical access and basing in support of coalition forces and operations being conducted in Iraq, Syria, Afghanistan, and elsewhere in the Central Region. The country hosts more than 10,000 U.S. and Coalition service members at Al-Udeid Air Base, home of USCENTCOM's Forward Headquarters, our air component, U.S. Air Forces Central Command (AFCENT), and its Combined Air Operations Center (CAOC). Qatar's Armed Forces also continue to support external operations in Syria and Yemen. In Syria, given their relationships with a wide range of actors, including more moderate elements, the Qataris are well-positioned to play an influential role in facilitating a political resolution to the conflict. Like most GCC countries, they continue to demand the removal of Bashar al-Assad as part of any resolution. Qatar has indicated a strong desire to enhance its partnership with the United States, both in terms of training engagements with U.S. forces and procurement of U.S. military equipment. Our continued role in their military modernization and development presents an invaluable opportunity to help expand their capability while strengthening our mil-to-mil relationship with a key and critical partner in the region.

The United Arab Emirates (UAE) is one of our most steadfast and capable partners in the USCENTCOM AOR. The Emirates have clearly demonstrated a willingness and ability to take an active role in shaping outcomes in the Central Region. The country hosts more than 4,000 U.S. service members and provides critical support for U.S. operations, goals, and objectives. The UAE was among the first countries to join the Counter-ISIS Coalition in 2014. While their primary focus has since shifted to support the ongoing KSA-led military campaign in Yemen, UAE continues to provide support to several of the C-ISIS Coalition's key lines of effort, including counter-messaging, counter-financing, and stemming the flow of foreign fighters. In Yemen, the UAE serves as the leading ground element in ongoing operations against the Saleh- and Iranian-backed Huthis. The Emirates are also supporting our efforts to counter the al Qaeda affiliate, AQAP. In April, using local fighters and tribal militias, the Emirates played a critical role in liberating Mukalla, driving AQAP elements out of the port city and thereby denying them a key source of revenue. In conjunction with its military efforts, the UAE is heavily focused on providing humanitarian assistance to ease the crisis facing Yemen's population. We value our strong relationship with the Emirates and seek to build upon our robust mil-to-mil relationship, including by concluding a new Defense Cooperation Agreement that could serve as a foundation for expanded, mutually beneficial defense cooperation. We will work to expand our collaboration, specifically in the areas of security cooperation and foreign military sales. Additionally, we will work with the Emirates to promote their leadership role among partner nations in the region.

The Levant – The Levant represents the epicenter of ethno-sectarian tension and conflict in the USCENTCOM AOR. Partner nations in this sub-region continue to struggle with the impacts of

the fight against ISIS, as well as the ongoing civil war in Syria, which is an "engine of instability" in and of itself. The persistent conflict and resulting widespread unrest have caused an expanding humanitarian crisis with ramifications that reach far beyond the USCENTCOM AOR. Stability in the Levant is further complicated by competition for influence therein from outside actors, principally Iran and Russia. Many of the challenges present today in the Levant originate from or affect neighboring countries and thus are trans-regional in nature and require cross-COCOM coordination. We routinely work closely with our colleagues in U.S. European Command, U.S. Africa Command, and other USG agencies and organizations to ensure that our various efforts are complementary and well-synchronized.

With its strategic location, control of the Suez Canal, enduring peace treaty with Israel coupled with a religious and cultural Pan-Arab influence, **Egypt** remains a stalwart partner in pursuit of shared Middle East policy objectives that include counter-terrorism, counter-violent extremism, and improved regional stability. Of particular concern is the threat posed by the ISIS affiliate, IS-Sinai which conducts frequent attacks against the Egyptian Armed Forces (EAF) and security services. While the EAF has managed to contain violence in the Sinai Peninsula without a comprehensive strategy to defeat IS-Sinai, we have a vested interest in helping them to effectively address this threat to ensure that the Sinai does not become a safe haven for extremist elements, including by providing additional bilateral military and security training. Egypt is further challenged by a weak economy and widespread unemployment or under-employment, as well as an aggressive approach to countering internal threats which makes its population highly susceptible to radicalization by extremist elements. Continued U.S. support to Egypt is crucial to our strategic partnership, and our long-standing, resilient mil-to-mil relationship represents a key

pillar of that partnership. Over the past several months, we have expanded our collaboration while taking steps to bolster our force protection measures and rebalance the Multinational Force Observer (MFO) mission in the Sinai. In the coming months, we will continue to work closely with the EAF to further enhance their counter-terrorism capabilities and improve the security of their borders through continued engagement and our robust assistance and security cooperation programs.

The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is one of our strongest and most reliable partners in the Levant sub-region. Jordan provides access, basing, and overflight equal to or greater than that provided by any other partner in the USCENTCOM AOR. The Jordanian Armed Forces (JAF) and the Royal Jordanian Air Force (RJAF) continue to make key contributions in support of the Counter-ISIS Campaign. With U.S. and coalition assistance, the JAF have fortified Jordan's borders with Iraq and Syria, while enabling the International Community's ongoing efforts to address the burgeoning humanitarian crisis manifesting inside of Jordan (~650,000 refugees) and in two camps located along the border in southern Syria (~55,000-65,000 IDPs) . It is imperative that we remain actively engaged with our Jordanian partners. Jordan provides a much-needed moderate Islamic voice in the region and is a trusted intermediary in efforts to advance progress between the Israelis and Palestinians. Our strong mil-to-mil relationship and continued demonstrated support for the Government of Jordan, the JAF, and the RJAF remains critical to ensuring that Jordan is able to effectively manage the broad range of challenges facing the country and the region now and in the future.

Lebanon remains a key partner in our efforts to counter violent extremism in the Central Region, and their ground forces offer one of the greatest returns on investment in the region. They are routinely countering groups that include ISIS and Al Nusra Front, denying them freedom of movement, and strengthening the country's border defenses with our continued support. U.S. security assistance to Lebanon has enhanced the Lebanese Armed Forces' (LAF) ability to counter malign influences and terrorist elements operating within the country. A strong and capable LAF acts as a counterweight to the militant arm of Lebanese Hezbollah (LH), while diminishing LH's claim as the sole "resistance" in Lebanon. While LH has been preoccupied with its involvement in the fight in Syria in support of the Assad Regime, the LAF has gained increasing credibility among the Lebanese populace as the most respected institution in the country. On 31 October 2016, the Lebanese parliament ended the over two-year presidential vacancy with the appointment of President Michel Aoun, a Maronite Christian and leader of the Free Patriotic Movement Party. While this positive development ended political gridlock and restored government functions, significant challenges remain, exacerbated by the civil war in neighboring Syria. Of particular concern are the approximately 1+ million Syrian refugees in Lebanon. This population presents political, economic, and security challenges to Prime Minister Hariri and his newly formed government. In addition to straining national resources, the Syrian refugee population is mostly Sunni and thus could threaten the fragile sectarian balance of power in the country. The humanitarian burden facing Lebanon will require significant international assistance to bolster limited local resources. Our continued support for this valued partner is both merited and has proven to pay tremendous dividends as the LAF has routinely demonstrated the ability to make best use of U.S. assistance to increase its capability and capacity and bring about positive, measurable results.

Central and South Asia – Our primary interests in the Central and South Asia (CASA) sub-region are to prevent the establishment of terrorist safe havens, assure continued U.S. access, and support the sovereignty and independence of partner nations. Our engagement strategy is focused on these three interests and strengthening our bilateral relationships with the seven partner nations. We also encourage multi-lateral cooperation amongst these same seven nations, and our annual CASA Chiefs of Defense Conference serves as a mechanism for facilitating expanded dialogue and increased cooperation. This past year, we also held the highly successful inaugural CASA Directors of Military Intelligence Conference. The increased participation and elevated levels of mil-to-mil discussions clearly convey increased appetite for further U.S.-led engagement.

Despite increasing Russian, Chinese, and Iranian pressure designed to limit U.S. influence in the sub-region, the U.S. maintains its regional position by focusing on security cooperation areas where we have a comparative advantage such as counter-terrorism, border security, defense institution building, and professional development. Several CASA governments support transit of supplies to U.S. troops in Afghanistan through the Northern Distribution Network. We anticipate a continued need for these access routes. In this regard, our CASA partners have been and continue to be strong partners in our efforts to stabilize Afghanistan. Other areas of shared interest include countering violent extremism and counter-narcotics. Our training and exercise programs in the CASA sub-region clearly demonstrate our strong commitment to addressing these and other common challenges. For example, Exercise STEPPE EAGLE, traditionally a trilateral exercise with the U.S., U.K., and Kazakhstan, has become more regional in scope with Tajikistan and the Kyrgyz Republic also now taking part. Additionally, we are increasing

multilateral collaboration with our CASA-wide annual USCENTCOM Exercise REGIONAL COOPERATION.

We share two primary concerns with our CASA partners regarding stability and security in the region: 1) persistent worries about the long-term stability and viability of Afghanistan and 2) the threat posed by returning foreign fighters. The United States and NATO's continued commitment to the ongoing Resolute Support Mission in Afghanistan is helping to assuage these concerns, primarily by bolstering the Afghan security forces' ability to defend their security interests. At the same time, we continue to pursue opportunities that would allow for increased information sharing, improved border security, and enhanced training and multi-lateral collaboration to support our shared interests.

While our efforts in Afghanistan and Pakistan continue to require significant investment, elsewhere in the CASA sub-region we have clearly demonstrated the ability to achieve good effects with modest investments in terms of building partner nations' capabilities, improving multi-lateral cooperation, and addressing common security threats. Going forward, we intend to strengthen relationships and build on previous accomplishments while working together with our Interagency Partners to explore and pursue new opportunities in this strategically important part of the world.

The U.S.-**Kazakhstan** relationship is our most advanced military relationship in Central Asia. We are making notable progress as the Kazakhstani Ministry of Defense continues to focus on institutional reform of its NCO corps, training management, human resources administration, and

professional military education system. This progress continues despite enduring Russian influence and a Kazakhstani economy that is still recovering from the recent downturn in oil and gas prices. Kazakhstan remains the most significant regional contributor to Afghan stability, donating money to the ANA Trust Fund, continuing to provide educational opportunities to Afghans, and offering technical support services. Kazakhstan is also moving closer to a United Nations peace-keeping operations deployment with a unit that has been trained with U.S. assistance. Looking at future opportunities to strengthen our partnership, Kazakhstan has expressed interest in working with the U.S. to improve its logistical, medical, and engineering military branches. Kazakhstan also partnered with the Arizona National Guard through our State Partnership program, providing us the ability to assist in this effort.

The Kyrgyz Republic, Central Asia's sole democracy, faces a number of challenges including economic and border security issues. The Kyrgyz Republic sees political pressure from its larger, more powerful neighbors, including Russia, hosting a small Russian airbase outside the capital, Bishkek. Despite ongoing challenges in our bilateral and security cooperation, we continue to seek opportunities to improve our mil-to-mil relationship. After a lengthy period of time during which few bilateral activities occurred, the Kyrgyz military may be increasingly receptive to higher level military engagements and expanded cooperation in the areas of border security, counter-narcotics, counter-terrorism, and countering violent extremism. Furthermore, we continue to assist the Kyrgyz in building a deployable peace-keeping (PK) hospital capability that should be ready to support United Nations PK operations in the near future. Looking ahead, we intend to pursue opportunities for increased cooperation while taking steps to strengthen our relationships with the Kyrgyz.

Pakistan remains a critical partner in the counter-terrorism fight. Twenty U.S-designated terrorist organizations operate in the Afghanistan-Pakistan sub-region; seven of the 20 organizations are in Pakistan. So long as these groups maintain safe haven inside of Pakistan they will threaten long-term stability in Afghanistan. Of particular concern to us is the Haqqani Network (HQN) which poses the greatest threat to coalition forces operating in Afghanistan. To date, the Pakistan military and security services have not taken lasting actions against HQN. We have consistently called upon the Pakistanis to take the necessary actions to deny terrorists safe haven and improve security in the Federally Administered Tribal Areas (FATA) along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region. We have seen some promising coordination between the Pakistan and Afghanistan militaries aimed at addressing instability in the Afghanistan-Pakistan border region. The Pakistan military in particular continues to conduct counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency operations in the FATA and facilitate, via ground and air lines of communication, the sustainment of coalition operations in Afghanistan.

This past year we became increasingly concerned about the growing threat posed by the ISIS affiliate, Islamic State-Khorasan (IS-K). Although their operational capacity has diminished as a result of U.S., Afghanistan, and Pakistan military operations, we remain focused on defeating the group in both countries. Of note, we were encouraged to see the Pakistani military plan and execute a recent named operation in which they set up simultaneous multiple blocking positions along the Afghanistan-Pakistan border in order to reinforce ANDSF efforts to disrupt IS-K activities.

We also continue to see ongoing tensions between Pakistan and neighboring India. India remains concerned about the lack of action against India-focused militants based in Pakistan and even responded militarily to terrorist attacks in India-held territory earlier this year. We assess that these types of attacks and the potential reactions, increase the likelihood for miscalculation by both countries. Furthermore, India's public policy to "diplomatically isolate" Pakistan hinders any prospects for improved relations. This is especially troubling as a significant conventional conflict between Pakistan and India could escalate into a nuclear exchange, given that both are nuclear powers. Additionally, Pakistan's increased focus on its eastern border detracts from its efforts to secure the western border with Afghanistan from incursion by Taliban and al-Qaida fighters. Security along the western border will nevertheless remain a priority for Islamabad, as the Pakistani military seeks to expand border control and improve paramilitary security.

While there are challenges with respect to the U.S.-Pakistani relationship, we have endeavored to maintain a substantial level of engagement with our Pakistani military counterparts. We continue to execute a robust joint exercise program. Most recently, the Pakistani Air Force sent airmen and aircraft to participate in Exercise RED FLAG and GREEN FLAG at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada this past summer. The Pakistani military also continues to support our efforts elsewhere in the region; most notably, the Pakistani Navy is the most consistent and longstanding participant, second only to the United States, in Combined Task Force (CTF)-150 (counter-terrorism operations) and CTF-151 (counter-piracy operations) led by U.S. Naval Forces Central (USNAVCENT). Our relationship with Pakistan remains a very important one. We look forward to continuing our engagement with the Pakistani military leadership, to include

the new Chief of the Army Staff, General Qamar Javed Bajwa, in the days ahead as we work together in pursuit of shared interests.

Our mil-to-mil relationship with **Tajikistan** is deepening despite Moscow's enduring ties and the presence of the 201st Military Base near Tajikistan's capital of Dushanbe, Russia's largest military base outside of its borders. China has also initiated a much stronger military cooperation partnership with Tajikistan, adding further complexity to Tajikistan's multi-faceted approach to security cooperation. Tajikistan's long border with Afghanistan remains the nation's top concern, as the Taliban intermittently fights for control of Afghanistan's Kunduz province, which is less than 160 miles from Dushanbe. These border concerns remain a focus area for U.S. security cooperation as we continue to develop the Tajiks' capacity to address violent extremism, terrorism, and narco-trafficking; enhance border security; and, confront other trans-regional threats.

Turkmenistan's UN-recognized policy of "positive neutrality" presents a challenge with respect to U.S. engagement. Our efforts to date have focused primarily on training, including in the areas of counter-narcotics and medical services. Due to Turkmenistan's shared border with Afghanistan, the Turkmen remain concerned about the continuing instability in Afghanistan and, separately, the potential for the return of foreign fighters. We are encouraged somewhat by Turkmenistan's expressed interest in increased mil-to-mil engagement with the U.S. within the limits of their "positive neutrality" policy.

We are cautiously optimistic about the possibility of **Uzbekistan's** improved relations with its neighbors in the region following the first presidential succession in the nation's 25-year history. This is a promising development given Uzbekistan's central and strategic geographic location, in the heart of Central Asia and bordering Afghanistan. President Mirziyoyev has reaffirmed the country's unwillingness to allow other nations to establish military bases in Uzbekistan, its restriction against aligning with foreign military or political blocs, and its self-imposed restriction against any type of expeditionary military operations. Despite these limitations, our bilateral mil-to-mil efforts are focused on helping the Uzbeks improve border security, enhance their counter-narcotic and counter-terrorism capabilities, and prevent the return of foreign fighters into the country, which are shared U.S. interests in the region. We remain committed to these security assistance efforts. We also are helping the Uzbek military, which is the largest military in Central Asia, to professionalize its forces through advisory support and assistance to its professional military institutions.

Required Programs, Capabilities and Resources. The security environment in the Central Region remains complex and highly volatile. To ensure we are able to effectively achieve our mandate to protect our national interests, we must be properly postured with the necessary capabilities and resources to pursue opportunities in support of our goals and objectives, and to prevail in our various endeavors throughout USCENTCOM's 20-country area of responsibility. Below are the programs, capabilities, and resources most critical to our success.

Building Partner Capacity. Building Partner Capacity (BPC) is essential to achieving our objectives in the Central Region. To improve stability in the USCENTCOM AOR and mitigate

the need for costly U.S. military intervention, we must be forward-leaning and empower our partners to meet internal security challenges and work collectively to counter common threats. BPC is a lower-cost alternative to U.S. boots on the ground, has longer-term sustainability, and is necessary for interoperable, combined coalition operations. As such it represents a high return investment in the future of the Central Region. **By building capacity and enabling partners to assume a larger role in providing for the stability and security of their sovereign spaces, we will enhance regional stability while still maintaining our critical access and influence in the region.** Other tangible by-products achieved through our BPC efforts include enhanced interoperability, improved security for forward deployed forces and diplomatic sites, continued access and influence, and more professional regional militaries comprised of forces learning the importance of rule of law and compliance with human rights norms. **Continued support of key partners engaged in the ongoing military campaign to defeat ISIS in Iraq and Syria is particularly important**. As important as long-term regional stability is BPC's focus on the threat environment and shaping the region is critical to better prepare and deter and counter state and non-state aggression. Our key partners' ability to procure U.S. weapons and equipment and increase interoperability with U.S. and coalition forces is critical to our success. Any reduction of U.S. assistance risks undermining our allies and creating a security vacuum for exploitation by state and non-state actors with counter-U.S. or violent intentions.

Foreign Military Financing and Foreign Military Sales. For decades, U.S. security assistance provided to countries including Saudi Arabia, Jordan, Yemen, Kuwait and Egypt, has helped create lasting partnerships and improve regional stability. Foreign Military Financing (FMF) assistance and the Foreign Military Sales (FMS) program enable countries to meet their defense

needs, while also promoting U.S. national security interests by strengthening coalitions and enhancing interoperability between and among U.S. and coalition forces. **When we provide defense systems through U.S. security assistance, we are not just providing our partners with capabilities, we are committing to a long-term relationship that includes sustainment of those capabilities.** The complex and technical nature of advanced defense systems often require continuous collaboration between countries. This may include training and support in the use of the equipment, maintenance assistance, and, in some cases, continuing help to update and modernize the equipment throughout its life-cycle.

Nevertheless, **we must better anticipate our partners' requirements and find ways to improve our FMF and FMS programs' processes to better meet demand in today's high-paced global security environment**. Delays in procurement and delivery can, over time, jeopardize relationships with buyer nations and the potential for future FMS and FMF transactions. It is imperative that we make the FMF and FMS processes more responsive to partner needs.

In recent years we have seen an increase in restrictions placed on assistance provided to partner nations, limiting their ability to acquire U.S. equipment based on human rights and/or political oppression of minority groups. While these are significant challenges that must be addressed, **the use of FMF and FMS as a mechanism to achieve changes in behavior has questionable effectiveness and can have unintended consequences**. We need to carefully balance these concerns against our desired outcomes for U.S. security assistance programs – both DoD and State-funded – to build and shape partner nations' capability, interoperability, and self-reliance in

support of broader U.S. foreign policy. We should avoid using the programs as a lever of influence or denial to our own detriment.

USCENTCOM Exercise and Training Program. The USCENTCOM Exercise Engagement Training Transformation (CE2T2) program enhances U.S. capability to support contingency operations while improving readiness and maintaining presence and access to the region. At the same time, the program indirectly increases partner nations' operational capability; demonstrates mutual commitment to regional security; ensures an effective coalition posture; strengthens relationships; and, improves combined command, control, and communications interoperability (C3I). More importantly, in light of the fact that today's conflicts are increasingly trans-regional, all-domain, and multi-functional in nature, bi-lateral and multi-lateral exercises support the unity of effort requirement for coalition operations.

The USCENTCOM CE2T2 program continues to grow in complexity and relevance with expanded participation throughout the USCENTCOM AOR during FY2016 and into FY2017. **Last year, the command conducted 45 USCENTCOM- and/or Component-sponsored bilateral and multi-lateral exercises with 41 partner nations and spanning seven Geographic and Functional Commands.** These exercises shape the perceptions of key audiences in the USCENTCOM AOR to support U.S. strategic goals of reassuring partners and deterring aggressive and malign behavior. Exercise objectives and outcomes include maintaining key relationships while demonstrating multilateral, as well as unilateral, capabilities. They also enable increased cooperation and interoperability with our partners and

help to reinforce a strong military posture in the region. This helps counter any false perception of the U.S. "abandoning" the region.

Continued, robust, and reliable funding is necessary to fully support exercises as planned. For example, insufficient resourcing of component requirements can result in curtailment or even cancellation of efforts like Exercise EAGER LION, an annual multi-lateral training event in Jordan. This sub-optimization of the USCENTCOM exercise and training program ultimately will affect U.S. Joint and Combined Force readiness and create a perceived lack of commitment to our coalition partners. Combined with BPC, FMS, and FMF, the USCENTCOM CE2T2 program also actively promotes and supports regional stability through increased partner action and capability. These engagements not only build interoperability at the highest levels of command, but the benefits derived at the lowest, tactical levels of command and logistics manifest in long-term professional and personal relationships among participating country staffs.

Information Operations. Information Operations (IO) will continue to serve as a key element in shaping the environment to reduce or avoid conflict and as a force multiplier in the information space during and after major combat and counter-insurgency operations. **We have an enduring responsibility to employ IO to counter trans-regional threats.** By utilizing IO as a comprehensive, long-term capability to degrade VEOs' effectiveness and counter state-sponsored destabilizing activities across the USCENTCOM AOR, the USG helps to improve regional stability while reducing the requirement for deployed U.S. forces. The Department of Defense (DoD), in concert with other USG agencies, has developed several IO campaigns, leveraging the latest technologies, which operate in the information domain. These campaigns

include counter-propaganda messaging in print media, radio, television, short message service, Internet, and social media, and take a proactive approach to coordinating these activities with the country teams and embassies in our AOR. The nature and scope of threats prevalent today in the USCENTCOM AOR necessitates a robust response, and **IO is a cost-effective application of DoD resources to deter aggression, counter destabilizing behavior, and decrease the potential for kinetic operations in order to protect USG and partner nation interests in the Central Region.**

Cyberspace Operations. USCENTCOM cyberspace operations are built on the foundation of cyber readiness and include both Department of Defense Information Network (DODIN) Operations and command-centric Defensive Cyberspace Operations. **Our top cyberspace priority is mission assurance; the goal is to preserve freedom of maneuver in cyberspace to assure access to both U.S. and foreign assets critical to military operations.** Efforts include, but are not limited to, helping to set priorities and contributing to the desired end-state of denying adversaries the ability to operate on our networks and impact our missions. We recognize the importance of maintaining a holistic approach to this evolving capability that emphasizes the need for a synchronized effort across the whole of government. While the full and proper implementation of all available USG/DoD technical defenses plays a vital role, the human element is the most important factor to protect and defend from malicious cyber activity. Looking ahead, USCENTCOM will continue to adapt our network defenses to detect, deter, and better react to known or anticipated threats.

Anti-Access Area Denial. Potential adversaries are actively investing in competitive responses that include anti-access/area denial (A2AD) systems to minimize U.S. influence and abilities. Adversaries are also pursuing "layered defenses" to directly challenge U.S. diplomacy and presence. An enemy may use combinations of kinetic (e.g., ballistic/cruise missiles, moored/floating mines, small boat swarms, submarines, aircraft, drones, irregular warfare using proxies, terrorism, WMD) and non-kinetic (e.g., GPS jamming, spoofing, cyber hacking, EMP, underground facilities, dispersal/camouflage of weapons/assets, shielding from aerial/satellite surveillance, decoys) capabilities to inhibit projection of force and/or precision strikes.

Intelligence, Surveillance, Reconnaissance Assets. USCENTCOM holds daily requirements for over 2,800 hours of full-motion video, thousands of still images, thousands of hours of signal intelligence, and other key intelligence collection sources. **These requirements do not reside only in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria, but span the entirety of the USCENTCOM AOR. It is the layering, synchronization, and prioritization of national, theater, and tactical ISR capabilities that enable USCENTCOM force protection of transition, stability, and combat forces.** This critical capability also performs several key functions including: battlespace awareness for partner and U.S. operational commanders, as well as indications and warning to guard against strategic threats and miscalculation; identification of fixed ground networks and facilities; location and tracking of adversary operational elements and units; mapping and development of adversary command and control; interdictions of facilitation entities, suppliers, and supply routes; and, characterization and targeting of funding centers and other support nodes. Our greatest difficulties in this fight remain in the development of enemy networks, groups, cells, and nodes that fight from within the populace. There are critical airborne ISR

functions that must be present to map this unconventional threat. In priority order they are: 1) full-motion video, 2) signals intelligence, and 3) geospatial intelligence. **USCENTCOM's requirements consistently outpace theater airborne ISR capacity and capability and the demand will continue to grow**. We are able to address some of the shortfall through cross-CCMD and partner-nation coordination and capacity development. We also need to explore innovative ways to develop capabilities for persistent ISR through experimentation and technology maturation and demonstration projects. **Additionally, we need to address the shortfalls associated with processing, exploitation, and dissemination of collected intelligence.** For the foreseeable future, in the absence of additional much-needed ISR assets, maintaining operational awareness on threats, risks, regional stability, and humanitarian crises will require constant attention, creative application of ISR, hard choices on the prioritization of resources, and the determination of acceptable risk to mission and forces.

Precision Munitions. Highly accurate munitions are vital components of our kinetic strike and integrated air and missile defense capabilities, to dominate and counter our adversaries' increasingly sophisticated networks of coastal and air defenses coupled with precision ballistic missiles. Missile interceptors, air- and sea-launched cruise missiles, precision air-to-ground and air-to-air missiles, and long-range precision ground-to-ground missiles work in concert to counter the growing threats we face today. **We appreciate Congress' continued support for the procurement/replenishment, development, and forward positioning of precision and specific purpose munitions that are critical to the way we currently fight** – in urban areas, with very specific rules of engagement designed to protect civilians and limit damage to infrastructure. \

Counter Unmanned Aerial Systems (C-UAS). The enemy Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) threat and employment in the USCENTCOM AOR is rapidly evolving. Numerous non-state actors including ISIS, al Qaida, Taliban, Lebanese Hezbollah, and Fatah al-Sham are using both commercial-off-the-shelf and military drones to conduct operations against U.S. and coalition forces. This threat has evolved from reconnaissance and surveillance missions to weaponized drone attacks resulting in battlefield casualties. State actors continue to increase the sophistication of their UAS with all countries in the USCENTCOM AOR utilizing various classes of UAS for operations. **Given the evolving threat, the need for an effective Counter-UAS capability that can defeat all classes of UAS remains a top priority.** To address this problem, USCENTCOM is working with various Defense agencies and Industry through the Joint Urgent Operational Need (JUON) process to develop and acquire an effective system to employ against UAS. The ability to rapidly respond to this emerging threat is critical to mission success and requires increased funding to promote innovative solutions with expedited testing and rapid acquisition.

Joint and Interagency Partners. To ensure success in the pursuit of shared goals and objectives, our Joint and Interagency Partners must also be properly postured with the necessary capabilities and resources. Below are two key partners that play a significant role in support of USCENTCOM's mission and merit continued Congressional backing.

Joint Improvised-Threat Defeat Organization (JIDO) – JIDO, an element of the Defense Threat Reduction Agency, is an invaluable organization that is even more important as we fight by, with and through our partners with fewer resources, but more exposed U.S.

personnel and equipment in the fight. Their ability to rapidly respond to emerging threats is essential to enabling our efforts to counter improvised threats (e.g., counter-facilitation, counter-tunneling, counter-UAS) and build partner capacity in support of our deployed warfighters. The expert JIDO personnel embedded within our formations at USCENTCOM's headquarters in Tampa, forward deployed, and across the globe, provide mission-critical analytical, planning, and rapid acquisition support. Having this invaluable joint organization that can expose the broader counter-IED network, identify future disruptive threats, stay in front of technological changes, and integrate our efforts across the Interagency to rapidly implement solutions is essential to our ability to protect our forces, defeat threat networks and build partner national capacity.

Global Engagement Center – The best way to defeat an idea is to present a better, more appealing idea to vulnerable and undecided audiences. **The State Department's Global Engagement Center (GEC) effectively coordinates, integrates, and synchronizes messaging to foreign audiences designed to undermine the disinformation espoused by violent extremist groups,** including ISIS and al Qaeda, while offering positive alternatives. The Center is focused on empowering and enabling partners, governmental and non-governmental, who are able to speak out against these groups and provide an alternative to ISIS's nihilist vision. To that end, the Center offers services ranging from planning thematic social media campaigns to providing factual information that counters disinformation to building capacity for third parties to effectively utilize social media to research and evaluation.

Required Authorities and Appropriations. Fluid environments require flexible authorities with sustained and timely funding to respond to changes in conditions and maintain momentum of operational forces. **We sincerely appreciate Congress' continued support for key authorities and appropriations needed for current and future operations and response to unforeseen contingencies.** The required authorities and resources listed below enable USCENTCOM to accomplish its mission and stated objectives in support of U.S. national interests and the interests of our partners in the Central Region.

Iraq Train & Equip Fund (ITEF). Iraq's ability to defeat ISIS requires professionalizing and building the capacity of the Iraqi Security Forces (ISF), including military or other security forces associated with the Government of Iraq, such as Kurdish and tribal security forces or other local forces with a national security mission. Most notably, the ongoing Coalition Military Campaign to defeat ISIS relies on indigenous Iraqi Security Forces to conduct ground operations against the enemy and liberate ISIS controlled territory. They have risen to the task and are making progress in this ongoing endeavor. While the initial training and equipping of the ISF focused heavily on developing Iraqi Army (IA) Brigades to conduct offensive operations, future efforts will shift to sustainment of combat capability and hold forces **to ensure that liberated areas remain under the control of the GoI and that these forces are able to counter remaining ISIS pockets and any other VEOs which may emerge and attempt to fill the void created by the defeat of ISIS.** These hold forces will be a combination of local tribal fighters and police forces.

Syria Train & Equip Program. Protecting the United States from terrorists operating in Syria and setting the ultimate conditions for a negotiated settlement to end the conflict in that country will require the continued training and equipping of Vetted Syria Opposition (VSO) forces. Additional recruitment, retention, resupply, and support are central to our strategy to defeat ISIS in Syria. Our revised training approach is proving successful, improving the effectiveness and lethality of the force on path to a projected strength of up to 35,000 by the end of fiscal year 2017 and growing to 40,000 in 2018. **Procurement and manufacturing lead times for non-standard weapons and ammunition and delivery from varions foreign vendors complicates the already complex train and equip mission, so we appreciate as much flexibility as possible in authorizing and appropriating funds for this effort.** The SDF and VSOs continues to advance in defeating ISIS and holding and defending liberated areas, while also assisting local authorities in providing humanitarian and security assistance to the populace.

The Afghanistan Security Forces Fund (ASFF). Since 2005, U.S. provision of funds executed through ASFF has provided training, equipment, infrastructure, sustainment and salaries for a generated force of up to 352,000 Afghan National Defense and Security Forces (ANDSF) and 30,000 Afghan Local Police (ALP). **ASFF plays a critical role in enabling the ANDSF to secure Afghanistan with an effective and sustainable force** that is central to the U.S. strategy to prevent a Taliban or al Qaeda resurgence, defeat VEOs, and deny safe haven for external plotting against the U.S. Homeland and U.S. and partner nation interests in the region.

Afghanistan Aviation Transition Funding – The proposed Afghan Air Force (AAF) and Special Mission Wing (SMW) aviation transition program is critical to addressing capability gaps in Close Air Support (CAS) and lift for the ANDSF. **The program is designed to address the shortfall in available aircraft and trained pilots to ensure Afghan forces have the required aviation support and maintenance pipeline to move toward self-sustainment and increased independent operations.** DoD plans to achieve these results by transitioning the AAF and SMW to U.S.-manufactured rotary wing platforms. Although the availability of trained pilots remains a particular challenge for the ANDSF, recent successes are producing capable pilots and the recap plan is designed to ease the human capital burden over time. The additional capability that would be gained through the aviation transition program will provide the Afghans needed overmatch against insurgents and terrorists while improving ground forces' effectiveness and reducing ANDSF's casualty rates.

Coalition Support. The authorities and funding that underpin our ability to effectively conduct Coalition operations, including in support of partners whose contributions are critical, but who lack the resources to participate without our assistance, are key to our continued success. The Coalition Support Fund (CSF) provides the authority to reimburse certain Coalition partners for logistical and military support provided by that nation in connection with Iraq, Syria, and Afghanistan operations. The CSF also funds the Coalition Readiness Support Program (CRSP) which authorizes supplies, the loaning of equipment, and specialized training assistance to coalition forces. The CSF relieves the operational burden on U.S. forces and enhances the visibility of Coalition presence. This authority remains critical to our strategic approach to Coalition operations**, including, but not limited to, the ongoing military campaign to defeat**

the terrorist organization, ISIS in Iraq and Syria, and our transition in Afghanistan. The capability and interoperability that CSF funding facilitates is crucial to our bilateral relations, Coalition operations and training with partner nations, and to the success of our broader strategic and trans-regional objectives. The *Global Lift and Sustain* and successor authority further complements this approach by enabling us to provide transportation and life support to select Coalition partners.

Commanders' Emergency Response Program (CERP). CERP is authorized for local commanders to respond to urgent humanitarian relief and reconstruction requirements in Afghanistan, and may be used to make condolence payments for the loss of life, injury, or property damage resulting from U.S., coalition, or supporting military operations. The NDAA for FY2017 provides authority for ex gratia payments in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Syria for damage, personal injury, or death that is incident to U.S. combat operations. CERP funded projects directly benefit the indigenous civilian populations in Afghanistan and demonstrate the positive effects of our presence, while also providing tangible, quick mitigation when coalition actions result in casualties or property damage to civilians during the course of military operations. CERP is a proven force multiplier and a key enabler in responding to urgent humanitarian needs and promoting security. Going forward, we want to ensure commanders engaged in the Counter-ISIS missions can provide immediate, but limited, small scale humanitarian assistance to ISIS liberated areas, until national and international relief agencies can provide that support. Our responsiveness is critical to quickly stabilizing those areas in order to begin the holding phase of the campaign and to counter ISIS messaging.

Military Construction (MILCON). USCENTCOM stewards constrained resources and maintains an expeditionary approach to posturing capabilities in theater. We leverage existing infrastructure and host nation support and funding where possible, as well as maritime posture and reach back capabilities to meet steady state and surge requirements. In some instances, MILCON is required to establish infrastructure to support forces and equipment in the execution of their missions. Of note, **USCENTCOM requires support for development at Muwaffaq-Salti Air Base (MSAB), Jordan and construction of the new Consolidated Squadron Operations Facility at Al Udeid, Qatar. These two projects are essential to our contingency and steady state operations and support the Defense Strategic Guidance.** The projects will support executing our priority war plans by providing critical dispersed, resilient and flexible capacity to accept both steady state and enduring joint forces, multiple aircraft types and provide critical air C4I (command, control, communications, computers and intelligence) for current and future contingencies, theater and strategic surge and maritime operations within the USCENTCOM AOR. MILCON development is critical to support the realignment of U.S. forces operating from an expeditionary approach at various contingency bases scattered across the AOR to the required enduring posture approach necessary to protect U.S. interests and to sustain key bilateral relationships.

Prepositioned War Reserve Materiel (PWRM). Service Prepositioned War Reserve Materiel and capability sets remain critical force multipliers required to execute USCENTCOM's most dangerous and critical contingency plans. The Services and Defense Agency prepositioned capacity provides a shock absorber in rapidly emerging contingencies, buys critical decision

space for our national leadership, and mitigates the risk associated with the tyranny of distance when we are called upon to rapidly aggregate and reintroduce forces into the region.

The U.S. Central Command Team. **The outstanding men and women who comprise the USCENTCOM Team truly are our most important assets.** They continue to make tremendous contributions on behalf of our Nation and our partners and allies around the globe. **We must ensure they have everything they need to do their jobs effectively, efficiently, and as safely as possible.**

We also continue to benefit from the unique capability provided by our Coalition Coordination Center, which consists of more than 200 foreign military officers from nearly 60 partner nations. They, too, are important members of our USCENTOM Team and play a critical role in strengthening the partnerships between our nations.

We remain mindful of the fact that **success requires that we work together, not just within the command, but also with our teammates from other Combatant Commands, our Component Commands, established combined/joint task forces, the Central Region's 18 county teams, and various agencies and organizations throughout the USG and the Interagency.** Our close collaboration with counterparts at the U.S. State Department, the U.S. Treasury, CIA, FBI, and JIDO, for example, has paid enormous dividends in the pursuit of shared national goals and objectives. We look forward to continuing to work with them and others on behalf of our Nation.

We also are incredibly grateful for the support of our families. They are highly valued members of our USCENTCOM Team and we could not do what we do without them. They make important contributions and tremendous sacrifices each and every day in support of us and on behalf of the command and a grateful Nation.

The upcoming year promises to be a busy and challenging one in the Central Region. You can be assured that the world-class team at U.S. Central Command – *which includes more than 80,000 Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines, Coastguardsmen, and Civilians stationed today throughout the USCENTCOM area of responsibility* – is up to the task, and is highly-skilled, motivated, and stands ready to do whatever is necessary to accomplish the mission: defend our Nation and our interests, the interests of partners and allies, and improve stability and security in that strategically important part of the world.

USCENTCOM: Prepare, Pursue, Prevail!

[CLERK'S NOTE.—The complete hearing transcript could not be printed due to the classification of the material discussed.]

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 29, 2017.

UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND

WITNESS

GENERAL CURTIS M. SCAPARROTTI, COMMANDER, UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GRANGER

Ms. GRANGER. The Subcommittee on Defense will come to order.

This morning, the subcommittee will hold a hearing on the posture of the United States European Command.

First, I want to recognize the ranking member, Mr. Visclosky, for a motion.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, pursuant to the provisions to clause D of section 4 of the rules of the committee, I move that today's markup be held in executive session because of the classification of the material to be discussed.

Ms. GRANGER. So ordered. And thank you, Mr. Visclosky.

Our witness this morning is General Mike Scaparrotti, Commander of the United States European Command, NATO, and the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe.

General, welcome back to this subcommittee, and thank you for your service and your attention, and thank you for being here with us.

Threats from Russia and terrorists have interrupted decades of peace for EUCOM, NATO, and our allies. To complicate matters, a major refugee crisis is overwhelming many European countries, and ISIS is using this crisis to smuggle its own operatives into Europe.

General, given the challenges your command faces, we remain concerned you lack the support you need to accomplish your mission. The subcommittee has provided EUCOM with additional resources through the European Reassurance Initiative; however, we are concerned that it is not nearly enough, when you take into account the funding is significantly less than the resources Russia has dedicated to Crimea and Ukraine alone.

Bullies often understand one thing, and that is strength. Putin must know the United States will stand with our European allies and respond decisively to their resurgent aggression.

As chairwoman of the subcommittee, I believe our decisions should be guided by experts in uniform, like you. There are limited resources and significant needs. We should not make decisions in a vacuum and will rely on your best military advice. We look forward to your testimony and your insight.

But, first, I would like to call on the ranking member, my friend, Pete Visclosky, for his comments.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I thank the chairwoman for holding a hearing, and I look forward to the gentleman's testimony.

Ms. GRANGER. I needed a little situational awareness. I apologize.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I do too.

Ms. GRANGER. General, please proceed with your testimony. Your full written testimony will be placed in the record, and please feel free to summarize your oral statement so we can leave enough time to get to everyone's questions.

[The written statement General Scaparrotti follows:]

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

STATEMENT OF GENERAL CURTIS M. SCAPARROTTI

COMMANDER

UNITED STATES EUROPEAN COMMAND

March 29, 2017

I. INTRODUCTION

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this Committee, I am honored to testify before you in my first year as the Commander of United States European Command (EUCOM). It is a privilege to lead the great Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, Marines, Coast Guardsmen, and civilians in this Command. They continue to demonstrate remarkable commitment, dedication, and selfless service both in Europe and across the globe. We all appreciate your continued support.

The European theater remains critical to our national interests. The transatlantic alliance gives us an unmatched advantage over our adversaries--a united, capable, warfighting alliance resolved in its purpose and strengthened by shared values that have been forged in battle. EUCOM's relationship with NATO and the 51 countries within our area of responsibility (AOR) provides the United States with a network of willing partners who support global operations and secure the international rules-based order that our nations have defended together since World War II. Our security architecture protects more than 1 billion people and has safeguarded transatlantic trade, which now constitutes almost half of the world's combined GDP.

Nevertheless, today we face the most dynamic European security environment in history. Political volatility and economic uncertainty are compounded by threats to our security system that are trans-regional, multi-domain, and multi-functional. In the east, a resurgent Russia has turned from partner to antagonist. Countries along Russia's periphery, especially Ukraine and Georgia, are under threat from Moscow's malign influence and military aggression. In the southeast, strategic drivers of instability converge on key allies, especially Turkey, which has to simultaneously manage Russia,

terrorists, and refugee flows. In the south, violent extremists and transnational criminal elements spawn terror and corruption from North Africa to the Middle East, while refugees and migrants fleeing persecution to Europe in search of security and opportunity. In the High North, Russia is reasserting its military prowess and positioning itself for strategic advantage in the Arctic.

EUCOM fully recognizes the dynamic nature of this security environment, and in response, we are regenerating our abilities for deterrence and defense while continuing our security cooperation and engagement mission. This requires that we return to our historical role as a command that is capable of executing the full-spectrum of joint and combined operations in a contested environment. Accordingly, we are adjusting our posture, plans, and readiness to respond to possible future conflicts.

This shift would not be possible without congressional support of the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI). Thanks in large measure to ERI, over the last 12 months EUCOM has made demonstrable progress. U.S. tanks have returned to European soil. U.S. F-15s and F-22s have demonstrated air dominance throughout the theater. U.S. naval forces have sailed throughout European waters. EUCOM has operationalized its Joint Cyber Center. With the approval of former Secretary Carter, EUCOM delivered the first new operational plan for the defense of Europe in over 25 years.

ERI also supports high-end exercises and training, improved infrastructure, and enhanced prepositioning of equipment and supplies, while State Department and DOD funds build partner capacity throughout Europe.

EUCOM has also continued to strengthen our relationship with allies and partners. Our relationship with Turkey endured a coup attempt with minimal disruption

to multiple ongoing operations. EUCOM has strengthened ties with Israel, one of our closest allies. Above all, EUCOM has supported the NATO Alliance, which remains, as Secretary Mattis has said, the "bedrock" of our transatlantic security. Overall EUCOM is growing stronger.

II. THEATER ASSESSMENT – RISKS AND CHALLENGES

Over the past year I have highlighted three signature issues facing us in this dynamic security environment: Russia, radicals or violent extremists, and regional unrest – leading to refugee and migrant flows. At the same time, managing the political, economic, and social challenges posed by refugees and migrants is a consuming concern of our allies and partners.

Russia

Russia's malign actions are supported by its diplomatic, information, economic, and military initiatives. Moscow intends to reemerge as a global power, and views international norms such as the rule of law, democracy, and human rights as components of a system designed to suppress Russia. Therefore, Russia seeks to undermine this international system and discredit those in the West who have created it. For example, Russia is taking steps to influence the internal politics of European countries, just as it tried to do in the United States, in an attempt to create disunity and weakness within Europe and undermine the transatlantic relationship. Furthermore, Russia has repeatedly violated international agreements and treaties that underpin European peace and stability, including the Treaty on Intermediate-Range Nuclear Forces (INF) and the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe (CFE), and it is

undermining transparency and confidence building regimes, such as the Vienna Document and Open Skies, which provide greater transparency of posture and exercises in the region

Russia's political leadership appears to be seeking a resurgence through the modernization of its military. Russia is adjusting its doctrine, modernizing its weapons, reorganizing the disposition of its forces, professionalizing its armed services, and upgrading capabilities in all warfighting domains. Russia desires a military force capable of achieving its strategic objectives and increasing its power.

Russia's aggression in Ukraine, including occupation and attempted annexation of Crimea, and actions in Syria underscore its willingness to use military force to exert its influence in Europe and the Middle East. In Ukraine, Russia's willingness to foment a bloody conflict into its third year through the use of proxy forces in the Donbas and elsewhere is deeply troubling to our allies and partners, particularly Russia's closest neighbors. In Syria, Russia's military intervention has changed the dynamics of the conflict, bolstered the Bashar al-Assad regime, targeted moderate opposition elements, compounded human suffering, and complicated U.S. and coalition operations against the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Russia has used this chaos to establish a permanent presence in the Middle East and eastern Mediterranean.

This past year saw other significant demonstrations of Russia's renewed military capability, including the first ever combat deployment of the KUZNETSOV Task Force, nation-wide strategic exercises, joint air, ground, and maritime operations in Syria using new platforms and precision-guided munitions, and the deployment of nuclear-capable missiles to Kaliningrad. Russia's deployments in Ukraine and Syria also revealed increased proficiency in expeditionary combat and sustainment operations.

Another key component of Russia's military advancement is its Integrated Air

Defense Systems (IADS). For example, in connection with its deployment to support the Assad regime in Syria, Russia fielded advanced Anti-Access / Area Denial (A2/AD) systems that combine command and control, electronic warfare capabilities, and long range coastal defense cruise missiles with advanced air defense platforms. EUCOM assesses that Russia plans to meld existing and future IADS systems into a central command structure to control all air defense forces and weapons.

In the High North, Russia continues to strengthen its military presence through equipment, infrastructure, training, and other activities. Russia is positioning itself to gain strategic advantage if the Northern Sea Route opens and becomes a viable shipping lane between Europe and Asia.

Most concerning, however, is Moscow's substantial inventory of non-strategic nuclear weapons in the EUCOM AOR and its troubling doctrine that calls on the potential use of these weapons to escalate its way out of a failing conflict. Russia's fielding of a conventional/nuclear dual-capable system that is prohibited under the INF Treaty creates a mismatch in escalatory options with the West. In the context of Putin's highly centralized decision-making structure, Moscow's provocative rhetoric and nuclear threats increase the likelihood of misunderstanding and miscalculation.

In addition to recent conventional and nuclear developments, Russia has employed a decades-long strategy of indirect action to coerce, destabilize, and otherwise exercise a malign influence over other nations. In neighboring states, Russia continues to fuel "protracted conflicts." In Moldova, for example, Russia has yet to follow through on its 1999 Istanbul Summit commitments to withdraw an estimated 1,500 troops -- whose presence has no mandate -- from the Moldovan breakaway region of Transnistria. Russia asserts that it will remove its force once a comprehensive settlement to the Transnistrian conflict has been reached. However, Russia continued

to undermine the discussion of a comprehensive settlement to the Transnistrian conflict at the 5+2 negotiations. Moscow continues to play a role in destabilizing the Nagorno-Karabakh dispute by selling arms to both Armenia and Azerbaijan while maintaining troops in Armenia, despite an international pledge to co-chair the Minsk Group, which is charged with seeking resolution of the conflict.

Russia fiercely opposes one of our strongest EUCOM partners, Georgia, in its attempts to align with the European and transatlantic communities. Russia's occupation of Abkhazia and South Ossetia since its 2008 invasion of the Georgian regions has created lasting instability.

In the Balkans, Russia exploits ethnic tensions to slow progress on European and transatlantic integration. In 2016, Russia overtly interfered in the political processes of both Bosnia-Herzegovina and Montenegro.

Additional Russian activities short of war, range from disinformation to manipulation. Examples include Russia's outright denial of involvement in the lead up to Russia's occupation and attempted annexation in Crimea; attempts to influence elections in the United States, France and elsewhere; its aggressive propaganda campaigns targeting ethnic Russian populations among its neighbors; and cyber activities directed against infrastructure in the Baltic nations and Ukraine. In all of these ways and more, Russia is attempting to exert its influence, expand its power, and discredit the capability and relevance of the West.

Radicals

Violent extremists, most notably ISIS, pose a serious, immediate threat to U.S. personnel, our allies, and our infrastructure in Europe and worldwide. In 2016, there were major terrorist attacks in Berlin, Brussels, Istanbul, Nice, Paris, and elsewhere. ISIS has made its intentions clear: it seeks to overthrow Western civilization and

establish a world-wide caliphate.

While it's footprint in Iraq and Syria shrunk in 2016, since 2014, ISIS has significantly expanded its operations throughout Europe and now leverages its network to enable and inspire attacks by European-based extremists in their resident countries. Further, ISIS has exploited the migration crisis to infiltrate operatives into Europe. Since Turkey expanded its counter-ISIS role and advocacy for coalition operations in Mosul, it has experienced an increased number of terrorist attacks, and ISIS's leaders have called for more. We do not expect the threat to diminish in the near future.

As a consequence of this threat, European nations have been forced to divert financial resources and military personnel to internal security. The impact of this reallocation is not yet fully appreciated and will likely persist for years. In short, violent extremism poses a dangerous threat to transatlantic nations and to the international order that we value.

Regional Volatility

In EUCOM's AOR, Russia's indirect actions have sought to exploit political unrest and socioeconomic disparities. Russian aggression in Ukraine has led to the deaths of approximately 10,000 people since April 2014. Recently, in eastern Ukraine, Russia has controlled the battle tempo and is again ratcheting up the number of daily violations of the cease fire. Even more concerning, Russia is directing combined Russian-separatist forces to target civilian infrastructure and threaten and intimidate OSCE monitors in order to turn up the pressure on Ukraine. Furthermore, Moscow's support for so-called "separatists" in eastern Ukraine destabilizes Kyiv's political structures just as Ukraine is undertaking politically-difficult reforms to combat corruption and comply with IMF requirements.

Ukraine seeks a permanent and verifiable ceasefire, the withdrawal of heavy

weapons and Russian forces, full and unfettered access for OSCE monitors, and control over its internationally-recognized border with Russia. Russian-led separatist forces continue to commit the majority of ceasefire violations despite attempts by the OSCE to broker a lasting ceasefire along the Line of Contact.

Turkey has long been and remains an ally of the United States. It now occupies a critical location at the crossroads of multiple strategic challenges. To its west, it implements the Montreux Convention, which governs transit through the Turkish Straits, and Turkey is committed to local solutions for Black Sea issues. To its north and east, Turkey maintains a complicated relationship with Russia. Ankara seeks to resume the level of trade with Moscow that it enjoyed prior to Turkey's November 2015 shoot down of a Russian fighter. Turkey has absorbed the largest number of refugees from Syria--almost 3 million. Despite these challenges, EUCOM continues to work closely with Turkey to enable critical basing and logistical support to the counter-ISIS fight and supports Turkey to counter its terror threat.

Although the flow of refugees to Europe has slowed, the refugee situation remains a significant challenge to our European allies and partners. The strain on the social systems of European nations, especially along the Mediterranean Sea, diverts resources that could otherwise go toward military and defense spending, and finding solutions has tested political relationships. EU member states struggle to find a common, "shared" approach to admit and settle migrants. Both NATO and the EU, in conjunction with Turkish and Greek authorities, have committed law enforcement and military assets to this issue, including a maritime force in the Aegean Sea to conduct reconnaissance, monitoring, and surveillance.

The Syrian civil war and the risk of spillover into neighboring states, including Israel, continue to threaten stability in Europe and the Levant. Despite assistance from

the USG and the international community, the refugee population in Jordan and Lebanon has placed significant burdens on the government and local residents. Additionally, factional fighting in Syria has resulted in occasional cross-border fire into the Israeli-occupied Golan Heights. Israel has avoided being drawn into the conflict in Syria but has taken military action to deny the transfer of advanced weapons to Hezbollah.

The Balkans' stability since the late 1990's masks political and socio-economic fragility. Russia promotes anti-European views in this region by exploiting corrupt political systems, poor economic performance, and increased ethnic polarization. Additionally, Islamic radicals seek to take advantage of high unemployment rates, political turmoil, and socioeconomic disparities to recruit violent extremists.

Iran's regional influence in the Levant continues to grow through its ongoing support to radical groups such as Lebanese Hezbollah, Hamas, Palestinian Islamic Jihad, and paramilitary groups involved in the Syrian conflict and in counter-ISIS efforts across Iraq. Iran, which Israel views as its greatest existential threat, continues to transfer advanced conventional arms to Hezbollah and is clearly committed to maintaining Syria as the key link of the Iran-Hezbollah axis, which sustains a terrorist network in Syrian-regime controlled territory. Furthermore, Iran has taken advantage of the Syrian crisis to militarily coordinate with Russia in support of Assad.

III. THEATER ASSESSMENT - STRENGTHS AND OPPORTUNITIES

EUCOM will meet these challenges and adapt to the new security environment by capitalizing on our strengths and building new capabilities. We are developing a credible and relevant force structure built for deterrence and defense, leveraging a unified and adaptive NATO Alliance, and transitioning into a command able to address

the strategic challenges before us.

Deter Russia

EUCOM activities, facilitated by ERI funding, continue to be the primary demonstration of our deterrent capability.

Increased Rotational Forces. ERI has directly supported an increase in the rotational presence of U.S. forces in Europe, a critical augmentation to EUCOM's assigned forces. For example, ERI funded Fort Stewart's 1st Armored Brigade Combat Team's deployment to Europe from March to September 2016. Also, ERI funded the deployment of F-22 fighters, B-52 bombers, and additional combat and lift aircraft to Europe as part of the ERI Theater Security Package. Looking ahead, continued congressional support for ERI will sustain these rotations and enable additional anti-submarine warfare capabilities, complementing maritime domain awareness assets in Iceland that are included in the FY 2017 ERI request. Additionally, rotational Marine units will operate from Norway and the Black Sea region.

Trained and Equipped Component Commands. EUCOM has also used ERI to fund and field Army Prepositioned Stocks (APS), providing a rapid mobilization capability for additional armored units in Europe. Separately, EUCOM advocated for and received full support for a $220 million NATO Security Investment Program project (i.e., paid for by NATO common funding) that will build warehousing and maintenance capability for staging APS stocks in Poland. Additionally, ERI funds dozens of projects to upgrade flight-line and munitions-storage infrastructure across eight NATO nations to support not only rotational presence but also training events in Eastern Europe. The Navy is using ERI to fund capability enablers and force rotations to support EUCOM and NATO exercises, including mine countermeasures teams and additional flying hours, specifically to enhance EUCOM's deterrence posture.

Persistent Presence. ERI increased funding for U.S. forces in the Baltics, Poland, Romania, Bulgaria, and the Mediterranean during 2016. In addition, ERI allowed EUCOM to continue our contribution to NATO's Air Policing mission by funding a continued fighter presence in theater with the 493rd Fighter Squadron at RAF Lakenheath in the UK.

Complex Exercises with Allies and Partners. ERI expanded the scope of EUCOM's involvement in over 28 joint and multi-national maritime, air, amphibious, and ground exercises across 40 countries. In June 2016, EUCOM participated in the Polish national exercise ANAKONDA, which involved approximately 31,000 Allied troops, including over 14,000 U.S. personnel, and provided a robust demonstration of Allied defensive capabilities, readiness, and interoperability. ERI also supported Navy-led BALTOPS 16, the premier maritime exercise in the Baltic region with over 6,100 troops from participating nations. And utilizing ERI resources, the Air Force took part in over 50 exercises and training deployments across Europe. An Acquisition and Cross-Servicing Agreement concluded with the EU last December enables EUCOM to cooperate better with EU missions in the Balkans and elsewhere.

Russia Strategic Initiative (RSI): EUCOM leads the Department of Defense's Russia Strategic Initiative (RSI), which provides a framework for understanding the Russian threat and a forum for coordinating efforts and requirements. RSI allows us to maximize the deterrent value of our activities while avoiding inadvertent escalation. In just over a year, RSI has created a number of analytic products for combatant commanders that will enable a more efficient application of existing resources and planning efforts.

Deterring Russia requires a whole of government approach, and EUCOM supports the strategy of approaching Russia from a position of strength while seeking

appropriate military-to-military communication necessary to fulfill our defense obligations in accordance with the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017. Going forward, we must bring the information aspects of our national power more fully to bear on Russia, both to amplify our narrative and to draw attention to Russia's manipulative, coercive, and malign activities. Finally, NATO and U.S. nuclear forces continue to be a vital component of our deterrence. Our modernization efforts are crucial; we must preserve a ready, credible, and safe nuclear capability.

Enable the NATO Alliance

As the United States manages multiple strategic challenges, our enduring strength remains NATO, the most successful alliance in history. NATO's leadership understands that the security environment has radically changed over the past few years. The Alliance has placed renewed emphasis on deterring further Russian aggression, countering transnational threats, such as violent extremist organizations, and projecting stability in the Middle East and North Africa, while fulfilling its commitments in Afghanistan.

The Warsaw Summit last July was a significant demonstration of unity, cooperation, and strategic adaptation. As the member nations declared in NATO's Warsaw Summit Communiqué, "We are united in our commitment to the Washington Treaty, the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations (UN), and the vital transatlantic bond." This unity is NATO's center of gravity, and the United States must continue to support solidarity among the Alliance nations.

Enhanced Forward Presence (eFP). The signature outcome of the 2016 Warsaw Summit was the decision to establish an enhanced Forward Presence (eFP) in the Baltics and Poland to demonstrate NATO's cohesion in defense of the Alliance. Canada, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the United States have begun deploying

multinational battalion task forces to Latvia, Lithuania, Estonia, and Poland, respectively, on a rotational basis. Defense Cooperation Agreements (DCAs) signed in 2017 with Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania are facilitating the deployment of U.S forces there. The United States serves as the framework nation for eFP in Poland and is working closely with the other framework nations and their host nations to ensure NATO's key deterrence and defense measures are capable and integrated.

European Phased Adapted Approach (EPAA). EUCOM continues to implement the EPAA to defend European NATO populations, territory, and infrastructure against ballistic missile threats from outside the Euro-Atlantic region. In July 2016, the U.S.-funded Aegis Ashore facility in Romania became operational and transferred to NATO operational control. Work on the Aegis Ashore site in Poland (authorized and appropriated in fiscal year 2016 legislation) is underway and on track for completion by the end of calendar year 2018 and operational under NATO operational control in mid-2019.

Projecting Stability. NATO is a key contributor to ensuring security and projecting stability abroad. It is worth remembering that the first and only time the Alliance invoked the mutual defense provisions of its founding treaty was in response to the 9/11 attacks on the United States. Today, through NATO's Resolute Support Mission, over 12,000 troops (including over 5,000 non-U.S. personnel) provide training and assistance to Afghan security forces and institutions. NATO is committed to ensuring a stable Afghanistan that is not a safe haven for terrorists.

Additionally, it is notable that all 28 NATO nations participate in the counter-ISIS coalition. NATO committed AWACS surveillance aircraft and actively contributes to capacity building in Iraq. EUCOM supports NATO's goal of expanding its operations against this terrorist threat.

Support to Washington Treaty. EUCOM provides support for key articles of the Washington Treaty, enabling NATO members to meet their collective security commitments. EUCOM conducts activities, such as security cooperation, to help allies meet their Article 3 commitment to "maintain and develop their individual and collective capacity to resist attack." We have been able to reduce allies' dependencies on Russian-sourced, legacy military equipment thanks to ongoing congressional support for critical authorities and funding that provide shared resources. EUCOM also actively assists the Alliance when an ally declares, under Article 4, that its territorial integrity, political independence, or security is threatened. The last time an ally invoked Article 4 was 2015 when Turkey sought consultation following terrorist attacks. Most importantly, EUCOM is the force that backs the United States commitment to Article 5, which declares that an armed attack on one ally is an attack on all.

NATO Spending Trends. At the Wales Summit in 2014, the allies pledged to reverse the trend of declining defense budgets and invest in the development of highly-capable and deployable forces. Today, in addition to the United States, four allies (Estonia, Greece, Poland, and the United Kingdom) meet the NATO guidelines for 2% of GDP, up from three in 2014. Allies' defense expenditures increased in 2015 for the first time since 2009 and grew at a real rate of 3.8% in 2016, with 22 member nations increasing defense spending. Allies are showing demonstrable progress toward their commitment to contribute 2% of their GDP by 2024.

This is a positive trend, but allied nations must meet the 2% mark with 20% allocated to the modernization of equipment and infrastructure. Critical ally and partner capability shortfalls remain, including strategic lift; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR); deployable command and control; air to air refueling; and air and missile defense. Further, both EUCOM and NATO are hampered by inadequate

infrastructure that affects the ability to maneuver across the continent. The expansion of the Alliance to include former Eastern Bloc countries has exacerbated the lack of common transportation networks between the newer NATO members in the east and the more established allies in the west. EUCOM is working closely with NATO to identify and address infrastructure requirements to improve U.S. and NATO freedom of movement throughout the theater.

Build Partner Capacity

EUCOM has spent several decades working with the Department of State to help allied and partner nations develop and improve their military and other security forces. This partner capacity building has been accomplished with the support of this Committee, which has been generous in providing us the authorization we need to accomplish this critical task. I would highlight two activities in particular.

Defense Institution Building (DIB). DIB helps partner nations build effective, transparent, and accountable defense institutions. For example, EUCOM fully endorses the work of the Defense Reform Advisory Board in Ukraine, which is helping to bring about both political and military reform as the Ministry of Defense, General Staff, and Armed Forces transition from centralized Soviet-style systems and concepts towards a Euro-Atlantic model. We also support defense institutions in Georgia, helping them improve their strategic logistics, human and material resource management, and institutional aspects of their training management system. Overall, our DIB efforts lay the groundwork for broader security cooperation activities.

Joint Multinational Training Group Ukraine (JMTG-U). Together with forces from Lithuania, Latvia, Estonia, the UK, and Canada, using State Department-provided Foreign Military Financing and Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative funds, EUCOM trains, advises, and equips Ukraine security forces, helping them build the capacity to

defend their sovereignty and territorial integrity. Our team, working through the Multinational Joint Commission, has developed Ukraine's institutional training capability so that Ukraine can create a NATO-interoperable armed force. Our efforts include the training of both conventional and special operations units, as well as advising Ukraine on defense reform priorities.

Assist Israel

EUCOM's mission to assist in the defense of Israel, one of our closest allies, remains a top priority. Success will depend on the continued support of Congress and our strong relationship with the Israel Defense Forces. Many aspects of our bilateral relationship have been guided by the Strategic Cooperation Initiative Program (SCIP) framework, which dates to the Reagan administration. SCIP enables robust cooperation and coordination on a vast range of security matters. Going forward, we are working to update the SCIP to incorporate an examination of all major exercises to ensure each meets the three major pillars of our security relationship: (1) missile defense, air operations, and counter-terrorism; (2) managing the Weapon Reserve Stockpile for Allies-Israel (WRSA-I); and (3) ensuring Israel's qualitative military edge.

Counter Transnational Threats

Adopting a whole-of-government approach, EUCOM, together with its interagency partners, conducts initiatives to counter transnational threats including countering terrorism and the flow of foreign fighters, countering illicit finance networks, combatting the trafficking of persons and illicit substances, and building allied and partner security, investigative, and judicial capacity. In conjunction with the Departments of State, Justice, Homeland Security, and other federal law enforcement agencies, EUCOM works to monitor and thwart the flow of foreign fighters, support the dismantlement of facilitation networks, and build partner nation capacity to defeat violent

extremism.

Through our counterterrorism cell, EUCOM strengthens global counter-ISIS efforts in coordination with and support of U.S. Central (CENTCOM), Africa (AFRICOM), and Special Operations (SOCOM) Commands. We have focused on those who facilitate the ISIS brand and network through radicalization, financing, and propaganda.

Also, EUCOM and NATO are working to increase ties with the EU to enhance the capabilities Europe can collectively bring to bear against transnational threats. These three organizational nodes foster a shared understanding of the threats, help match resources accordingly, and can address all elements of national power including diplomatic, informational, military, and economic. In order to realize this networked approach, EUCOM will support NATO efforts to expand the capability and capacity of Allied Joint Forces Command – Naples.

Enable Global Operations

EUCOM personnel actively support operations in AFRICOM and CENTCOM AORs. EUCOM's well-developed and tested infrastructure provides critical capabilities in strategic locations such as Incirlik, Turkey; Sigonella, Italy; and Morón and Rota, Spain. Basing and access in Germany, Greece, Italy, France, Spain, Turkey, and the United Kingdom enable more timely and coordinated trans-regional crisis response.

IV. RESOURCE REQUIREMENTS

Significant U.S. force reductions following the collapse of the Soviet Union were based on the assumption that Russia would be a strategic partner to the West. These reductions now limit U.S. options for addressing challenges in a changing European strategic environment. The strategic rebalance to Asia and the Pacific, combined with budget limitations in the Budget Control Act of 2011, have contributed to substantial

posture reductions across our land and air domains. For example, between 2010 and 2013, two fighter squadrons and a two-star numbered air force headquarters were inactivated, along with associated critical enablers and staff personnel. In addition, the last two heavy Brigade Combat Teams (BCT), a two-star division headquarters, and a three-star corps headquarters were removed from Europe, leaving only one Stryker and one airborne brigade. As a result of the BCT losses, without fully-resourced heel-to-toe rotational forces, the ground force permanently assigned to EUCOM is inadequate to meet the combatant command's directed mission to deter Russia from further aggression.

Deterrence Posture. Going forward, we will need to continue maintaining capable forces for effective deterrence. EUCOM is coordinating across the DoD to obtain the forces we need in every warfare domain. This may include additional maneuver forces, combat air squadrons, anti-submarine capabilities, a carrier strike group, and maritime amphibious capabilities. We will continue to enhance our plans for pre-positioning equipment across the theater as a flexible deterrent measure and to exercise the joint reception, staging, and onward integration of CONUS-based forces into Europe.

ERI Requirements. EUCOM continues to require the ability to deter Russian aggression and counter malign influence while assuring allies and partners. We anticipate needing to continue deterrence measures initiated in previous ERI submissions, to include Army and Air Force prepositioning, retention of F-15 presence, improved airfield infrastructure improvements, and to address some new capabilities needed in the theater.

Indications and Warnings (I&W). EUCOM's ability to provide strategic warning is critical to credible deterrence. A robust intelligence capability enables accurate analysis

and rapid response in a changing theater security environment. This capability also supports the design of realistic exercises, posture alignment, and future requirements. Furthermore, when completed, EUCOM's Joint Intelligence Analytic Center at Royal Air Force Croughton will provide a dedicated, purpose-built intelligence facility collocated with NATO and AFRICOM's analytic centers that will enhance capability and capacity in both combatant commands and NATO. Finally, additional intelligence collection platforms in theater, such as the U-2, the RQ-4, and the RC-135, are required for accurate and timely threat information to support strategic decisions.

Recapitalization Efforts. The European Infrastructure Consolidation effort announced in January 2015 enables EUCOM to divest excess capacity and consolidate missions and footprints at enduring locations. However, with aging infrastructure and little recent investment, recapitalization and consolidation projects are required to support warfighter readiness, command and control requirements, deployments, training, and quality of life. This Committee has been key to these critical efforts. We continue to modernize communications facilities and schools across Europe. Last year, Congress authorized the final increment for the Joint Intelligence Analysis Center, which enables the closure of RAFs Molesworth and Alconbury.

V. CONCLUSION

Let me conclude by again thanking this Committee's Members and staff for their continued support of EUCOM, not only by providing our requested funding, but also by helping us to articulate the challenges that lie before us. Support from other senior leaders and, above all, from the public at home and across Europe is vital to ensuring that we remain ready and relevant. This is a pivotal time for EUCOM as we transition to meet the demands of a dynamic security environment. I remain confident that

UNCLASSIFIED

through the strength of our Alliance and partnerships, and with the professionalism of our service members, we will adapt and ensure that Europe remains whole, free and at peace.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—The complete hearing transcript could not be printed due to the classification of the material discussed.]

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 26, 2017.

UNITED STATES PACIFIC COMMAND

WITNESS

ADMIRAL HARRY B. HARRIS, JR., COMMANDER, UNITED STATES PACIFIC COMMAND

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GRANGER

Ms. GRANGER. The Subcommittee on Defense will come to order.

Today the subcommittee will hold a hearing on the posture of the United States Pacific Command. First I want to recognize the ranking member, Mr. Visclosky, for a motion.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I move that those portions of the hearing today which involve classified material be held under executive session because of the classification of the material to be discussed.

Ms. GRANGER. So ordered. Thank you, Mr. Visclosky.

Our witness this morning is Admiral Harry Harris, Commander of the United States Pacific Command. Admiral, welcome back to the subcommittee, and thank you for your service. Sorry you had to wait on us. We had a couple of votes.

An increasingly provocative North Korea, rising tensions in the peninsula, and China's military expansion in the South China Sea continue to threaten stability in the region and remind us of the challenges you face. To complicate matters, the PACOM area of responsibility encompasses nearly half the Earth's surface. The 36 nations comprising the Asia Pacific region are home to more than 50 percent of the world's population and several of the world's largest militaries.

Admiral, this subcommittee is committed to providing you with the resources you need to enhance stability in the Asia Pacific region, promote cooperation and peace, deter aggression, and if necessary, fight to win.

As Chairwoman of the subcommittee, I believe our decisions should be guided by experts in uniform like you. There are limited resources and significant needs. We should not make decisions in a vacuum, and we will rely on your best military advice. We look forward to your testimony and your insight.

First I would like to call on the ranking member, my friend, Mr. Visclosky, for his comments.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I just want to thank the Chairwoman for holding the hearing today; Admiral, your service. I know it is a long day for you. And look forward to hearing from you.

Thank you very much.

Admiral HARRIS. Thank you, sir.

Ms. GRANGER. Admiral, please proceed with your testimony. The full written testimony will be placed in the record. Feel free to

summarize your oral statement so we can leave enough time to get to everyone's questions if you do decide to do that.

Admiral, thank you for your testimony, and I will call on you now.

Admiral HARRIS. Yes, ma'am. Thank you, Chairwoman and Representative Visclosky and distinguished members. It is an honor for me to appear again in front of this committee.

[The written statement of Admiral Harris follows:]

STATEMENT OF
ADMIRAL HARRY B. HARRIS JR., U.S. NAVY
COMMANDER, U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND
BEFORE THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE – DEFENSE SUBCOMMITTEE
ON U.S. PACIFIC COMMAND POSTURE
26 APRIL 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. This is my second posture assessment since taking command of U.S. Pacific Command (USPACOM) in 2015. During this time, I've had the extraordinary privilege to lead the Soldiers, Sailors, Marines, Airmen, Coast Guardsmen, and Department of Defense civilians standing the watch in the vast Indo-Asia-Pacific region. These men and women and their families inspire me with their relentless devotion to duty, and I'm proud to serve alongside them.

This past January 1st, USPACOM commemorated its 70th birthday. For 70 years, our joint military forces have protected the territory of the U.S., its people, and its interests throughout the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Working in close concert with other U.S. government agencies, defending our homeland and our citizens is always "Job number 1" at USPACOM. It is my top command priority. And together with our allies and partners, USPACOM enhances stability in the region by promoting security cooperation, responding to contingencies, deterring aggression, and, when necessary, fighting to win. This security approach is based on shared interests, partnerships, military presence, and readiness.

The U.S. has enduring national interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. In fact, I believe America's future security and economic prosperity are indelibly linked to this critical region, which is now at a strategic crossroads where real opportunities meet real challenges. Of the five global challenges that currently drive U.S. defense planning and budgeting – ISIS (Islamic State of Iraq and Syria), North Korea, China, Russia and Iran – four are in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. We cannot turn a blind eye to these challenges. We must not give any country or insidious non-state actor a pass if they purposely erode the rules-based security order that has served America and this region so well for so long.

Rising from the ashes of World War II, the rules-based international order, or what I sometimes call, "the Global Operating System," has kept the Indo-Asia-Pacific largely peaceful and created the stability necessary for economic prosperity in the U.S. and countries throughout the region. Ironically, China is the country that has benefitted the most. The collective respect for, and adherence to, international rules and standards have produced the longest era of peace and prosperity in modern times. These conditions are not happenstance. In my opinion, they have been made possible by a security order underwritten by seven decades of robust and persistent U.S. military presence and credible combat power. This security order has been reinforced by America's five bilateral security alliances with Australia, Japan, the Republic of Korea (ROK), the Philippines, and Thailand. This order is further bolstered by our growing partnerships with India, Indonesia, Malaysia, New Zealand, Singapore, Sri Lanka, Mongolia, and Vietnam.

This Global Operating System upholds critical principles – the rule of law, adherence to standards, peaceful resolution of disputes, freedom of navigation for all civilian and military

vessels and aircraft, and open access to the sea, air, space, and cyberspace domains. Its outcomes are two-fold: enhanced security and unimpeded lawful commerce. Sustainable security requires effective and enduring institutions, both civilian and military, that are guided by these principles. Defense, diplomatic, and development efforts are intertwined and continue to reinforce each other to promote stability in both conflict-affected and steady state environments to build and sustain stable democratic states.

The Indian and Pacific Oceans are the economic lifeblood linking the Indian Subcontinent, Southeast Asia, Australia, Northeast Asia, Oceania and the U.S. Oceans that once were physical and psychological barriers that kept us apart are now maritime superhighways that bring us together. Each year, approximately $5.3 trillion in global trade transits the South China Sea and $1.2 trillion of this sea-based trade involves the U.S. Fifty-five percent (55%) of the global gross domestic product (GDP) comes from this region (including the U.S.). Five of America's top 10 trading partners are in the Indo-Asia-Pacific and it's a destination for one-fourth of our exports. The diverse region drives global economic growth and is home to the world's two largest economies after the U.S. (China and Japan) and led by the three fastest growing large economies (China, India, and the 'ASEAN Five' (Indonesia, Malaysia, Philippines, Thailand, and Vietnam)). Nine of ten megacities in the world are in this region (including Karachi, Pakistan).

The Indo-Asia-Pacific has the world's most populous democracy (India), and is home to more than half the world's population. Some estimates predict that percentage could rise to near 70 percent by 2050, which will lead to further competition for dwindling resources. Indonesia, an important security partner of the U.S., is a maturing democracy, and the world's largest Muslim-majority state. Eleven of the top 15 largest militaries in the world are in or adjacent to the region, as are two-thirds of the nine countries that possess nuclear weapons.

Simply stated, what happens in the Indo-Asia-Pacific matters to America. And the region needs a strong America, just as America needs the region.

In fact, the need for American engagement in the Indo-Asia-Pacific is demonstrated in the long history of U.S. commitment to the region. It's overwhelmingly in America's security and economic interests to defend the rules-based order against challengers that would seek to unilaterally rewrite it or alter its fundamental principles. It's overwhelmingly in America's interests to deepen our diplomacy in the region while backing up peaceful resolution of disputes with undisputed, credible combat power. It's overwhelmingly in America's interests to remain the region's security partner of choice by working closely with our allies and partners who share our commitment to uphold peace, economic prosperity and security.

This document is my assessment of the regional security challenges and opportunities of strategic value. First, I will outline some of the specific challenges we face in the Indo-Asia-

Pacific including threats to the Homeland. I will highlight critical needs in order to seek your support for budgetary and legislative actions to improve U.S. military readiness in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. I will discuss the value of U.S. strategic force posture and forward presence and how these preconditions improve the readiness of our joint force to fight tonight, enhance our ability to reassure allies and partners, and maintain regional stability. And finally, I will discuss how USPACOM strengthens existing alliances and cultivates critical partnerships with regional actors – both of which deliver strategic benefits and improve readiness to protect and defend U.S. interests.

Overview

As we look ahead to the next quarter century, if not the next few months or years, security and stability are threatened by a range of regional state and non-state actors who are challenging the rules-based security order that has helped underwrite peace and prosperity for America and throughout the region for over 70 years.

North Korea continues to disregard United Nations sanctions by developing, and threatening to use intercontinental ballistic missiles and nuclear weapons that will threaten the U.S. Homeland. China has fundamentally altered the physical and political landscape in the South China Sea through large scale land reclamation and by militarizing these reclaimed features. Beijing continues to press Japan in the East China Sea, is stepping up diplomatic and economic pressure against Taiwan, and is methodically trying to supplant U.S. influence with our friends and allies in the region. Furthermore, China is rapidly building a modern, capable military that appears to far exceed its stated defensive purpose or potential regional needs. China's military modernization is focused on defeating the U.S. in Asia by countering U.S. asymmetric advantages. China's military modernization cannot be understated, especially when we consider the Communist regime's lack of transparency and apparent strategy. China is committed to developing a hypersonic glide weapon and advanced cyber and anti-satellite capabilities that present direct threats to the Homeland. China's near term strategy is focused on building up combat power and positional advantage to be able to restrict freedom of navigation and overflight while asserting de facto sovereignty over disputed maritime features and spaces in the region. Russia is modernizing its military and once again exercising its conventional forces and nuclear strike capabilities in the Pacific, which also threaten the Homeland. Transnational terrorists, inspired by and in some cases led by ISIS, have set their sights on the Indo-Asia-Pacific by supporting and encouraging attacks in Indonesia, Bangladesh, Philippines, and Malaysia while recruiting and fund-raising there and elsewhere. Drug trafficking, human smuggling, piracy, weapons proliferation, natural disasters – as well as illegal, unreported, and unregulated fishing – further challenge regional peace and prosperity.

To counter these challenges, USPACOM is enhancing U.S. force posture, presence, and resiliency, while modernizing U.S. force capability and training to ensure our forces are ready to

fight tonight and win in any contingency. USPACOM is working with our many and invaluable allies and partners on a bilateral – and increasingly multilateral – basis to address these common challenges. The growth in multinational "partnerships with a purpose" demonstrates that the countries in the Indo-Asia-Pacific view the U.S. as the security partner of choice. By working together, we enhance capability and capacity to respond to the range of threats endemic to the region.

Key Challenges

North Korea: North Korea remains our most immediate threat in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. It dangerously distinguishes itself as the only country to have tested nuclear weapons in this century. As former Secretary of Defense William Perry once said, we must deal with North Korea "as it is, not as we wish it to be." Kim Jong-Un has stated repeatedly that denuclearization is not an option. He is on a quest for nuclear weapons and the ballistic missiles capable of delivering them intercontinentally. The words and actions of North Korea threaten the U.S. homeland and that of our allies in South Korea and Japan. That's North Korea as it is.

I know there's some debate about the miniaturization and other technological advancements made by Pyongyang. But an aggressive weapons test schedule, as demonstrated by yet another ballistic missile launch this April, moves North Korea closer to its stated goals. As a military commander, I must assume that Kim Jong-Un's claims are true – his aspirations certainly are. USPACOM must be prepared to fight tonight, so I take him at his word. That means we must consider every possible step to defend the U.S. Homeland and our allies. That's why the ROK-U.S. alliance has decided to deploy THAAD – the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense system – in South Korea as soon as possible. That's why the United States continues to call on China – North Korea's principal ally – to exert its considerable influence to stop Pyongyang's unprecedented campaign of nuclear weapons ballistic missile tests. That's why we continue to emphasize trilateral cooperation between Japan, ROK, and the U.S. That's why American leaders and diplomats continue to rally the international community to loudly condemn North Korea's unacceptable behavior.

North Korea vigorously pursued a strategic strike capability in 2016. We assess that the progress made in several areas will encourage Kim Jong-Un to continue down this reckless and dangerous path. Pyongyang launched more ballistic missiles last year than it did in the previous few years combined. This included the first launches of the Musudan intermediate range ballistic missile (IRBM) and the developmental submarine-launched ballistic missile (SLBM). Both systems experienced noteworthy – and often spectacular – failures, but they also both achieved some successes. Just as Thomas Edison is believed to have failed 1000 times before successfully inventing the electric light bulb, so too, Kim Jong-Un will keep trying. One of these days soon, he will succeed. The 2016 SLBM test and the numerous land-based tests employed solid-fuel engines, another indication that Kim Jong-Un is continuing to modify and improve missile

reliability and performance. Those successes advance North Korea's technical and operational base and allow continued development. Aggressive rhetoric since the New Year strongly suggests North Korea will not only continue to test these proscribed systems, but is also likely to attempt a first launch of a similarly prohibited intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM).

At the same time, North Korea's nuclear scientists and engineers are hard at work attempting to transform fissile nuclear materials into reliable nuclear weapons. Pyongyang defied the international community and detonated nuclear devices five times – including two in 2016. Kim Jong-Un has threatened the pre-emptive use of nuclear weapons against the U.S. and other regional targets. Kim's strategic capabilities are not yet an existential threat to the U.S., but if left unchecked, he will gain the capability to match his rhetoric. At that point we will wake up to a new world. North Korea's existing capabilities are already a significant threat to several of our regional treaty allies and the 90,000 U.S. troops stationed in the Western Pacific.

North Korea fields the fourth largest conventional military in the world. Despite a number of noteworthy shortfalls in training and equipment, we must take seriously the substantial inventory of long-range rockets, artillery, close-range ballistic missiles, and expansive chemical weaponry aimed across the Demilitarized Zone at the Republic of Korea and U.S. forces stationed there. North Korea also maintains sizeable numbers of well-trained, highly disciplined special operations forces. Pyongyang made a point recently of publicizing a Special Forces exercise that attacked and destroyed a detailed mock-up of the ROK Presidential complex in an attempt to underscore the capability and lethality of its forces.

Pyongyang's emphasis on strategic and military capabilities comes at the expense of the North Korean people, who continue to struggle with a lifeless economy and international isolation.

In confronting the North Korean threat, it is critical that the U.S. be guided by a strong sense of resolve both publicly and privately in order to bring Kim Jong-Un to his senses, not his knees.

China: The rapid transformation of China's military into a high-tech force capable of regional dominance and a growing ability to support aspirations for global reach and influence is concerning. A February 2017 study from the International Institute for Strategic Studies (IISS) concluded that Chinese weapons and air power in particular are "reaching near-parity with the west." Studies from DOD's Office of Net Assessment further confirm this trend in our decreasing capability overmatch. I agree with these reports. Our dominance in high tech advanced weapons cannot be taken for granted. To do so would be a strategic mistake.

China's activities on the seas, in the air, and in cyberspace have generated concerns about its strategic intentions. For the past two years, the People's Liberation Army (PLA) has been implementing an extensive reorganization which has so far included the creation of

geographically focused Theater Commands, each organized and equipped for specific regional contingencies. This reorganization may be the most important development in the PLA's growing ability to organize for modern combat. The structural reforms that created the Theater Commands institutionalized a joint command and control concept to allow the PLA to maximize the individual services' warfighting strengths into a more cohesive joint force. However, it is likely to take several years before the full benefit of this change is realized. One early indicator that China is already addressing some of the challenges of joint operations is the recent unprecedented appointment of a Navy Admiral to replace an Army General as the commander of the largely maritime-focused Southern Theater.

China's equipment development and fielding programs are comprehensive and impressive. The PLA Navy (PLAN) boasts some of the most advanced warships in the region, including the Type 052D (Luyang-III) guided missile destroyer and the Type 039A (Shang) attack submarine. Within the next two years the first Type 055 (Renhai) guided missile cruisers will join the fleet. These modern, multi-functional ships can support a range of missions and employ sophisticated air defense, surface attack, and subsurface munitions, including anti-ship missiles with ranges far exceeding existing U.S. Navy anti-ship weapons. The PLAN's aircraft carrier program is progressing with the CV-16 (Liaoning) serving as a test and development platform while China builds its first indigenous aircraft carrier, anticipated to be at full operational capability early in the 2020s, and expected to be a spiral upgrade in capabilities. CV-16's deployment to the South China Sea in December and January showed China's growing ability to employ carrier-based aviation. The Type 094 (Jin) ballistic missile submarine can launch nuclear missiles capable of reaching parts of the continental U.S.

The PLA Air Force (PLAAF) and Naval Air Force (PLANAF) are similarly fielding greater numbers of advanced fighters, bombers, and special mission aircraft while aggressively developing new platforms. Flying prototypes of J20 and J31 multi-role fighters portend a near-term capability to field near-5th generation fighters. A new heavy lift transport (Y-20) will give China a greater ability to move troops and equipment anywhere in the world. New and/or upgraded bombers, electronic warfare, command and control, and anti-submarine aircraft all expand PLA abilities to conduct a wide range of operations.

PLA ground forces are large, modern, and well trained. Also reorganized in 2016, the PLA increasingly operates in combined arms formations – integrating attack helicopters, artillery, electronic warfare, and other arms into their training activities. They've incorporated some of the training methods used by the U.S. (e.g., combat training centers with dedicated opposing forces and instrumentation) to increase realism and sophistication in their training.

Another component of the ongoing PLA reorganization is the expansion of capabilities and numbers of the PLA Navy Marines. While the full scope of the change is unclear – some reports

have the number of marines increasing five-fold to as many as 100,000 troops – what is clear is the growing importance China places on building the ability to project power using an expeditionary capability. PRC media has highlighted recent marine deployments for training in harsh weather conditions and on unfamiliar terrain. Chinese leadership likely envisions using the expanded marine capability as an expeditionary force to both seize Taiwan and protect Chinese interests overseas.

The PLA Rocket Force (PLARF) controls the largest and most diverse missile force in the world, with an inventory of more than 2,000 ballistic and cruise missiles. This fact is significant because the U.S. has no comparable capability due to our adherence to the Intermediate Range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty with Russia. (Approximately, 95% of the PLARF's missiles would violate the INF if China was a signatory.) The PLARF is organized for a range of missions, with large numbers of missiles targeted against Taiwan, and others intended to strike targets as far away as Guam and the so-called second island chain, and intercontinental-range missile capable of delivering nuclear weapons to strike the continental U.S. China is also heavily investing in advanced missile technologies like hypersonics and, on average, launches more than 100 missiles each year for training or research and development.

The PLA Strategic Support Force (PLASSF) was established last year to better manage and employ the PLA's impressive array of cyber, space, and other specialized capabilities. The PLASSF is a potential game-changer if it succeeds in denying other countries the use of space, the electromagnetic spectrum, and networks.

To train and integrate these capabilities, Chinese forces have increased the scope of operations in number, complexity, and geographic range. Submarine deployments to the Indian Ocean, air exercises in the Middle East, and port visits to Europe or South America are on the rise. For example, President Xi will travel to Djibouti in the near future to officially open the Chinese naval base there. The base is strategically positioned on the narrowest point of the strategic strait of Bab al Mandeb, a key intersection for international commercial and defense related navigation. This base could support Chinese force projection through the Indian Ocean and into the Mediterranean and Africa.

An encouraging sign that China is willing to shoulder a greater role in international affairs is the expansion of Chinese peacekeeping missions, something we promote in our interactions with the PLA. My goal remains to convince China that its best future comes from peaceful cooperation, meaningful participation in the current rules-based security order, and honoring its international commitments.

Territorial Disputes and Maritime Claims: A number of friction points where competing territorial claims overlap exist throughout the Indo-Asia-Pacific, e.g., between Russia and Japan

(Northern Territories) and between the Philippines and Malaysia (Sabah) – but none are as fraught with the potential for escalation and military conflict as the South and East China Seas.

South China Sea: The U.S. takes no position on competing sovereignty claims in the South China Sea, but we encourage all countries to uphold international law, including the law of the sea as reflected in the Law of the Sea Convention, and to respect unimpeded lawful commerce, freedom of navigation and overflight, and peaceful dispute resolution.

There are three notable disputes over territorial sovereignty in the South China Sea. The first dispute is between China, Taiwan, and Vietnam over the Paracel Islands, which China took by force from Vietnam and has occupied since 1974. The second dispute is between China, Taiwan, and the Philippines over Scarborough Reef. In 2012, the U.S. brokered a deal between the Philippines and China where both countries committed to keep their naval forces away from Scarborough. While the Philippines honored the commitment, China continued to operate with its Navy and Coast Guard and, soon after, expelled Philippine fishermen. The third dispute involves multiple claimants within the Spratly Islands where China, Taiwan, Vietnam, Brunei, Malaysia, and the Philippines each claim sovereignty over some or all of the features.

The past year included some major developments in the status of these disputes. The landmark ruling by the Arbitral Tribunal under the Law of the Sea Convention (the Tribunal) in July 2016 addressed the status of features and maritime claims specified in the Philippines' arbitration case. While the tribunal did not rule on the sovereignty of specific features, the tribunal did declare a number of China's maritime claims and actions unlawful. However, China ignored the ruling and maintains and even articulated new excessive maritime claims throughout the South China Sea. All the activities underway before the ruling, including the militarization of the artificial landforms created by China and the provocative actions of military and law enforcement forces, continue unabated.

China's military-specific construction in the Spratly islands includes the construction of 72 fighter aircraft hangars – which could support three fighter regiments – and about ten larger hangars that could support larger airframes, such as bombers or special mission aircraft. All of these hangars should be completed this year. During the initial phases of construction China emplaced tank farms, presumably for fuel and water, at Fiery Cross, Mischief and Subi reefs. These could support substantial numbers of personnel as well as deployed aircraft and/or ships. All seven outposts are armed with a large number of artillery and gun systems, ostensibly for defensive missions. The recent identification of buildings that appear to have been built specifically to house long-rang surface-to-air missiles is the latest indication China intends to deploy military systems to the Spratlys. During my Congressional testimony last year, I reported my belief that China was clearly militarizing the South China Sea. China's activities since then have only reinforced this belief. We should cease to be cautious about the language we use to

describe these activities. Despite its claims to the contrary, China has militarized the South China Sea through the building of seven military bases on artificial islands constructed through the large-scale damage of a fragile environment in disputed areas.

The presence of these military capabilities undermines China's consistent claim that these massively expanded features are for safety and humanitarian purposes. Recently China has tried to obscure the military purposes of its Spratly Islands efforts by calling for private investment, residential settlement, and tourism. The latter may prove especially problematic as China's land creation effort over the past few years has destroyed the once vibrant marine ecosystem surrounding the features.

China's naval, coast guard, maritime militia, State Oceanic Administration, and air force presence in the South China Sea remains substantial. China Coast Guard (CCG) ships remain present near Chinese outposts and other features. CCG and PLAN ships also continue to control activities near Scarborough Reef, a feature also claimed by the Philippines. In February, China announced it was seeking to revise its domestic Maritime Traffic Safety Law to empower its maritime services to control or penalize foreign ships operating in "other sea areas under the jurisdiction of the People's Republic of China" beyond those allowed under international law as reflected in the Law of the Sea Convention. Given China's continued rejection of the Tribunal ruling and continued articulation that much of the South China Sea is "under its jurisdiction," we can only assume China intends to improperly apply its domestic law to foreign ships operating lawfully in the area.

China protests the legal and long-standing U.S. presence in the South China Sea by falsely claiming Washington is the cause for tensions. U.S. military forces have been operating routinely and persistently on, below, and above the South China Sea for more than 70 years – this hasn't changed. What has changed the status quo in the South China Sea in recent years is the increased coercive behavior by China's military, Coast Guard, and a vast network of private vessels controlled by the PRC that act as a maritime militia of "little green fishermen." Furthermore, China's unprecedented artificial island construction and land reclamation has increased tensions with other claimants and its neighbors. The U.S. has consistently called for all claimants to find a peaceful, diplomatic resolution to their land and maritime disputes in the South China Sea.

Specifically, since 1979, the U.S. Freedom of Navigation program has peacefully challenged excessive maritime claims by coastal states all around the world (including those of our friends and allies). This program consists of diplomatic communications and operational assertions, which are not provocative and are not a threat to any country. These operations are conducted globally to maintain open seas and open skies, which underpins economic prosperity for the U.S. and all countries.

Freedom of navigation operations (FONOPs) are conducted for exactly what the title says – to exercise the right of all nations to operate freely at sea and in the air wherever international law allows. In 2016, USPACOM forces conducted three FONOPs near disputed features in the South China Sea. These and future routine FONOPs demonstrate that the U.S. military will continue to fly, sail, and operate wherever international law allows, especially where excessive maritime claims attempt to erode the freedom of the seas.

East China Sea: Tensions between Japan and China over the Senkaku Islands continue to worsen. This past year saw a sharp rise in the number PLAAF aircraft operating over the East China Sea. China persistently challenges Japan's administration over the islands by deploying warships into the area, sailing Coast Guard ships inside the territorial waters surrounding the Senkakus, and protesting Japanese reconnaissance flights. The presence of military and law enforcement assets in close proximity to one another and the accompanying rhetoric create an environment conducive to miscalculation and unintended incidents. U.S. policy is clear here: the Senkakus are under the administration of Japan and we will defend them in accordance with the U.S. – Japan Treaty on Mutual Cooperation and Security. Secretary Mattis recently said during his trip to Japan that, "...our longstanding policy on the Senkaku islands stands. The U.S. will continue to recognize Japanese administration of the islands and as such Article 5 of the U.S. – Japan Security Treaty applies."

Russia: Although focused on Europe and the Middle East, Russia is engaged militarily and politically in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. I share General Lori Robinson's view that Russia continues to exhibit increasingly aggressive behavior, both regionally and globally.

The Russian Pacific Fleet operates and exercises throughout the region. The second Borey (Dolgorukiy-class) nuclear ballistic missile submarine transferred to the Pacific Fleet last fall, and the Kremlin announced the acquisition of 6 new advanced Kilo attack submarines for the Pacific by 2021. The Russian Pacific Fleet's five Project 949A (Oscar II) nuclear-powered guided missile submarines have a mission to track and attack aircraft carriers and other priority targets – including land targets – in the event of war. In late 2015 Russia announced a plan to upgrade the Oscar II to fire new, more-advanced long-range missiles. The first Steregushchy-class guided missile corvette was commissioned in January 2017 with more planned as part of ongoing military modernization efforts. Russian troops and warships held combined island-seizure training with China in the South China Sea last summer. On land, Russian forces fielded long-range anti-ship missiles along the coast, moved S-400 strategic air defense missiles to the east, and stationed the advanced Su-34 fighter-bomber to patrol the skies. Nuclear-capable bombers continue to fly missions focused on rehearsing strikes on the U.S. mainland or regional targets. Additionally, Russia has introduced a new generation of highly precise, conventionally armed cruise missiles that can reach the United States and our allies.

Of particular note are Russian efforts to build presence and influence the high north. Russia has more bases north of the Arctic Circle than all other countries combined and is building more with distinctly military capabilities.

Russian economic and political outreach brings both positive and negative impacts for the region. Expanding exports of Russian natural gas and oil provides new, diversified sources for Asia's growing energy demands. Japan and ROK are among the leading importers of Russian coal. Japanese investment in the Russian Far East may prove extraordinarily helpful to regional growth and stability. But Russia also seeks to mitigate the effects of international sanctions imposed in response to its military operations in Ukraine, and may be trying to wedge itself into new relationships by opportunistically providing economic aid packages and military assistance (e.g., the Philippines).

ISIS / Violent Extremist Organizations (VEOs): ISIS is a clear threat that must be defeated. The main geographic focus of the U.S.-led counter-ISIS coalition has rightfully been in the Middle East and North Africa. But, as ISIS is defeated in Iraq, Syria and Libya, it will undoubtedly seek to operate in other areas. Increasing numbers of returning fighters alone have already forced USPACOM to think ahead about "what's next" in the fight against ISIS. As I mentioned earlier in this testimony, there are far more Muslims living in the Indo-Asia-Pacific than in the Middle East and North Africa. The vast majorities are peaceful people who seek to live lives free from the curse of terrorism. But even if a very small percentage of the Muslims in the USPACOM AOR are radicalized, there could be deadly results.

In 2016 alone, we witnessed ISIS-inspired terrorism in Bangladesh, Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines. Additionally, it's clear to me that as our military operations in the Middle East continue to deny ISIS territory, some foreign fighters originally from the Indo-Asia-Pacific will try to return home. They'll come back to their home countries radicalized and weaponized. So we must stop them now at the front end and not at the back end when the threat can become more dangerous. But we cannot do it alone. To halt ISIS' cancerous spread, we must work together with like-minded nations in the region and across the globe.

USPACOM seeks to advance multinational partnerships with a purpose. Malaysia, Indonesia, the Philippines, Australia and New Zealand are partners we are engaging to tackle the threat against ISIS and other VEOs. Many Indo-Asia-Pacific countries like Australia and New Zealand have joined the coalition dedicated to ISIS' complete destruction. Through multinational collaboration, we can eradicate this disease before it metastasizes in the USPACOM area of responsibility.

Countering violent extremism in the Indo-Asia-Pacific requires close collaboration with U.S. government interagency partners like the Federal Bureau of Investigation (FBI), Department of Treasury, and the various agencies of our intelligence community. Through an interagency network reinforced by liaison officers embedded in USPACOM headquarters and Special Operations Command (SOCOM) we are able to leverage tools from across our government to fight terrorist organization.

Transnational Crime: Transnational Criminal Organizations (TCOs), many of whom operate as sophisticated global enterprises that traffic in human beings, weapons, drugs and other illicit substances, exist throughout the Indo-Asia-Pacific. The revenue from criminal endeavors threatens stability and undermines human rights. Corruption follows wherever these organizations flourish, weakening governments and contributing to regional instability.

Methamphetamine and amphetamine-type stimulants continue to be the primary drug threat in to the U.S. from the region. Joint Interagency Task Force-West (JIATF-W) reports that while Asia-sourced methamphetamine production is significant, methamphetamine produced elsewhere supplements the region's increasing demand. Maritime container shipments of China-sourced chemicals account for the bulk of the precursors used by Latin American drug trafficking organizations to manufacture methamphetamine and heroin, most of which is intended for the U.S. market – a direct threat to the U.S. homeland. Additionally, China-sourced fentanyl and new psychoactive substances are now a growing threat to the U.S.

While much remains to be done, USPACOM forces, including JIATF-W, are coordinating with our interagency and foreign partners to address these threats.

Proliferation Issues: The Indo-Asia-Pacific has the busiest maritime and air ports in the world. Technological advances have outpaced many countries' ability to effectively manage export controls to counter the proliferation of component technology. Trade includes dual-use technology, such as commercial items controlled by the nuclear, ballistic missile, and chemical/biological weapons control regimes, including manufactured or re-exported materials from other countries with limited export control enforcement. USPACOM's Countering Weapons of Mass Destruction (C-WMD) community supports proliferation operations throughout the Indo-Asia-Pacific by addressing concerns through key leader engagements, combined and joint exercises, and international security exchanges focused on counter proliferation activities.

Natural Disasters: The Indo-Asia-Pacific region remains the most disaster prone region in the world. 75 percent of Earth's volcanoes and 90 percent of earthquakes occur in the "Ring of Fire" surrounding the Pacific Basin. According to a 2015 UN report, disasters over the last 10 years

took the lives of a half a million people in the region, with over 1.5 billon people affected and damages of over a half a trillion dollars.

In the 2015 Nepal earthquake response, in coordination with the Nepalese government and USAID, USPACOM's Joint Task Force 505 delivered about 120 tons of emergency relief supplies and transported 553 personnel and conducted 69 casualty evacuations. This last fall USS SAMPSON (DDG 102) and Maritime Patrol and Reconnaissance Aircraft assisted New Zealand in its response to an earthquake on its South Island.

While disaster response is not a primary USPACOM focus, a key element of our Theater Campaign Plan (TCP) is building capacity with allies and partners to improve their resiliency and capability to conduct humanitarian assistance/disaster response (HA/DR). HA/DR cooperation is also an effective means to deepen and strengthen relationships. USPACOM's Center for Excellence for Disaster Management (CFE-DM) increases regional governments' readiness to respond to natural disasters by serving as a node for distribution of best practices. Our service components are prepositioning HA/DR stocks to facilitate timely response and to build access. And, when possible, U.S. military forces can and do assist with unique capabilities in the areas of air and sealift, infrastructure restoration, and emergency medical support.

Budget Uncertainty: Fiscal uncertainty injects substantial risk to USPACOM's long-term mission. The Budget Control Act and yearly Continuing Resolutions degrade USPACOM's ability to effectively plan.

I've said this many times before – sequestration must be repealed.

In 2013, sequestration cut every defense program equally. As a result, real readiness suffered. For example, we were forced to cancel an important joint exercise, NORTHERN EDGE. We need predictable funding to meet our current mission requirements and to prepare for the future. Keeping self-imposed spending cuts is a long-term threat to our national security.

Fiscal uncertainty and reduced funding levels have forced the services to make offsets in crucial investments toward modernization, infrastructure, and future readiness. These tradeoffs will continue to have a negative impact on the Indo-Asia Pacific Theater strategy. Equally important, the uncertainty of the current fiscal landscape places a heavy burden of unpredictability onto our service members and their families, our government civilians, Department of Defense contractors, and supporting industry. The U.S. will experience degraded warfighting capabilities unless decisive actions are taken to end fiscal uncertainties.

The strategic priorities from the Services must be funded to provide USPACOM what we need in order to provide for the national defense.

Without a bipartisan agreement that provides relief from the Budget Control Act caps, the Department of Defense will be forced to decrease investments that have given our warfighters the technological edge they have enjoyed for decades. Our near-peer competitors like China and Russia are quickly closing the technological gap. I need weapons systems of increased lethality that go faster, further, are networked, are more survivable, and affordable. If USPACOM has to fight tonight, I don't want it to be a fair fight. If it's a knife fight, I want to bring a gun. If it's a gun fight, I want to bring in the artillery, and the artillery of all of our allies. But as I said during Congressional testimony last year, sequestration could reduce us to wielding a butter knife in this fight. We must not let that happen. In order to deter potential adversaries in the Indo-Asia-Pacific, we must invest in critical capabilities, build a force posture that decreases our vulnerabilities and increases our resiliency, and reassure our allies and partners while encouraging them to be full and cooperative partners in their own defense and the defense of the rules-based international order.

Critical Capabilities

The most technical, high-end military challenges America faces in the region continue to grow. While forward presence, alliances, and partnerships address these challenges, USPACOM requires our most technologically advanced warfighting capabilities to fully meet them. The critical capabilities in this section demand our attention and treasure. We must preserve our asymmetric advantages in undersea and anti-submarine warfare, and we must strengthen our abilities to counter strategies designed to limit our freedom of action.

China has developed and fielded capability and capacity to challenge our regional maritime dominance. I need increased lethality, specifically ships and aircraft equipped with faster and more survivable weapons systems. Longer range offensive weapons on every platform are an imperative. And, then we must network this force and take advantage of man-machine teaming to improve our responsiveness.

Pacing the threats we face in this region is not an option in my playbook. We must work hard and invest the money to outpace the competition to develop and deploy the latest technology to USPACOM. Examples include Navy Integrated Fires and the AEGIS Flight III destroyer and its Air and Missile Defense Radar (AMDR) – essential tools in today's complex operating environment.

Munitions, Fuels, and Logistics Networks: Critical munitions shortfalls are my top warfighting concern. Munitions are a large part of determining combat readiness in pursuit of national strategic objectives. We are short in "here-and-now" basic munitions like small diameter bombs. Our near-peer competitors continue to modernize their weapons systems and

leverage new technologies to close capability gaps between us and them. We must maintain our capability to operate in contested environments. Additionally, we must continue to expand cross domain fires capabilities and focus on joint integration to strengthen deterrence and enable joint combined maneuver.

Priorities include long-range and stand-off strike weapons, anti-ship weapons, advanced air-to-air munitions, theater ballistic/cruise missile defense, torpedoes, naval mines, and a Cluster Munitions replacement. With respect to ship-to-ship and air-to-ship munitions that allow us to defeat an aggressor from greater range, we are looking at capabilities similar to Long Range Anti-Ship Missile (LRASM) and Joint Air-to-Surface Standoff Missile – Extended Range (JASSM-ER). In the air-to air realm, I am seeking advancements in munitions that will provide us an advantage in a denied environment, such as the AIM-120D and AIM-9X2 air superiority missiles. We must modernize and improve our torpedo and naval mine capabilities to maintain our undersea advantage. Continued improvements in the capability and capacity of ballistic/cruise missile defense interceptors will further enhance homeland defense capabilities and protect key regional nodes from aggressive action. In support of the Korean Peninsula, I support efforts to acquire a replacement for Cluster Munitions – we need an Area Effects Munition replacement now.

As new inventory becomes available, current storage capacity will become critical. Current, legacy storage locations are inadequate to store specific types of modernized munitions and meet the requirements of FY21 Department of Defense Explosive Safety Standards. To meet security and safety standards for future inventory, additional new military construction (MILCON) will be required. When munitions storage MILCON projects lose to competing projects and are not funded we put unnecessary risk on our personnel. We must fund these MILCON projects.

Fuel is a critical commodity, and its strategic positioning is a key pillar of our logistics posture. Ensuring we have the right fuel, in the right amount, at the right location, at the right time, is vital to USPACOM's ability to project power throughout the Indo-Asia-Pacific. I remain committed to building the capacity of our prepositioned war reserve stocks of fuel, including resiliency of the facilities, infrastructure, and supply chain on which these stocks depend.

Finally, our nation's ability to project power rides on the backbone of airlift and sealift. This is most true in USPACOM. Our Air Force made tough decisions to transition airlift to Backup-Aircraft Inventory (BAI) status and transition Active Components to Guard and Reserve in order to meet budget constraints. Unfortunately, these decisions resulted in a lack of flexibility and readily available capacity for combatant command war plans. Today's global competition for airlift resources hinders the joint force's ability to promptly achieve operational objectives. In war, this shortcoming can result in greater loss of life, increased risk on USPACOM-fielded forces, and risk to our Nation's credibility with partners and allies. I remain concerned about the

current airlift posture and support an increase in airlift capacity, resources, and innovative deployment technologies. The long-term health of the U.S. flag commercial fleet and the availability of the merchant marine is also a concern.

Taken collectively, these individual gaps and shortfalls in our logistics capabilities represent overall erosion in USPACOM's operational readiness and require an initiative like APSI to reverse those negative trends. A strategic initiative to arrest and reverse those trends would be beneficial and worth consideration.

Air Superiority: In order to deter potential adversaries in the Indo-Asia-Pacific we must possess the capabilities that allow us to gain air superiority at a time and place of our choosing and we must be able to maintain that air superiority long enough to complete critical missions. For the last several decades the U.S. has enjoyed unmatched air superiority including 4th generation fighters and air-battle-management platforms. Our potential adversaries, however, are rapidly closing the gap as both Russia and China have fielded their own versions of 5th generation fighters just as the U.S. has begun the fielding of our 5th generation platforms in the Pacific. While we continue to invest in 5th generation platforms, we must also find innovative ways to make our 4th generation aircraft more capable. Regardless of the pace of 5th generation fielding, these 4th generation platforms will be in our active inventory for years to come and we will have to rely on them to address the same threats.

Undersea Warfare: Roughly 230 of the world's 400 foreign submarines are in the Indo-Asia-Pacific, of which approximately 160 belong to China, North Korea, and Russia. Potential adversary submarine activity has tripled from 2008 levels, requiring a corresponding increase of U.S. activity to maintain undersea superiority. China is improving the lethality and survivability of its attack submarines and building quieter, high-end diesel and nuclear powered submarines. China has four operational nuclear-powered Jin-class ballistic missile submarines (SSBNs) and at least one more may enter service by the end of this decade. When armed, a Jin-class SSBN will give China an important strategic capability that must be countered. Russia is modernizing its existing fleet of Oscar-class multi-purpose attack nuclear submarines (SSGNs) and producing their next generation Severodvinsk Yasen-class SSGNs. Russia has also homeported their newest Dolgorukiy-class SSBN in the Pacific, significantly enhancing its strategic capability. USPACOM must maintain its asymmetric advantage in undersea warfare capability including our attack submarines, their munitions, and other anti-submarine warfare systems like the P-8 Poseidon and ship-borne systems. Additionally, the Integrated Undersea Surveillance System (IUSS), including the Surface Towed Array Sensor Systems (SURTASS), plays a key role to theater operations and must be resourced appropriately to ensure it remains relevant. Maintaining pace with submarine activity growth is necessary and I support the Secretary of the Navy's 2016 Force Structure Assessment which calls for a 355-ship navy including 66 attack submarines.

Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR): The challenge of gathering credible deep and penetrating intelligence cannot be overstated. The Indo-Asia-Pacific presents a dynamic security environment requiring flexible, reliable, survivable deep-look and persistent ISR to provide indications and warning and situational awareness across a vast geographic area. As previously noted, USPACOM faces a variety of challenges and potential flashpoints. Our treaty allies rely on U.S. ISR capabilities to support mutual defense treaties. ISR is required to prevent strategic surprise, buy decision space for national leadership, accurately assess the security environment and, if necessary, defeat potential adversaries. Continued advancements of our near-peer competitors requires additional advancements to how our intelligence is collected and processed – including the risks involved – to avoid greater long-term risk. Our ISR capabilities must be suited to our unique operating environment.

Space and Cyberspace: USPACOM relies on space based assets for satellite communications (SATCOM), ISR, and Positioning, Navigation, and Timing (PNT) capabilities to support missions across the range of military operations. USPACOM's region spans over half the globe and space-based assets are high-demand, low-density resources. As the space grows increasingly congested and contested, our adversaries have and continue to develop means to deny our space-enabled capabilities. USPACOM requires resilient and responsive space based capabilities to support operations. China continues to pursue a broad and robust array of counter-space capabilities, which includes direct-ascent anti-satellite missiles, co-orbital anti-satellite systems, cyber-attack and exploitation, directed energy weapons and ground-based satellite and PNT jammers.

Freedom of maneuver across the cyberspace domain is critical to USPACOM's ability to execute military operation. We face constant threats in this domain from both state and non-state actors and must ensure we have a robust and capable cyber force, as well as the equipment necessary to operate and defend the U.S. military's portion of the Department of Defense Information Network within USPACOM's area of operations. In addition, USPACOM requires an agile and defensible network infrastructure to enable information sharing and collaboration with our mission partners. This network infrastructure will foster better command and control in joint and coalition efforts, and will provide a true fight tonight communication capability that does not currently exist.

Our offensive cyber capabilities, currently under the responsibility of USCYBERCOM, continue to develop. As the command and control relationships continue to mature between USPACOM and USCYBERCOM, and between USCYBERCOM and its subordinate headquarters, we continue to advocate for increased unity of effort and unity of command for all cyber forces within USPACOM's area of operation. It is important that we strike the right balance between maintaining a sufficiently capable cyber force within our theater working directly for USPACOM and its subordinates and developing a capable cyber force under USCYBERCOM.

Integrated Air and Missile Defense (IAMD): USPACOM faces unique IAMD challenges despite efforts to forward station additional IAMD sensors and weapons capabilities in the Indo-Asia-Pacific to protect our forces and allies. Hawaii, Guam, and our Pacific territories are part of our Homeland and must also be defended. North Korea's persistent research, development and active testing of both its missile and nuclear programs and China's development and operational fielding of advanced counter-intervention technologies that includes fielding and testing of highly maneuverable re-entry vehicle/warhead (i.e., hypersonic weapons) capabilities challenges U.S. strategic, operational, and tactical freedom of movement and maneuver. Other notable challenges include challenging new cruise missiles and Unmanned Aircraft System (UAS) technologies.

USPACOM's IAMD priority is to establish a persistent, credible, and sustainable ballistic missile defense presence by forward deploying the latest advancements in missile defense technologies to the Indo-Asia-Pacific. Accordingly, TPY-2 radars in Japan, the THAAD system on Guam, and the Sea-Based X-band Radar (SBX) based in Hawaii defend the Homeland and our allies. USPACOM and USFK with the support of the DOD, the U.S. Army and MDA are working bi-laterally with South Korea to ensure the emplacement of a THAAD battery on the Korean peninsula in the next few months. The U.S. Navy is moving forward with the port shift of the USS MILIUS from San Diego to Yokosuka, Japan in 2017. Since the arrival of the USS BENFOLD and USS BARRY to Japan in fiscal year 2016, the U.S. Seventh Fleet is in a better position to support the U.S.-Japan alliance with more flexible missile defense capability. USPACOM will continue working with Japan, the ROK, and Australia to improve our level of staff coordination and information sharing and the goal of creating a fully-integrated Ballistic Missile Defense (BMD) architecture that must also address the increasing cruise missile threat.

Innovation: Innovation continues to be critical to addressing USPACOM's capability gaps and maintaining our military advantage. USPACOM partners with DOD-wide organizations, national laboratories, and industry to provide innovative solutions to fill capability requirements. USPACOM also continues to work closely with the OSD Strategic Capabilities Office (SCO) to develop and field game-changing technologies for the Indo-Asia-Pacific. USPACOM recognizes that advances in artificial intelligence, machine learning, large data analytics, and predictive forecasting will enable our warfighters to make better decisions and to confront the challenges of our near-peer adversaries. The DOD Third Offset Strategy provides the mechanism to invest in innovative capabilities that will enhance the joint warfighter given the challenges in the Indo-Asia-Pacific Theater. As I have stated, this is not about winning wars on the cheap, as some critics may suggest. It's about winning wars on the smart. USPACOM will continue to push the boundaries of innovation and "fail smartly" so that we can ultimately develop and field the best solutions for the joint warfighter.

Fires...Achieving Multi-Domain Battle (MDB): Over the past two decades, China has developed numerous ground and air launched missile systems that far outrange U.S. systems. They have done this at a fraction of the cost of some of our more expensive systems. Constrained in part by our adherence to the INF treaty, the U.S. has fallen behind in our ability to match the long-range fires capabilities of the new era. China is not a signatory to the INF treaty and the other main signatory, Russia, has repeatedly violated the treaty as they develop capabilities that could prevent the U.S. from fulfilling its alliance obligations.

Just as our adversaries have adapted to counter our asymmetric advantages, we, too must adapt the way we fight to leverage new technologies and approaches to operations to maintain our edge. We need systems that are fast, long-range, lethal, survivable, networked, rapidly deployable, and maneuverable. Given existing technology, such systems should be relatively inexpensive.

With this in mind that I have become a strong advocate for the operational concept known as Multi-Domain Battle (MDB). The Deputy Secretary of Defense has called MDB, "the first operational concept of the third offset." MDB is the ultimate joint concept that allows a commander to achieve cross-domain effects. Because of this, it gives a commander multiple options from across the joint force and confuses our adversaries by making them face multiple dilemmas. MDB calls for combined arms operations across all domains with joint force capabilities being brought to bear in the long-range fight as well as close combat. Recognizing that we may no longer be able to maintain broad sea and air control as we did in the past, one benefit of MDB in the Indo-Asia-Pacific is the addition of ground, space, electromagnetic spectrum, and cyber forces operating across archipelagic regions to augment sea and air forces to create temporal pockets of dominance that can be exploited to gain tactical and operational advantage.

We already have much of the capability for MDB in our force. However, one of the biggest capability gaps in terms of joint effects is the lack of connectivity between the Navy's Cooperative Engagement Capability (CEC), Army's THAAD and Patriot Systems, and the USMC's C2 systems. I know the Services are working on this problem. The technology is out there and the proof is in the lethal systems developed by our adversaries. More importantly, MDB requires a new jointness to bring it all together. MDB conceptualizes bringing jointness further down to the tactical levels allowing smaller echelons to communicate and coordinate directly while fighting in a decentralized manner that still allows for clearance of fires and deconfliction of efforts. I have tasked my component commands at USPACOM to test this operational concept in a major exercise. We are well on our way to meeting that goal thanks to a great team of service component commanders and their organizations.

Strategic Force Posture in the Indo-Asia-Pacific

The tyranny of distance and short indications and warnings timelines place a premium on robust, modern, and agile forward-stationed forces at high levels of readiness. USPACOM requires a force posture that credibly communicates U.S. resolve, strengthens alliances and partnerships, prevents conflict, and in the event of crisis, responds rapidly across the full range of military operations. USPACOM's force posture is also supplemented by the deployment of rotational forces and the fielding of new capabilities and concepts that address operational shortfalls and critical gaps.

Global Force Management (GFM): The Department of Defense is continuing several GFM initiatives that include adding the Navy's newest airborne early warning and control aircraft, the E-2D Advanced Hawkeye, to the USS RONALD REAGAN Strike Group in Japan, and increasing the presence of ballistic missile defense-capable surface ships. The Army is stationing a THAAD battery in South Korea and maintains the rotation of an Armored Brigade Combat Team (ABCT), plus enabling forces, to the Korean Peninsula. The Army also continues to support collective training and forward presence across the region through Pacific Pathways, thus enhancing partnership opportunities, avoiding permanent basing, and increasing Army readiness. The Air Force deploys a broad range of assets to the region, including F-22s, F-16s, E-8s, RC-135s and strategic bombers, including B-52, B-1 and B-2 bombers, to maintain presence in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. The forward stationing and deployment of 5th generation airframes to the region continues to be a priority for USPACOM – notably the Marine Corps has deployed the first F-35B squadron based in Japan. The Marine Corps continues to execute a reduction in the footprint on Japan by distribution of the capability across the region. Rotational forces west of the International Date Line are positioned to deter and defeat potential aggressors in the region.

Force Posture Initiatives: As geopolitical issues and challenges in the security environment continue to evolve, the importance of infrastructure recapitalization and the fielding of advanced capabilities have increased. In support of USPACOM's ability to execute national tasking and meet national objectives, fiscal year 2017 military construction projects support the arrival of next-generation platforms and capabilities to include the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter (Kadena Air Base, Japan), DDG-1000 Zumwalt-class Destroyers (San Diego, California and forward operating locales), RQ-4 Global Hawk (Andersen Air Base, Guam), and C-130J Super Hercules transport aircraft (Yokota Air Base, Japan). Other investments support increased resiliency for the joint force via projects in Japan, Guam, and Australia, increased critical munitions storage capacity in California and Guam, and quality of life investments for our forces and their families in South Korea and Japan.

Host country support at established locations remains robust. Two examples of this include our efforts in Korea (Yongsan Relocation Plan and Land Partnership Plan), and Japan (Okinawa

Consolidation and the Defense Policy Review Initiative). In support of these initiatives, the Government of Japan committed up to $3.1 billion to help realign U.S. Marines from Okinawa to Guam and other locations. This funding includes approximately $300M for the joint military training ranges Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas (CNMI). Additionally, the Government of Japan committed $4.5 billion to expand the airfield and associated facilities at Marine Corps Air Station Iwakuni. Finally, The Japan is also funding Okinawa Consolidation and the Futenma Replacement Facility at ~$4 billion. Outside of the above initiatives, Japan and Korea continue to provide other support, which play a critical role in supporting U.S. presence in the region.

Furthermore, USPACOM is expanding its activities to include the continued execution of the Marine Rotational Force-Darwin (MRF-D), Enhanced Air Cooperation (EAC) in Australia, and Bilateral Air Contingent Events-Philippines (BACE-P. Additionally, we are attempting to increase presence by seeking the assignment of additional ISR and BMD assets in the region.

USPACOM continues to execute five major force posture initiatives: (1) U.S.-Japan Defense Policy Review Initiative (DPRI) / USMC Distributed Laydown, (2) U.S. Forces Korea Realignment, (3) Resiliency, (4) Agile Logistics and (5) Agile Communications.

DPRI/USMC Distributed Laydown: DPRI is a vital part of the larger U.S. military Integrated Global Basing and Presence Strategy. A major goal of DPRI is to create an environment that supports the enduring presence of U.S. forces in Japan. USPACOM maintains significant focus and effort on these initiatives. DPRI is one of the largest construction efforts since the end of the Cold War. Much work by both the U.S and Japan remain, but progress is being made towards realigning U.S. Marines from Okinawa to Guam and build-up of facilities at other locations such as Marine Corps Air Station (MCAS) Iwakuni.

Another critical cooperative effort, the Futenma Replacement Facility (FRF) at Camp Schwab/Henoko, will enable the U.S. to fulfill its security obligations to Japan while also enabling the return of MCAS Futenma to Okinawa. More than ever before, U.S. troop presence in Okinawa matters today. The presence of U.S. forces brings unique capabilities that cannot be replicated. So it was encouraging to see the 10 February joint statement between President Trump and Japan Prime Minister Abe that reaffirmed the commitment of both countries to construct the FRF. This solution maintains our presence at Marine Corps Air Station Futenma for another decade until the FRF is completed.

USFK Realignment: The consolidation of U.S. forces in Korea via the Land Partnership Plan (LPP) and Yongsan Relocation Plan (YRP) continues to move ahead and is a success story. Construction will triple the size of Camp Humphreys and increase the base's population to ~46,000 troops and family members. The ROK is bearing the majority of the relocation's cost,

committing $10 billion. USPACOM appreciates the Congress' continued support of DOD's largest peace-time relocation project.

Resiliency: USPACOM resiliency efforts include investment in a more robust infrastructure in ally and partner countries, ensuring proper dispersal and optimization of critical enablers including communication nodes, fuel repositories, medical readiness, logistic support equipment and infrastructure, and the hardening of discrete facilities. For example, USPACOM continues to harden facilities in Guam as well as enhancing airfields at dispersed sites throughout the theater.

Agile Logistics: USPACOM continues to face significant force posture challenges, the largest being the distance and fragility of the lines of communication within the Indo-Asia-Pacific. The tyranny of distance and short timelines to respond to crises require investment in infrastructure to properly preposition capabilities and capacity throughout the region. Ensuring that our logistics – munitions, fuel, and other war materiel – are properly prepositioned, secured, and available to meet requirements is essential to providing flexible and rapid force closure in support of national defense planning.

Agile Communications: The ability to communicate with our allies and partners underpins all efforts from command and control interoperability through logistics coordination. Today's Defense communications systems continue to be hampered by obsolete encryption technology that forces us to build or contort information networks to comply with restrictive information sharing policies. Our acquisition systems cannot support the pace of rapid information technology advancements. As a result, we are not fully postured with the latest technology to interoperate with multiple partner combinations over all the phases of military operations. Furthermore, we will not have the communication capacity and sharable encryption capability to support the most modern warfighting platforms and associated weapon systems as they are built and deployed.

Readiness: USPACOM is a "fight tonight" theater with short response timelines across vast spaces. Threats as discussed earlier require U.S. military forces in the region maintain a high level of readiness to respond rapidly to crisis. USPACOM's readiness is evaluated against its ability to execute operational and contingency plans, which place a premium on forward-stationed, ready forces that can exercise, train, and operate with our partner nations' militaries and follow-on forces able to respond to operational contingencies.

Forward-stationed forces west of the International Date Line increase decision space and decrease response times, bolster the confidence of allies and partners, and reduce the chance of miscalculation by potential adversaries.

The ability of the U.S. to surge and globally maneuver ready forces is an asymmetric advantage that must be maintained. Over the past two decades of war, the U.S. has of necessity prioritized the readiness of deploying forces at the expense of follow-on-forces and critical investments needed to outpace emerging threats. A shortage of ready surge forces resulting from high operational demands, delayed maintenance periods due to sequestration, and training pipeline shortfalls limit responsiveness to emergent contingencies and greatly increase risk. These challenges grow each year as our forces downsize while continuing to deploy at unprecedented rates. We are at risk of overstressing the force if the Services are not assured fiscal stability to establish conditions to reset their force elements.

Fiscal uncertainty requires the Department to accept risk in long-term engagement opportunities with strategic consequences to U.S. relations and prestige. Continued budget uncertainty and changes in fiscal assumptions in the FYDP degrade USPACOM's ability to plan and program, leading to sub-optimal utilization of resources. Services must be able to develop and execute long-term programs for modernization while meeting current readiness needs. Budgetary constraints have limited procurement and fielding of 5th generation fighter aircraft (F-35) in sufficient quantities to maintain pace with potential adversary advancements. Modernization of 4th generation aircraft (F-15, F-16, F/A-18) is essential to prevent capability gaps. Much of the supporting infrastructure in the Pacific and on the West Coast of the U.S. mainland was established during World War II and during the early years of the Cold War. The infrastructure requires investment to extend its service life but the Services struggle to maintain infrastructure sustainment, restoration, and modernization accounts at appropriate levels. If funding uncertainties continue, the U.S. will experience reduced warfighting capabilities and increased challenges in pacing maturing adversary threats.

Allies and Partners

Strengthening and modernizing alliances and partnerships are top USPACOM priorities. USPACOM's forward presence, force posture, and readiness reassure allies and partners of U.S. commitment to a stable and secure Indo-Asia-Pacific. USPACOM is building a network of likeminded nations committed to the current rules-based order that is anchored by our treaty allies. Partnerships with many other countries and organizations create an environment of cooperation that allows us to work together on the shared challenges we face.

Bilateral and Multinational "Partnerships with a Purpose": USPACOM is directly connected to regional leaders. I am in frequent communication with my regional counterparts and appreciate the ability to reach out at any time to share perspectives. USPACOM maintains a close link with allies and partners through staff exchange and liaison officers, in addition to a series of formal bilateral mechanisms. In Australia, key engagements stem from the ANZUS treaty obligations, and are guided by USPACOM's principal bilateral event with Australia, the

Military Representatives Meeting. Similarly, USPACOM's military-to-military relationship with Japan is guided by the annual Japan Senior Leader Seminar. Military Committee and Security Consultative Meetings are the preeminent bilateral mechanisms that guide the ROK and U.S. alliance. Each year, USPACOM, with the Armed Forces of the Philippines, co-hosts the Mutual Defense Board and Security Engagement Board to deal with 21st-century challenges. USPACOM conducts annual Senior Staff Talks with Thailand to address security concerns and reinforce U.S. commitment to democratic principles. Formal bilateral mechanisms also exist with non-alliance partners throughout the region, including India, Indonesia, Singapore, Malaysia, and Vietnam.

Our multilateral cooperation is further enhanced by numerous Flag and General Officer (FOGO) exchange officers that work for the U.S. at USPACOM. These foreign officers from our "Five Eye" (FVEY) partners (Australia, Canada, New Zealand, and United Kingdom) serve under my Command as fully integrated members of the USPACOM team. Our operations and intelligence watch centers are FVEY environments. Our service components also have embedded FOGOs serving as Deputy Commanders and senior staff officers.

The future lies in multilateral security mechanisms. USPACOM is broadening key bilateral relationships into multilateral partnerships with a purpose that will more effectively address shared security concerns. For example, U.S.-Japan-ROK trilateral coordination in response to North Korean provocative behavior is improving. The ROK and Japan each recognize that provocative actions by North Korea will not be isolated to the peninsula and greater coordination and cooperation are required. Historical tensions between the nations have lessened and cooperation and collaboration with the ROK have improved. U.S.-Japan-ROK trilateral cooperation is benefitting from these developments. The November 2016 signing of the Japan-ROK General Security of Military Information Agreement (GSOMIA) is a major accomplishment in improving bilateral relations between Seoul and Tokyo, and lays an essential foundation for expanding cooperation enabling the U.S. to work more closely with both allies. This cooperation also led to two successful U.S.-Japan-ROK trilateral missile defense information link maritime exercises in 2016. I look forward to increasing the frequency and complexity of trilateral information sharing while simultaneously enhancing trilateral security cooperation.

To encourage multilateral cooperation, USPACOM hosts the Chiefs of Defense Conference (CHODs) annually. The CHODs conference location normally rotates between Hawaii and a regional partner. In 2016, 31 countries attended the CHODs conference in Manila, Philippines. USPACOM also participates in Australia-Japan-U.S. trilateral defense dialogues, including the Security and Defense Cooperation Forum (SDCF). The 2017 conference will be held in Victoria, British Columbia, in September.

The trilateral relationship between the U.S., Japan, and India is growing stronger. All three countries share democratic values, interests in protecting sea lanes of commerce, and respect for international law. The three sides launched a trilateral HA/DR working group at the first Ministerial meeting in 2015 and agreed to establish a maritime domain awareness working group. On the security front, all three countries participate in India's increasingly complex annual Malabar military exercise as well as the multinational Rim of the Pacific exercise. As a next step, USPACOM is encouraging the addition of Australia to form a quadrilateral partnership with a purpose. India, Japan, Australia, and the U.S. working together will be a force for the maintenance of the Global Operating System.

Allies

Australia: The U.S.-Australia alliance anchors peace and stability in the region. Australia plays a leading role in regional security, capacity-building efforts and addressing disaster response. Australia is a key contributor to global security and a significant contributor to counter-ISIS efforts in Iraq and Syria and the Resolute Support mission in Afghanistan. With the implementation of force posture initiatives, the Marine Rotational Force-Darwin successfully completed its fifth deployment while increasing its presence from 1,177 to 1,250 U.S. Marines. The sixth deployment began this month and will include four MV-22 Osprey aircraft, providing a more robust capability. Cooperative activities under Enhanced Air Cooperation, another force posture initiative, formally commenced in February 2017 with the deployment of F-22 aircraft to northern Australia. The U.S. and Australia are increasing collaboration in counter-terrorism, space, cyber, integrated air missile defense, and regional capacity building. Australia is procuring high-tech U.S. platforms that will further increase interoperability. These include the F-35A Lightning II, P-8 Poseidon, C-17 Globemaster III, EA-18G Growler, Global Hawk UAVs, and MH-60R helicopters. To enhance interoperability, the Australian Government provides a General Officer and Senior Executive (civilian) to USPACOM and a General Officer to U.S. Army Pacific on a full-time basis. Australia has also set a goal of reaching 2% of its GDP on defense spending over the next decade.

Japan: The U.S.-Japan alliance remains the cornerstone for peace and stability in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. Operational cooperation and collaboration between USPACOM and the Japan Joint Staff continue to increase. Japan's Peace and Security Legislation authorizing limited collective self-defense and the revised Guidelines for U.S.-Japan Defense Cooperation have significantly increased Japan's ability to contribute to regional stability more broadly. Japan continues to support USPACOM activities to maintain freedom of navigation in the South China Sea, and remains concerned about Chinese activities in the East China Sea.

Republic of Korea (ROK): The U.S.-ROK alliance remains ironclad. We continue to work with our ROK allies as they move toward obtaining the capabilities required under the

Conditions Based OPCON Transition Plan (COT-P). In response to the evolving threat posed by North Korea, the U.S. and the ROK made an Alliance decision to deploy a Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) system to the ROK to improve the Alliance missile defense posture. North Korea's provocative actions, and its refusal to engage in authentic and credible negotiations on denuclearization, compelled our Alliance to take defensive measures. The decision to deploy THAAD to the Korean Peninsula is based solely on our commitment to defend our allies and our forces from the North Korean threat.

The Philippines: The U.S.-Philippine alliance remains resolute. Through frank and frequent dialogue with Philippine leadership we continue to maintain a robust defense relationship comprised of 258 activities for calendar year 2017, which include joint and service-to-service exercises. All plans, activities, exercises, and construction in the Philippines are done in close coordination with, and with the full approval of, Philippine leadership. On January 12, 2016, the Philippine Supreme Court ruled in favor of the Enhanced Defense Cooperation Agreement and the new Philippine administration is also supportive of this agreement. Project development at various Philippine bases will improve interoperability and build partner capacity of the Armed Forces of the Philippines (AFP) in Maritime Security, Maritime Domain Awareness, and HA/DR capabilities. We remain committed to supporting the AFP to counter-terrorism not only in the Southern Philippines, but in the tri-border area in Sulu and Celebes Seas. At the request of several Philippine administrations, Special Operation Command Pacific (SOCPAC) continues to provide counter-terrorism support and assistance. We will continue to consult with the Government of the Philippines and tailor our activities and assistance to address our shared security concerns. I am convinced that with some strategic patience and mutual respect, our Philippine alliance will remain strong and continue to stabilize the region as it has for over 60 years.

Thailand: The longstanding U.S.-Thailand alliance is supported by deep bilateral military-to-military ties that go back to our 1950 Agreement Respecting Military Assistance between the Government of the united States of America and Government of Thailand. Thailand offers unique training opportunities and essential logistical nodes for our forces. The most significant exercise being Cobra Gold, the largest multilateral military exercise in Southeast Asia. I spoke at the opening ceremony for this year's exercise in February and reiterated U.S. commitment to Thailand. Thailand is committed to a return to democracy with national elections in 2018, and we remain important alliance partners. I remain convinced that the best way for the U.S.to promote security and healthy civil-military relations in Thailand is to engage more, not less, with Thai military leadership.

Partners

India: India continues to emerge as a significant strategic partnership in the Indo-Asia-Pacific region. In June 2016, India was designated as a Major Defense Partner to the U.S. This declaration is unique to India and places it on the same level as many of our closest allies for the purposes of defense trade and technology sharing. U.S. and Indian militaries participated together in three major exercises and more than 50 other military exchanges this past year, in addition to conducting a joint-course in peacekeeping for ten African partners. We signed the Logistics Exchange Memorandum of Agreement (LEMOA) after more than a decade of negotiation to further deepen our military-to-military relationship and serve as a force multiplier during exercises and real world HA/DR operations. We also held our first annual 2+2 U.S.-India Maritime Security Dialogue last year to help identify and implement our common strategic interests. The US-India Defense Technology and Trade Initiative (DTTI) continues to expand opportunities for cooperation, adding new working groups to focus on areas of mutual interest. Defense sales are at an all-time high with U.S.-sourced airframes, such as P-8s, C-130Js, C-17s, AH-64s and CH-47s. We recently concluded a deal for 145 M777 howitzers. USPACOM will continue to advance the partnership with India as the "new normal" by strengthening our relationship and working toward additional enabling agreements that enhance interoperability between our forces.

Indonesia: Indonesia plays an essential role in the security architecture of the region. We maintain a robust defense relationship comprising 221 activities for calendar year 2017. USPACOM continues to partner with Indonesia, particularly in maritime security. Indonesia desires to play a larger role in international economic and security issues. Their goal to provide 4,000 deployable peacekeeping troops by 2020 is another important area where we can engage. Indonesia continues to build and exercise in strategic maritime border areas to bolster its defense capabilities, and has concerns with Chinese activities in the vicinity of the Natuna Islands.

Malaysia: Our close security ties with Malaysia are based on our Comprehensive Partnership. Malaysia's regional leadership role, technologically advanced industry, sizeable economy, and capable military make it an important partner in securing peace and prosperity in Southeast Asia. We continue to assist Malaysia in building an amphibious force to address non-traditional threats in and around their territorial waters. Malaysia has reached a trilateral agreement with the Philippines and Indonesia for improving the maritime security environment in the Sulu and Celebes Seas. Malaysia also has an on-going dispute with China with respect to the Luconia Shoals, which China also claims. Nevertheless, Malaysia has demonstrated the capacity and resolve to contribute to regional security, and we continue to support Malaysia's emerging maritime security requirements.

Mongolia: Mongolia endures as a small yet strong partner in Northeast Asia and continues to demonstrate staunch support for U.S. regional and global policy objectives – especially those linked to the Global Peace Operations Initiative and security operations in Afghanistan. The government engages with the U.S. and other countries as part of their "Third Neighbor" policy. Mongolia also markets itself as a model for emerging democratic countries such as Burma, Nepal, and Timor Leste. I visited Mongolia last summer and spoke at the KHAAN QUEST 2016 closing ceremony, reaffirming that USPACOM's goals are to assist the Mongolian Armed Forces through their defense reform priorities to include development of professional military education for officers and non-commissioned officers, developing a professional NCO corps, and developing an Air Force and ready reserve force. The Mongolians punch above their weight and we should continue to support them where we can.

New Zealand: Our military-to-military relationship has reached new heights over the past two years, despite longstanding differences over nuclear policy. Relations remain strong and are the most encouraging in decades. The November 2016 visit of the USS SAMPSON (DDG 102), the first ship visit to New Zealand in more than thirty years, marked a new milestone. New Zealand remains a respected voice in international politics and a leader in the South Pacific that shares common security concerns with the U.S., including the need to address terrorism, transnational crime, and maritime security.

Singapore: A key strategic partner in Southeast Asia, we depend on Singapore for its insights on regional dynamics and its support to U.S. security priorities. Singapore has been a major security cooperation partner for over a decade and provides us invaluable access including hosting of Littoral Combat Ships, Maritime Patrol and Reconnaissance Aircraft, and the Seventh Fleet's Logistics Force headquarters. Recently, our partnership expanded into new areas including cyber security and counter-proliferation. We conduct dozens of military exercises with Singapore each year and Singaporean military officers regularly attend U.S. professional military education. This combination of forward deployed forces, logistics, and deep training relationships contributes to readiness, builds deeper ties and allows the U.S. to promote maritime security and stability with regional partners.

Sri Lanka: President Sirisena, elected in January 2016, is serious about addressing Sri Lanka's human rights issues. Throughout the last year he continued Sri Lanka's path toward reconciliation and democracy following its civil war. I believe it is in America's interest to increase military collaboration and cooperation with Sri Lankan forces. Accordingly, I visited Sri Lanka last November – the first 4-star to do so since 2008. USPACOM has expanded military leadership discussions, rule of law training, increased naval engagement, and focused security cooperation efforts on defense institution building in areas such as demobilizing and military professionalism. I look forward to continuing to expand our relationship in the future

Vietnam: Vietnam continues to expand cooperation with the U.S. at a moderate, but steady pace. USPACOM provides support for Vietnam's modernization and capacity building, focusing on maritime security, peacekeeping, and disaster response. The U.S. will transfer maritime security vessels including maintenance and training packages to Vietnam's Coast Guard over the next few years, which will build their capacity for maritime domain awareness. In addition, we are discussing a proposal to improve our mutual ability to cooperate in the field of HA/DR as well as enhance ongoing bilateral cooperative activities.

Other Key Actors

Oceania: Maintaining strategic influence in Oceania is becoming ever more important to U.S. national security. The provisions included in the Compacts of Free Association with the Federated States of Micronesia, the Republic of the Marshall Islands, and the Republic of Palau are important mechanisms that guide the relationships, including U.S. obligations for their defense. In return, these agreements provide assured access to the three Compact Nations in a contingency situation. They also give the U.S. authority to grant or deny access to another nation's military forces which allows the U.S. to maintain a clear strategic line of communication across the Pacific. I strongly urge Congress to pass legislation to approve and implement the 2010 Palau Compact Review Agreement at the earliest opportunity. The passage of this legislation will have a significant impact on our defense relationship with Palau, and will provide a measurable advantage in our strategic posture in the Western Pacific. Continued U.S. commitment to defend the Compact Nations and to partner with other Pacific island countries enhances American influence and sends a strong message of reassurance throughout the region.

ASEAN: ASEAN turns 50 this year and the U.S. will commemorate the 40th year of U.S.-ASEAN dialogue relations. The U.S. and ASEAN share the common principles of a rules-based order, respect for international law, and the peaceful resolution of disputes. The ten ASEAN member states, under the chairmanship of Laos last year and the Philippines this year, continue to seek ways to improve multilateral security engagements and advance stability in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. During this past year, the U.S. strengthened its commitment to ASEAN with engagements at the Secretary of Defense and Presidential levels where agreement on whole-of-government approaches to shared challenges in areas of maritime security and maritime domain awareness were reached. Throughout the past year USPACOM participated in ASEAN exercises, key leader engagements, and practical multilateral cooperation related to the spectrum of shared transnational challenges. Malaysia and the U.S. will co-chair the ASEAN Expert Working Group on Humanitarian Assistance and Disaster Relief with Malaysia over the next three years.

Burma: Aung San Suu Kyi's National League for Democracy's election victory was a historic milestone. While challenges remain during the transition to civilian leadership, USPACOM's

goal is to support and empower the civilian government, while encouraging the professionalization of its military. Our assistance through defense engagement programs is designed to bring together civilian and military officials to promote cooperation and understanding. These limited programs also promote the development of a professional military in a democratic system of government and broaden the exposure of isolated military officials to international norms of conduct and civilian control.

China: The U.S.-China relationship remains complex. While Chinese actions and provocations create tension in the region, there are also opportunities for cooperation. USPACOM's approach to China is to cooperate where we can to collectively address our shared security challenges, but remain ready to confront its provocative actions where we must. USPACOM's engagements with the People's Liberation Army, governed by section 1201 of the FY2000 NDAA, improve transparency and reduce risk of unintended incidents.

USPACOM conducted numerous bilateral and numerous multilateral engagements last year with China. USPACOM co-led the U.S.-China Military Maritime Consultative Agreement (MMCA) plenary and working group focused on operational safety in November 2016. Encounters between our forces at sea and in the air are generally safe, but the MMCA provides a forum for continuous dialogue to identify and address safety issues when they arise.

Areas of common interest that allow military cooperation include counter piracy, military medicine, and disaster response. USPACOM forces participated in the annual Disaster Management Exchange with the People's Liberation Army in Kunming, China designed to share HA/DR lessons learned from real world events. USPACOM encourages China's participation in international efforts to address shared challenges in a manner consistent with international law and standards.

Taiwan: Democratic elections in January 2016 reflect the shared values between Taiwan and the U.S. The U.S. maintains its unofficial relations with Taiwan through the American Institute in Taiwan and we continue supporting Taiwan's security. USPACOM will continue to fulfill U.S. commitments under the Taiwan Relations Act. Continued, regular arms sales and training for Taiwan's military are an important part of that policy and help ensure the preservation of democratic institutions. As the military spending and capability of the PRC grow every year, the ability of Taiwan to defend itself decreases. We must continue to help Taiwan defend itself and demonstrate U.S. resolve that any attempt by China to force reunification on the people of Taiwan is unacceptable.

Activities, Direct Reporting Units, and Mission Partners

Security Cooperation and Capacity Building: USPACOM's Security Cooperation approach focuses on building partner readiness, reducing partner capability gaps, and building partner capacity. One of the more powerful engagement resource tools is the State Department's Foreign Military Financing (FMF). FMF enables USPACOM to meet regional challenges to include border security issues, disaster response, counterterrorism, and maritime security.

USPACOM will continue to leverage the FY16 NDAA section 1263 "Southeast Asia Maritime Security Initiative" authority to enhance maritime domain awareness and maritime capacities and capabilities of partners and allies in the South China Sea region, through assistance to, and training of, partner and allied country maritime security forces.

USPACOM will continue to rely on FMF as a source of providing major end items to eligible countries. MSI support notified pursuant to the Section 1263 authority should be viewed as complementary and additive in nature to these FMF plans. Under MSI, PACOM plans to provide niche capabilities, more multi-mission types of equipment, and connective tissue that will help partners better deploy and employ these maritime security capabilities – both domestically to protect their sovereign territory and as a means of fostering greater regional interoperability.

Additionally, USPACOM is looking forward to leveraging the consolidated Security Cooperation authority in FY17 NDAA as a responsive tool for building partner capacity as security situations and relationships evolve. I am concerned the changes in the FY17 NDAA could impact both operational support to foreign law enforcement and capacity building efforts focused on countering narcotics flows and transnational crime. We are currently working with the rest of the Department of Defense to develop the policies needed to implement this new law.

Maritime Domain Awareness: Southeast Asian partners support U.S. security cooperation efforts in the area of maritime domain awareness. USPACOM will continue to leverage MSI and the new Section 1263 authority and other existing authorities to develop multilateral approaches to information sharing to develop a regional maritime picture. USPACOM and the Daniel K Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Strategic Studies (DKI APCSS) co-hosted a policy level workshop on best practice for information sharing. Additionally, the Philippines, Australia, and the U.S. co-hosted an operational level workshop to discuss regional maritime security best practices. These workshops facilitate whole-of-government discussions on maritime challenges that support creation of a regional maritime domain awareness network to share information between Southeast Asian partners. USPACOM will continue to support these workshops to improve regional awareness. We need to go beyond Maritime Domain Awareness to improve our partners' and allies' multi-domain awareness and increase their domain denial capability so that they can better protect their territory and enforce their maritime rights.

Global Peace Operations Initiative (GPOI): Indo-Asia-Pacific countries provide over 30% of the world's uniformed peacekeepers to United Nations (UN) peacekeeping operations worldwide and of these peacekeepers, 62% of the peacekeepers come from the 12 GPOI partners in the Indo-Asia-Pacific where they support 15 of the 16 UN peacekeeping missions. Not only is GPOI helping to build the capability and capacity of our partners to deploy forces, the USPACOM GPOI is focused on providing high-quality, action-oriented, challenging scenario-based training so that peacekeepers are better prepared to implement the mandates contained in UN Security Council Resolutions – protecting vulnerable civilians, halting conflict-related sexual violence, working to put a stop to the use of children soldiers, addressing misconduct and trying to bring long-term peace and security to conflict torn regions. Partners are working towards meeting program goals of achieving self-sustaining, indigenous training capability. Most recently in March 2017, USPACOM and Nepal cohosted Shanti Prayas-3 – a multinational peacekeeping exercise – training personnel from 34 countries for deployment to UN peacekeeping missions. USPACOM will continue improving partner military peacekeeping skills and operational readiness and provide limited training facility refurbishment. This program not only supports our efforts to improve UN peacekeeping, it is also helping to strengthen interoperability with U.S. forces and builds the trust required to improve interoperability in other relevant areas.

Joint Exercise Program: USPACOM's Joint Exercise Program deliberately synchronizes frequent, relevant, and meaningful readiness exercises and engagements across the Indo-Asia-Pacific region to ensure the joint force is prepared for crises and contingency operations. This important joint exercise program, funded through the Combatant Commander Exercise Engagement Training Transformation (CE2T2) program, provides the critical means and enablers to improve readiness of forward deployed assigned forces. It also advances many Theater Campaign Plan objectives to include strengthening our alliances and partnerships while sustaining USPACOM's military preeminence. USPACOM appreciates Congress' continued support of these important programs to maintain progress made in joint readiness.

Joint Interagency Task Force-West (JIATF-W): The drug trade in the Indo-Asia-Pacific is a growing concern that threatens regional stability as drug trafficking organizations expand into new markets and develop new and disturbing partnerships across the globe. USPACOM combats drug trafficking in the region through JIATF-W by disrupting flows of drugs and precursor chemicals that transit the region and hardens the theater against the continued growth of transnational criminal organizations.

Chinese and, to a lesser extent, Indian chemical producers continue to be the primary source of precursors for synthetic drugs, including powerful synthetic opioids like fentanyl, as well as more traditional drugs like cocaine and heroin. JIATF-W identifies avenues of cooperation with the government of China on this issue to assist U.S. law enforcement with seizures of these

chemicals and drugs. JIATF-W identified and tracked chemical flows resulting in the seizure of roughly 140,000 kilograms of methamphetamine precursor chemicals in 2016.

As demonstrated by its effect on the Philippines, the illicit drug trade can have far reaching, and even strategic impacts. The internal pressures caused by criminal organizations and their operations, as well as the associated corruption and the demands placed on society by the need for treatment and prosecution, can and do cause enormous stress on governance. These stresses ultimately affect U.S. interests in the region. JIATF-W continues to build partner capacity to counter illicit trafficking of narcotics in the coastal areas of the Philippines, Vietnam, Cambodia, Indonesia, Malaysia, Maldives, Sri Lanka, and the border regions of Bangladesh and Thailand.

In Australia, cocaine prices reach ten times the retail prices in the U.S., providing a strong incentive for drug traffickers to expand their reach across the Pacific. The drug trade feeds enormous amounts of cash back into the Mexican and South American drug cartels. This, in turn, contributes to challenges faced by our law enforcement agencies on the Southwest border. JIATF-W works closely with agencies throughout the South Pacific, including the French Armed Forces in Polynesia, as well as both Australian and New Zealand law enforcement, military and intelligence services to counter this lucrative drug trade.

Center for Excellence for Disaster Management (CFE-DM): CFE-DM increases capacity of U.S. and partner nation military forces to respond effectively to disasters through its education training and applied research and information sharing programs. The Center annually trains about 8,000 military and civilian annually. This includes training deployable forces and foreign audiences. Broad based partnerships encourage a robust collection of best practices.

The Daniel K. Inouye Asia-Pacific Center for Security Studies (DKI APCSS): While DKI APCSS is no longer a Direct Reporting Unit to USPACOM, I have formally designated it as a "Mission Partner" to underscore its importance to the USPACOM mission set. DKI APCSS builds and sustains key regional partnerships and partner nation capacity and in enhances cooperation on regional security challenges. The Center's courses, workshops, dialogues, and alumni engagements directly support OSD-Policy and USPACOM priorities and are integrated into USPACOM's Theater Campaign Order. Focus areas include rule-of-law based governance emphasizing civilian oversight of militaries, defense institution building, enhancing regional security architecture – particularly ASEAN, collaborative approaches to maritime security and domain awareness and counterterrorism, and improved capability and cooperation in HADR. DKI APCSS has major competitive advantages in location, credibility, convening power, and alumni network. Those advantages and the Center's focus on substantive and sustainable outcomes have broadly improved security sector governance. Specifically, this organization is leading DOD in the implementation of UNSCR 1325 (Women, Peace, and Security) and the U.S. National Action Plan to achieve greater inclusion of women in the security sector.

Joint Enabling Capabilities Command (JECC): U.S. Transportation Command's JECC responds rapidly and effectively to events in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. JECC's support is critical to USPACOM's ability to facilitate rapid establishment of joint force headquarters, fulfill Global Response Force (GRF) execution, and bridge joint operational requirements by providing mission-tailored, ready joint capability packages. JECC supports real-world real world contingencies and operational plans.

Logistics Support Agreements (LSAs): USPACOM continues to view LSAs as critical Theater Security Cooperation (TSC) enablers. We have 14 agreements in the region, to include the recent agreement with India. We continue to actively work with eligible but as yet uncommitted partners to conclude as many of these agreements as possible, and I personally stress their importance in my engagements with partner country leadership. The logistics agreement with Japan was especially useful during the Kumamoto earthquake disaster, and I often share this experience with our other partners.

Pacific Area Senior Officer Logistics Seminar (PASOLS): PASOLS is an annual forum that brings together senior logisticians from 30 countries in the Indo-Asia-Pacific. The goal is to strengthen regional cooperation, improve interoperability, and develop partner capacity to cooperatively address regional challenges. Singapore hosted PASOLS 45 in November 2016. PASOLS is our most important annual logistics engagement event.

Pacific Amphibious Leaders Symposium (PALS): PALS is an annual forum that brings together senior leaders of allied and partner nations throughout the Indo-Asia-Pacific to discuss key aspects amphibious operations, capabilities, crisis response, and interoperability. 22 countries participated in PALS 2017, which was hosted by the Republic of Korea Marine Corps.

Conclusion

U.S. interests in the Indo-Asia-Pacific are real and enduring. The growing challenges to our interests are daunting and cannot be overstated. In order to deter potential adversaries in the Indo-Asia-Pacific, we must continue to invest in critical capabilities, build a force posture that decreases our vulnerabilities and increases our resiliency, and reassure our allies and partners while encouraging them to be full and cooperative partners in their own defense and the defense of the rules-based international order. Our allies and partners are hedging and need reassurance. We must demonstrate our commitment in actions. The good news is that America's resolve is strong. I ask this committee to continue support for future capabilities that maintain our edge and prevent would-be challengers from gaining the upper hand.

Thank you for your enduring support to the USPACOM team and our families who live and work in the Indo-Asia-Pacific – a region critical to America's future.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—The complete hearing transcript could not be printed due to the classification of the material discussed.]

WEDNESDAY, MAY 24, 2017.

NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU/RESERVE COMPONENTS

WITNESS

GENERAL JOSEPH L. LENGYEL, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GRANGER—PANEL 1

Ms. GRANGER. The Subcommittee on Defense will come to order. This morning, the subcommittee will hold a hearing on the posture of the National Guard and Reserve Components. This will be a two-panel hearing. Panel 1 recognizes the Chief of the National Guard Bureau. Panel 2 will recognize the Reserve Component Chiefs from the Army, Navy, Marine, and Air Force Reserves. I would encourage all members to stay for both panels.

Our witness for panel 1 is General Joe Lengyel, Chief of the National Guard Bureau. We are pleased to welcome General Lengyel, a four-star sitting member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

Welcome, and welcome to the subcommittee hearing, your first time to testify as Chief. As Chief of the Guard Bureau, General Lengyel will address all joint Army and Air National Guard questions.

General, we have known each other for a long time, and as Chairman, I value your knowledge and your experience in leading the National Guard. Given the challenges our Nation faces, we want to ensure that you have the resources and support to accomplish your mission. This subcommittee has provided the Guard with additional resources to the National Guard and Reserve Equipment Account, an appropriation which has never been included in a President's budget request, additional funding for counterdrug operations, HMMWVs, helicopters, fixed-wing aircraft, and more.

However, we are concerned this is not nearly enough when you take into account the funding is significantly less than the vast resources available to the Active Components. Our country stands for strength, and citizen soldiers are the background and the foundation of that strength. There are limited resources and significant needs. We should not make decisions in a vacuum. We will rely on your best military advice to guide these funding decisions. We look forward to your testimony and your insight. But, first, I would like to call on the ranking member, my friend, Pete Visclosky, for his comments.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Well, I simply want to thank the Chairwoman for holding the hearing today and, General, for your service and your testimony. I look forward to it. Thank you very much.

Ms. GRANGER. General, please proceed with your testimony. A full written testimony will be placed in the record. Please feel free

to summarize your oral statement so we can leave enough time to get to everyone's questions.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF GENERAL LENGYEL

General LENGYEL. Thank you, Chairwoman. Thank you very much.

I think I say that to you and to Ranking Member Visclosky and distinguished members of the subcommittee, it is a pleasure for me to be here today, and I look forward to talking to you about the men and women of not only the Army National Guard but also the Air National Guard.

In summary, the National Guard focuses on three things. It focuses on our warfighting mission, the homeland mission, and building partnerships. And thanks to the support from this committee, I can tell you that the National Guard that I have the honor to represent here today is the most ready it has ever been, I think, or the most capable National Guard it has ever been in our 380-year history.

As I talk to you today, we have 18,000 men and women deployed in every combatant command around the globe. In addition to that, I have 4,000—you have 4,000 of your men and women working for homeland defense and Homeland Security missions here today. And we have made and continue to develop robust partnerships with not only our international partners through the State Partnership Program, which is about to go to 79 partnerships when we formalize the relationship with Malaysia here in the near term—thanks to you and the funding that this committee has provided, that State Partnership Program has taken on a strategic impact that I think maybe, when we developed it, we didn't see that it was becoming.

This committee provides the resources for us through NGREA, as you mentioned in your remarks, to maintain a force that is first ready for the war fight but used as a dual-nature force, as it is our job as the National Guard to be ready to provide those forces here in the homeland when the Governors and the States need us to do that. And never have we been more ready to do that, whether it is fires or floods or winter snowstorms or terrorists, such as bombs blown up in Boston, the National Guard is there, and we are trained, and we are ready because of the resources that this committee has chosen to give it.

The relationship with our parent services, the Active Duty Air Force and the Active Duty Army, I have to tell you, has never been better. My relationship with General Milley and General Goldfein, who I understand testified yesterday, have committed to a Total Force that includes an operational use of the Reserve Component. And if I have one ask of this committee today, it is to maintain the Reserve Component, and, in my case, the National Guard, as an operational force. We have been driven to that because of the demands placed on our Department of Defense and the global nature of the threat.

The services have had to rely more on the use of the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard than ever before, and because of that, they are willing to invest in us, invest in our leaders, invest in our training, and because of the resources this committee

gives us, we have the equipment, the people, and the training to go there. Can we use more? Can we get better? Yes, we can. But I report to you today, and I thank this committee today for the opportunity to testify, and I look forward to your questions.

[The written statement of General Lengyel follows:]

WRITTEN STATEMENT BY

GENERAL JOSEPH L. LENGYEL

CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU

BEFORE THE

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

FIRST SESSION, 115TH CONGRESS

ON

THE NATIONAL GUARD

AND RESERVE POSTURE HEARING

MAY 24th, 2017

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISSEMINATION

UNTIL RELEASED BY

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

INTRODUCTION

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and distinguished members of the subcommittee, it is a pleasure to be here today with my fellow National Guard and Reserve Leaders.

Always Ready, Always There ... this is the motto of America's National Guard. It embodies the character and spirit of all those who have served in the National Guard from its founding in 1636 to those serving today. From militia companies mustering on village greens in response to Paul Revere's warning, to the ever-evolving and complex world that we live in today, the National Guard is more resilient, relevant and ready than ever before.

Since assuming my duties as Chief of the National Guard Bureau last summer, I have traveled and talked to the men and women of our National Guard serving in the homeland and abroad. The locations were different and the missions varied, but what I took away from each encounter was the pride I felt in our Guard members and the dedication each of them exhibited in serving their communities, their states and our nation. Today's National Guard is the finest we have ever had.

Our security environment is more dynamic and complex and our nation places greater reliance on its National Guard. This is why my focus every day is to ensure we are ready and we have the resources to accomplish our three core missions -- fighting America's wars, securing the homeland, and building enduring partnerships at the local, state, Federal and international levels.

WARFIGHT

Fighting America's wars and defending our nation must be our primary mission. From Brigade Combat Teams deploying on schedule to get into the fight as fast as air and sea lift can move them, to flying manned and unmanned platforms anywhere around the world – we are the primary combat reserve of the Army and the Air Force.

After 9/11, our National Guard began its transition to the operational force it is today. Since then, Guard members have deployed more than 850,000 times to locations such as Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait, the Balkans, Guantanamo Bay, and the Sinai. Today, we are an operational force that fights seamlessly with the joint force. With the implementation of Total Force initiatives with the Army and Air Force, we are more closely integrated than ever before.

Our interoperability with the joint force will deepen and evolve as we confront future threats – threats that are now global, emanate from all domains, and are adaptable and multi-functional in their forms. Only a well-integrated and well-trained force will keep our nation safe and secure our national interests.

On any given day, the National Guard has approximately 18,000 Soldiers and Airmen mobilized in support of combatant command missions overseas. During my visits with our men and women, I was told time and again they wanted to do more and they were not tired. I know we can judiciously increase our deployment numbers to relieve stress on active duty forces and help them grow readiness to address emerging threats.

HOMELAND

Here in the homeland, the National Guard is the nation's primary military crisis response force. We use the experience and capabilities we gain from combat to respond to threats here at home such as Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) attacks, large scale natural disasters, and cyber-attacks.

In order to be more prepared and have the ability to respond quickly and effectively, the National Guard Bureau initiated an All-Hazards Support Plan to help state Adjutants General plan and execute response and recovery operations, and provide the Secretary of Defense greater awareness of non-federalized Guard activities.

On average, more than 4,000 Guard members conduct operations here in the United States on any given day. Whether we are providing security forces, logistics, communications, emergency medical assistance, or other types of support to civil authorities, we do it with speed and proficiency. We also help facilitate a unified response across local, state and Federal agencies using legal authorities that permit the Guard to be employed under state or Federal command.

In my first 120 days as Chief of the National Guard Bureau, our nation encountered two large-scale disasters, flooding in Louisiana and Hurricane Matthew on the East Coast. At the height of the record flooding in Louisiana, approximately 3,000 Guard members supported civil authorities with water evacuation, search and rescue, and shelter support. During Hurricane Matthew, over 8,300 Guardsmen and women worked with our Federal, state and local

government agencies and first responders to support recovery efforts along the eastern seaboard.

Although these events serve as reminders of the devastation that disasters can wreak on our communities, businesses, and families, I am inspired by the skill, professionalism, and dedication I witnessed from our Guard members. I could not be more proud of how seamlessly, and professionally we augment and integrate our entire emergency response network. The National Guard is essential to All Hazards recovery and the resilience of our communities when disaster strikes.

While our combat and homeland response missions are what we do, building enduring partnerships is an essential part of how we do it. We accomplish our missions overseas and at home only through the partnerships we forge at the international, Federal, state and local levels. The relationships that the Guard develops on a continuing basis play a critical role in our ability to maintain preparedness and respond quickly to disasters and emergency events.

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS

On the international level, our State Partnership Program (SPP) will be 79 nations strong once we formalize our partnership with Malaysia. The SPP allows us to partner with nations around the globe to realize mutual understanding, friendship, and security cooperation. This low-cost, high-leverage program has built enduring partnerships and bonds of trust with approximately one-third of the nations in the world -- relationships that assure our allies, deter our foes, and

support the transition of many nations from security consumers to global security providers. This program is a part of the long game. We build relationships, friendships, and build our future.

On the Federal and state levels, we work with our partners on matters such as cyber defense; counterdrug; all-hazards planning; CBRN defense; and emergency response. Close relationships with partners such as the Department of Homeland Security, including the Federal Emergency Management Agency, are essential in helping to synchronize Federal, state, and local efforts and resources when disasters strike. National Guard partnerships bring a holistic approach to coordination that promotes unified response efforts and an exchange of information before, during, and after an event. We build and provide resiliency in our communities and help our nation respond, rebuild, and heal from catastrophes like no other military component.

Across the nation in hometown America, our Guard members are active in both Federal and state statuses with programs and services such as Youth ChalleNGe, Joining Community Forces, and rendering military funeral honors for veterans. These programs provide critical support to families and individuals when they need it the most.

Our nation faces a myriad of challenges. Emerging near-peer competitors, rising regional powers, and the constant threat of violent extremist organizations pervade our security environment. Threats emanate from both state and non-state actors, who often conduct operations that stop short of direct conflict, yet provoke,

disrupt, and destabilize – both abroad and here at home. Resource challenges require we make every dollar count.

In response to these challenges, I have established three priorities I will focus on during my time as Chief of the National Guard Bureau.

READINESS

My first priority is to provide ready forces to the President and our Governors. Readiness begins with our force structure. I am working with the Army and Air Force to have a balanced array of combat and enabling forces that largely mirrors the active component and is modernized concurrently. We must prepare by providing high-level collective training opportunities such as Combat Training Center rotations and Red Flag exercises. Realistic training improves the readiness of the National Guard and develops leaders that are able to support joint force requirements.

Readiness also includes plans to replace and upgrade obsolete or aging National Guard facilities and warfighting equipment. Ensuring proper training facilities and the latest equipment greatly enhances the readiness of our force.

ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

For the Army National Guard, Total Army readiness continues to be the top priority. The nation must ensure all three components of the Army are trained and interoperable to project land and air power across all warfighting domains. The Army began its Associated Units pilot program, a multi-component initiative

bringing together capabilities from the Army, the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. These partnerships allow our soldiers to train and build readiness together as a Total Army.

In order to achieve and maintain our readiness, the Army National Guard is identifying the appropriate levels of end strength, full-time support, and modernization such as Armored Brigade Combat Teams, Stryker Brigade Combat Teams and aviation platforms. We are also reviewing the locations of our Army National Guard Readiness Centers, some of which are in isolated rural areas, to ensure our stationing reflects changing U.S. demographics. It will also give us the ability to respond to emergencies in densely populated areas.

AIR NATIONAL GUARD

The Air National Guard continues to leverage its existing model of multi-component forces with its associate wings. The Air Force and the Air National Guard maintain the same standards of operational readiness and cross-component operational capabilities for daily and surge operations. Developing 21st Century Guard Airmen, readiness, and modernization and recapitalization are essential Air Guard efforts. This past year, National Guard Airmen supported more than 16,120 deployment requirements to 56 countries. At home, we are the primary force provider to the North American Aerospace Defense Command protecting America's skies, while continuing to respond to state and local emergencies when requested. The Air National Guard is always ready when our nation calls.

PEOPLE

My second priority is our people. The well-being of our Soldiers and Airmen, including support for our families and employers, is the foundation that underpins our service. We are committed to establishing a respectful environment that always strives for a diverse force where all members have the opportunity to reach their military goals. Acts that demoralize units and degrade readiness, such as sexual assault and sexual harassment, will never be tolerated. We must ensure all victims receive our utmost support and care.

The number of Soldiers and Airmen taking their own lives is a tragedy. Simply put, we can and will do more to prevent suicides. We will ensure first-line supervisors, battle buddies and wingmen have the training they need to look out for each and every Soldier and Airman. We will place great emphasis on mental health programs and provide resiliency training to units and leaders as we strive to prevent further suicides in our ranks.

We will also ensure increased awareness of family readiness programs and employment assistance programs so that families know where to turn for help. We will do our best to provide our Guard members and their families more predictability in order to better plan and prepare for deployments and training obligations. We owe these measures to our service members and their families for their dedicated service and the sacrifices they undertake for our nation.

Employers are critical to the success of the National Guard. Our employers deserve the same predictability as our service members and families, particularly if

our deployments increase in the future. The National Guard benefits from our part-time force's civilian skills and experience, which is a unique strength of the reserve components. In return, our employers can leverage the military training and experience our Guardsmen and women take back with them. It is truly a win-win situation.

INNOVATION

My third priority is innovation. As the character of war and threats continue to evolve, creative minds are necessary more than ever. We need to develop imaginative solutions to our most serious challenges. We must inspire a culture willing to change. While we have been fighting for the past 15 years, the rest of the world has not remained idle. Our adversaries have improved their technology and our technological superiority is waning.

The National Guard will continue to work with our active component counterparts in high-priority mission sets such as Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance and Remotely Piloted Aircraft. Our ability to use our civilian-acquired skills and partner with critical infrastructure owners, government entities, public and private utilities, and other non-governmental organizations uniquely positions the National Guard to protect America's critical infrastructure.

Although innovation often relates to technology, we also have to think about innovation in other ways. We have to leverage our culture, our skill sets, our authorities, and our way of doing business. Innovation will help us strengthen our ability to recruit and retain, forge the most resilient force, implement more efficient

processes, and update obsolete doctrine in order to better protect our states and nation.

CONCLUSION

I am proud to serve with each and every member of the National Guard. Although we have daunting challenges ahead, we will employ our skills to the fullest and continue to contribute in ways not seen before. Every Citizen-Soldier and -Airman is indispensable to our operational force, and we can succeed only through their commitment and extraordinary talent. We must strive to be more innovative, responsive, capable, and affordable as we continuously move forward to confront the challenges ahead.

Thank you for your continued support of the National Guard and their families.

SEQUESTRATION

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you so much. I want to make our members aware that we will be using a timer for each member and that you have 5 minutes, including questions and responses, for the witness. A yellow light on your timer will appear when you have 1 minute remaining. If time permits, we will have a second round of questions.

I am going to ask a question to begin. General Lengyel, full-spectrum readiness training has been suppressed over the past 15 years due to combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. In recent years, sequestration further squeezed the readiness dollars needed to resume such training. Could you describe the impact this has on military readiness now and in future years, and how does the fiscal year 2018 request begin to address those concerns?

General LENGYEL. Yes, ma'am. I think you address the problem that the service Chiefs have talked about in terms of the ability to maintain full-spectrum readiness for their force, mostly because of the demand on that force and the limited funding to sustain things like flying hour programs, complex training scenario programs. But we are beginning to dig out of that and rebuild readiness inside the services and inside the National Guard.

The Army National Guard and the Air National Guard have been used in an operational sense, which has allowed the services in some cases to maintain or rebuild their readiness.

Sequestration clearly is going to limit every aspect, would limit every aspect of our ability to do that, should it come in the future. And I would tell you that predictable and dependable funding is probably the single most important factor that we in the National Guard need so that we can plan to recruit our people, so that we can plan to train our people, and so that we can maintain our equipment and recapitalize our equipment through the services as we normally do. So I think that clearly readiness is funding-related, and this budget begins to build some of that back, but it is going to take a long time before all of the things, the recapitalization and modernization of the force, are fully complete.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. Visclosky.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I will pass. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Ms. McCollum.

FAMILY ASSISTANCE SPECIALIST

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Thank you. Good morning. I am going to touch on something, and then I have a question. So I am glad you are here today, in part because we are going to learn a lot more on how we can be a proactive partner in making sure that the Guard remains the successful part of our military force that it is.

But I also want to take this opportunity to reinstate some concerns that I have with you about the family assistance specialists. It is still causing a lot of concern among my Guard members, family members, constituents which include the businesses that employ these Guard members and many, many other people in Minnesota and, I know, other States as well.

As we talked about in my office, these specialists provide critical benefits and assistance. And in Minnesota alone, there were 1,700 cases handled by these folks. I understand there has been a new contract issued, but, folks, when someone's hourly wage increase for a job that they are doing is cut from $21 to 11—to $14 an hour, it sends a message to the people who had been previously doing this job: You can work for less money, or your work is not valued.

So we are going to be watching to see what happens with county veterans service offices in Minnesota's caseloads, what happens in our congressional office with caseloads now that the expertise isn't there. So I know you are going to be monitoring this, too, and change is always an option, and we need to maybe work with a new vendor or figure something out if this is a problem. Maybe it won't be, but we are a little alarmed.

ARMORED BRIGADE COMBAT TEAMS

What I would like to focus on is the five National Guard armored brigade combat teams. Currently, the operating tempo has been drastically increased so the number of training days for National Guard soldiers went from 60 to 90. That is an extra month, right, on average. So we know this increase in training days is important. But along with what we have happening with mobilization, deployments, it is putting more and more of a burden on the quality of life for soldiers, their units, and their families. So I am concerned and the Minnesota National Guard is concerned about long-term retention in these brigades. I know we want to make sure that we have a great readiness posture so everybody is able to perform their job successfully and come home safely.

But can you tell me how you are going to be monitoring and some of the concerns that you might have with going from 39 to 60 days on average?

General LENGYEL. Well, yes, ma'am. I can tell you that we are aware of this issue, and that is one of the things as the Chief of the National Guard Bureau that I track closely, is I worry about the business model of the National Guard, which means our soldiers and airmen have a civilian life and a military life. And if I lose support from the soldier or airman to support both of those lives, if he is forced to make a choice or she is forced to make a choice, then I know which one they will pick, and most likely I will lose that soldier or that airman.

So what we are trying to do, as you are aware is, yes, it is true that the armored brigade combat teams will require more training to be ready should the United States Army need them to fight in any of the various scenarios where they will be.

I will tell you that some of this transformation has already happened in terms of the Army force generation model previously has been for several years now a graduated increase in the training requirements as the brigade progresses through its training cycle just before it is available to be deployed, and that is not new.

What is new is that the United States Army has decided to increase the training available to the brigade combat teams. We are going to go from two combat training center rotations a year to four combat training centers a year. In my estimation, that is a good thing in that it is going to make this operational Army National

Guard more valuable to the country, more valuable to the Army, and more ready so it can be ready quicker should it go out the door.

To your point about how are we going to monitor them, well, I think that this is a leadership issue. This is something where we have to watch the people, personal engagement on my part, on the adjutant general's part, on the commander's part, with making sure that the schedules that we give these soldiers are predictable, that we let the employers know that you can count on these soldiers, and that these increased training times actually result in a deployment for the soldiers at the end. Otherwise, they won't be seen as a reason why—why should an employer endure the extended time away from their jobs if, at the end of that training period, they don't use them? So, as we are going through this now, the plan is for the Army to use these forces and deploy them.

This is the first cycle of this, and some people have decided that they have to change. They can't support it, and they will change MOSes and go someplace else. I lived this in the Air National Guard myself as a guardsman in the mid-1990s, when we began to deploy regularly, and it definitely changes the paradigm. So there will be a change as this goes forward, and we are going to have to work with the employers and the members to the maximum extent possible so that we don't lose them.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Well, thank you for your answer, and I am taking it in the spirit in which I think you totally meant it, but I am going to put a cautionary tale on it. This just isn't about leadership to put up and to be quiet about it. This is also about leadership to see if we need to go back and review and figure out how these folks are not only trained but deployed in the future.

Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you. Chairman Emeritus Rogers.

END STRENGTH

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

Welcome, General, to these premises. Let me ask you, the Guard has a dual responsibility, one to the State of their location, the Governor, and, of course, then the combatant commands on the Federal level. The previous administration proposed cuts, continued cuts, to Guard end strength. But our 2017 bill reversed those cuts to end strength and will add 1,000 Army Guard troops above the 2016 level. Tell us how you are going to utilize that extra manpower.

General LENGYEL. Yes, sir. Thank you. That is true, and we are happy to see that the reduction in end strength stopped for the Army National Guard. And because of the two missions we have, when force structure leaves our States, it is a double hit. It is a hit against the Federal mission, and it is a hit against the ability to do our homeland mission. So our plan is to take the additional manpower that we have. If you recall, we were on a glide path to 335,000 force structure inside the Army National Guard. It stopped at 342,000 last year, and we were able to grow it back 1,000 to 343,000 this year. Our intent is to take that additional manpower, and as I talked about on the five brigade combat teams, is we are going to place it against and increase the readiness of these high-

demand, operationally deploying units that will make them more ready, be able to get ready quicker, and train as they go.

One of the concerns, frankly, of the increased manpower is we got the people back, but we didn't get the increased full-time support back with it. We got the part-time soldiers back. We took the full-timers out all the way down to 335,000. We built the Army Guard back up to 343,000, but they were part-time billets and not full-time billets. And that hurts our ability to generate the force quickly and keep it ready and minimize the time it takes to get it ready to go out the door.

COUNTERDRUG PROGRAM

Mr. ROGERS. In my State, and I suspect I speak for all States when I say this, we have got a tremendous, incredible drug problem. And in my area, the Guard has had a great program to eradicate marijuana in the remote hills of Appalachia, where it is apparently a very great climate for the growth of marijuana. But that Guard unit has just been tremendous. In joint support operations, they have eradicated 13 million marijuana plants. They have seized tons of marijuana, illegal weapons, and so forth, all to the tune of $25 billion.

And we are seeing now across the country an effort apparently to make marijuana legal. But in the hills of Kentucky—and I have been on a couple of these missions where they fly into a very remote area of mountains, no homes or properties of any kind—mainly the marijuana is grown under high-tension electric wires right-of-way. Number one, you can't prove who owns it. And, number two, you can't get there with a helicopter because of the electric lines and the like. And the troopers have to rappel down a rope, cut the marijuana, put it in a big bag, put it over their shoulder, and they are picked up by the helicopter and carried 50 miles dangling 100 feet from below a helicopter. Very dangerous work but very productive. Do you see that continuing, and what can we do to help you see that?

General LENGYEL. Well, first, let me thank this committee for the $234 million we got in this year's appropriation for the Counterdrug Program. That Counterdrug Program, as you said, sir, is incredibly important, I believe, to leverage the skill sets that we have in the National Guard to facilitate and work with law enforcement to detect, disrupt, curtail illegal drug activities in every State.

As you mentioned, the State of Kentucky has an issue with marijuana, and I think that, you know, as you look across the Nation, every State's program is tailored for the individual requirements that they have inside their State, and that is the way it should be. So, as we look at the disbursement of the $234 million, we have what is called the threat-based resource model, which has about 70 different factors. It allows each State to prioritize what is important to them such that when they come into the pool, their particular problem gets resourced, and then the States use those funds and develop their own plan, and in your case, sir, it is the eradication of marijuana inside Kentucky. And so I want to be able to continue to support that.

I want to thank this committee for the continued funding of that program. Your funding of that program has enabled not only a ro-

bust liaison with law enforcement, but the schooling, the five additional schools that are funded have allowed us to build additional capacity to fight this drug issue, whether it is marijuana or opioids or heroin or synthetics. And we all know the significant toll that that has taken on our country across the Nation.

Mr. ROGERS. You mentioned opioids. My area was ground zero 14 years ago at the outset of an OxyContin rage that raged across the country. But these marijuana growers frequently are the dealers in opioids, and it is a double whammy with the money that we put into the antimarijuana program because it does bring in additional breakers of the law.

Well, we appreciate your service, sir.

General LENGYEL. Thank you, sir.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Ruppersberger.

RUSSIA AGRESSION

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Thank you for being here, and also we do appreciate your service and what you do in our hometowns and also what you are doing to fight the war with ISIS and the other issues we deal with.

I come from local government, so many, many times with storms and hurricanes, the National Guard has been there. And I also want to get a little local, but I want to acknowledge the Adjutant General Linda Singh, who is doing a great job in Maryland, is heading that area.

As you know, the National Guard also plays a critical role in deterring Russia's aggression. I was just in Estonia about 3 weeks ago, and Maryland National Guard has about 500 members there right now that are working on the cyber capability and helping Estonia deal with the Russian aggression and Russian hacks and those types of things.

And when we met, I think a couple months ago, you said it was critical that Russia must respect the frontline National Guard combat units as well as the full time. And do you believe at this point that Russia sees the National Guard units in a strength position? Where do you feel we are at this point? Are there additional capabilities that this committee needs to help fund to get you to that level? And then also if you have time—I think we do—I want to talk, if you can talk a little bit about that Maryland National Guard in Estonia and what their mission is and what they are doing, and what is their future there?

General LENGYEL. Congressman, I think when the Russians look across in Estonia or anywhere else in uniform and they see men and women in the Army, wearing an Army uniform, they see the United States Army. That is what I think they see. I think that is thanks in many ways to this committee. It is in thanks to 15 years or more now of continuous deployments, of integration of Army National Guard formations with Active Component formations, of a Total Force policy from General Milley and those on his staff that support this associate unit pilot program that is training our brigades with the Active Army brigades, aligning their formations so that we can train together and fight together.

And I do think that everywhere I go—I was in the Sinai Peninsula this past week. I saw the swap out of an infantry brigade from

Minnesota National Guard to the Massachusetts National Guard in the Sinai for the multinational force and observer mission, and I can tell you that they see no difference when they look across and they see, whether it is combat maneuver forces or whether it is combat support services, they are wearing the United States Army uniform. And there is one training standard for the Army, and the National Guard doesn't have a different one. The National Guard will train, will deploy, will be ready at the same training standard as the United States Army, and that is what I think Russia sees.

And the second part of your question, Estonia, the State Partnership Program—and, again, thanks for the significant amounts of plus ups that you gave us for this year; I believe we got an additional $9 million added to the program from this committee—that enables the engagements we have. The cyber relationship with Estonia and their Cyber Center of Excellence over there, is a model for programs around the globe. That engagement since 1993, they were among the first three programs that started in the Baltics with us there. That ability to assure our allies of the United States' commitment to the region, that ability to train together with the forces in the region, have had a strategic impact on our ability to assure and strengthen the NATO alliance. And my thanks to Linda Singh, who has been a great supporter of that, the State Maryland, and everyone else who is part of that.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. You know, Estonia is only 120 miles from Russia, and Putin is continuing to threaten it. And they had one of those severe attacks, and as a country, they only have close to a million people. They decided they were going to take on Russia. And with our help, the United States' help and working with them, they have become pretty sophisticated, I think, from all the countries in that region dealing with the Russian aggression and trying to counter the Russian attacks.

General LENGYEL. Absolutely.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield back.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. Calvert.

MODERNIZATION RECAPITALIZATION STRATEGY

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Good morning, General Lengyel. Thank you for appearing before the committee, and thank you for your dedicated service to our great Nation, especially on the eve of honoring those who sacrificed everything in the service of our country this coming Memorial Day.

Readiness is the most dangerous limiting factor across all branches of our military, ranging from the timely training of personnel to aging aircraft. Congress, as you are aware, has appropriated additional funds for Army aircraft procurement, specifically for Black Hawk helicopters. In fiscal year 2017, Congress provided the Army National Guard with 15 additional Black Hawks. As you may know, my home State of California is one of the country's most active emergency response forces, and its primary workhorse for aerial support is the Black Hawk helicopter. California flies one of the oldest fleets of Black Hawks in the country. Sixty-five percent of them were built before 1990. In 2015, only 55 percent of the State's Black Hawk fleet was operational at any given time.

Please explain to us your current modernization recapitalization strategy for allocating these aircraft and those projected in fiscal year 2018 and 2019. When do you expect the States to receive the first of those additional aircraft?

General LENGYEL. Yes, sir. Thank you and to this committee for the funding for the 15 Black Hawks. I think that, as we do with all our dispersion of equipment and recapitalization and modernization decisions, we look across the enterprise and see where it best makes sense to recapitalize a fleet at the time. I am not exactly sure yet when those Black Hawks are going to get delivered. I think that will make a case to determine when we get them. We will look at things like readiness as a fleet, maintenance statistics of the fleet, the sustainment levels of the fleet, potential deployments and utilization of those for our three missions—war fight, homeland, and partnerships—and, at the time, work with the Army National Guard to determine where its best to deploy those additional 15 Black Hawks. That is how we look at every stationing of all equipment, sir, and I thank you for your support of getting those Black Hawks.

Mr. CALVERT. I hope in that process you think of good ole California.

General LENGYEL. Absolutely. Yes, sir.

COUNTERDRUG OPERATION

Mr. CALVERT. To carry on with Chairman Rogers' line of questioning, combating terrorism and protecting our national interests abroad is only a part of the Guard's expansive mission. Protecting the homeland through the counterdrug operation is a vital mission I know that you take very seriously. In my area and throughout the United States, what are you seeing from these drug cartels, and do you see any association or collaboration between cartels and terrorist organizations?

General LENGYEL. So, sir, I think the consensus is that they are one in the same. I think that the money from the drug cartels is part and parcel to terrorist organizations. And counterterrorist organizations, countertransnational criminal organizations are all networked and aligned and work against the security of the United States.

Mr. CALVERT. Do you see any collaboration outside of organizations in South America, or are there organizations outside of South America involved in the drug activities?

General LENGYEL. It is a global network, no question. It is not limited to South America. The funding streams, part of the things that the National Guard provides is counterthreat finance analysis. We train people who do these kinds of analysis in great detail, and it is clear that funding streams in these networks are not geographically limited. They are global in their nature. No question.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Cuellar.

NATIONAL GUARD STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And, again, thank you for your service.

A couple things. There are some of us who pushed for two items. One was the million dollars more to the National Guard State Partnership Program, from 8 to 9. I would like to get your thoughts, what you are looking at doing with that extra money. And the other item was the, I think, fiscal year for the Counterdrug Program was 192, and some of us pushed it to $234 million. So I would like to get your quick thoughts on those, and then I would like to ask you a question about Operation Phalanx.

General LENGYEL. Yes, sir. Thank you. As I mentioned the State Partnership Program and thanks to your funding, it is an incredible tool, strategic tools, for the Department of Defense, for the country, for our States. And the $234 million, my only worry is we got it so late in the year, I am worried that getting the money this late will be difficult for us to execute some of it because, as you know, we have the posture in the SPP, troops and people to go, and events, and work with host-nation countries, and some of these things take time to develop.

Mr. CUELLAR. And we understand.

General LENGYEL. But, clearly, we can spend every bit of money you give us for the State Partnership Program, given the lead time to spend it. And the same thing for the Counterdrug Program. There is no shortage of requirements or asks from law enforcement agencies for what we do across the program. So absolutely thank you for the——

OPERATION PHALANX

Mr. CUELLAR. If you want to just share with the committee and ourselves later on what your plans are, I would like to do that. I know the last time we were with Chairman Rogers and Mr. Womack, we went down to South America, and there are some partnerships out there. Chile has one with Texas, and you have other States also. Do you all have anything with Mexico? I know we have been trying to do something with Mexico. If we can help you, it would only make sense that our largest neighbor, at least to the south, is one. So if we can help you on that, let me just say that. We can follow up.

I do want to ask you about Operation Phalanx. I know that Chairman Carter and Governor Abbott and I have been working on it. As you know, when you have Border Patrol, and they are doing night operations, the Air Marine, with all due respect, they do it during the day. They don't want to go out at nighttime. But you still have Border Patrol that are going out there, and you got to have something at nighttime, and unfortunately, some of our Air Marine folks, and we can address this later, but they don't go after 5 o'clock. And now they are trying to move away from the border, trying to set up—like they have a base in Laredo. They want to move to San Antonio. They want to be away from the border, which is counterintuitive. But the National Guard has done a heck of a job.

We added some money, the leadership of John Carter and other folks, we added some money for Operation Phalanx, but what happened was that the Homeland Secretary, the previous Homeland Secretary, even though the money was there, they never asked. Then they send this little letter that really didn't mean anything.

It was a feel-good letter. Then we contacted the new Secretary of Homeland, and his people are not familiar with it. You are familiar with it. We would ask you to get a hold of the new Secretary's office, and I believe the money is there. And whatever you all can do, because we got to give our men and women of the Border Patrol support at nighttime. It is unfair that they are out there in the night and there is no aerial support for them. So I would like to—I got about a minute and a half, but if you can finish on that thought, some of us, including Governor Abbott and ourselves, are big supporters of this.

General LENGYEL. Sir, I thank you for the $19 million for Operation Phalanx. I have already spoken to Secretary Kelly. I went to his office, and I met with him, and I told him about my recent trip to the Southwest border, McAllen was one place I went, and also in Nogales in Arizona, at the request of Senator McCain, to see the Southwest border. And I saw firsthand the need, the requirement, for additional air support to the folks who are on the border, the Customs and Border Protection agents who are there. I rode in an Army National Guard helicopter at night flying as part of the Counterdrug Program, with a Customs and Border Protection agent in the helicopter, and I must share with the committee it was not much different than what you see on TV for taking down a spot in Afghanistan. There weren't bullets and things flying along, but there were escorters. There were people running. There were police officers trying to apprehend them. And it is absolutely useful. So I commit to go back to Secretary Kelly, and I already have, and provided his staff a briefing on the capability we can provide.

Mr. CUELLAR. I know John Carter and other folks are interested, but if you can keep us informed, we really would appreciate it. Thank you for your time.

My time is up. I yield back.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Womack.

FULL-TIME MANNING

Mr. WOMACK. Thank you very much, Madam Chair, and thanks to General Lengyel for his leadership and the work of our National Guard both on the Army and the Air side. Great questions coming from my colleagues today, talking about things like Border Patrol, security, counterdrug, operational tempo, Black Hawks, and those kinds of things.

I am going to open a line of questioning about what I consider to be the single biggest issue facing our Guard today, and that is in relation to full-time manning. It is not a sexy subject. But it is a critical subject if we are going to continue to utilize our National Guard, as we should, as an operational force. As an example—and you correct me if I am wrong—when we were doing the drawdown on end strength, the Army Guard was scheduled to go to a number, and we were on the glide path to get to that number. And proportionately, full-time manning was cut based on that number. And then when this Congress gives money back to the Guard for end strength and we increase that end strength, not increased was the proportionate loss of the full-time manning. That is insane that we would allow this to happen.

So my question for you, General Lengyel is, how has this happened, and what is this doing to impact the readiness of a critical operational force for our military and our National Guard? Take all the time you need.

General LENGYEL. All right, sir. Thank you very much for that question. And so our business model in the National Guard is different. And I am a protector of that business model. I don't want to look like the United States Army. I do not want to look like the United States Air Force. We need to remain a preponderantly part-time force. That is the value in it for this country and for what we do.

The United States Air National Guard is about 35 percent full-time. In its 100,000 people, 105,000, it is about 35 percent full-time. In the Army National Guard, 343,000 people, we are about 16 percent full-time. What that full-time force does, and the only reason we have them and the only reason I am here before you today is to make ready for the United States Army and United States Air Force and the Governors in our States, is to make ready that force, to be ready, to be manned, to be trained, to be equipped, so that we can do the missions. That is why we have full-time people in the Army National Guard.

So you need to understand why they were gone. Money—I understand why they are gone, why we took them. We had incredible bills to pay. In our budgets, that is where all our money is. Our money is in that small chunk of change, $16 billion in the Army Guard. Two-thirds of that is people. Most of that is people. Same thing for the Air National Guard. So that is why it went. We had bills to pay and sequestrations and drawdowns and budgets. But what this force does is it prepares the force so that, when they come to drill for the 39 days or the 45 days or the 60 days, they have the structure to do the collective training they need to do to do their wartime tasking. They make sure that the equipment that they need to train on, the tanks and the Bradleys, that they work, that the aircraft are flyable, so that when the people come in, they can fly not only together, but they can fly in collective training, and they can do the kinds of training that the Army needs them to do. Same thing for the Air Force side. So the full-time support piece is what enables us to make the Army National Guard ready quicker. They come in and they prepare for a military unit training assembly for people to come in for a drill, and they put them together for 3 and 4 days at a time so that they can do some more training. They build the battlefield. They build the command post. They build everything so the soldiers come in, they get out of their pickup truck, they walk into the field, and they train. So, without the full-time support, then they waste time. They have to come in. They have to build the battlefield. They have to train. They have to fix the equipment so they can fly it. It is incredibly important.

I am not looking for huge numbers of—by the way, I am looking at my staff, NGB, where do we have full-time people right now so that, if I could, I could put some back out into the fields so that they can help make the operational force more ready. And I would tell you that I think if we are going to be ready quicker, stay an operational force, we are going to have to slowly increase the percentage of full-time support in the Army National Guard.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. Ryan.

RESERVE COMPONENT BENEFITS PARITY ACT

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Let me associate myself with all of my colleagues' remarks. Since I have been here, I agree they have got some great questions.

First, thank you. Obviously, Ohio is a huge part of the team and has deployed and will continue to deploy around the globe. And we know that post-9/11 use of the Guard has been a big part of our plan. One of the things I am concerned with is making sure that we are providing the benefits that match the service our National Guard are providing. And I understand there are significant differences in the benefits provided to our National Guard based upon minor administrative coding orders, and I will give you an example. I have cosponsored the bipartisan Reserve Component Benefits Parity Act designed to ensure National Guard who are activated in administrative codes, such as 12304(a) and 12304(b) of title 10, U.S. Code, are treated in the same manner as other Active Duty orders for determining veterans' benefits. This issue and many like it were documented in the October 1, 2014, Reserve Force's policy board memorandum, and yet we are still struggling to make sure that our National Guard and Reserve get the correct benefits that they have earned.

So what have we done to focus on educating our National Guard and Reserve on the differences administrative coding can make in veteran benefits? And how is your leadership making every effort to correctly reflect the importance of military service of our National Guard and Reserve by using the appropriate coding so their service counts toward their earned benefits?

General LENGYEL. Sir, I think this is one of the more important issues that we need to fix going forward, is the parity of benefits for service. I am thankful for the Parity Act. I completely think it is the right thing to do. 12304 bravo was a flexible mobilization authority given to the service Secretaries which has enabled access, mobilization of the force. However, when they created it, funding numbers being what they were, they didn't attach all the entitlements that go with it. So the soldiers who are in the Sinai who I just spoke to, they want this fixed.

Mr. RYAN. How are we coming with it? We are getting calls on this, and this is obviously a pocketbook issue for so many? Are we making some progress on this?

General LENGYEL. The awareness that thing has got is we have got to fix it here. We have got to find the resources to put against it so that there is no difference so that they are entitled to healthcare beyond 180 days when they come back, so that they are entitled to post-9/11 GI Bill education benefits, so that they have access to early retirement as per other mobilization authorities.

So what my soldiers are doing, what the soldiers from the States are doing, is they are changing their mobilization authority to voluntary status, which doesn't give them the protections of the dwell periods that we talked about earlier with Congresswoman McCollum; that is, they are voluntarily giving up their rights to serve their employers and their families and give themselves their dwell

period as citizens so that they can get the health benefits and retirement benefits that they deserve. So I ask for your continued support here. It is an important issue that needs to be fixed.

I think that the commission that was established a couple years ago, MCRMC commission—I am sorry; I can't spit out that acronym for you, exactly what it is—retirement benefits and duty status reform, OSD is actually working on behalf of all of the Reserve Components, not just National Guard, to streamline and make right the entitlements that go with pay and duty status, like service equals like pay in benefits. So I do sense, inside the Department at least, there is a push to make that happen and a push to make the reform. There will be a bill with it to do it, but it is the right thing to do.

OPIATE DRUG ISSUE

Mr. RYAN. Well, we need you to continue to push us, and we will push you and hopefully make some progress. Real quick because I only have 30-some seconds, I know the chairman brought up earlier the opiate drug issue. Are you starting to make a distinction in prioritization of opiates versus marijuana because the problem is so big? Are you prioritizing how you are deploying your resources, I guess I should say?

General LENGYEL. So, because of the rise and the devastating effects of the opiate piece, it has taken on a more important role in the threat-based resource model. That team has come together, which is adjutant generals from the States, its academic institutions who study this. It is subject-matter experts who come together. There used to be 20 variables per State, because, as I said earlier, every State has a unique and distinct environment that threatens their State. So we need a model that is flexible so that each State can articulate it. And so the opioid issue has risen inside that threat-based resource model, and we will apply the right authority to it.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Carter.

ASSOCIATED UNITS PROGRAM

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

General Lengyel, I welcome a fellow Texan.

I want to thank my friend, Mr. Cuellar, for raising the issue on the border, and I associate myself with all the conversation we have had today.

General, our Associated Pilot Program, high-demand National Guard units see more training days in combat training center rotations as part of the Army Associated Units Pilot Program. We talked about that a little bit. The Army requires training together to increase the readiness across all three components, keep up the demand for soldiers around the world. Can you provide the committee with an assessment of the Associated Pilots Program to date and if you feel like you are meeting the accomplishments that you are seeking to meet? And are there any additional funding requirements that you feel like we should know about as we go forward?

And I am reading a book called "Fast Tanks and Heavy Bombers" that General Milley gave me. And I would venture to say that

the National Guard trains more than the regular Army did. Today, we train more than the regular Army did during this period of time between World War I and World War II, and that is an amazing change in the Guard's requirements. Would you tell us a little bit about that, sir?

General LENGYEL. Thank you, sir.

I am thankful for the Commission and their recommendations that came up with the Associated Units Program. It is a test, and I am thankful that General Milley has embraced it. And by all counts so far, I am willing to say that, from every indication I have, it is a success. It has been embraced by the Army. It has been embraced by the Army National Guard. It has resulted in people swapping unit patches and becoming part of each other's uniform. It is a fundamental cultural change of integrating the Air National Guard into the United States Army, and I think only good things will come from it.

Time will tell. We will look at the end of this, and we will determine, has our readiness increased? I will tell you what is increasing: the trust in each other, the ability and the awareness of the commanders, the sharing of resources and training, the utilization of our force. Everything has gotten better since we have become this operational force, and I believe the Army Unit Pilot Program, the Associated Units, is nothing but good. That is incredible.

With respect to how we train, I couldn't be more impressed. I spent the last 5 years of my life learning about the Army and the Army National Guard and how we train. It is an amazing undertaking to train a brigade combat team. It is logistically complex. To amass the forces and equipment and training that you need in the right places where you can actually use them and train on them, it takes an immense amount of coordination, and, quite frankly, it is expensive.

Where we save the money is the 27 brigades that we have in the Army National Guard save you a little money when they are not training. We cost the same when you use us. We cost the same when you train us, but when you are not using us, we save some money. So it is my job, I think—you don't want 27 brigades in the Army National Guard at C–1. That is not where you save money because it will spoil that readiness before you use it. So we want to meter that readiness. We want to make them ready faster. General Milley needs us inside of 60 days, inside of 90 days, if something happens in North Korea.

We have to look hard at our business models. We have to look hard at the mobilization process. How do we mobilize? How can we mobilize faster? I think that is what we are trying to do in the Army National Guard Service, is make that force ready quicker, and be ready to participate as part of the Army as fast as they need us.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you. We are very proud of you.

General LENGYEL. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mrs. Roby.

CURRENT OPERATIONAL TEMPO

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you, Chairwoman. And thank you, sir, for being here. It is great to see you again. I have a few questions but first a few comments.

As you know, the Site Survey Team is in Montgomery right now with the 187th Fighter Wing and at Dannelly Field for the future fielding of the F–35. And as a long supporter of the F–35 program, it is exciting to see how much progress the program has made, and I would be remiss if I didn't take the opportunity to say to you that, if there are any questions from the Guard for the community or for any Member of the Alabama delegation, we continue to make ourselves available to you. The Alabama delegation, of course, in the community and our State is so excited about this possibility.

In your testimony, you highlight the numerous deployments that the Guard has performed since 9/11 and the fact that the operational tempo today remains very high. And so I want to thank you and all members of the National Guard for your selfless service in protecting the Nation in these challenging times and the sacrifice of your families.

I am concerned, however, and have recently had some conversations with friends of mine who served about how sustainable current operational tempo is and what has been brought to my attention as it relates to dwell time. We have placed a huge burden on our Guard families and not to mention their employers. And the question I have, are we placing too much on the Guard to constantly be an operational partner? And I have heard the comments of my colleagues in here, and I listened to you as well. But when my phone rings and it is a member of the Guard who has served both in the Active, for many years in the Active Component, and now as a pilot in the Guard, and what is being communicated to me is that there is concern by those who continue to serve their country hearing these rumors about a decrease in the dwell time from 5-to-1 to 4-to-1, and then is that a slippery slope? So I just really wanted you to take an opportunity to address these concerns that I have heard and I am sure others have as well.

General LENGYEL. Yes, ma'am, the concerns are real. I think you probably heard from the fellow Joint Chiefs yesterday that the threats that the country is facing is absolutely going to require the continued operational use of the National Guard.

One of the things that you are seeing in Alabama, particularly in the 135 arena, KC–135 arena, so, because all of these issues that we are dealing with are far away, they require a lot of air refueling capability. For the past 15 years, the Air Force has had the good fortune to have, you know, pretty much a downturn in the airlines cycle in which they had pilots available and willing to work who were either waiting or not engaged in an airline job. And so the volunteerism of people who were able to deploy beyond normal mobilized deployment was high. And so what has happened now is the availability that the airline industry is booming. They have a large draw on our pilot force who are now fully engaged in a civilian job, and so that volunteerism is beginning to be harder to get.

You have to keep in mind what our units are funded to do. So there are areas that are being stressed on the utilization, and I

would tell you that KC–135s are one of them. Writ large across the force, we are using, as I mentioned in my remarks opening statement, 18,000 men and women deployed right now today. If you go back 10 years ago, we had 70,000 men and women deployed today, and an average of that for over 10 years. So I characterize the sustainability of our force, the utilization of our force right now, as a normal walk, maybe a brisk walk. Whereas, 10 years ago, 2005, with 100,000 people deployed plus 50,000 during Hurricane Katrina, that was a full-out sprint, and that would not have been sustainable. Overall, writ large across the force, we can sustain what we are doing today, but we have to be careful and look at specific threatened areas like KC–135s and work to do that, and maybe associations can help. Maybe we can put additional Active pilots in there, and they can take on some of those flying responsibilities.

Mrs. ROBY. I certainly don't claim to have the solution, and that is why I wanted to just bring it to your attention and continue to have this conversation. These men and women are there because they want to be there and because they love their country, and I know we all recognize that, but I do appreciate your commitment to them, and I would like to continue to have this conversation with you down the road.

General LENGYEL. Yes, ma'am.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Visclosky.

COUNTERDRUG PROGRAM

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Thank you very much.

A couple of statements. First of all, General, there is a series of questions for the record on the Tactical Wheeled Vehicle Strategy for the Guard and certainly attaching importance to that program. I will be interested in the Guard's response.

I would join with a number of my colleagues who have mentioned the Counterdrug Program, very important in our State, particularly important in my congressional district, and I do appreciate the Guard's work with the local communities.

Also, it has been talked about, the partnership act. I think it is a very enriching program for the Guard, for our country, for the other countries we are involved with. I am very proud again that our State now has two such partnerships. I was interested in the exchange you had with Mr. Ryan, and I will be interested in the Guard following up on his question. Some years ago, I asked in a different fashion the same question. Some years ago, the Guard said they were working on it. So I would hope that some progress is being made.

HOMELAND SECURITY AND NATIONAL DISASTERS

For the questions I have, there has been mention of the Guard's responsibility for homeland security, for responses to national disasters. You just mentioned Katrina. As far as equipment in the Guard, as far as training of the Guard, when you do have a hurricane—it could be in Florida; it can be a tornado in a Midwestern State, wildfire—are there enough training dollars? Are there particular types of training programs that we should be attuned to that may not be fully funded? Are there types of equipment for

some of these natural disasters that Guard units across the country may not have adequate resources for? We are always thinking of overseas deployment, homeland protection, but if there is that natural disaster, is there something we are missing here as far as the needs that you and the Guard have?

General LENGYEL. Sir, I thank you. You know, I think one thing I would point out is thanks for NGREA money that we get that allows us to buy some of the equipment that we use specifically for the homeland, communications stuff, engineer stuff, modernize our aviation fleet with things that help us do our homeland mission. A lot of that is done for and used by the NGREA account.

The money that we get in the Counterdrug Program to have the schools and to train our servicemembers to be value-added, for that helps us. And I consider the counterdrug a huge part of the Homeland Security mission and support mission that we do.

I don't have a specific additional ask for you. I would tell you that we are looking right now at our cyber training requirements. Although I will say, for the most part, our cyber training schools are on track, the money that this committee gives us—I think we had $12 million this year for the Army National Guard to fund the positions that allow us to build and grow out our cyber network—we wouldn't be able to do that without the money. Although the training is validated by the Army, it is not yet funded, is straight in our baseline budget. So, without the funding that we get from this committee, we wouldn't be able to complete those kinds of training things. So I will give you a more direct list, but those are the things that come to mind as I sit here right now.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I mean, as far as natural disasters, there is nothing that comes to mind that we are missing as far as resources?

Okay, thank you very much.

Ms. GRANGER. General Lengyel, thank you for your time and your attention to this concern.

This will conclude panel one.

[The information follows:]

The Army National Guard (ARNG) has identified several domestic operations equipment priorities. The ARNG requires $4.1 billion to modernize its Black Hawk inventory A models to M models and $100 million for HMMWV modernization. Equipping needs for disaster response include Hydraulic Excavators, High Mobility Engineer Excavators, and Heavy Scrapers ($117.5 million), nine additional Disaster Incident Response Emergency Communications Terminal systems ($13.5 million), and CBRN detection and protection equipment for ARNG first responders ($1.2 million). The Air National Guard (ANG) domestic operations equipment needs include personal protective equipment, such as modernized EOD bomb suits ($3 million) and Emergency Responder Personal Protective Gear Decontaminators for ANG Fire and Emergency Services flights ($1.8 million). Aircraft modernization priorities include KC–135 Fuel Off-Load Hoses ($0.3 million), HH–60 Firefighting and Search and Rescue modernization ($1.7 million), and RPA Sense and Avoid systems for MQ–9 Launch and Recovery elements ($25 million).

RESERVE COMPONENTS

WITNESSES

LIEUTENANT GENERAL CHARLES LUCKEY, CHIEF OF THE ARMY RESERVE
VICE ADMIRAL LUKE McCOLLUM, CHIEF OF THE NAVY RESERVE
LIEUTENANT GENERAL REX McMILLIAN, COMMANDER, MARINE FORCES RESERVE
LIEUTENANT GENERAL MARYANNE MILLER, CHIEF OF THE AIR FORCE RESERVE

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GRANGER—PANEL 2

Ms. GRANGER. We will now move to panel two: The Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force Reserves. I would encourage all members to please stay for this panel. We are going to break for just 3 minutes to change panels.

General LENGYEL. Thank you, Chairwoman.

[Recess.]

Ms. GRANGER. If you will be seated, please.

Our second panel this morning consists of leaders of the Reserve Components: Lieutenant General Charles Luckey, Chief of the Army Reserve; Vice Admiral Luke McCollum, Chief of the Navy Reserve; Lieutenant General Rex McMillian, Commander, Marine Corps Reserve; and Lieutenant General Maryanne Miller, Chief of the Air Force Reserve.

We are pleased to welcome these four very distinguished general officers as witnesses today, and the subcommittee thanks each of you for your service.

As I mentioned in my opening remarks for the first panel, this country relies now, perhaps more than ever, upon the service of your soldiers, sailors, and airmen to ensure mission success. The committee commends the Reserve Components for their dedication to service and to our Nation. We look forward to your testimony and your insight, but first, I would like to call on the ranking member, my friend, Pete Visclosky, for his comments.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Madam Chair, I appreciate again that you are holding this hearing, and appreciate the panel before us for your testimony and your service, and I look forward to hearing it. Thank you very much.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

General, please proceed with your testimony. Your full written testimony will be placed in the record. Please summarize your oral statement so we can leave enough time to get to everyone's questions.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF LT. GENERAL LUCKEY

General LUCKEY. Chairwoman Granger, Vice Chairman Visclosky, distinguished members of the committee, I will keep my remarks brief, as the chairwoman just requested. I want to thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning. It is an awesome opportunity and an honor for me to represent the 200,000 soldiers of America's Army Reserve, who are serving today across 20 time zones and around the globe. On behalf of them, their families, the employers of America, and the Department of Army civil-

ians who support us, I want to thank each of you for your unwavering support and commitment to this team.

As I noted in my posture statement, which has been filed with the committee, as the leader of this team, I am well attuned to the persistent presence of the asymmetric threat of terrorism and radical groups, as well as the emerging and compelling challenges presented by near-peer competitors, potential adversaries with the capability, propensity, and willingness to contest American power in all domains. We have not faced these conditions for over a quarter of a century. And the Army Reserve must take action, along with the rest of our Army, to meet the new and evolving threats.

In this environment, an operational reality where the lethality and complexity of the battlespace presents new challenges to our Army, America's Army Reserve's practice of building rotational readiness and units over time will no longer be sufficient. We must prepare some units for full-spectrum operational environment immediately. This includes making ready significant portions of our team able to go fast, in some cases in days or weeks, in order to immediately complement and augment the Active Component formations who rely on America's Army Reserve to fight and win on the battlefield for the first round downrange.

In this new threat paradigm, some 300 units of action or approximately 30,000 soldiers, need to be able to deploy in harm's way in less than 90 days, many in less than 30. I refer to this force as Ready Force X. It is a fast-deploying set of capabilities, which I will be happy to discuss with the committee in more detail. We need to deliver these units for the mobility, survivability, connectivity, and lethality needed to win on the modern battlefield.

As always, consistent and predictable funding for essential training, equipment, and modernization is crucial to our success. The degree of funding which the committee has afforded us in the past and continues to is of tremendous benefit to America's Army Reserve. It is a superb tool, which in accordance with your guidance, enables me to procure certain high-priority capabilities that can be used for both combat operations and, as appropriate, domestic response operations. I thank you for your continued support in this regard.

Let there be no doubt that my team's number one priority is readiness. In fact, as I testified today, America's Army Reserve has just completed the largest crew-served weapons gunnery operation in its history, Operation Cold Steel, conducted up at Fort McCoy, Wisconsin. There, we rapidly accelerated the training qualification of our master gunners, of our vehicle crew evaluators, and individual soldiers, while reinvigorating the Noncommissioned Officers Corps of America's Army Reserve, which, as you all well know, is the first line, if you will, the core role in our Army of training and leading our soldiers when the lead hits the air. This is money and time well spent and much needed as we move into the future, and I appreciate this committee's support in that regard.

As for the future, America's Army Reserve is uniquely postured and empowered to leverage the wide-ranging reservoir of professional talent to understand, develop, and exploit emerging commercial markets and cutting-edge technologies by partnering with private industry in order to stay on pace in a very dynamic world.

Working closely with Defense Innovation Experimental Unit here in Washington, D.C., and spread around the country, as well as Military District 5 over at National Defense University and other partners, we are well on the way to strengthening linkages between the private sector and America's Army.

I want to reiterate the message I shared with the American people in closing. I shared this with them on the Army Reserve's 109th birthday last month in Times Square, joining that stage, if you will, with the Army's noncommissioned officer of the year, who, by the way, happens to be an Army Reserve soldier from the Golden State of California: My team relies, as I told the American people, on our families, on the commitment to support them, and the persistent willingness of America's employers to share their finest talent with us, and working the delicate balance between being ready enough to be relevant, but not so ready that my soldiers can't maintain good rewarding civilian employment. As I reach out to the influences across America and around the globe, I ask them and press them to act and to encourage their communities, cities, campuses, congressional districts, and the employers located therein, to see themselves as full partners in national security, sharing America's best talent with us, America's Army Reserve, as we support and defend the Constitution of the United States of America.

Distinguished members, your Army Reserve has always met the challenges of the time. With the committee's help, we will continue to provide the capabilities and readiness, live the example, and exude the ethos that the people of the United States expect and deserve. We will remain your premier team of skilled professionals, serving the Nation's both soldiers and engaged civilians around the globe. That is just who we are.

I look forward to your questions.

[The written statement of General Luckey follows:]

The 2017 Posture of the United States Army Reserve

The Army Reserve: America's Global Operational Reserve Force

Submitted by

LIEUTENANT GENERAL CHARLES D. LUCKEY
33d Chief of Army Reserve and
8th Commanding General, U.S. Army Reserve Command

May 24, 2017

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED BY THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

Title 10 USC 3038(f) specifies the Chief of Army Reserve shall submit to the Secretary of Defense, through the Secretary of the Army, an annual report on the state of the Army Reserve and the ability of the Army Reserve to meet its missions.
The report shall be prepared in conjunction with the Chief of Staff of the Army and may be submitted in classified and unclassified versions.

INTRODUCTION

For the past 15 years, the United States has embarked upon a far-reaching battle to defeat the forces of radical terrorism and bring a measure of peace and stability to a region that presented a direct threat to the safety and security of the American people. While this undertaking focused our time, treasure and attention on counterinsurgency and counterterrorism, current and potential adversaries seized the opportunity to study our tactics and invest in the modernization of their forces and capabilities.

Russia is arguably the best case in point. Having developed, tested and operationalized significant capabilities across all domains, Russia has clearly demonstrated its prowess as a global competitor, and its propensity to unilaterally use military force to achieve its perceived security objectives. China's emerging capabilities across a variety of domains, coupled with its own economic objectives, make it a rising challenge to American security partners in the Western Pacific. Less capable as a competitor, but arguably more immediately problematic as a strategic challenge, North Korea's unyielding quest for a road-mobile intercontinental ballistic missile (ICBM) that can reach the United States with a nuclear warhead raises obvious concerns that could drive hard choices for America. Iran's funding of terrorism and pursuit of highly-capable missile technologies can reliably be expected to continue into the future. Taken together, these developments, combined with emerging technologies in hypersonics, cyber-strike, artificial intelligence and digital disruption, create a new and disrupting threat paradigm for the United States and its allies.

U.S. dominance in positioning, navigation and timing, stealth technologies, global reach, global command and control (C2), air supremacy, space operations and all aspects of maritime flexibility have been the foundational underpinning of America's relative freedom-of-action in military operations. Indeed, the vast majority of Soldiers serving today have never experienced a time in which America's status as the preeminent global military power was open to challenge or contention. Nor have they been subject to an operating environment in which large concentrations of U.S. troops, supplies, or C2 nodes could be strafed; however, U.S. technological supremacy on the battlefield is a planning assumption we can no longer take for granted - in fact is quickly eroding. Such an environment demands that America's Army Reserve be ready to operate in a full-spectrum environment that spans the continuum from persistent asymmetric warfare against the forces of radicalism and threat networks to the high-end demands of one or more peer competitors. We must move quickly to deliver the mobility, survivability, connectivity and lethality to win on the battlefield of tomorrow.

America's Army Reserve has always risen to meet the challenges of our time, evolving from a nascent corps of doctors and nurses, to an Organized Reserve and, later, a strategic reserve under Federal control, to what is today an integral and essential element of the operational Army and a force-provider to the Joint Force. Yet, our mission remains the same: to provide mission-critical capabilities for the Army and the Joint Warfighter whenever and wherever they are needed, anywhere on earth. Our vision for the future is clear. It is to forge and sustain the most capable, combat-ready and lethal Army Reserve force in the Nation's history.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. Introduction

II. The State of the Army Reserve
- Most combat-tested and experienced Army Reserve in the Nation's history
- Provides enabling capabilities essential to major combat operations
- New vision and action to increase combat readiness, capability and lethality

III. Global Environment, Readiness and the Future Force
- Peer and near-peer states are challenging U.S. technical supremacy
- Indicators point to an increasing lethal and disruptive battle-space for the future force
- Building and Sustaining the Ready Force
- Readiness - Manning, Training, Equipping and Leadership
- Families and Employers
- Suicide Prevention
- Sexual Harassment and Assault Prevention
- Shape and Grow the Future Force
- Resourcing and Sequestration

IV. America's Army Reserve: Capable. Ready. Lethal.
- Balancing the requirements of today with training for tomorrow
- Highly skilled and educated Citizen Soldiers match the military needs of the Nation
- The world is changing but the Army Reserve will remain ever capable, ever ready

STATE OF THE ARMY RESERVE

The United States Army Reserve is the Army's sole, dedicated federal Reserve force, providing operational capability and strategic depth to the Total Army and the Joint Force in support of U.S. national security interests and Army commitments worldwide. The Army Reserve comprises nearly twenty percent of the Army's organized units, almost half its total maneuver support, and a quarter of its mobilization base-expansion capacity. Its unique status as both a component of the Army and a singular Command imbues it with the flexibility, agility and unity of effort needed to respond to any mission at home or abroad, often with little notice.

Manned, trained and equipped primarily to enable combat formations, the Army Reserve provides quick access to trained and ready Soldiers and units and the critical enabling and sustaining capabilities the Army needs to win. These include key strategic and operational capabilities such as Petroleum Pipeline and Terminal Operations, Rail Units, Biological Identification Detachments, Broadcast Operations, Civil Affairs and Psychological Operations, a variety of Military Police capabilities, Horizontal and Vertical Construction, as well as Combat Engineers, Assault Aviation, Logistics, and an array of Medical Commands and formations.

Engaged globally, the Army Reserve plays an integral role in America's national defense architecture, meeting high operational tempo demands, generating forces as required, and providing reliable capabilities all Combatant Commands. Since 2001, more than 300,000 Army Reserve Soldiers have been mobilized and deployed to not only Iraq and Afghanistan but to world-wide missions in support of Theater Security Cooperation, Foreign Humanitarian Support, Homeland Defense, Defense Support of Civil Authorities and other military missions at home and around the world. Today, nearly 15,000 Army Reserve Soldiers are supporting global combatant command operations, around the world, to include Civil Affairs missions in the Horn of Africa, deterrence operations in Kuwait, Military Police operations at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba and Medical Support operations in Honduras. Today's Army Reserve is the most combat-tested and experienced force in its history. However, we now need an Army Reserve that is ready to win in an environment that is growing in lethality and complexity. We must build an Army Reserve that is a more capable, combat-ready, and lethal force in the Nation's history.

GLOBAL ENVIRONMENT, READINESS AND THE FUTURE FORCE

In 2016, America's Army Reserve continued to meet the current and evolving threats of our time. In addition to the emergence of near-peer competitors on the global stage, the rapid technological evolution of offensive and defensive weapons across all domains presents the opportunity for adversaries to enhance their capabilities, reach, and lethality in new ways. For example, low-cost and highly adaptable technology platforms, like unmanned aerial vehicles systems (UAS), can threaten exponentially larger and more powerful platforms such as aircraft carriers. Next-generation cruise missiles, attack submarines, deep submersibles, space, and cyber

capabilities can place all U.S. Forces within an enemy's reach at any given time. New hypersonic and electro-magnetic pulse (EMP) weapons and increasingly sophisticated cyber-actors portend a progressively lethal and disruptive battlespace at home and abroad, while emerging technologies, such as artificial intelligence, 3-D printing and human performance modification, will likely disrupt the battlefield in ways we do not yet understand.

In this evolving global security environment in which both U.S. technological supremacy and vital national interests are subject to challenge by states who potentially possess both the means and proclivity to challenge U.S. dominance in critical areas and non-state actors who may acquire capabilities to acutely challenge our forces for discrete attacks, the mandate is clear: increase the readiness of Army Reserve forces – primarily units with a bias for action – in order to enable them to deploy and engage on short notice. This focus on readiness, of both individual Soldiers and action oriented units, drives the Army Reserve's strategy for manning, training and equipping its "fight tonight" formations and adds credence to the Nation's deterrence posture.

Readiness is our first priority, and full-spectrum threats demand full-spectrum readiness. In addition to sustaining the counter-insurgency and counterterrorism capabilities we have developed, the Army Reserve must be ready to respond to evolving threats in several theaters, and be prepared for the warfighting demands of large-scale, nearly simultaneous contingencies in more than one of them. Should they materialize, these contingencies would require significant and rapid mobilization, and require lead formations from America's Army Reserve to provide technical enabling capabilities crucial to opening, synchronizing, and sustaining major operations.

In this new threat paradigm, the time-tested model of rotational readiness will no longer suffice. Our traditional "patch chart" approach will not generate the significant surge capacity that such contingencies – arising quickly with little strategic indications and warning – will demand. To that end, the Army Reserve must now focus its training, equipping and manning priorities to meet the challenge of generating full-spectrum readiness for a Ready Force of some 25,000 to 33,000 Soldiers who are capable of deploying to the fight in a matter of days and weeks. This work includes having sufficient critical Army Reserve enabler capabilities and ensuring there are no interoperability gaps in areas such as mobility, lethality, battlefield communications and mission command systems.

Building and Sustaining the Ready Force

Work is well-underway at the United States Army Reserve Command at Fort Bragg, to assess and identify those types of units that will be most critical to rapidly support the warfighter through the Army Service Component Commands around the globe, and to win in contested environments across multiple domains. These units, which include early-entry/set-the-theater capabilities, are being specifically identified to ensure that leaders throughout the chain-of-command are cognizant of potential deployment timelines and, accordingly, steady-state readiness requirements. These units will be appropriately manned (or capable of being augmented in days to meet manning requirements), trained and equipped to meet the timelines driven by the warfighter and will be

maintained at that level until further notice. This Ready Force construct will enhance unit and Soldier stability, mitigate the cascading impacts of cross-leveling, and rationalize training, equipping and modernization strategies. Drafting off of the Army's Sustainable Readiness model, other units will remain sized, trained, and postured to protect the Nation and its interests as required, to include Homeland Defense (HD) and Defense Support of Civil Authorities (DSCA) missions.

At its heart, readiness begins at the Soldier level with deployable troops who are able to mobilize and deploy quickly in highly capable units to win the Nation's wars. Individual Readiness is the foundation of combat power and the decisive edge. It relies on energetic leadership and execution, the ultimate force multiplier, and depends upon both the families who support and sustain our Soldiers, and the employers who enable them to serve the Army and the Nation.

Readiness – Manning, Training, Equipping and Leadership

There are four essential components of Readiness: Manning, Training, Equipping, and Leadership. They are all critical, and they are largely interdependent.

Manning is the cornerstone of readiness for America's Army Reserve. This applies across the force in general and all the more so in quick-turn deployable units. It begins by positioning force structure in the right locales to leverage national demographics and emerging trends in order to capitalize on a mixture of population densities, predisposition to service, as well as other factors, that set units up for success in recruiting and retaining talent in an all-volunteer environment. This also includes re-aligning Full Time Support (FTS) personnel from lower priority units – from a deployment timeline perspective – to those units in the Ready Force which are tagged to move more quickly.

Training is the second component of readiness. To maintain operational readiness and prepare for current and future threats to our Nation, the Army Reserve is revamping its collective training strategy, returning to its expeditionary Army roots, and focusing on mission-essential tasks. Soldiers and units will not only be proficient in their warrior tasks and drills, but focused collectively on the unit and occupational specialties required to win decisively in a complex and dynamic operational environment. The Army Reserve will train to Objective T standards, which means that Commanders, at all levels, will ensure that units achieve participation rates and execute decisive action training required to meet these new readiness requirements. Because predictable multi-component integrated training is essential to building the readiness required to meet short-notice contingency requirements, the Army Reserve will prioritize resources to ensure early entry enabler formations participate in Army and Joint training events that leverage live, constructive, virtual and gaming capabilities.

Equipping is the third component of readiness, and modernized equipment ensures that Army Reserve early enablers remain both interoperable and readily available as a vital component of the operational force. Equipping requires sustained and predictable funding to maintain a fully

operational Army Reserve. Insufficient funding widens capability gaps which jeopardize the Army Reserve's ability to support the Joint Force. Although the Army Reserve represents nearly 20 percent of the Total Army, it received less than 3.4 percent of the Total Army's equipment procurement budget in FY 2016. Lack of interoperability puts all Army formations at risk when deployed. Equipping, funding and fielding should ensure Army Reserve is ready and interoperable with deploying forces within the timelines expected for supporting the Army and Joint Force in decisive action operations against a peer adversary.

Leadership pervades all aspects of readiness, and serves as the ultimate force multiplier. Leaders are the most effective hedge against complexity and uncertainty, and a resource that can neither be replaced by technology nor substituted with weaponry and platforms. The Army Reserve has combat-seasoned force leaders, at every echelon, who have led in combat. We will build on that experience and harness it to meet our Nation's future tactical, operational and strategic objectives. The Army Reserve will also use its unique position with the private sector to access talent and develop leaders with advanced technical skills for use in military formations.

Families and Employers

Readiness is built and sustained by garnering and retaining the support of both our families and, for America's Army Reserve, the employers who enable us to serve the Army and the Nation. The reason for this is as simple as it is self-evident: in a Nation that depends upon an all-volunteer force for its survival, if you are unable to hold the support of our families and fellow-citizens, you do not have an Army. Families who feel embraced, appreciated and integrated in to the Army Reserve are our key enablers. Similarly, the unwavering support of employers for Army Reserve Soldiers often determines their ability to continue to serve the Nation without being forced to choose between a civilian career or continued service to the people of the United States as an American Soldier.

Translated into action, this reality requires a coherent and integrated approach whereby a variety of Family Support programs and initiatives are leveraged to support Families and sustain a sense of community and mutual support in spite of the geographic dispersion of our units and Soldiers who are spread around the world. Sustaining employer support becomes an even more complex and demanding challenge when seen in the context of the Army's appropriate reliance upon the Army Reserve to generate the requisite combat power the nation requires. Persistent and persuasive engagement with employers and the communities in which they reside through a variety of outreach tools, is the key to reminding American businesses of the essential linkage between their "patriotism" and national security. We cannot, and will not, throttle back on this effort. Our U.S. Army Reserve Ambassadors, Public-Private Partnership Program and community support initiatives at the local level are all critical enablers in this push.

By way of example, the Army Reserve maintains an around-the-clock capability to support our Soldiers and Families. Manning a 24/7 watch floor, via phone or email, the Fort Family Outreach

and Support Center at Fort Bragg, North Carolina provides a direct conduit to command and community resources with comprehensive and confidential information, assistance, and referrals for every aspect of military life. Moreover, the Army Reserve Volunteer Program promotes and strengthens volunteerism by uniting community volunteer efforts, enhancing volunteer career mobility, and establishing volunteer partnerships.

Our Survivor Outreach Services Program maintains a family's connection with the Army family in times of loss, regardless of a fallen member's duty status or component. Child and Youth Services helps geographically dispersed Soldiers and families find affordable childcare and youth supervision options within local communities. Army Family Team Building is a readiness training program to educate Army Families about military life. These and other Family Readiness programs support more than a quarter of a million dependents in America's Army Reserve.[1] They are initiatives that have proven themselves effective time and again.

Suicide Prevention

Suicide prevention is the shared responsibility of commanders, leaders, Soldiers, Family members, and Army civilians at all levels and our efforts are a key component to personal unit readiness. Ensuring prompt access to quality care is an essential component of suicide prevention but we must also reduce risk, and one of the greatest risks is stigma. In the Army Reserve, we are working to reduce or eliminate the stigma associated with seeking help for suicidal thoughts or feelings, and are working to providing supportive environments for those with emotional and psychological issues. The Army Reserve is diligent in raising awareness of the many tools and resources available to increase individual resiliency and eliminate the incidences of suicide. For example, Military OneSouce provides free financial counselors for military members facing serious financial issues – a key suicide risk factor. The Comprehensive Soldier Fitness (CSF) Program helps Soldiers learn resiliency and have the tools to grow through demanding experiences. The Army Reserve's Fort Family Outreach Support Center (1-866-345-8248)[2] provides live assistance for Soldiers and Families in need, 24 hours a day, seven days a week. The Army Reserve is unleashing the power of the team to take care of our teammates and eliminate suicides within our team.

Sexual Harassment and Assault Prevention

Sexual harassment and assault are taken seriously across the entire Army Reserve. The Army Reserve is a family, a close-knit team. Sexual harassment and assault is an attack on our team, and it is not tolerated. Just as we would not let anyone hurt our immediate family members, we will not let anyone harm a member of our Army Reserve team and our unit readiness. The leaders at all echelons of the Army Reserve are the shields of trust for each Soldier. We must have high levels of mutual trust to get after those who would break that bond. As the shields to our team, the entirety of the Army Reserve is committed to 1) Protect victims, provide compassionate care, protect their rights and privacy, and prevent sexual assaults from occurring in the first place; 2)

Report every allegation, ensure that they are thoroughly and professionally investigated, and take appropriate action based on the results of those investigations; 3) Create a positive command climate, and an environment of trust and respect in which every person can thrive and achieve their full potential; 4) Hold individuals, units, Commanders and leaders responsible for their actions or inactions; 5) Fully engage the chain of command, and hold it accountable for everything that goes on in the unit.

The Army Reserve is fully committed to preventing harassment and sexual assault,[3] caring for the victims, and holding those who commit such egregious acts accountable.

Shape and Grow the Future Force

Staying current with force structure changes, unit positioning, leader development, and leveraging emerging technologies, capabilities and opportunities are key aspects of the agility the Army Reserve will use to shape and grow the future force.

The positioning of force structure, units and capabilities is a vital part of developing tomorrow's Army Reserve. Building for the future means ensuring that America's Army Reserve not only anticipates and flexes to meet new and emerging force structure requirements, but that ready units are positioned where future Soldiers are living and working in their chosen fields. Aligning force structure and unit locations with trending demographics will also help overcome perennial recruiting and retention challenges.

Developing agile leaders who can thrive in a full spectrum environment, are capable of making hard decisions under stress, and can operate in a complex and potentially digitally- disrupted or austere environment is a key component of our strategy to shape and grow the future force.

The Army Reserve's deep connection to the private sector is a substantial advantage in understanding and exploiting cutting-edge technology advances and capabilities, such as those in the cyber domain. For example, we are already positioning structure to support high tech-focused Department of Defense (DoD) initiatives leveraging "digital key terrain" in select locations in the United States, and seizing on further opportunities to draw upon our civilian skills and relationships with the private sector to meet critical needs of the Army.

Finally, infrastructure is also a critical component of generating readiness. No one installation is ideally suited to providing first-class training to all formations at all times of the year. Training platforms – their location, capabilities and limitations – must be assessed and leveraged in a manner that optimizes their ability to provide relevant, combat-focused training experiences for Army Reserve units, and maximizes their ability to increase the combat-readiness of discrete capable units in the minimum time possible.

Resourcing and Sequestration

Consistent funding is critical to current and future readiness. Without predicable funding, the Army Reserve, along with all components of the Total Army, will have difficulty meeting the operational capability requirements of the Army and Combatant Commands in a full spectrum environment. When the Budget Control Act of 2011 caps return in FY 2018, the Army Reserve will incur significant risk in training, facility restoration and modernization, and equipping and modernization programs vital to generating the readiness necessary to win our Nation's wars.

Military Construction (MILCON) funding is necessary to restore critical aging and decaying infrastructure and replace facilities that can no longer be economically sustained. Army Reserve Training Centers are essential readiness platforms enabling home station training and generating individual and collective readiness within and among units. Under current MILCON funding levels, the Army Reserve is taking significant risk to readiness in the ability to sustain, restore, and modernize enduring facilities that are necessary to execute the Army's training strategy.

As with training and facilities investments, equipping the force requires predictable and sustained funding to achieve full spectrum operational readiness. Current funding levels require continued reliance on less modern or interoperable equipment. Additionally, the combination of aging equipment and constrained depot maintenance funding drives higher levels of risk to unit readiness and the operational force. If the threat of sequestration is not eliminated, training for decisive action will be at high risk.

Areas of high risk for the Army Reserve include Mission Command Systems. Specific capability shortfalls include battle command systems, tactical radios and satellite transport platforms. The velocity of technological change continues to outpace the Army's procurement and modernization strategy.

Since 2013, as the Army Reserve's share of base modernization funding decreased, the importance of the National Guard and Reserve Equipping Appropriation (NGREA) has increased, accounting for 26 percent of the Army Reserve's total procurement funding. The Army Reserve is grateful for the support Congress has provided through NGREA.

AMERICA'S ARMY RESERVE: CAPABLE. READY. LETHAL.

America's Army Reserve is a capable, ready, and lethal team providing critical capabilities to Army Service Component Commands and all Combatant Commands. Although the threats to America are dynamic and ever increasing, the Army Reserve remains a highly effective and responsive force for the nation. As it has since its founding in 1908 as the Medical Reserve Corps, today's Army Reserve – anchored in civilian employment and local communities across the nation, and highly trained and educated in 148 different military career fields – stands ready to serve the Nation at home and abroad. America's Army Reserve – a force of technically and highly skilled Soldiers, leaders, and units: Capable. Ready. Lethal.

ENDNOTES

[1] Army Reserve Family Programs; database available online at: http://arfp.org/.

[2] The Fort Family Outreach and Support Center at http://arfp.org/fortfamily.html or via the Fort Family phone number at 1-866-345-8248 provides live, relevant, and responsive information to support Army Reserve Soldiers and Families. Available 24 hours a day, seven days a week, and 365 days a year, it provides unit and community- based solutions that connects people to people. Assistance is provided during times of crisis as well as routine assistance for other immediate needs to help maintain Soldier and family readiness and resiliency. By pinpointing Families in need and local community resources, the Fort Family Outreach and Support Center can quickly connect the Soldier and Family to resources, providing installation-commensurate services in the geographic location of the crisis. Fort Family Outreach and Support Center has established a community-based capacity by engaging our Nation's "Sea of Goodwill" to support Soldiers and Families close to their residence. Simply stated, Fort Family via web or phone connects Soldiers and Families with the right service at the right time.

[3] The Army Reserve established four full-time Special Victim Counsel (SVCs) positions, located at each of the four Regional Support Commands; 42 Troop Program Unit (TPU) SVCs, located at the Army Reserve General Officer Commands (GOCOMs); and 27 SVCs, located within each Legal Operation Detachment. The Army Reserve also established 50 full-time Sexual Assault Response Coordinator/Victim Advocate (SARC/VA) positions that span the footprint of the Army Reserve. Forty-three of the 50 SARC/VA positions are currently filled with personnel in a MILTECH and AGR status. Previously, the Army Reserve maintained five hotlines listed on the Department of Defense (DoD) Safe Helpline website, which were accessible for referral through the Helpline operators. To improve responsiveness, accessibility and breadth of resources, the Army Reserve consolidated all hotlines under the Fort Family Outreach and Support Center. The Army Reserve routinely participates in and hosts forums and panels at all levels of command in the Army. This includes meetings with the HQDA SHARP Program Office and the SHARP Academy to improve Army Reserve participation in policy formulation, training, and future developments. The Army Reserve also utilizes improved analytics to inform current and future mitigation efforts. Finally, our adoption of a more aggressive focus and stance on Sexual Harassment and Sexual Assault demonstrated a positive impact in the force. We are fully committed to maintaining an environment free of sexual harassment and sexual assault throughout the Army Reserve.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF VICE ADMIRAL MCCOLLUM

Admiral MCCOLLUM. Good morning, Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and certainly the distinguished members of the subcommittee. It is a distinct honor to be here this morning to talk to you about the state of the Navy Reserve and talk to you about the Navy's fiscal year 2018 budget request and, probably more importantly, to report on the dedicated men and women of our Reserve Force.

The Navy Reserve is the busiest it has ever been, and as an integrated force with the Active Component, we are experiencing competition in the maritime environment. This environment, it is fast-paced, it is complex, it is ambiguous, and, at times, uncertain. And the demand signal for the Reserve support has now exceeded over 79,000 individual mobilizations around the globe. And as you may know, these individuals, our sailors have left their civilian jobs, sometimes up to a year, and their families as well.

In addition to these mobilizations that I referenced, we have about 20 percent of the force that is engaged day to day performing what we call operational support. The Navy Reserve works out of 123 operational support centers, and these support centers are across the 50 States, Puerto Rico, and Guam. And the force structure is the result of the Navy's imperative to optimize interoperability and operational effectiveness of the Navy.

We spread our units around the country, beyond our fleet concentration areas, and this has allowed the Navy to retain valuable human capital and provides reservists a convenient place to train while remaining close to their businesses and their homes. One highly successful example of this strategy is the Naval Air Station Joint Reserve Base in Fort Worth, Texas, and this facility alone is a model for inter-service cooperation and community support that achieves the readiness that I am referring to. This installation holds 40 Tenant Commands, encompassing nearly 10,000 personnel across all four services. This is just one example of how the Navy Reserve is operating around the country in each of your districts.

The fiscal year 2018 budget request is focused on restoring balance and wholeness and laying the foundation for future investments. This is both in our equipment and our people. And as an integrated force, the Navy knows that its heartbeat is its people. And this investment addresses Reserve personnel wholeness in areas such as unmanned aircraft, cyber shipyard maintenance, and tactical operations.

While our Navy Reserve continues to execute at extremely high levels, our hardware, specifically our aging aircraft fleet, is facing some obsolescence challenges and rapidly approaching the end of its designed service life. Sixteen years of hard use has accelerated this effort. Accordingly, aircraft recapitalization remains the Navy Reserve's top equipping priority. The fiscal year 2018 budget request allows us to restore wholeness in aviation maintenance accounts and sets a solid foundation for next and future years' investments. And to continue restoring the wholeness of our force, we need stable, predictable funding mechanisms that allow us to plan effectively and react to contingencies.

Additionally, your increased support for flexible funding authority for the NGREA is needed. Providing us this authority as well as flexible funding methods enables the Navy Reserve to provide operational support where and when needed, and that will maximize the total effectiveness of the Total Force.

While the challenges ahead of us are significant, I could not be more proud of our Navy Reserve force. Every time I set foot in one of our operational reserve centers around the country, I come away, as you can imagine, very impressed with the dedication and the commitment of these sailors. And the pride that they take combining their civilian skill sets with their professional competence in military operations, I must admit, is very inspiring.

So, on behalf of the Navy and the Navy Reserve, I thank the members of the committee for your support, and I look forward to your questions.

[The written statement of Admiral McCollum follows:]

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASED BY THE HOUSE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

STATEMENT OF

VICE ADMIRAL LUKE M. McCOLLUM, U.S. NAVY

CHIEF OF NAVY RESERVE

BEFORE THE

HOUSE SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

MAY 24, 2017

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL
RELEASED BY THE HOUSE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

United States Navy Biography

Vice Admiral Luke M. McCollum
Chief of Navy Reserve
Commander, Navy Reserve Force

Vice Adm. Luke McCollum is a native of Stephenville, Texas, and is the son of a WWII veteran. He is a 1983 graduate of the U.S. Naval Academy and is a designated surface warfare officer. McCollum holds a Master of Science in Computer Systems Management from the University of Maryland, University College and is also a graduate of Capstone, the Armed Forces Staff College Advanced Joint Professional Military Education curriculum and the Royal Australian Naval Staff College in Sydney.

At sea, McCollum served on USS Blue Ridge (LCC 19), USS Kinkaid (DD 965) and USS Valley Forge (CG 50), with deployments to the Western Pacific, Indian Ocean, Arabian Gulf and operations off South America. Ashore, he served in the Pentagon as naval aide to the 23rd chief of naval operations (CNO).

In 1993 McCollum accepted a commission in the Navy Reserve where he has since served in support of Navy and joint forces worldwide. He has commanded reserve units with U.S. Fleet Forces Command, Military Sealift Command and Naval Coastal Warfare. From 2008 to 2009, he commanded Maritime Expeditionary Squadron (MSRON) 1 and Combined Task Group 56.5 in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. He also served as the Navy Emergency Preparedness liaison officer (NEPLO) for the state of Arkansas.

As a flag officer, McCollum has served as reserve deputy commander, Naval Surface Force, U.S. Pacific Fleet; vice commander, Naval Forces, Central Command, Manama, Bahrain; Reserve deputy director, Maritime Headquarters, U.S. Fleet Forces Command; and deputy commander, Navy Expeditionary Combat Command.

McCollum became the 14th chief of Navy Reserve in September 2016. As commander, Navy Reserve Force, he leads approximately 60,000 Reserve Component personnel who support the Navy, Marine Corps and joint force.

He is the recipient of various personal decorations and campaign medals and has had the distinct honor of serving with shipmates and on teams who were awarded the Joint Meritorious Unit Award, the Navy Unit Commendation, the Meritorious Unit Award and the Navy "E" Ribbon.

Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

FORCE STRUCTURE 2

CURRENT OPERATIONS 3

NEW & EXPANDING MISSIONS 5

ENABLERS 7

- FISCAL PREDICTABILITY 7
- CIVILIAN SKILLS 8
- TALENT MANAGEMENT 8
- MOBILE TECHNOLOGY 9
- EMPLOYERS 10
- MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS 10

RESILIENCE AND PREVENTION PROGRAMS 11

READINESS 13

- EQUIPPING THE FORCE 14
- FACILITY INVESTMENT 16
- NOSC SECURITY 17
- ACCESS 18

CONCLUSION 19

INTRODUCTION

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and distinguished Members of the Subcommittee, as Chief of Navy Reserve it is my distinct honor to report to you on the state of the Nation's Navy Reserve and its sailors. Navy Reserve proudly provides properly trained and equipped sailors to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Joint Force. As an essential component of the Navy, the Navy Reserve provides operational capability and surge capacity, both overseas and at home, across the full spectrum of naval missions.

Navy Reserve is comprised of 58,000 citizen sailors from every state and territory. Since 2001, these dedicated men and women have mobilized over 79,000 times to every theater of operations, including 5,755 personnel in FY16. This morning, in addition to individual mobilizations, Navy Reserve has over 12,000 sailors performing Operational Support directly to the fleet around the globe; approximately 20 percent of the force.

In 2016, the Navy Reserve continued its century-long tradition of supporting Navy, Marine Corps and Joint Operations in superb fashion, including the most recent conflicts in Iraq, Afghanistan and against violent extremists. Furthermore, in order to keep pace with improving technology and pivot to confront new and emerging threats, a strategic "deep dive" into the structure and organization of the future Navy Reserve has begun. The resulting Strategic Campaign will be underpinned by lines of effort (LOEs) clearly articulated in the *Navy's Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority*. Meanwhile, Navy Reserve will continue to do what it does best - combating the complex network of threats that the nation faces across multiple domains.

On behalf of the Navy Reserve, I would like to extend my sincere gratitude for your continued support.

FORCE STRUCTURE

Today's force structure is the result of Navy's imperative to optimize the interoperability and operational effectiveness of the Navy Reserve. As a direct result of the Navy Reserve's force structure realignment, most Reserve sailors now routinely work and train alongside their Active Component (AC) counterparts. Due to the high levels of personnel and mission readiness attained as a result of this synergy, Reserve sailors are able to provide a rapid response to calls for support, often on a moment's notice. Additionally, where appropriate, Reserve Component (RC) hardware units are aligned and integrated with AC unit training and deployment cycles. These RC units, comprised of military professionals with extensive operational experience, act as force multipliers through mission augmentation and provide surge capacity where and when needed. This is one of the most cost-efficient and mission-effective models available across all reserve components today.

Commander Navy Reserve Forces Command (CNFRC) operates six region headquarters (Reserve Component Commands (RCCs)) and 123 Navy Operational Support Centers (NOSCs). Located in all 50 states as well as Puerto Rico and Guam, these facilities collectively serve over 1,400 RC units. NOSCs reside both on and off DoD installations as a mix of stand-alone facilities, Navy-Marine Corps Reserve Centers, and joint Armed Forces Reserve Centers.

Commander Naval Air Forces Reserve (CNAFR) is comprised of three air wings, two Joint Reserve Bases (JRBs) and one Naval Air Facility (NAF): Fleet Logistics Support Wing (FLSW) and Tactical Support Wing (TSW) at Naval Air Station (NAS) JRB Fort Worth, TX, Maritime Support Wing (MSW) at NAS North Island, CA, NAS JRB Fort Worth, TX, NAS JRB New Orleans, LA and NAF Washington, D.C. In addition to these standalone commands, the Navy Reserve operates multiple Squadron Augment Units (SAU) which directly support various

AC Navy squadrons around the country. In all, the Navy Reserve owns and flies approximately 150 aircraft across the force.

CURRENT OPERATIONS

The Navy routinely responds to combatant commander requirements with tailored Reserve units and personnel. This force structure provides integration options ranging from the mobilization of an entire unit to the activation of a single Individual Augmentee (IA) sailor. This model delivers the increased flexibility and depth needed for the Total Force to face the dynamic nature of the global security environment. As of March 31st, 2017, 3,018 Reserve sailors were mobilized, 1,576 Reserve sailors were preparing to mobilize, and 343 were de-mobilizing. These sailors are involved in operations directly supporting Central Command (CENTCOM), Southern Command (SOUTHCOM), Africa Command (AFRICOM), and European Command (EUCOM). These individual mobilizations are in addition to the Operational Support that Navy Reserve units provide to combatant commanders on a daily basis in the Expeditionary Warfare, Naval Air Warfare, Fleet Air Logistics, Cyber Warfare, Unmanned Aerial Vehicles, and Shipyard Maintenance domains.

Navy Reserve Operational Support missions are broad, diverse, and critical to the mission of each of the geographic combatant commands. For example: In the continental United States, Navy Reserve Coastal Riverine Squadrons (CRS) - specifically CRS 1, CRS 11, CRS 8, and CRS 10 – form the backbone of the Navy's High Value Unit (HVU) escort mission. These units conducted 622 HVU Escort missions in FY16, and have conducted 151 to date this FY, providing afloat escort security for Navy vessels at strategic ports. Outside of the Continental United States a rotating team of CRS personnel (69 sailors strong) conduct HVU operations at

Djibouti, Africa. Additionally, rotating CRS personnel based out of Bahrain continue to support Embarked Security Team (EST) operations, providing maritime security for port visits, underway replenishments, and chokepoint transits in the Middle East.

In the Southern hemisphere, Navy Reserve forces provide timely support to every SOUTHCOM sponsored Humanitarian Assistance exercise, and contribute thousands of man hours to operational and exercise intelligence, medical, and logistics in support of SOUTHCOM's efforts to be the region's preferred security partner. At Joint Interagency Task Force South (JIATF-South), Navy Reservists serve an integral role in the Counter Drug/Counter Narcoterrorism (CD/CNT) detection and monitoring mission. At Joint Task Force Guantanamo Bay (JTF-GTMO) Navy Reserve manpower contributions to medical, intelligence, legal and Chaplain support services are critical to the mission. In Central America, Navy Reservists provide 40 percent of the Force Protection and Information Technology manning requirements at the OCONUS Cooperative Security Location in Comalapa, El Salvador, where deployed P-3C aircraft conduct the Counter Illicit Trafficking (CIT) mission. The Navy Reserve is a significant force multiplier in SOUTHCOM's continuing effort to encourage strength and unity of purpose between the U.S. and our regional partner nations.

In the Pacific, the Reserve Maritime Support Wing (MSW) is supporting Pacific Command (PACOM) objectives to advance stability and security in a volatile region. Specifically, Navy Reserve P-3C squadrons are deployed and flying maritime patrol and reconnaissance missions alongside their sister AC patrol squadrons. This operational deployment of RC capacity has eased the workload of AC units, helping facilitate the transition of the Navy's Maritime Patrol and Reconnaissance Force from the legacy P-3C to the new P-8A aircraft. Meanwhile, Helicopter Sea Combat Squadron (HSC) 85 is deployed and flying

missions in support of Special Operations Command, Pacific (SOCPAC). HSC-85 flies the HH-60H, and is the Navy's only rotary wing squadron solely dedicated to supporting the mission of Naval Special Warfare.

Around the globe, Navy Reserve's Fleet Logistics Support Wing (FLSW) provides 100 percent of the Navy's intra-theater air logistics capability. FLSW aircraft and flight crews are essential to sustaining maritime operations, transporting naval personnel and priority cargo to forward deployed units throughout the world. In FY16, FLSW transported more than 115,000 naval personnel and nearly 22 million pounds of cargo in support of Fleet operations while maintaining 24/7/365 C-40A and C-130T support in the CENTCOM, PACOM, and EUCOM AOR's. Additionally, the Naval Information Force Reserve (NAVIFORES), which comprises 15% of the uniformed Navy Reserve, provided over 470,000 man-days of operational support over the course of FY16, a 10% increase over FY15. The command filled over 76% of the total Navy Information Warfare Community Individual Augmentation requirement, providing support in 11 different countries and afloat.

NEW & EXPANDING MISSIONS

The volatile, complex and ambiguous nature of the threats facing the nation demand a Navy that can generate forces and capabilities with the agility and adaptability to respond efficiently and effectively. Specifically, Navy Reserve is expanding in three key emerging mission sets: Cyber warfare, Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) and Surge Maintenance Units (SurgeMain).

As the cyber warfare threat continues to grow, the Navy Reserve is growing its capacity to meet this challenge. The Reserve Information Warfare Community will grow by over 300

personnel to provide support to the Cyber Mission Force integration strategy within the Navy Reserve's authorized strength levels. Moving forward, Commander, U. S. Fleet Cyber Command will continue to assess requirements for Reserve integration into Navy's Cyber Mission Force, and the potential for creating Reserve Cyber Mission Support Units or Detachments.

With reliance on Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) continuing to expand, the Navy Reserve is well positioned to provide remote operator support, as the planned and periodic operating construct of UAS operations is a perfect fit for RC sailors. For instance, the Navy Reserve maintains two Navy Special Warfare SEAL Teams to provide additional capacity to the AC. In 2015, these teams began adding unmanned aircraft systems to their mission inventory to meet the increasing requirement for expeditionary Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) capability. Reserve sailors provide operational support to these ISR detachments on a rotational basis.

The MQ-4C Triton, formerly known as Broad Area Maritime Surveillance UAS, is a maritime UAS that provides real-time ISR over vast ocean and coastal regions. Twenty percent of the Navy's MQ-4 mission will be supported by over 100 members of the Navy Reserve. These reservists consist of Full Time Support Reservists (FTS) and Selected Reservists (SELRES) whose ranks are filled with pilots, naval flights officers and aviation warfare operators as well as reservists in various administrative and supportive roles. As a group they will operate as a SAU, providing valuable stability to the ever growing and evolving missions in which UAS participate.

Navy Reserve SurgeMain Units are made up of a part-time, flexible, fully qualified maintenance work force that provides skilled labor vital to Navy shipbuilding. These teams of RC sailors become a mobilization force when the Navy needs to "surge" its maintenance

infrastructure to support fleet readiness and the Optimized Fleet Response Plan. Over 1,400 SurgeMain sailors provided over 12,000 man-days of shipyard support in FY16. These units have been instrumental in mitigating risk by filling capability and manpower gaps created as a result of an increased shipyard workload and civilian work force attrition. In addition to providing additional manpower, SurgeMain sailors often bring new perspectives to problem solving as well as best practices from their civilian experience at a significant cost savings. Accordingly, Navy intends to increase its investment in RC SurgeMain manpower moving forward. Over the next few years, the shipyard augmentation work force is forecast to grow by 394 billets to 1,856 personnel (within authorized end strength levels), which is a testament to the success of the SurgeMain program and the skill and dedication of its sailors.

ENABLERS

FISCAL PREDICTABILITY

Predictable and dependable funding ensures that Navy Reserve sailors are able to provide consistent and timely operational support to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Joint Force. Reserve Personnel, Navy (RPN) funding is the primary fiscal means with which the Navy Reserve provides this support. Currently, the RPN account is funded to a level that enables the Navy Reserve to support 31 percent of operational demand. Your continued support in ensuring RPN funding remains robust, consistent, and predictable is a key enabler in maintaining readiness and accomplishing the Navy Reserve's mission.

CIVILIAN SKILLS

Many of the civilian skill sets of Reserve sailors add invaluable expertise and capability to the force. In some cases, RC sailors' civilian skills have provided exclusive and much needed capabilities in critical mission areas. Conversely, their military training and professional development make them more capable leaders in their civilian communities. Citizens who serve in the Navy Reserve strengthen the bond with the American public while educating families, employers and communities about military service.

Whether a tradesman, first responder, executive, or licensed professional, the Navy has long benefitted from the civilian experience and maturity of RC sailors. Moving forward, the Navy Reserve is focused on developing and improving its processes so it can more consistently leverage these abilities. This unique combination of civilian and military experience and skills provided by Reserve sailors offers the diversity of thought and insight which inspires innovation and acts as a force multiplier.

Military commanders often comment that the value of Reserve sailors' civilian expertise enhances their unit's mission effectiveness. As one Joint Task Force Commander noted, "The background and contemporary industry knowledge members of the Navy Reserve bring to my organization cannot be overstated – they bring a unique set of skills which consistently results in a better solution or product when they work side-by-side with their active duty counterparts, government civilians and contractors."

TALENT MANAGEMENT

The Navy Reserve has numerous initiatives underway to retain and extend the service of thousands of men and women in uniform as they transition from active duty. This ability to

retain their training and experience is a critical element in managing Navy talent and is vital to the future health of the Total Force.

Many of Navy's talent management programs fall under the concept of Continuum of Service (CoS), a transformational approach to personnel management that provides opportunities for seamless transitions between the active and reserve components. CoS provides flexible service options and improves life-work balance, which directly helps RC sailors. CoS provides both full-time and part-time service opportunities, depending on the Navy's needs and sailors' own personal desires. This supports CNO's vision of a seamless Navy Total Force that is valued for their service, and enables them to volunteer for meaningful work that supports the Navy mission. Retaining sailors in the Navy Reserve when they leave active service enhances readiness and reduces personnel training costs by capitalizing investments made when serving on active duty and building a Total Force team of trained and experienced professionals.

MOBILE TECHNOLOGY

Mobile access to a myriad of Navy IT systems is a key enabler for Navy Reserve sailors to maintain mobilization readiness and to perform their mission requirements, even when not at their assigned command. Navy Reserve must consolidate and modernize the systems used to enable and manage readiness, while improving access to those systems. Navy Reserve has taken a full-spectrum approach and has partnered with industry to produce creative and advanced IT solutions. Reserve sailors can now securely conduct business utilizing a mobile application to access various Navy and Navy Reserve IT systems, a cloud-based pilot to provide access to office productivity and collaborative tools, and expanded Navy NOSC hotspot capabilities to optimize the use of personal devices during drill weekends. Collectively, these solutions reduce

the time and effort required to meet readiness and training requirements. Every Reserve sailor's time must be focused to the greatest possible extent on the mission and not on administrative overhead.

EMPLOYERS

The RC relies heavily upon the sacrifice and dedication of local employers in each member's home state to support the nation's hundreds of thousands of reservists. Many companies provide flexible work options for both drilling and deploying RC service members. Some companies even go above and beyond what is required by law and continue to support members of the RC with pay and benefits while they are activated. For both large and small companies, this sacrifice can be considerable. Most importantly, supportive employers send a clear message to RC members that they need not worry about their civilian jobs while serving their country. The value of this reassuring message cannot be overstated –an employer's level of cooperation and encouragement is directly related to the productivity and mission focus of RC members when they put on the uniform. Employer support is a vital component of the success of the entire RC, and the Navy Reserve goes to great lengths to recognize supportive employers every year through various programs and initiatives.

MEDICAL PROFESSIONALS

RC sailors must be healthy, fit, mobilization ready and mission capable. To ensure high levels of medical and dental readiness throughout the force, Navy Reserve continues to leverage the skills and experience of the Navy Reserve's Medical Professionals in support of completion of Periodic Health Assessments (PHAs), immunizations and dental screenings. These medical

personnel contribute to all Reserve sailor Individual Medical Readiness (IMR) requirements. Drilling medical personnel, primarily in the Operational Health Support Units (OHSUs), support RC sailors drilling at the NOSCs on a regular basis on drill weekends. Additionally, since 2001, over 6,700 Navy Reserve Medical Professionals and Hospital Corpsmen have been deployed across the globe in support of combat operations, bringing critical skills that have directly contributed to the impressive and unprecedented combat survival rate experienced over the past 16 years of conflict.

RESILIENCE AND PREVENTION PROGRAMS

Navy Reserve resilience programs connect with other military and family programs to promote the mission-ready sailor. Key to this effort is providing a support network, programs, resources, and training needed to build life skills and winning in adverse environments. Building resilience through a culture of wellness - physical, mental, social and spiritual - will remain one of the Navy Reserve's top priorities.

Serving as a reservist requires RC sailors to balance many priorities associated with their civilian jobs, family commitments, and duties as a part-time sailor. The Navy Reserve utilizes several tools to help sailors manage the stressors that can accompany this busy lifestyle. The Navy Reserve's Psychological Health Outreach Program (PHOP) ensures all Reserve sailors have access to appropriate psychological health care services. Regional PHOP counselors provide Operational Stress Control (OSC) briefings and behavioral health screenings to Reserve sailors across the nation. The Resiliency Check-in tool allows PHOP counselors to provide one-on-one behavioral health assessments that include on-the-spot initial and follow-up referrals when needed. This is a proven way to ensure sailors have access to counseling support from

providers who are trained in resiliency methods to deal with common issues associated with the military lifestyle, including the stress related to family separation, continuous deployments, and post-mobilization reintegration.

The Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program (YRRP) supports Reserve sailors and their families through all phases of the deployment cycle. All deploying sailors participate in Pre-Deployment Health Assessments (PDHA) and Post-Deployment Health Reassessments (PDHRA). Thanks to Congress, the language in the FY16 NDAA amended the number of YRRP phases from four (Pre/During/Demobilization/Post) to three (Before/During/After) which helps to simplify and streamline service delivery. A key program within the YRRP is the Returning Warrior Workshop (RWW), which focuses on the reintegration process for service members and their spouse/family members, and helps identify sailors in need of follow-on care. 663 service members and an additional 530 spouse/family members attended an RWW in FY16. Navy leadership routinely receives positive feedback on the impact that this dynamic program has towards the reintegration process. Continued funding for the YRRP is vital to Navy Reserve's continuum of care.

The Navy Reserve remains committed to eradicating self-destructive behavior. The Navy's mantra of "Every Sailor, Every Day" promotes a culture that educates, trains, and empowers sailors to identify signs and trends that are indicative of impending self-destructive behaviors. Navy Resilience and Suicide Prevention Programs promote community and embody comprehensive wellness.

The Navy Reserve fosters a climate that is intolerant of sexual assault. Navy leadership is committed to preventing sexual assault by training sailors to intervene in unethical situations, while further improving victim response and care. Navy Reserve sailors are trained and

empowered to intervene and take action to stop behaviors contrary to the Navy's Core Values and Ethos. Navy Reserve promotes a culture of dignity and respect for all, and emphasizes the importance of living with honor, courage and commitment - both on and off duty. To further DoD's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) efforts, Navy Reserve recently released guidance to reinforce and clarify proper handling of SAPR issues unique to Reserve sailors.

The Victims' Legal Counsel (VLC) program provides sexual assault victims with a dedicated attorney to help explain the investigation and military justice process, and protect the victim's legal rights and interests. The Navy Reserve has played an important role in the VLC program since its inception in August 2013 by consistently filling VLC billets with Reserve judge advocates. A trusted VLC program made up of experienced, dedicated judge advocates encourages reporting by giving victims the confidence that their rights will be protected.

READINESS

The Navy Reserve's primary mission is to provide mobilization ready sailors, available at a moment's notice, to the Navy, Marine Corps, and Joint Force. Traditionally, the Navy Reserve maintains readiness as a result of an integrated force structure, enforcement of military standards, and the operational support that RC sailors routinely perform. In any given week, nearly 20 percent of the Navy Reserve is delivering operational support to the Navy and the Joint Force across the globe. Due to the tight integration with the active force, Navy Reserve's readiness levels very closely mirror that of the AC.

EQUIPPING THE FORCE

Aircraft recapitalization is without question Navy Reserve's number one equipping priority and is critical to the Navy Reserve's ability to provide required operational support to the Naval Aviation Enterprise. Almost fifteen years of increased operational tempo within a constrained procurement environment has taken a toll on the aircraft and equipment that RC sailors operate. Navy Reserve's integrated force structure depends on the ability to quickly and seamlessly assimilate with AC units to execute the mission. Accordingly, the Navy Reserve depends on the availability of modern, compatible hardware. As the Navy continues to prioritize investments in advanced aircraft, weapons systems and equipment, the total force will ensure that RC procurement is adequately resourced in these accounts as well. This will ensure that RC forces maintain high levels of safety, interoperability, and readiness.

For example, the Fleet Logistics Support Wing (FLSW), made up entirely of RC sailors, executes the Navy Unique Fleet Essential Airlift (NUFEA) mission to provide responsive, flexible, and rapidly deployable air logistics support required to sustain combat operations at sea. The aircraft that support this mission are the C-40A, C-130T and C-20G. The C-40As, payload, reliability, cost effectiveness, and unique ability to transport hazardous cargo and passengers simultaneously make it the preeminent platform to conduct fleet air logistics support in all of DoD. Procurement of the C-40A began in 1997 as a replacement for Navy Reserve's fleet of legacy C-9 and C-20G aircraft. The wartime requirement for the C-40A was assessed to be 23 aircraft; however the risk adjusted inventory objective was determined to be 17 aircraft. To date, the Navy Reserve has taken possession of 15 C-40As. Furthermore, the Navy's venerable fleet of 23 C-130T aircraft is aging rapidly. These C-130T aircraft are 23 years old and maintenance

issues are beginning to impact their reliability. In the not too distant future, the C-130T will require increase maintenance modifications, upgrades and follow-on recapitalization.

RC strike-fighter aircraft are also in need of recapitalization. The F-18A+ aircraft being flown by Navy Reserve are some of the oldest in operation. Significant maintenance and systemic compatibility limitations negatively impact aircraft availability rates and cause these squadrons to struggle to meet their strategic and operational mission. Navy plans to address this shortfall through a "waterfall" process in which F/A-18C and eventually F/A-18E/F aircraft are to be transferred to the RC. This will occur as F-35C and additional F/A-18E/F aircraft are either procured or available via increased depot production throughput.

The Navy's surge capacity within the Maritime Patrol and Reconnaissance Force (MPRF) consists of two RC patrol squadrons that operate legacy P-3C Orion aircraft. These RC patrol squadrons will be relied upon for operational capacity and capability to support P-3C sensor requirements for Combatant Commanders through mid-2023. Due to current fiscal constraints, there are no plans to fund P-3C sustainment after the AC patrol squadrons have completed the transition to the P-8A.

Navy Reserve executes 100% of the CONUS High Value Unit (HVU) escort mission performed by the Coastal Riverine Force within Navy Expeditionary Combat Command (NECC). The work horse of the HVU mission is the 34ft Patrol Boat. These boats have a 12 year service life, and 79 percent of the Reserve boats will exceed their service life by the end of FY19. Continued operation of a normal 34ft patrol boat beyond the 12-year service life requires a modernization and overhaul service life extension to bring the boat up to current standards. This extension program takes up to 8 months, with an associated cost between $600,000 and $800,000 on average per vessel. To operate a boat past the 12-year service life without the

modernization/overhaul risks catastrophic mechanical and/or mission failure. The future platform for HVU operations, and NECC operations as a whole, is the Patrol Boat-X (PB-X) program, which is set to begin production during FY17. In cooperation and coordination with NECC, Navy Reserve will seek to begin this recapitalization effort next year.

FACILITY INVESTMENT

As part of the integration and alignment efforts, Navy Reserve consolidated many of its facilities, closing 23 percent of NOSCs since 2005. Where able, Navy Reserve has partnered with other service components to relocate NOSCs onto military installations in order to leverage existing infrastructure and force protection resources. Navy Reserve has also partnered with other service components to establish joint reserve facilities. The resulting optimal footprint has allowed us to make best use of limited military construction and facilities sustainment funding in order to provide an environment for RC sailors to maintain their mobilization, training and readiness standards.

As a piece of the Navy's Energy Program for Security and Independence, the Navy Reserve continues to seek opportunities to gain energy efficiencies through facilities modernization and new construction. Navy Reserve military construction projects focus on building modern, energy-efficient, and technologically up-to-date facilities. For example, current plans prioritize vacating obsolete buildings, such as those currently occupied by NOSC Augusta, Georgia and NOSC Reno, Nevada. Navy Reserve has also prioritized the modernization and construction of two Joint Reserve Intelligence Centers. These facilities are "hubs" of intelligence expertise that facilitate direct support to forward deployed warfighters and are a critical part of the Joint Intelligence Program.

Each year Navy Reserve directs allotted Facilities Sustainment, Repair and Modernization funds to address the highest priority modernization and repair projects. However, the funds in any given year are only sufficient to address a portion of the total facilities sustainment requirement. Adequate facilities are necessary to keep Reserve sailors ready to mobilize and deploy forward. Your support represents an essential investment in the future health and readiness of Navy Reserve sailors. Stable, predictable funding levels across the FYDP will allow the Navy Reserve to modernize facilities in the most effective and expeditious manner.

Military Construction, Naval Reserve (MCNR) investments enable the Navy Reserve to support the Navy's operational mission and maintain the readiness of the force. Investments were targeted across the FYDP toward facilities that directly support operations, such as the aforementioned intelligence center, and towards relocating old NOSCs from off-installation to on-installation locations. Navy Reserve projects remain a priority despite budget constraints and limited funding for military construction, requesting MCNR funds for four projects from FY17 through FY19, and additional MCNR projects are being considered for inclusion in the upcoming budget submission. The FY17 Request for Additional Appropriations also includes a request for additional funding to complete construction of the Fallon NOSC. The Navy will continue to appropriately prioritize Navy Reserve projects to ensure the most critical mission requirements are attended to first.

NOSC SECURITY

Navy Reserve has embarked on an initiative to provide armed security for the 71 NOSCs located outside the confines of a major military installation. Assisting in this process are 78

SELRES sailors serving as Master-at-Arms who maintain the NOSC weapons programs and train select NOSC personnel on Standing Rules for Use of Force and Pre-Planned Responses. Currently, more than 284 Reserve sailors are qualified and serving in the NOSC Armed Watch Stander Program. These sailors provide armed security at their respective facilities during working hours and on drill weekends.

Additionally, in coordination with Navy Installations Command and Naval Facilities Engineering Command, the Navy Reserve conducted a broad Anti-Terrorism Force Protection (ATFP) assessment of all off-installation NOSCs to identify measures to enhance each facility's force protection posture. These physical security surveys were completed in June of 2016.

FY16 funds were obligated to address high priority security improvements at 14 NOSCs, and additional funds were provided for Selected Reserve armed security watch standers. Navy Reserve will continue to enhance physical security at the remaining NOSCs to mitigate security concerns identified during the ATFP assessments.

ACCESS

The Navy has grown dependent on regular and reliable access to the RC over the past decade. Under the Presidential Declaration of National Emergency (DNE), the services and combatant commanders have benefitted from involuntary access to the RC via Title 10 USC 12302 authority. When there is no longer a need for an annual DNE, access to the RC could be constrained under Title 10 USC 12304b authority, which only provides involuntary access for preplanned missions of units supporting combatant commander requirements.

CONCLUSION

"Citizen Sailors" continue to carry on the proud tradition of supporting the Navy, Marine Corps and Joint Force looking optimistically to the future in terms of their ability to contribute to vital national security interests. The broad spectrum of capabilities they can bring to bear in the fight against burgeoning superpowers and violent extremists are both effective and efficient. With over 3,000 personnel mobilized around the world and over 12,000 personnel providing global operational support each week, Navy Reserve sailors deliver unique skill sets to the battlefield. Driven and dedicated to serving their country, the men and women of the Navy Reserve have become a cornerstone in the *Navy's Design for Maintaining Maritime Superiority.*

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF LT. GENERAL MCMILLIAN

General MCMILLIAN. Chairman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today to testify on behalf of the Commandant of the Marine Corps about your Marine Corps Reserve. I am honored to be here with my fellow Reserve Component chiefs, and with me here today is my force sergeant major, Sergeant Major Kimble.

I have been at the helm of the Marine Forces Reserve for a year and a half, and I am pleased to inform you that your Marine Corps Reserve is thriving. On average, we are 95 percent manning, and our leadership, morale, and personnel health of the force is at unprecedented levels. I am continually impressed by the professionalism, competence, dedication, and motivation of our Reserve Marines. Like their Active Duty brothers and sisters, they serve selflessly to protect our Nation while at the same time balancing their civilian careers and their families. The strength of Marine Forces Reserve is the talent, skill, and discipline of our individual Marines and sailors.

I am motivated by the most common question that I receive from your Reserve Marines, which is, when do we get to deploy? They maintain the same mindset as the Active Component Marine Corps. We are ready to fight tonight, and we are ready to respond to any mission.

My primary focus remains being combat-ready and having Reserve Marines and units capable of moving, shooting, and communicating across the battlefield. Reserve Marines are viewed the same and are expected to respond the same as our Active Duty counterparts on a moment's notice. We are integrated with the Active Component as part of the Total Force. We are expected to be a force that is fully complementary, seamless, and an equal teammate to the Active Component. We are manned, trained, and equipped to support Marine Corps operational requirements across the full range of military operations. We are 39,000 strong, formed into major commands that comprise the Marine Air-Ground Task Force, and we are unofficially known as the Fourth Marine Expeditionary Force. As the Commandant of the Marine Corps has said, we are one Marine Corps, a Total Force Marine Corps.

To seamlessly integrate with the Active Component, Marine Forces Reserve must maintain equipment parity. Shortfalls in equipment modernization result in less interoperability with the Active Component, which slows the pace of operations and increases risk to your Marines and risk to mission accomplishment. Marine Forces Reserve continues to see shortfalls in modernization, like our most pressing shortfall, the KC-130J, which is used for tactical assault support, air-to-air, and ground refueling, and combat logistics support. It is the major end item which facilitates moving to and across the battlefield. We should not send our Marines to a fight with legacy equipment. Transition to modern equipment requires budget resources.

NGREA, as you are all familiar with, is a complement to the Presidential budget. And while we greatly appreciate NGREA,

greater spending flexibility, combined with a more representative funding proportion that is more aligned with our historical percentage, would significantly contribute to the ability of Marine Forces Reserve to modernize legacy equipment, transition to new systems, improve our readiness, and better support our young marines.

We owe it to our Nation's most precious assets, the young men and women in uniform, to send them into combat with the most modern equipment available. With the continued support of Congress, Marine Forces Reserve will continue to serve as a crucial operational and tactical shock-absorber to the Active Component.

In conclusion, I want to leave this distinguished body with two final thoughts: Number one, I want to personally thank you for passing the fiscal year 2017 omnibus appropriations bill. Having a predictable and consistent budget in the future will significantly improve readiness across the services. And, number two, we need a flexible NGREA that complements the budget to assist your Marine Corps Reserve in funding major end items, as defined by law.

I appreciate the opportunity to be here today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The written statement of General McMillian follows:]

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED
BY THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

STATEMENT OF

LIEUTENANT GENERAL REX C. McMILLIAN

COMMANDER, MARINE FORCES RESERVE

UNITED STATES MARINE CORPS

BEFORE

THE HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

CONCERNING

THE GUARD AND RESERVE

ON

MAY 24, 2017

NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED
BY THE HOUSEAPPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE

Lieutenant General Rex McMillian

Lieutenant General Rex C. McMillian assumed the duties of Commander, U.S. Marine Corps Forces Reserve and Marine Forces Northern Command on 12 September 2015. A native of Norfolk, Virginia, he graduated from the University of Southern California and was commissioned in 1980 via the Platoon Leaders Class program.

As a Lieutenant, he trained with VT-21 in Kingsville, Texas and remained as a flight instructor flying the TA-4J. In 1983, he reported to Marine Fighter Attack Training Squadron 101 for transition training in the F-4S. In 1986, Captain McMillian transitioned to the F-18 at Strike Fighter Squadron 106, Naval Air Station Cecil Field, Florida, and flew the Hornet with VMFA-531 in El Toro, California.

In April 1989, Captain McMillian transferred to the Marine Corps Reserve and joined Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 134. As a Major, he served as the Operations Officer and Executive Officer of Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 134 in Miramar, California.

Lieutenant Colonel McMillian served as the Assistant Air Operations Officer, 1st Marine Expeditionary Force Augmentation Command Element / I Marine Expeditionary Force at Camp Pendleton, California. In January 2000, he assumed command of Marine Fighter Attack Squadron 134 in Miramar, California and relinquished command in January 2002.

While a Colonel, in 2003 he was mobilized and reported to 3rd Marine Aircraft Wing as the Chief of Staff for both overseas and stateside duties in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. In June 2005, he was demobilized and transferred to MAG 46 in order to serve as the Deputy Commander.

Upon selection to Brigadier General, he served as Deputy Commanding General of Marine Corps Forces Pacific, Honolulu, Hawaii. From 2009 to 2010, Brigadier General McMillian assumed the duties as the Deputy Commanding General, I Marine Expeditionary Force at Camp Pendleton.

Major General McMillian served as the Commanding General, 4th Marine Aircraft Wing from July 2010 to August 2012. Following command, he served as the Director, Reserve Affairs Division, Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps until May 2013. Prior to his current assignment, he served as the Senior Advisor to the Commander for Reserve Affairs, assigned to North American Aerospace Defense Command and United States Northern Command. His secondary responsibility was a Threat Assessor for NORAD and NORTHCOM.

Prior to his return to active military service, Lieutenant General McMillian was a Captain for Delta Air Lines in his civilian employment. He has been a career airline pilot since 1989.

Introduction

The United States Marine Corps is the Nation's force-in-readiness. For approximately eight percent of the defense budget, your Corps provides an immensely capable and immediately responsive national security insurance policy for the American people. When our Nation calls, the American people expect quick, decisive action from Marines – both the Active and Reserve Components. All Marines must be disciplined, focused, and lethal. As the Commandant of the Marine Corps previously stated, we are one Marine Corps, a Total Force Marine Corps.

Your Reserves have been fully engaged across the Globe over the past 16 years in theater security cooperation activities and overseas contingency operations, serving side-by-side with our Active Component. Organized as a traditional Marine Air-Ground Task Force, Marine Reservists from each of our major subordinate commands -- 4th Marine Division, 4th Marine Aircraft Wing, 4th Marine Logistics Group, and Force Headquarters Group -- have made a tremendous impact across a diverse spectrum of operations in support of every geographic combatant commander's operational and theater security cooperation requirements in addition to Service commitments.

I continue to be deeply impressed by the professionalism, competence, and dedication of our Reserve Marines. Like their Active Component counterparts, they serve selflessly to protect our great Nation. I am inspired by the way they balance family responsibilities, civilian careers, and military service. They do so with humility, without fanfare, and with a sense of pride and dedication that is consistent with the great sacrifices of Marines from every generation. Without a doubt, the success of the Marine Corps hinges on the quality of our Marines.

Your Marine Corps Reserve is recruited, organized, manned, equipped, and trained to provide a professionally ready, responsive, and relevant force as a Marine Corps solution to enable Joint and Combined operations. Today's force will remain ready to fight and win across the range

of military operations and in all five warfighting domains – maritime, land, air, cyber, and space. While we remain ready, I thank you in advance for ensuring your Marine Corps Reserve achieves competitive readiness levels and equipment modernization.

A Total Force

Over the past year, the Marine Corps Reserve supported each combatant commander by providing forces focused on theater security cooperation, crisis response, crisis prevention activities and combat operations. Marine Forces Reserve has sustained a robust operational tempo while providing critical capabilities essential in maintaining national security at the strategic level. Global deployments, along with participation in Service, Joint, and Multi-national exercises, develop the desired depth of experience of the Reserve Force, ensuring the Marine Corps Reserve is relevant, ready and responsive to meet combatant commanders' requirements for highly trained general-purpose forces. The performance of our Reserve Forces in recent Total Force operations demonstrates this fact.

In 2016, more than 612 Reserve Marines mobilized supporting 18 operational requirements in five of the six geographic combatant commands. Likewise, nearly 5,200 Reservists participated in 34 training exercises, supporting requirements in 18 countries across the globe. Additionally, more-than 170 Reserve Marines volunteered to serve as Individual Augmentees, providing support to nearly every combatant commander.

During 2017, Marine Forces Reserve continues to support the combatant commanders by mobilizing an additional 813 Reservists and providing 4,500 Marines for a multitude of theater-specific exercises and security cooperation events. These operations and exercises greatly increase the Reserve Component's interoperability with the Active Component, Joint Force, and our allies.

Though the necessity to activate Marine Corps Reserve units on a large scale has decreased

in recent years, the demand for the Marine Corps' unique capabilities has increased. For example, this year we plan to provide forces for a new emerging security force requirement in southwest Afghanistan. In addition, for the second year in a row, we have mobilized and will deploy a task-organized Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force to U.S. Southern Command in support of theater security cooperation objectives. Last year, this formation of ground, air, and logistical capabilities supported U.S. Government humanitarian assistance that was provided to Haiti immediately after Hurricane Matthew.

Marine Forces Reserve continues to provide daily support to combatant commanders in a wide range of roles that include multi-lateral exercises, such as African Lion in Morocco, Ulchi Freedom Guardian in South Korea, and Maple Resolve in Canada. I anticipate Marine Forces Reserve will continue to deploy and integrate with the Active Component to meet combatant commander high-priority requirements through the use of existing mobilization authorities.

In addition to participating in operational requirements across the globe, Marine Forces Reserve continues to support the Total Force by dutifully executing the sensitive and crucial mission of providing casualty assistance to the families of our fallen Marines. Inspector-Instructor and Reserve Site Support Staffs are geographically positioned to accomplish the vast majority of Marine Corps casualty assistance calls and are trained to provide compassionate and thorough assistance to families. Indeed, the majority of Marine Corps casualty notifications and follow-on assistance calls to the next of kin are made by our Marines. During Calendar Year 2016, our Inspector-Instructor and Reserve Site Support staffs performed 85 percent of the 361 casualty calls performed by the Marine Corps.

There is no responsibility that we treat with higher regard than the solemn mission of providing casualty assistance. The professionalism and compassion of our Casualty Assistance

Calls Officers (CACOs) continues well beyond the initial notification. We ensure that our CACOs are well trained, equipped, and supported by all levels of command through the combination of in-person and online training. Once assigned, the CACO serves as the family's central point of contact and coordinates with funeral homes, government agencies, and other organizations. They assist family members with planning the return and final resting place of their Marine; and ensure the filing of appropriate documents is completed so that the family receives any veteran benefits to which they are entitled. In many cases, our CACOs provide a long-lasting bridge between the Marine Corps and the grieving family.

Additionally, Marine Forces Reserve units and personnel provide significant support for military funeral honors for our veterans. The Inspector-Instructor and Reserve Site Support staffs, with augmentation from additional Reserve Marines, performed more than 19,000 Military Funeral Honors, which represented 91 percent of all funeral honors rendered by the Marine Corps during Calendar Year 2016. As with casualty assistance, we place enormous emphasis on providing timely, compassionate, and professionally executed military funeral honors.

Finally, Marine Forces Reserve serves as the most wide reaching link between the Marine Corps and communities across the Nation. We present the face of the Marine Corps to the majority of the American public. With Reserve units located across the country, Marine Forces Reserve is uniquely positioned to interact with the public and communicate the Marine Corps story to our fellow citizens; most of whom have little or no contact with the Marine Corps. For example, last year Marine Forces Reserve personnel and units conducted more than 500 local and regional public engagement and community relations events across the country.

Predictability

Operationally focused, the Marine Corps Reserve remains an integral part of the Total Force. We remain manned, trained, and equipped to seamlessly integrate with and support the Active Component - whether conducting combat operations, serving within a Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Force, or assigned as advisors with security cooperation teams in support of steady-state requirements.

We work to augment, reinforce and sustain the Active Component across the range of military operations while maintaining Force readiness to support major contingency operations. We ensure units and personnel are ready to meet any challenge by employing a Force Generation Model that rotates Marine Reserve units through a five-year Training and Readiness Plan. At any given time, the Force Generation Model enables the Reserves to provide combat ready units and detachments, which includes two infantry battalions; artillery, combat logistics, and multiple aviation capabilities; as well as an assortment of other forces. In total, a ready bench of more than 3,000 Reserve Marines and Sailors is prepared to augment and reinforce Active Component forces in support of a contingency response or as part of a theater security cooperation mission.

Our Force Generation Model provides a level of predictability for Force planners and our Reserve Marines, while maintaining the "train as we fight" philosophy. The Model provides our Reservists, their families, and their employers the ability to plan for upcoming duty requirements five years and beyond. This empowers service members to achieve the critical balance between family, civilian careers, and service to our Nation while enabling informed employers to plan for and manage the temporary absence of valued employees.

The key element in the Force Generation Model is the consistent integration of Reserve units, detachments, and individuals into Service, Joint and Multi-lateral exercises, thereby building increasing interoperability over the plan's five-year cycle. The units are assessed through a

culminating Integrated Training Exercise during the fourth year of the training cycle to certify their readiness for use on the "ready bench" during the fifth year. Seamless integration with the Active Component in training exercises is conducted in the United States and abroad; this training facilitates the Active and Reserve Components interoperability, thus achieving success with the Total Force Marine Corps.

Personnel

Marines, Sailors and civilians are the foundation of all that we do. The resources we dedicate to sustaining and developing this foundation directly contribute to the success of our institution. The vast majority of the Marine Corps Selected Reserve's authorized end strength of 38,500 fall under Marine Forces Reserve. The Selected Reserve is composed of Marines in four categories: Selected Marine Corps Reserve Units, Active Reserve, Individual Mobilization Augmentees, and service members in initial training. Embedded with these Marines are 1,800 Active and Reserve component Sailors who serve critical roles in the operational and medical readiness of our Reserve Force. The success of Marine Forces Reserve would not be possible without the continued support from the U.S. Navy.

In addition to the Marines and Sailors of the Selected Reserve, Marine Forces Reserve administratively controls approximately 65,000 Marines who serve in the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR). Marine Forces Reserve continues to monitor the mobilization viability of these Marines who have fulfilled their active service commitment and returned to civilian life. The mobilization potential of the IRR is monitored through the use of muster events that are conducted at multiple locations across the country. These muster events are the Marine Corps' opportunity to physically inspect these Marines to ensure they meet the requirements for mobilization. These events also provide the opportunity to address administrative issues, complete mental health and

post-deployment assessments, review Reserve obligations and new opportunities, meet with prior service recruiters, and reconnect with fellow Marines. During the past year, Marine Forces Reserve conducted 26 muster events with 6,545 Marines who serve in the IRR.

The Marine Corps Reserve completed its current decrease in end strength to 38,500 in Fiscal Year 2016. We will continue to strive to retain the very best Marines capable of fulfilling our leadership and operational needs. The option of continued service in the Reserve Component has become increasingly appealing to young Marines leaving active duty. Marines approaching the end of their current contracts, whether Active or Reserve Component, receive counseling on the tangible and intangible benefits of remaining associated with the Selected Reserve. We educate each transitioning Active Component Marine on opportunities for continued service in the Marine Corps Reserve through the Marine Corps' transition assistance and educational outreach programs.

Despite reduced authorized end strength, our personnel readiness has reached record high levels. To sustain this high level of readiness we have concentrated on improving our personnel administration and retention programs. Throughout the past year, our Marines have worked hard to initiate enhancements to our administrative processes and standard operating procedures. Additionally, we are improving the timeliness and accuracy of Reserve pay and entitlement disbursement through the consolidation of administration at the battalion, squadron, and group levels.

Recruiting and retaining high quality Marines remains essential to the Marine Corps' reputation as the Nation's force-in-readiness. Marine Forces Reserve enjoys high affiliation and retention rates enhanced through incentive programs, such as occupational specialty retraining, inactive duty travel reimbursement, and bonus payments. These programs remain essential to ensure we continue to meet authorized end strength and retain our most talented Marines. Over the

past three years your support for these critical programs has helped bolster our overall personnel end strength to 99 percent of the total requirement with a grade and Military Occupational Specialty match rate of 85 percent. This high rate of personnel readiness is not only reflective of the health of the Force, but directly contributes to our overall operational readiness. While we fully expect to meet our Selected Marine Corps Reserve retention and recruiting goals again this year, continued use of these incentive programs are critical to optimally align our inventory against our requirements, maintain individual and unit-level readiness, address shortfalls in staff non-commissioned officers, and fully rebuild readiness from previous force structure changes. Your continued support for incentives that promote service in our Reserve Force will ensure our ability to recruit and retain the very best service members.

Equipment

For the most part, Reserve Component units remain highly interoperable with their Active Component counterparts due to the Marine Corps' Total Force approach to equipment fielding and management. Active and Reserve Component Forces are manned, trained and equipped to the same standards, facilitating the seamless employment of Reserve Component Forces to meet combatant commander requirements. Marine Forces Reserve mission essential equipment readiness levels are sufficient and capable of supporting all home station training requirements, as well as current operational deployments.

In the Reserve Component, personnel resources to identify and conduct maintenance are limited to the small full-time support staffs at each Reserve Training Center. These staffs are augmented by Reserve Marines during the monthly drill and annual training periods. Focusing these limited resources on the combat essential readiness reportable items constrains routine preventative and corrective maintenance on the remainder of equipment. Recent modernizations,

coupled with the increase in equipment density and complexity, have compounded this challenge.

For many years, Marine Forces Reserve has mitigated risk to maintenance readiness in two ways. First, by continually refining the Training Allowance, which is the portion of the unit's full Table of Equipment kept on-hand at the Reserve Training Center. Our goal is to balance the minimum amount of equipment necessary to effectively conduct training with the amount of equipment that can reasonably be maintained within the personnel and fiscal resource constraints. Second, by leveraging Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) dollars to pay for mobile maintenance support teams from Marine Corps Logistics Command to travel to Reserve Training Centers and augment the organic maintenance capacity. Previous reductions in the availability of these OCO dollars have caused Marine Forces Reserve to reduce mobile maintenance support capacity, resulting in a noticeable decrease in the readiness of non-reportable items. Consequently, this negatively affects the quality of training that can be conducted by Reserve units. Congressional support for our amended FY 2017 Operations and Maintenance, Marine Corps Reserve budget request, both OCO and non-OCO, is paramount to our continued success in maintaining high equipment readiness.

The top procurement priorities of Marine Forces Reserve are the KC-130J Super Hercules and the RQ-21A Blackjack Small Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System. The Marine Corps Active Component has fully fielded the KC-130J. However, the remaining 23 Reserve Component aircraft are not scheduled to be fully fielded until 2027. This extended fielding timeline forces the Reserve Component to simultaneously operate the KC-130J and the legacy KC-130T aircraft over the next ten years. These two aircraft models have vastly different logistics, maintenance, and aircrew requirements, resulting in an increased outlay of resources necessary to maintain the readiness of the Reserve Component squadrons.

Our second procurement priority is the RQ-21A Blackjack Small Tactical Unmanned Aircraft System. The RQ-21A will provide a dedicated intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance system capable of delivering intelligence products directly to the tactical commander in real time. The program is still in low-rate initial production. The Active Component began initial procurement in Fiscal Year 2014 and the Reserve Component is scheduled to receive its first RQ-21A in Fiscal Year 2021.

Training

During June 2017, Marine Forces Reserve will conduct its fifth Service-level Integrated Training Exercise aboard Marine Corps Air-Ground Combat Center, Twenty-nine Palms, California. This exercise consists of a two Battalion assessed live-fire and maneuver exercise, featuring Reserve Component Forces from the Marine Air-Ground Task Force elements (i.e. command, ground, air, and logistics). The unique nature of this exercise ensures maximum training benefits for the ground, aviation, and logistics combat elements under the command of a regimental headquarters. The Integrated Training Exercise is an indispensable component of our Training and Readiness Plan by serving as an annual capstone exercise, the principal mechanism for examining our training and readiness levels, and assessing our operational capabilities. Units participate based on future activation potential in accordance with the Marine Forces Reserve Fiscal Years 2017-2021 Training and Readiness Plan. The Integrated Training Exercise provides all Marine Air-Ground Task Force elements an opportunity to undergo a Service-level assessment of core competencies that are essential to expeditionary, forward-deployed operations. Additionally, individuals serving on the regimental command element staff receive training that ensures the ability to augment a Marine Air-Ground Task Force and/or a Joint staff. In summary, the Integrated Training Exercise improves combat readiness, efficiency in Total Force integration,

and enables more rapid activation response times at the battalion and squadron level.

Marine Forces Reserve continues to maximize continental United States-based training events. In Fiscal Year 2016, we provided an exercise force of approximately 2,000 Reserve Component Marines and Sailors for training opportunities in Exercise Northern Strike. Northern Strike is a joint, combined-arms, live-fire exercise emphasizing close air support, joint fire support, and coordinated maneuver with fires. The exercise also provides highly sought after amphibious training. Executed aboard Camp Grayling, Michigan, at the Joint Maneuver Training Center, Northern Strike provides an opportunity for Reserve Marines to train alongside Army and Michigan Air National Guard (ANG) forces as well as Canadian forces, under realistic conditions. Such an exercise ensures our Marines maintain the highest levels of proficiency and readiness to integrate with the Active Component for worldwide deployment.

At our Reserve Training Centers, we continue to maximize training efficiencies by utilizing simulators wherever possible to preserve fiscal and materiel resources. The Reserve Component Indoor Simulated Marksmanship Trainers (ISMTs) and other simulation systems safeguard consistent capabilities across the Total Force by ensuring Reserve Marines are trained to the same tasks, conditions, and standards as the Active Component. The ISMTs particularly benefit remote site locations that are distant from Department of Defense training ranges by preserving valuable training time during drill weekends.

With our Marines deploying around the globe, we also access and leverage a variety of other sources for language and culture training, such as the Marine Corps' Center for Advanced Operational Culture and Language, the Defense Language Institute, and Regional Language Centers. These enhanced language and culture learning opportunities coupled with realistic operational training events strengthen core competencies and postures Marine Forces Reserve as a

ready, relevant, and responsive force.

Facilities

Marine Forces Reserve occupies facilities in 47 states, the District of Columbia, and the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico. These facilities include 27 owned and 133 tenant Reserve Training Centers (RTCs), three family housing sites, one permanent barracks, three emergency troop housing barracks, and one General Officer Quarters in New Orleans, Louisiana. Although some RTCs are located on major Department of Defense bases, most of our centers are located in regional population centers, ranging from civilian neighborhoods to industrial and commercial districts. We continue efforts to improve maintenance and the security of our facilities to ensure the safety of our Marines and Sailors.

Sixty-six percent of the facilities budget simply sustains the existing physical plant and meets base operations costs by focusing on daily support and infrastructure maintenance. Costs of maintaining the physical plant steadily increase with the age of buildings. We have improved the overall readiness of our facilities inventory and corrected some chronic facility deficiencies through Marine Forces Reserve Facilities Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (FSRM) support. There has been a focused and on-going effort to improve overall anti-terrorism security at all of our centers by working with our Service partners and the National Guard for joint occupied facilities. Although we have leveraged additional funding, these emergent anti-terrorism security requirements have placed added strain on our already limited budget.

The Marine Corps' Military Construction, Naval Reserve (MCNR) program focuses on new enduring requirements and recapitalization of our aging facilities. The construction provided by the annual authorization of MCNR funding has been an important factor in advancing the Marine Forces Reserve facilities support mission. Systemic authoritative

engineering analyses have been undertaken in order to fill gaps in facility condition information. The combined effects of our targeted consolidation, FSRM, and MCNR programs have steadily reduced the number of inadequate or substandard Reserve Training Centers. Continued support for our facilities program will enable Marine Forces Reserve to improve the physical infrastructure that supports and reinforces the mission readiness of our units. Moreover, Marine Forces Reserve continues to pursue opportunities to place training facilities within existing Department of Defense compounds.

In accordance with national mandates, Marine Forces Reserve completed energy assessments at our owned sites and continues to implement the recommendations from those assessments as funds are available. Priority is given to sites that are the biggest energy users nationally and specific projects which offer the best return on investment. Environmental stewardship continues to be a major priority for Marine Forces Reserve sites and units as we continue to comply with national, state, and local laws.

Health Services and Behavioral Health

Marine leaders have a moral obligation to ensure the health and welfare of the Nation's Marines from the day they make the commitment to serve. We also must care for the Sailors under our charge; and the families of our Sailors and Marines. We take this responsibility seriously and strive to maintain the trust and confidence of Congress and the American people by immediately addressing any challenge to our readiness and finding solutions through our people and readiness programs.

Between deployments, our Health Services priority is to ensure the Department of Defense goal of 85 percent Total Force Medically Ready. During Fiscal Year 2016, Marine Forces Reserve individual medical and dental readiness rates were 84.6 percent and 89 percent,

respectively. We strive to improve medical readiness through a robust Post-Deployment Health Reassessment (PDHRA) Program at Marine Forces Reserve and an accurate monitoring, identification, and notification of unit-level actions necessary to attain readiness goals. Additionally, our Health Services personnel participate in Force Readiness Assistance & Assessment Program unit inspections; and our PDHRA Program participates in the Defense Health Agency's electronic audits. These inspections and audits provide oversight at unit level and the ability to monitor policy adherence which ultimately affects enterprise-level readiness.

The Reserve Health Readiness Program (RHRP) has greatly increased overall medical and dental readiness throughout the Force. This program funds contracted medical and dental specialists to provide services to units that do not have direct medical or dental support personnel and are not supported by a military treatment facility. During Fiscal Year 2016, the RHRP performed 14,918 Periodic Health Assessments; 15,860 Mental Health Assessments; 850 PDHRAs; 163 immunizations; 3,713 laboratory services; 21,536 audio services; and 18,323 dental procedures. In addition to RHRP, the Marine Corps' comprehensive behavioral health program addresses issues such as substance abuse prevention, suicide prevention, combat and operational stress control, domestic violence, and child abuse prevention.

Marine Forces Reserve continues to conduct Operational Stress Control and Readiness (OSCAR) training at all levels. The training is provided during pre-deployment training to service members of units deploying for more than 90 days, as well as all commands in garrison. The purpose of this training is to provide the requisite knowledge, skills, and tools to assist commanders in preventing, identifying, and managing combat and operational stress concerns as early as possible.

Navy Bureau of Medicine continues to support behavioral health through various

independent contracted programs, such as the PDHRA and the Psychological Health Outreach Program (PHOP). The PDHRA places an emphasis on identifying physical, behavioral, and mental health concerns that may have emerged since returning from deployment. During Calendar Year 2016, Marine Forces Reserve successfully raised current completion totals to nearly 36,000 PDHRA screenings and 16,000 Mental Health Assessments. The PHOP addresses post-deployment behavioral health concerns and crisis-related interventions through contractors with various social work-related backgrounds via a wide array of referral services in the community to include follow-up with service members. These programs provide a pathway to identify Marines and Sailors in need of behavioral health assistance, and an avenue to seek behavioral health assistance.

Signs of operational and combat stress can manifest long after a service member returns home from deployment. Delayed onset of symptoms presents particular challenges to Reservists who can be isolated from vital medical care and the daily support network inherent in Marine Reserve units. Encouraging Marines to acknowledge and vocalize mental health issues is a ubiquitous challenge facing our commanders. We address the stigma associated with mental health care through key programs, such as the Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program. Further, we market all of our behavioral health initiatives and programs through our Marine Forces Reserve portal website and during key Marine Corps forums throughout the year. Your continued support of our behavioral health initiative programs is greatly appreciated.

Marine Forces Reserve Drug Demand Reduction Program (DDRP) continues to focus on reducing illegal drug use and prescription drug misuse within the Reserve community. Marine Forces Reserve relies profoundly on its drug-testing program, which acts as a powerful deterrent against drug use. Each Reserve unit annually conducts random, compulsory drug testing that

ensures systematic screening of all Reservists for the presence of drugs. The DDRP staff provides education and awareness training on the dangers of misusing and abusing prescription drugs. The staff also provides information to Reservists on the proper disposal of old, unused, and outdated medications. Additionally, the DDRP increases leaders' awareness on the dangers of abusing prescription drugs through annual substance abuse supervisory level training.

Suicide prevention remains a high priority for the Marine Corps. Marine Forces Reserve focuses its suicide prevention efforts on six initiatives: in-theater assessments, PDHRA, PHOP, Care Management Teams, Marine Intercept Program (MIP), and Unit Marine Awareness and Prevention Integration Training (UMAPIT). The in-theater assessments target Reservists who are exhibiting or struggling with clinically-significant issues during a deployment. These Marines are evaluated by appropriate medical authorities for possible treatment with follow-up decisions made prior to the return home. The PDHRA Program specifically seeks to identify issues that emerge after Reservists have returned home from deployment. The PHOP secures treatment referrals and provides essential follow-up treatment and case management for our service members to receive appropriate behavioral health services. MIP is an evidence-informed targeted intervention for active duty service members, including Reservists, who have had an identified suicide ideation and/or suicide attempt. MIP includes a series of telephonic voluntary caring contacts in which a PHOP counselor reaches out to the Reservist and assesses for risk, encourages use of a safety plan, identifies and addresses any barriers to services. The PHOP counselors then incorporate these caring contacts into the counseling process. Lastly, UMAPIT provides annual training based on evidence-informed practices to raise awareness of common risk factors and warning signs associated with behavioral health issues. This training also focuses on building techniques to protect against behavioral health issues, ensuring that Marines understand their responsibility to

fellow Marines, and limiting the stigma associated with seeking assistance for suicidal ideations.

Additionally, Reservists and their family members can access Marine Corps installations' behavioral health programs through Marine Corps Community Services while they are on active-duty orders. When not on active-duty orders, Military OneSource provides counseling, resources, and support to Reserve service members and their families anywhere in the world. The Marine Corps DSTRESS Line is another resource available to all Reserve Marines, attached Sailors, and family members regardless of their activation status. DSTRESS is a 24/7/365, Marine-specific crisis call and support center, providing phone, chat, and video-telephone capability for non-medical, short-term, solution-focused counseling and briefings.

Sexual Assault Prevention & Response

Sexual assault is a complex problem that is often interrelated with other destructive behaviors. Marine Forces Reserve remains focused on executing solutions to address the continuum of destructive behaviors, with the goal of preventing sexual assault within our ranks. To accomplish this goal, Marine Forces Reserve has six full-time employees who provide supportive services across the geographically-dispersed force. In addition to the Force-level Sexual Assault Response Coordinator (SARC), each Major Subordinate Command within Marine Forces Reserve has a SARC who manages their commanding general's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) Program from the headquarters office in New Orleans. Together with the SARCs, the professional civilian victim advocate is available to support service members, as well as civilians who are eligible for SAPR services. Marine Forces Reserve continues to increase victim services, improve victim response capabilities, and emphasize prevention.

Additionally, the SAPR staff trains up to 160 new Uniformed Victim Advocates (UVAs) each year during week-long courses held at the Marine Corps Support Facility, New Orleans.

After being trained and credentialed through the Department of Defense's Sexual Assault Advocate Certification Program, UVAs are appointed by their commanders as Advocates for their respective Reserve Training Centers. Each SARC provides continuous support and guidance to the geographically-dispersed Victim Advocates within their MSC. In total, Marine Forces Reserve's SAPR Program maintains a roster of more than 300 UVAs within the Reserve Component.

Marine Forces Reserve members can report at any time, and do not have to wait to be performing active service or be in inactive training to file their report. If reporting a sexual assault that occurred prior to or while performing active service or inactive training, the Service members will be eligible to receive timely access to SAPR advocacy services from a SARC and a UVA. They also have access to a Victims Legal Counsel regardless of the duty status of the individual if the circumstances of the alleged sex-related offense have a nexus to the military service of the victim.

UVAs respond to service members regardless of their activation status, as well as adult dependents who make a report of sexual assault. With the support of their SARC, UVAs screen for potential safety issues and provide required safety updates, offer ongoing supportive services and referrals, and maintain a data base of nationwide resources for victims of sexual assault who may not reside on or near an installation. The SARCs and UVAs collaborate with providers who are local to the sites to create a network of support and response capabilities for the Reserve Component across the nation.

Another essential aspect of the response protocol is the 24 hours a day, seven days a week Support Line that is advertised to service members and their families via written and digital media and during all SAPR classes and briefs. The Support Line is manned by the professional SAPR

staff members who serve as a readily accessible resource for those who need anything from immediate assistance to those with questions about how to make a report. The Marine Forces Reserve actively publicizes the DoD Safe Helpline that is a crisis support service for members of the DoD community affected by sexual assault. The DoD Safe Helpline is available 24/7 worldwide with "click.call.text" user options for anonymous and confidential support.

Our prevention strategy is holistic and integrated with other programs that support the prevention effort, such as the Equal Opportunity Program, Family Readiness, and Behavioral Health. Marine Forces Reserve emphasizes setting the example of discipline and respect at all levels of command by encouraging a positive, retaliation-free, command climate. Leadership is encouraged to actively engage with our Marines and Sailors to learn what we can do to further support a positive environment that is free from attitudes and behaviors that are incompatible with our core values. Preventative education continues to play a role as all non-commissioned officers receive "Take a Stand" bystander intervention training and all junior Marines participate in the "Step Up" bystander intervention training each year. Additionally, our Marines participate in the various events during Sexual Assault Awareness and Prevention Month.

In summary, Marine Forces Reserve is committed to preventing sexual assault while responding with the highest quality of supportive services and advocacy to those who need it.

Quality of Life

We are dedicated to ensuring quality of life support programs are designed to help all Marines and their families, whether they are deployed or on the home front. Reserve Marines and their families make great sacrifices in service to our country and they deserve the very best support in return. They are dispersed throughout the country and away from the traditional support systems of our major bases and stations. Therefore, we strive to ensure awareness of, and access

to, the numerous support programs available for their benefit. Family Readiness Officers provide the vital link to ensuring support reaches those who need it.

Marine Forces Reserve tracks the submission of medical service treatment records to ensure Reserve Component Marines receive timely access to Department of Veterans' Affairs (VA) health care services. Working across 178 reserve sites, we aggressively target our performance for submission timeliness to ensure our Marines will not be delayed in their submission of VA benefit claims once they have separated from the service.

Marine and Family Readiness Programs remain flexible, constantly adjusting to meet the needs of our Marines and their families. The result is a ready and resilient Force, well equipped to achieve success. This heightened state of resiliency is primarily achieved by providing robust, relevant and standardized training to our unit commanders, Family Readiness Command Teams, Marines and their families. Our Marine Corps Family Team Building (MCFTB) program offers non-clinical primary and secondary preventative education and professional training to support service members and their families throughout mission, life, and career events. MCFTB training events are delivered in person at Marine Corps units across the United States and through interactive computer based trainings on the MarineNet platform. During Fiscal Year 2016, Marine Forces Reserve conducted 256 training events at which 10,530 Marines and family members received valuable information to help prepare for upcoming deployments, thrive during a deployment, and achieve a positive post-deployment reintegration experience.

A key component to our quality of life and resiliency is the religious ministry support provided by the 202 Chaplains and Religious Program Specialists who serve in our ranks; 127 of whom are in Reserve units, while 75 support the Active Component. Of those, 11 are mobilized in support of combatant commanders across the globe. This support includes providing divine

services across the spectrum of faith communities, advising on spiritual and ethical matters, and pastoral care in a safe, confidential environment. One signature program is the Chaplain Religious Enrichment Development Operations (CREDO) program. The Marine Forces Reserve CREDO program provides two transformational workshops: the Marriage Enrichment Retreat (MER) and the Personal Resiliency Retreat (PRR). These events equip Marines, Sailors, and their families with practical relationship and communication tools that strengthen marriages and individual resilience while on the home front and during deployments. The PRR curriculum also helps Marines and Sailors set personal goals, make good decisions, deal with stress, and live lives with greater purpose and satisfaction. During Fiscal Year 2016, 12 Marriage Enrichment Retreats were conducted with 288 participants and two Personal Resiliency Retreats were conducted with 27 participants.

The Marine Corps Personal and Professional Development programs continue to provide training and educational resources to service members and their families. The Transition Readiness Program implements a comprehensive transition and employment assistance program for Marines and their families; the program emphasizes a proactive approach that will enable Marines to formulate effective post-transition entrepreneurship, employment, and educational goals. Transition Readiness is a process that occurs across the Marine for Life Cycle, not an event that occurs at a single point in time. Additionally, the Marine For Life Network provides education and awareness briefs to Reserve Marines and their family members during IRR Mobilization Exercises, with the intent to link them to employment, education, and community resources in support of their overall life goals.

Our Semper Fit program continues to be fully engaged in partnering with our bases and stations to provide quality, results-based education and conditioning protocols for our Marines and

Sailors. The High Intensity Tactical Training program includes hands-on, science-based strength and conditioning courses, online physical fitness tools, mobile applications for service members to access anywhere, recorded webinars, as well as instruction on injury prevention, nutrition, and weight management. Our Marines' and Sailors' quality of life is also enhanced through stress management and *esprit de corps* activities, such as unit outings and participation in competitive events. These programs are crucial to unit cohesion and camaraderie.

The Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program (YRRP) is an invaluable partner with the Marine Corps Unit, Personal, and Family Readiness Program at every command level. Since its inception during 2010, the YRRP has held more than 792 training events for more than 37,000 Marines, Sailors, and family members. In Fiscal Year 2016, 132 YRRP training events were conducted with 1,509 participants. The YRRP is a tool for commanders to remain engaged with the challenges and issues facing Marines, Sailors, and their families. The YRRP continues to thrive. Marine Forces Reserve, with the assistance of our Marine Corps Family Team Building staff, has developed innovative methods for program delivery that are sustainable in any fiscal or deployment climate. This includes developing webinars that can be delivered nationally, mail-outs, social media, personalized briefs designed to meet the individual needs of the service member and family, and working with the Family Readiness Officers to leverage national and local resources at no cost to the government.

We remain supportive of Military OneSource, which provides our Marines, Sailors, and their families with an around-the-clock information and referral service via toll-free telephone and internet resources. Military OneSource provides counseling on subjects such as parenting, child care, education, finances, legal issues, deployment, crisis support, and relocation.

Our Marines, Sailors, and their families, who sacrifice so much for our Nation's defense,

should not be asked to sacrifice quality of life. We will continue to be a faithful advocate for a robust Family Readiness Program that evolves and adapts to the changing needs of our Marines, Sailors and their families. The combined effect of these programs is critical to the readiness and retention of our Marines, Sailors, and their families, and your continued support is greatly appreciated.

Supporting our Wounded, Ill, or Injured Marines and their Families

The Marine Corps ensures the availability of full spectrum care to all wounded, ill, or injured (WII) service members, whether they are Active or Reserve, through the Wounded Warrior Regiment (WWR). Marines Forces Reserve ensures Reserve Marines' unique challenges are addressed through a liaison who provides subject matter expertise and special coordination with the WWR staff.

The WWR staff includes the Reserve Medical Entitlements Determinations Section, which maintains specific oversight of all Reservists' cases requiring medical care for service-incurred and duty-limiting medical conditions. Reservists facing complex care and recovery needs have access to WWR's network of 45 Recovery Care Coordinators who provide one-on-one transition support and resource identification for WII Reservists and families, who often live long distances from military installations. The WWR also has medical advocates at the regimental staff who are available to assist Reservists in need of medical care coordination and advocacy and has district injured support coordinators and field support representatives dispersed throughout the country who coordinate with Reserve units to ensure we keep faith with all Marines.

Marine Forces Reserve will not forget the sacrifices our Marines have made for this great Nation; and we will continue to work with the WWR to establish resources and programs that address the unique and ongoing needs of our Reserve population.

Conclusion

The Marine Corps is our Nation's force-in-readiness and will continue to be most ready when our Nation is least ready. As part of the Total Force Marine Corps, Marine Forces Reserve must remain manned, trained, and equipped to provide forces to the Active Component to respond across the operational spectrum and in all five warfighting domains. Although this unstable and increasingly dangerous operating environment is further complicated by a constrained resource environment, we must continue current operations, reset our equipment, and maintain our warfighting readiness while modernizing the force. Accordingly, we will make pragmatic institutional choices as we balance our available resources between current commitments and future readiness requirements. Semper Fidelis!

SUMMARY STATEMENT OF LT. GENERAL MILLER

General MILLER. Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. I am honored to have with me this morning Command Chief Master Sergeant Ericka Kelly. Together, we represent America's 69,000 Reserve citizen airmen, providing operational capability and surge capacity, ensuring airspace and cyber dominance around the globe.

Twenty-six years of continuous global operations and decreased budgets have stressed our force, which is always in demand. Last year, we were the fourth largest major command contributor to combat operations, filling over 10,000 air expeditionary and volunteer taskings across the U.S. and in 30 foreign countries. Our airmen deliver critical capabilities to the fight every day, through global vigilance, global reach, and global power.

Your Air Force Reserve operates with 16,000 fewer airmen and 220 fewer aircraft than we did in Desert Storm. The stress of our size, the steady state operations tempo, and our funding shortfalls keep us challenged, yet we remain a lethal combat-ready force, composed of amazing and resilient airmen and families.

The concerns which weigh most in our day-to-day operations are insufficient manpower for both full-time support and critical skills, training availability and funding, weapon system sustainment, and concurrent fielding of aircraft and equipment. We continue to make incremental steps in the readiness needed for today's fight, while posturing for the complex future threats and the many challenges.

Although the fiscal year 2018 President's budget request is a good beginning, to ensure that we deliver the most ready, capable, and lethal force, a long-term effort is needed. This balance of readiness today and the needs of tomorrow is difficult without predictable, sustainable funding through the outyears.

The fiscal year 2018 President's budget request continues our efforts to build readiness and capability by adding 800 positions across our rated space, cyber, and our ISR missions. The budget request, with the additional overseas contingency operation support, begins to fund weapon system sustainment closer to the required levels, ensuring that we can produce the exercise, training, and combat sorties needed to sustain the best Air Force in the world. Modernization and recapitalization are essential to maintaining our combat edge. With continued congressional support for the National Guard and Reserve equipment appropriation, we can smartly invest in weapon systems, which will increase our capability and recapitalize systems that will minimize risk against our emerging threats.

And I thank you for the fiscal year 2017 NGREA funding of $105 million, which provided all-weather targeting pods for the F–16, enabled KC–135 defensive systems, updated digital displays for platforms, such as the A–10, and afforded personal recovery equipment for our Pave Hawk helicopters. This funding helps ensure that we maintain that lethal edge to dominate and to survive in all spectrums of the conflict.

Delivering combat air power to the joint force is our mission. To best execute this requirement, we must develop a concurrent field-

ing and investment strategy to ensure operational parity with the Active Component. This ensures synchronized use of manpower, equipment, and training resources in a fiscally constrained environment.

Over the past few decades, we have successfully adjusted to an operational Reserve. Portions of our force are stressed, but our Reserve citizen airmen are resilient, engaged, and honored to serve. We require your support for sufficient resources to meet full-spectrum readiness, increase end strength to support integrated operations, and an increased budget to buy back the readiness deficit and modernize weapon systems. A stable, predictable budget will ensure Air Force Reserve is combat-ready at all times.

Thank you again for your support and this amazing opportunity to represent our airmen, and I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

[The written statement of General Maryanne Miller follows:]

United States Air Force

Testimony

Before the House Appropriations
Subcommittee on Defense

Guard and Reserves

Statement of
Lieutenant General Maryanne Miller
Chief of Air Force Reserve

May 24, 2017

Not for publication until released by the House Appropriations
Subcommittee on Defense

INTRODUCTION

Chairman Granger, Representative Visclosky, and distinguished members of this Subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to talk with you today. I am honored to represent America's Reserve Citizen Airmen: men and women who live and work locally in your represented states, yet serve globally, providing operational capability and surge capacity ensuring unrivaled air, space, and cyber dominance.

For 69 years, this nation has called on the Air Force Reserve (AFR) to support national security objectives in all types of military and humanitarian operations around the globe. Today nearly 70 thousand Reserve Airmen are postured to respond to any crisis or contingency when needed. In fact, there are currently 6,000 Air Force Reservists on active duty orders operating in air, space, and cyber domains, supporting overseas contingencies and other stateside operations. In order to remain viable for today's fight and postured for tomorrows, it is critical, we not only improve but sustain our readiness and ensure we integrate into key mission sets to support the joint fight. However, shrinking defense budgets and a lack of fiscal stability stress our readiness levels and threaten our ability to reach and sustain full-spectrum readiness. As a critical component of the One Air Force Team we will not be fully successful without proper and sustainable funding into the out years.

Today, I am going to affirm our current state of readiness, explain how we integrate into the joint environment, and describe what makes the AFR uniquely structured to support operational demands in air, space, and cyberspace.

STATE OF THE AIR FORCE RESERVE READINESS

Over two decades of continuous operations coupled with decreased budgets have left us with a smaller force of seasoned airmen and strained the readiness of our force as we continue to

support the unceasing demand for the operational effects of our airpower and other critical battle space operations. To help recover from the stress on our force we must grow our manpower concurrently with the active component based on current and emerging mission requirements to best support our nations call. Reserve Citizen Airmen are crucial to meeting national objectives and combatant commanders' demands. We must continue to leverage our strengths and always partner with the Active Component to successfully field new weapon systems, as we have with the F-35 and KC-46, and expand in areas like space, cyber, and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR).

We define full-spectrum readiness as the right number of Airmen, trained and equipped to accomplish operational missions in support of joint forces in both contested and uncontested environments. Critical skills availability, training resource availability, flying hour programs, weapons system sustainment, and operational tempo measure our readiness. Congressional support within these critical areas is needed to strengthen our readiness. Specifically, my top four concerns are lack of sufficient manpower in both full time support and critical skills, maintenance concerns due to operations tempo and aging fleets, ensuring concurrent fielding of aircraft and equipment and limited budgets with continuing resolutions.

Manpower

With a force of nearly 70 thousand, we feel the pressures of the budget shortfalls as well as the pull from industry of our most skilled airmen. Our rated force is currently short 445 pilots and on average, our flying squadrons are 72 percent manned. Research from RAND suggests the major airlines will hire over 9,000 pilots within the next six years. As a comparison, the Air Force, with all three components combined, has approximately 17,000 pilots. A downward trend in our pilot manning will continue if we don't take measures to recruit and retain pilots through

bonuses and other quality of life programs. We cannot compete on the same pay scale with commercial industry but we must continue to leverage other means to retain the quality airmen we need to get the mission accomplished.

We are beginning to see similar industry dynamics with our maintenance force. Our full-time maintenance manning is 80 percent, with a shortfall of 1,500 full-time maintainers. We have been successful in retaining our traditional reserve maintenance force and are manned at 100 percent but our shortfall in full time maintainers, coupled with the unrelenting demand for air power, are contributing to our decrease in aircraft availability rates and training and support to all flying operations.

As demands for rapidly evolving space, cyber, and ISR missions increase, so does the need for increased manpower for these critical skill sets. Our 11 Reserve space units are aligned with either Air Combat Command or Space Command supporting space operations globally. We have over 700 space professional Individual Reserve Augmentees (IMA) supporting Major Commands, Numbered Air Forces, and Interagency staffs in 25 different locations around the world. The AFR represents 11 percent of the total force manpower in the eyberspace superiority portfolio with 14 Cyber Organizations supporting Major Commands and Combatant Commanders. In FY17, we increased our ISR manning authorizations by 222 to support coverage of full-spectrum ISR operations. We added one target system analysis squadron and two intelligence support to cyber mission forces squadrons. These growth areas require additional manpower.

For 16 consecutive years, the AFR has met its recruiting goals and our retention rate remains at 90 percent, which is a testament to the dedication and professionalism of our force, yet we know these success stories mask an underlying stress on the force. High demand Air

Force Specialties are critically stressed and undermanned. Many of our seasoned personnel, such as pilots, maintainers, space, cyberspace, and ISR professionals, have chosen to leave the Reserve or transition from full-time to part-time service for various reasons such as pay and entitlement disparity, reduced funding, unpredictable budget and high operations tempo. Our shortages, especially in the Air Reserve Technician (ART) program, are compounded by Sequestration, Continuing Resolutions, and hiring freezes. We are very thankful for your support in programs such as recruiting, retention, and relocation (RRR) bonuses that allows us to target continued service for these individuals.

To effectively grow our force, we must attract, recruit and retain the highest quality Citizen Airmen. One of our top recruiting priorities continues to be capturing Airmen transitioning from the active component. We prefer recruiting prior service members who are already trained to make immediate use of their capabilities and minimize training costs. Retaining active duty Airmen results in a significant cost-savings and brings a wealth of operational familiarity and mission expertise. However, we are currently experiencing a downward trend in prior service recruiting. Last year, 38 percent of our accessions were non-prior service, a six percent increase from the prior year. Non-prior service recruits significantly increase our training costs and delay readiness.

While retaining pilot experience garners media attention, we must remember the combat-tested warriors across our other disciplines and career fields. In order to support the growing demand for space, cyber, ISR, and other critical Total Force mission areas, we will leverage our unique Reserve Citizen Airmen civilian sector experience to retain our competitive edge. However, the Reserve needs your help in ensuring a slight growth in manpower over the next few years. Since we are postured through Unit Type Codes, we do not have excess manpower to stand up emerging missions without pulling manpower from other areas.

Training and Flying Hours Program

A stable, predictable budget is critical to allow AFR Citizen Airman the ability to plan their participation for the year. This permits our people to stay proficient in their civilian career and qualified in their Air Force Specialty. Funding for Seasoning Training, Continuation and Proficiency Training, and Flying hours is vital to maintain our Air Force standards. By leveraging our high experience levels in the training environment, we minimize cost and set our newest Airmen up for future success, but we must have continuity in the form of a stable budgeting process to plan our participation.

Our Reserve Seasoning Training Program (STP) funding is critical to ensure new members are qualified, but many of our units report inadequate funding. STP training normally occurs immediately out of Basic Military Training and Technical School. Without the availability of these funds at the beginning of every year, we cannot plan for training. Unpredictability damages the relationship between our Airmen and their civilian employers and communities. With any shortage of STP funds, we miss training opportunities which ends up delaying personnel readiness.

Training and funding of the flying hour program is crucial to maintain, rebuild and improve readiness. Air Force Mobility Air Force (MAF) flying hours are currently funded at 85 percent, with some platforms funded as low as 68 percent. If the Transportation Working Capital Fund (TWCF) shrinks, our MAF crews will need more Training, Test, and Ferry (TTF) or Operations and Maintenance (O&M) funds to offset training deficiencies. The Combat Air Forces (CAF) flying hour training program has also been impacted; specifically, Reserve allocations for formal training have been reduced. Resources and funding for the flying hour training program are critical to preparing for combat operations.

Weapon System Sustainment

To achieve program balance and build AFR equipment readiness, unfunded requirements must be approved; otherwise, risk will increase in our aircraft fleet and supporting systems. Additionally, our fleet modernization requires immediate attention.

Our weapon system sustainment baseline funding has been below 80 percent for the past few years. We are more successful with our sustainment efforts due to the additional OCO funding which takes our funding to approximately 85 percent but the system is still stressed due to aging fleets, depot modifications, corrosion and supply issues.

The average age of Reserve fleet is nine years older than the Active Component's fleet. Our oldest aircraft, the KC-135, is almost 60 years old, and our Aircraft Availability lingers 19 percent below standard. Modernization would help solve our legacy aircraft supply chain and test equipment issues, so proactive funding of Reserve modernization projects, even in this fiscally constrained environment, must be a top priority until we can replace aging systems. Modernization and recapitalization are essential to ensure the AFR remains combat-ready today and relevant for tomorrow's fight.

Our current modernization efforts revolve around upgrading legacy systems to enhance situational awareness and improve combat effectiveness. While these upgrades ensure we maintain our combat capability and interoperability with the active component, the Reserve is not funded nor structured to maintain completely separate weapon systems or aircraft from our Active Component partners.

We must develop a concurrent mission design series fielding and divestment strategy for the Air Force. This is vital to ensure operational parity with Active Duty. We are facing non-current fielding issues as the F-16 bridges the gap until the F-35 reaches full operational

capability. As the Air Force plans to grow, we must concurrently field the same mission design series to allow for synchronized training and resources. Similarly, as the Air Force divests from aircraft like the HC-130H and converts to J-models, the Reserve faces a situation where we will be unable to draw trained pilots and maintainers from the Active Component. As we plan to support new platforms, like the KC-46, we must focus on mission impact and ensure installations are sized appropriately. Concurrent fielding and divestiture increases our operational relevancy, improves our ability to provide combat-ready forces without shortages while making the most efficient use of our precious resources and dollars.

Infrastructure

Reserve readiness also requires a look at our infrastructure. Without proper military construction funding, our ability to support mission requirements is limited. The AFR maximizes cost-effectiveness by sharing facilities and infrastructure with our active and joint partners rather than exclusively operating our own facilities. We leverage existing infrastructure at more than 58 partner installations, while only operating nine host installations. These shared facilities, such as aircraft hangars and maintenance shops, include more than 17.1 million square feet of infrastructure. As we expand into emerging missions and reevaluate legacy requirements, we see in many cases our infrastructure is not aligned to meet our needs.

Currently, the AFR has identified a $910.0 million military construction backlog to address recapitalization, modernization and consolidation opportunities throughout the command. Due to limited military construction funding across the Future Years Defense Program, we are increasingly forced to use O&M funding for Facilities, Sustainment, Restoration and Modernization (FSRM) work to accommodate mission changes, increase building efficiencies and ensure facilities meet mission requirements. The AFR has a $1.3 billion backlog for required FSRM. Our goal is to make every dollar count, and we will continue to use

our Facilities Operational Capabilities and Utilization Survey program to determine the best use of military construction and FSRM funding. As we work through the planning and programming for FY18, we will build and submit our priority MILCON projects. With Congressional support, we can smartly invest in MILCON execution and apply our facility savings to fleet modernization and readiness.

INTEGRATION

Global Vigilance, Reach, and Power

Operations tempo is one of our measures of readiness. Despite the high operational tempo of the last 25 years, our Airmen guarantee mission success. During 2016, Reserve Citizen Airmen integrated seamlessly with our active and joint partners, performing nearly 4.4 million man-days. Air Force Reserve Command was the fourth largest contributor to combat operations filling more than 3,200 Air Expeditionary Force tasks. Our professional Airmen provided Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power for national security to the joint forces. The Remotely Piloted Aircraft community collected over 35,000 ISR combat hours. ISR analysts contributed over 240,000 combat mission hours. 1,500 space professionals supported space operations worldwide, and 4,000 cyber operators engaged in total force cyber protection teams ensuring Global Vigilance. Air Mobility operations ensured Global Reach in over 80 different countries. Reserve crews flew over 4,000 missions, 7,000 sorties, and 32,000 hours delivering over 36,000 passengers, and over 34,000 tons of cargo. Our fighters, bombers, and Remotely Piloted Aircraft delivered Global Power by conducting precision strikes around the world on a daily basis supporting joint, special operations and coalition forces. As examples, the Reserve RPA community had over 1,000 kinetic strikes resulting in over 1,400 enemies killed in action and over 500 enemy high value targets destroyed while the 44th Fighter Group F-22's flew 161 combat missions and destroyed over 1,100 targets.

Our daily and continuous operational capability is part of what makes us a valuable partner for today and for tomorrow. But, as we fight today, we must shape our force for tomorrow by focusing on retaining the competitive edge of our resilient Reserve Citizen Airmen and expanding in air, space, cyber, and ISR missions.

Associations

The Reserve has 66 Classic Associations and 10 Active Associations. We have nine new associations awaiting approval. We've been engaged in Classic Associations for over 50 years. These associations support every Major Command providing sustained operations, strategic depth and surge capacity. Two thirds of the Air Force's Total Force Integration associations are with the Reserve. Classic Associations maintain about a 20 percent full-time force dedicated to serving and training the part time Reservist. They are 100 percent Unit Type Code postured for surge capability. The Reserve is dedicated to remaining cost-efficient, maintaining mission effectiveness, and fostering better communication with our active and joint partners. Building these associations champions Total Force initiatives and leverages the unique strengths of each component.

Space

There are over 1,500 integrated Reserve space professionals and supporting staff in 11 associated units throughout Air Combat Command and Space Command. High Velocity Analyses support Air Force Reserve involvement in space operations to meeting the increasing needs of this expanding mission. The Reserve will grow in intelligence support to space operations, but future mission requirements will necessitate increased support to the Space Mission Force and the Ready Space Program, focusing on protecting satellite communications, offensive and defensive space control and space aggressor support to the Space Mission Force.

Cyber

Cyberspace is arguably the most rapidly-evolving and highly contested domain in the current environment. Our network is constantly under siege as we protect our information and our people from cyber-attacks. We must continue building a force that understands how to protect our networks to ensure mission success. The Reserve has over 3,500 cyber professionals throughout the Combatant and Major Commands. Under the Reserve Cyber Operations Group, there are seven Classic Associations to include the Cyber Operations Squadron that integrates over 100 personnel within Cyber Protection Teams. We plan to grow Mission Defense Teams, Cyber Command and Control, and Cyber Mission Forces aligned with the Active Component portfolio. As we develop our cyberspace technology, we must recruit, leverage the expertise and training opportunities in the civilian sector that uniquely benefit our part-time Reservists, and train a force with superior understanding of this domain.

ISR

The Reserve has aggressively invested in full-spectrum ISR operations covering support to air, space and cyber domains. Our ISR capabilities are synchronized with Air Force strategy, responsive to the Air Force and Joint priorities. We currently have one ISR group with 11 classic associate units, three added in Fiscal Year 2017. Recruiting for ISR is successful at 112 percent which backlogs our training pipeline.

UNIQUENESS

People

By preserving our part-time force structure, Reserve Citizen Airmen remain a superb financial value to the Air Force and the American taxpayer. The AFR is currently about 79 percent part-time, permitting us to remain cost-efficient and mission effective. A part-time Reserve Airman costs less than a Regular Air Force (RegAF) Airman. Over a career, our cost

savings are significant; the 20 year life cycle cost for a part-time Reserve officer is approximately half of the active component, with a non-prior service member being even less. Another cost advantage of the AFR is the ability to capture prior-service RegAF members wishing to affiliate as a part-time Reservist. Thus, growing the AFR end-strength is a fiscally responsible approach to addressing current capabilities and capacity gaps. The reserve is uniquely positioned to retain the Air Force's vast investment in human capital and maintain cost effective capability against unanticipated requirements.

The Air Force Reserve provides flexibility through our ability to adjust reservist participation rates based on demand. Our Selected Reserve force is made up of roughly 65 percent Traditional Reservist (TR), Full Time Support (FTS), to include 16 percent Air Reserve Technicians (ART) and 4 percent Active Guard Reserve, and 10 percent IMA. We have over 3,000 Civilians and 250 Active Component partners, part of our FTS cadre, who are 5 percent of our manpower. Our FTS personnel are responsible for preparation and administration of policies and regulations to organize, administer, recruit, instruct, train, or support the Air Force Reserve. Additionally, the Air Force Reserve has a strategic depth consisting of those members in the Individual Ready Reserve, Active Duty Retired, Retired Reserve (AFR and ANG), and Standby Reserve, who the President and Secretary of Defense may recall when needed. It is this flexibility and capacity which make the Reserve a unique and critical partner in our Total Force team. We deliver our diverse portfolio capability and Title 10 status as your federal reserve in order to meet the nation's requirements. It is my job to assure Reserve readiness, and I guarantee Reserve Citizen Airmen will remain operationally relevant to the joint fight by ensuring the right number of Airmen are available, trained properly and equipped appropriately. It is critical we are

allowed to manage our various statuses to give the Reserve the flexibility to execute the mission efficiently and in the best interest of the nation.

Air Force Reserve TRs voluntarily serve this country and continue to positively impact your communities. Our Reserve Citizen Airmen balance their home life, their civilian job and their military commitment on a daily basis. Training and readiness require dedicated time, and most hold full time civilian jobs requiring them to coordinate with their employer and predict time for participation. Reserve Citizen Airmen leverage a diverse range of civilian careers, including attorneys, information technology professionals, health care providers, small business owners and corporate executives. These civilian skills make our Air Force team even stronger.

The Air Force Reserve IMA program exemplifies the Total Force Enterprise. IMAs provide the flexibility needed to support total force requirements at a moment's notice. IMAs train with their active duty counterparts and can easily expand and contract the number of duty days they work to support the joint force. In today's austere manning environment, IMAs can surge to help augment active component units who could otherwise not accomplish their mission. During normal manning times, IMAs revert to their minimum work schedule of either 22 or 36 days a year, providing a ready force at an extremely low cost. The IMA program provides exactly the degree of adaptability and reliability the Air Force needs to economically and reliably continue the Air Force mission, whether it's at the squadron level or the Combatant Command.

Reserve Citizen Airmen have been in continuous combat operations for the past 25 years, hindering their time to focus on full-spectrum readiness items. Some of our Airmen volunteer to deploy on 60-90 day rotations or 365 day deployed-in-place tours which does not allow enough dwell time for full spectrum readiness training. Many reservists volunteer to exceed the desired 1:5 mobilization-to-dwell in order to meet mission requirements. Deployments and mobilizations

are not decreasing; in fact, a four percent increase is projected in Fiscal Year 2018. The Air Force Reserve is initiating eight six-month Reserve Component Periods to stabilize mobilization-to-dwell above 1:5 and dedicate more time at home base for required training and readiness items. However, if the operational tempo does not decrease or if we are unable to adjust deployment cycles, then overall Air Force and Reserve end strength will need to increase or we must accept increased risk in our ability to provide surge capacity.

As we look to the future, we need more portability for Airmen to transfer seamlessly between active and reserve components. We are working with Congress to update laws and policy to allow greater flexibility for our Airmen to serve among all three Air Force components wherever the need is greatest. This flexibility will allow the Air Force to retain the talent in our professional Airmen regardless of status, shaping us to be a more agile, experienced and effective One Air Force Team.

Mission

The Air Force Reserve owns the sole responsibility to execute the mission of the Hurricane Hunters and Aerial Spray while sharing aerial firefighting duties with our Air National Guard (ANG) partners. Last year showed great success. The Hurricane Hunters flew 135 missions with more than 1,000 hours monitoring weather conditions in support of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. Our Aerial Spray crews dropped 79,000 gallons of pesticides on over 191,000 acres to control disease and vegetation proliferation. The Reserve collaborated with the Guard to extinguish 16 raging wildfires, while amassing a total of 64 flight hours and 54 fire retardant drops which dispersed over 1.3 million pounds of retardant. These missions would not get done without the Air Force Reserve.

The Air Force Reserve owns significant equity, over 25 percent, in many other missions providing critical support to the joint fight. We provide 60 percent to Aeromedical Evacuation,

33 percent to Air Mobility Operations Squadrons, 56 percent of the Airlift Control Flights, and 100 percent of the C-5 Formal Training Unit. These missions would have critical failures without the support of Reserve Citizen Airmen.

In order to care for our Airmen, the Air Reserve Personnel Center (ARPC) was established. They are responsible for the mobilization of Air Force Reserve personnel and retired active duty members when directed. ARPC provides administrative, records maintenance, and personnel support for over 1.3 million members of the RegAF, ANG, AFR and retired personnel in all categories. ARPC manages the complex processes, status dependent, of the Air Reserve Component. ARPC professionals have experience and training to understand these complexities and ensure both Guard and Reserve processes are seamlessly integrated into Air Force operations.

Funding

In addition to administering our own Reserve Personnel Appropriation and O&M dollars, a second source of our funding is the National Guard Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA). Created in 1981 by Congress, NGREA is Guard and Reserve specific procurement dollars for aircraft modification and support equipment that ensures the Reserve and Guard operational combat capacity is not diminished.

Historically, the Reserve Component has received Congressional funding through NGREA to modernize and fulfill our obligations to the Total Force. We continue to operate legacy systems, including the C-130H and HH-60W which depend entirely on NGREA for sustainment. If other funding sources are unavailable, NGREA permits us to take small steps towards modernizing our fleet.

CONCLUSION

The Air Force Reserve will remain an integrated, flexible and combat-ready force providing accessible and sustainable capabilities as a viable Air Force Component supporting joint partners and national security objectives. Ensuring diverse, operational experience enables us to be a combat-ready force with continuity and depth. The key to our success in achieving balance between today's fight and tomorrow's threat is the right equipment, the right manning and stable, predictable funding. We must continue to build on our readiness and supporting systems and structures to handle current and future operational tempos. Armed with the right equipment and infrastructure we can continue to impact the fight every day. Essential to our future as a ready force, we must shape our journey to be ready for the next fight while preserving our strength as an agile, professional, sustainable, reserve citizen airmen force. Thank you for your tremendous support of the Air Force Reserve and for the opportunity to represent your Reserve Citizen Airmen in our discussion today. I look forward to your questions.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much. I thank all of you for your testimony and for describing the service and the sacrifice and the needs of those that you represent here today.

We will be using a timer this morning. We are going to reduce the time for you to ask and answer questions to 3 minutes, because of the size of the panel and the number of members who are here, and we have a hard end time at 12 o'clock. That will include questions and responses. If time permits, we would have a second round, but I doubt that will happen.

I am going to call on Ms. McCollum first.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I am going to submit for the record a question on Lodging-in-Kind, and what we can do to have, especially in the Army Reserve, our soldiers not paying out of pocket for some of the training that they perform.

[The information follows:]

LODGING-IN-KIND

WITNESS: MCCOLLUM, LUKE M.

Question. What can we do to have, especially in the Army Reserve, our soldiers not paying out of pocket for some of the training that they perform?

Answer. Navy provides lodging, at no cost to members, for Navy Reservists who travel 50 miles, or more, to their drill site. Transient Department of Defense (DOD) quarters are used whenever available. When DoD accommodations are not available, commercial berthing is provided at no personal expense to Navy Reserve personnel meeting eligibility requirements. When Navy Reservists are on travel orders (e.g., Inactive Duty Training Travel (IDTT), Annual Training (AT), Active Duty Training (ADT), and Active Duty for Special Work (ADSW)) to a location outside the vicinity of their drill site, they may receive lodging and per-diem pursuant to Joint Travel Regulations.

WITNESS: LENGYEL, JOSEPH L.

Question. What can we do to have, especially in the Army Reserve, our soldiers not paying out of pocket for some of the training that they perform?

Answer. For eligible, unaccompanied personnel, the Army National Guard (ARNG) and Air National Guard (ANG) provides lodging-in-kind to members traveling over 50 miles for inactive duty training. The ARNG and ANG fund lodging in kind out of operations and maintenance accounts.

WITNESS: MCMILLIAN, REX C.

Question. What can we do to have, especially in the Army Reserve, our soldiers not paying out of pocket for some of the training that they perform?

Answer. The Marine Corps has used Inactive Duty Training (IDT) travel reimbursement to offset certain critically-short military occupational specialties and/or military billets. This is a targeted program that addresses the need of the Service to offset costs for Marines who have to travel to locations that are more than 150 miles from the Home Training Center (HTC). We expanded the program to fill critically-short leadership billets over the past year. There aren't any other programs that specifically target travel costs. As highlighted during the Reserve Component Duty Status reform process, Reserve Marines receive double the amount of basic pay for two drill periods performed in one day than if they were in one day of pay status. This differential can be seen as a means to lower out-of-pocket expenses. Due to the relatively small number of HTCs geographically, Marine Corps Reservists often have to travel long distances to attend training.

WITNESS: MILLER, MARYANNE

Question. What can we do to have, especially in the Army Reserve, our soldiers not paying out of pocket for some of the training that they perform?

Answer. Air Force provides lodging, at no cost to members, for Reservists who travel 50 miles, or more, to their drill site. Transient Department of Defense (DoD) quarters are used whenever available. Air Force also provides reimbursement for

travel expenses up to $300 per drill weekend provided the reservist was assigned to a unit or position that was affected by a Defense Base Realignment or closure or if the individual is in a critical AFSC and there is a documented shortfall in the organization for that grade/skill level.

WITNESS: LUCKEY, CHARLES D.

Question. What can we do to have, especially in the Army Reserve, our soldiers not paying out of pocket for some of the training that they perform?

Answer. Regarding Lodging-in-Kind, we have addressed it internally by funding this program with $26 million per year average through FY22. Regarding the related issue of Inactive Duty for Training (IDT) travel outside the local commuting area, currently, the Joint Travel Regulations cap reimbursement for IDT–T expenses (e.g. plane tickets, rental cars, and lodging) at $300 per round trip for select Reserve Component members assigned to a unit or position that was affected by a Defense Base Realignment or closure or in a skill designated as critically short. Over 25% of claims submitted by Service Members to the Army Reserve are above the $300 limit.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. But I do have a question. I think it affects all of you. I commend people who decide to continue in the Reserves after their discharge. Sometimes it is a very heavy family discussion about whether or not people are going to stay in the Reserves. And so people who do that do it with their eyes wide open about what a deployment could really be meaning for them.

So, when they come home, they come home as a citizen too. And this is a question I had had with General Luckey, but I want to pose this to all of you. In many, many cases, soldiers and airmen are deployed with as little as 30 days' notice, and that can put a lot of strain on the family. So, because they have been planning their lives moving forward, they don't have the same protection in their civilian jobs that sometimes—and I commend our businesses in Minnesota for what they do for our National Guard—but they have personal money invested. They are getting ready to close on homes. They might have paid tuition forward.

What are we doing? What can we do to help you? What is your team doing to ensure that families of these soldiers and airmen, when they are given this short notice, that they don't find themselves in financial harm or with unexpected consequences with their employment when they come back home? Thank you.

General LUCKEY. To the extent that the question was initially directed to me, I will respond first.

Ms. MCCOLLUM of Minnesota. I figured you would take one for the team.

General LUCKEY. So, as you well know, and I think we have discussed this before, part of the focus from a priority-of-work perspective, if you will, of America's Army Reserve is to make sure that we are tracking, if you will, or witting of which families and which units are most likely to be forced to do exactly what you just said, Congresswoman, which is move very quickly.

This past weekend, I spent the better part of 2 days in Oklahoma City at what we call Family Programs University. It is an Army Reserve program to essentially bring in volunteers, family program coordinators, and family program facilitators from units, particularly those units that are most likely to be called to go first.

So I can't give you a complete comprehensive answer as it pertains necessarily to units located in eastern Minnesota. What I can tell you is the focus and the energy, if you will, of our efforts to make sure we have good quality engaged outreach, if you will, to

families is particularly seized with the problem you have just articulated. So I want you to know that I am paying very close attention to that.

Admiral MCCOLLUM. Thanks for that question. Just an additional thing I would add onto it. The greatest return on investment to the American taxpayer in the military for a transitioning military individual is if we can retain them into the Reserve Component. We don't have to train them; we can take advantage of the time they spent on Active Duty.

So it certainly behooves us to maximize and create an environment that allows that reservist to thrive, thrive with their families, thrive with their civilian employers. And the way I would answer that question is predictability. Create a predictable environment with funding that we don't have a sustained period of long continuing resolutions, and that that predictability allows the reservist, with confidence, that they know that they can plan; there is going to be funding and funding available for the training to get ready to meet those commitments.

Ms. GRANGER. Anyone else?

You are welcome to respond.

General MCMILLIAN. Ma'am, as you know, the Marine Corps is a force in readiness. We have to be ready to fight tonight. The Commandant depends very much on his Reserve Component to be ready on a moment's notice.

The biggest thing that we do is express that out to our Marines and their families at every opportunity, to be prepared mentally, to be prepared physically, to know their MOS, to not waste 1 minute of their training time. We have 38 training days with them a year in order to prepare them to go downrange into combat. They have to be ready to fight tonight.

We have a lot of history or examples throughout our history of having to get out the door very quickly, inside of 30 days, 45 days, and directly into combat. Their families know that; they are prepared for it. They are leaning forward. We ask them to reach out to their employers to make sure that they are aware of the commitment that they have to the United States Marine Corps and to the United States for the defense of this Nation.

General MILLER. And for the Air Force Reserve, our response time is 72 hours. So, for those longer term deployments, at the Air Force, we have done an amazing job over the last 26 years of getting that battle rhythm of reservists deploying downrange. And we will give them 180 days' notice to 270 days' notice, and that is good. But every reservist knows they are on a 72-hour hook, and our systems support that. Our wing commanders support that. The Yellow Ribbon Program supports that, and we are structured to support that.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. Womack.

STATE OF READINESS

Mr. WOMACK. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

And thanks to the distinguished panel that is gathered in front of us. Because of the short timeframe, I will go to one question. Before I do, I want to take just a moment of personal privilege in wel-

coming the great admiral over here, Mr. McCollum, who before he took this particular job was working at a small five-and-dime in northwest Arkansas that I represent and the proud parent I might also add of a young son who is making his rounds in the Arkansas General Assembly and doing remarkable work, and we are really, really proud of him.

I wanted to ask the panel if they would just take a moment and tell us what their top one or two issues are right now. And I will take out of those answers funding, because we know funding is the answer to a whole lot of problems that everybody has. So we will just leave that off to the side. I don't know if it is OPTEMPO. I don't know if it is modernization. I don't know if it is medical fitness. But in the Reserves, you have got a different set of issues that affect you. And so just go from Army down the line and give me the top two. What should this committee understand to be your top couple of issues?

General LUCKEY. So thank you for the question. Very simply, two things: one, being able to generate the formations that I need to generate in the timelines required to support the warfighter, primarily focusing on two different theaters of operation, so the Pacific and Europe, and being able to generate, as I said in my opening remarks, capabilities on the orders of 10,000, 15,000 soldiers in less than 45 days up to 33,000 soldiers in about 90 days. So the units, if you will, incorporate those capabilities, and the soldiers in those units have to be at a very high degree of state of readiness.

So my challenge, first of all, is to be able to identify those requirements, make sure that each one of those formations has the training, the equipment, the modernization, and the, if you will, mission command architecture to operate in a completely interoperable efficacious fashion with Active Component formations very quickly.

Inside that, I would say the number two thing is deployability of the individual soldiers, making sure that I am affording every soldier the opportunity to get everything that they need done so that they are completely in a deployable status at the time that somebody needs them to go do a job. So that is a persistent ongoing challenge for us, but we are getting after it.

Admiral MCCOLLUM. Congressman, thank you for the question. So you won't allow us to use the word "budget," but may I just use the word what the budget does for us. It creates wholeness. Creating wholeness creates the ability to generate readiness. And at its core, the U.S. Navy is an integrated force and the Navy Reserve, as a component of that, relies on the help of Congress to give us the ability to be whole, to fix our, what I would say, divots are in our readiness accounts, our maintenance accounts. And by doing that, the second thing it does then is it then generates readiness to deploy when and where the American public chooses us to go.

General MCMILLIAN. Congressman, thank you for the question. I will tell you what keeps me awake at night is readiness of the force, the Reserve Forces, to fight tonight and be able to get out the door and seamlessly augment and reinforce the Active Component in a fistfight.

The things that we need to do is investment in our future, modernization of our equipment, and then the maintenance of our leg-

acy equipment, those two things and, specifically, transition of the KC–130T and the AH–1Z attack helicopter for the Marine Corps Reserves.

General MILLER. The two things I think that are most important for the Air Force Reserve are the critical skills manning, particularly our pilot shortage and our cyber professionals. On the cyber side, industry is just pulling them. We can attract them, and we can train them, but we don't keep them that long. So your Reserve and Guard are the capacity that can keep them in uniform, which is great.

The other piece is weapon system sustainment and making sure that is—that is vital to our readiness.

Mr. WOMACK. Thanks for the extra time.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Ruppersberger.

CYBER PROTECTION TEAMS

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. First, General, thank you for meeting with me yesterday.

I want to get into cyber. When we met yesterday, you mentioned you were on track to provide 10 cyber protection teams for the Army Reserve. Those soldiers who are in cyber-related positions require specific skills, as we know. What challenges could you face with attempting to fill these cyber positions?

MODERNIZATION OF READY FORCE

And let me ask you another readiness question. Then I will stop. The National Guard Reserve equipment account we know is critical to Army Reserve Force readiness. Can you explain how this account and the funds in it will be used to enhance the modernization of your ready force and what concerns you have with equipment currently on hand and modernization levels in the Army Reserve?

General LUCKEY. So, sir, if I may answer the second question first, very briefly.

So, in the main, the money that has been given to us by the committee—and, again, thank you for that—basically along the lines I articulated here earlier this morning. So it is about mobility. So some of this is platforms, if you will. A significant portion of the investment portfolio is going to go against mission command systems. As I think I have explained to some members before, one of my concerns is making sure that every one of my platforms is completely interlocked, if you will, from a network perspective, in terms of communications, architecture, and Blue Force Tracker, to make sure that all of my formations are completely interoperable from a communications command-and-control perspective. So the priority is really focusing on lethality, mobility, and that net of C2, command and control, structure.

Circling back to the issue about the cyber specifically, as I think I have mentioned before, from a build perspective, we are in a very good place. So you are correct, Congressman. So 10 cyber protection teams over time building out, we are on a good glide path for that. In fact, what I would say is—and I touched on it a little bit in my opening remarks—part of what we are doing in America's Army Reserve is looking at those places in America where there is rap-

idly evolving, if you will, digital capabilities, technologies—so cyber, artificial intelligence, all sorts of, if you will, exploding capabilities in the private sector—making sure that the Army Reserve is posturing force structure to be able to retain and in some cases actually assess those capabilities into the Army Reserve, to make that a much more integrated part, if you will, of the Army's linkage, the warfighter's linkage, Department of Defense's linkage to the emerging private sectors.

I think I mentioned to you I have gone out to see private industry in many locations. We are investing capabilities and we are moving folks, if you will, or billets, opportunities to create structure into those rapidly developing parts of commercial America. So I think we are in a very good place.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Anybody else?

General MCMILLIAN. Yes, sir, I will just dive in on that. We are building out in the Marine Corps Reserves two cyber protection teams from our marines who have gotten out, gotten into the civilian work sector, learned that skill set, and now finding out that we are trying to stand up two teams, one on the West Coast, one on the East Coast: one at the 1st Marine Expeditionary Force in San Diego; the other one at the 2nd Marine Expeditionary Force at Camp Lejeune.

What drives these Marines to come back into the Reserves to join cyber protection teams is that they are closer to the fight. They want to be with those tactical deploying units that have the potential to go downrange and do work wherever the country may need them. So they are excited about getting their boots dirty and deploying downrange with tactical units. Thank you.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I yield back.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Carter.

READINESS AND RETENTION OF SKILLED PERSONNEL

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I am going to address this question to the whole panel. General Luckey and I had a conversation yesterday.

Thank you for coming by. I really appreciate that conversation.

But as citizen lawyers and members of the Armed Forces Reserve, people are often called upon to face the challenge in the workforce, because people miss work due to their deployments. Please provide the subcommittee with your assessments of how these challenges affect not only readiness but retention of highly skilled personnel and what resources or assistance can we provide that will help you sustain your level of readiness and retention.

General LUCKEY. So let me just take that first, if I may, very quickly.

I will tell you the biggest thing that this committee could do to continue to support America's Army Reserve in this regard is to, if you will, be the influencers that can help me influence other influencers in America. As I have discussed with members of this committee before in a more informal context, part of our challenge is making sure we continue to message, as I said in my opening remarks, to the employers of America that they are strategic partners in the national security of the United States of America. And by allowing them, if you will, and encouraging them to understand

how fundamentally important their support is to make sure that our soldiers—I would say sailors, airmen, and marines—all have an opportunity to be shared, if you will, between those employers and these teams is absolutely critical to us being able to continue, if you will, to take some pressure off our soldiers to be able to do both.

So I would just—I really don't think this is about money so much. Fundamentally, it is about messaging and making sure our employers really understand how vital their support continues to be.

Admiral MCCOLLUM. And, sir, just to complement General Luckey's words is the idea of partnerships and the idea of leveraging those relationships that these, in our case, sailors and airmen and marines, that they have, not only with their employers, but with friends of the military, and understanding those connection points and whatever constituency gathering, whatever activity that is in place, where we understand the heart and soul of what generates the capability of America's military power, which is our people, and all those programs that support how we take care of our people, whether it is when they get back home in the repatriation programs or how we support them when they are forward in giving the readiness, finding the readiness to be ready, to distract them from any problems they may have otherwise.

General MCMILLIAN. Much the same answer, sir. Thank you for the question.

Again, we are at 95 percent manning across the board, highest I have ever seen it, healthiest I have ever seen it, morale, leadership, esprit de corps off the top of the charts. Reserve marines want to be here and serve and go downrange and do good work for our country. The key to that is the public support for their employers. I think their employers are proud to have marines in their organizations. But a pat on the back goes a long way, and so the public support, as General Luckey and Admiral McCollum have touched upon, is huge for us and helps out with our retention and the serving.

General MILLER. Yes. For the Air Force Reserve, as I stated, the 72-hour response time is the tether that we are all on. So, with that, we have a great relationship at every wing level across all our 36 wings with the employees who are part of Guard and Reserve. So it is that expectation management between the reservist and the employer that we bring together around the table so there is no misunderstanding.

A perfect example of that would be the airline pilot. General Goldfein last week got us together around the table with 70 airline executives from the majors to the regionals. And we sat around the table and said—we keep tugging on both—either—you know, we have the uniform arm, and they have the airline arm of these pilots, and we are pulling them. We are pulling them apart, basically.

So we had to sit around the table and basically come to an agreement of, how we are going to use this one asset, this national asset that has now become a crisis for this country? So that is the perfect example of how we work together with industry. And we are beginning steps to do that to work our way through this.

Mr. CARTER. Well, I, for one, if you can get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country. So, if you can get me that information, I will put my people to work to do that.

[The information follows:]

EMPLOYERS THAT EMPLOY MEMBERS

WITNESS: LENGYEL, JOSEPH L.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. The National Guard Bureau does not have a method of tracking or collecting comprehensive employer data for all 54 states and territories. However, Service members nominated several employers of the National Guard from Texas' 31st Congressional District for the 2017 Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award through the Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESRG) program. The nominees include: (a) ARCIL Inc. (Round Rock) (b) Sprint (Killeen) (c) Wilsonart International (Temple) (d) Real Green Pest & Lawn (Round Rock)

WITNESS: MCCOLLUM, LUKE M.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. Naval Operational Support Center (NOSC) Austin, TX supports 250 Navy Reservists and 9 Navy Reserve units. Many of these service members live and/or work in Texas' 31st congressional district. The following is a list of major employers of NOSC Austin Reservists.

Company	Mailing Address	City, State, Zip
Ash Chiropractic	3688 Williams Dr, Ste 5	Georgetown, TX 78628
Georgetown ISD	1313 Williams Dr	Georgetown, TX 78628
Discount Tire	2720 E Whitestone Blvd	Cedar Park, TX 78613
City of Round Rock	301 E Main St	Round Rock, TX 78664
Firestone	100 E. Old Settlers Blvd	Round Rock, TX 78664
Mattress One	1208 N. IH35 Suite 900	Round Rock, TX 78664
Dell	2401 Greenlawn Blvd Bldg 7	Round Rock, TX 78664
Baylor Scott and White	2401 S 31st St	Temple, TX 76508
Johnson Controls	1908 Kramer Ln Ste 100	Round Rock, TX 78664
Pacesetter K9 LLC	555 County Road 200	Liberty Hill, TX 78260
Dell Inc	7215 Alacia Dr	Leander, TX 78641
DFPS	503 Priest Dr	Killeen, TX 76549
Dell Inc	1 Dell Way	Round Rock, TX 78664
TEK Systems/Emerson	1100 Louis Henna Blvd	Round Rock, TX 78681
Baylor Scott & White	2401 S 31st St	Temple, TX 76508
Amplify	202 Walton Way Ste 200	Cedar Park, TX 78613

WITNESS: MCMILLIAN, REX C.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. Information and data collection concerning employers in 47 states, the District of Columbia, and the commonwealth of Puerto Rico that employ Marine Corps reservists is not easily attained or readily available. We are currently reviewing options to satisfactorily respond to this question.

WITNESS: MILLER, MARYANNE

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. The Air Force Reserve does not track employers that employ Service members of any Reserve Components by congressional district. However, Employer Support for the Guard and Reserves (ESGR) provided a listing of employers nominated by Service members for the FY 2017 Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award via the attached listing. These employers in Texas have earned praise from their Service member employees for their support of our reserve component military members. Other interested members can obtain similar data.

WITNESS: LUCKEY, CHARLES D.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. Congressman Carter, we appreciate your support and willingness to contact employers in your district and while the USAR works closely with many employers in communities across the nation, we do not track employer information for each member of the Army Reserve. With that in mind, we believe providing a partial list would potentially be damaging to your overall goal of recognizing all employers who provide employment support to America's Army Reserve Soldiers.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) recognizes outstanding employers on a regular basis through its progressive awards program. Starting with the Patriot Award all the way up to the Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award, ESGR works to build positive employment environments for Reserve Component members and veterans. In Fiscal Year 2016, ESGR presented 10,627 Patriot Awards to supervisors nominated by their Reserve Component employees and received 3,064 nominations for the Freedom Award. The Freedom Award is the highest honor given by the U.S. government to employers for their support of employees who serve in the Reserve Components. Started in 1996, the Freedom Award has been presented to a total of only 250 employers (small, large, and public) who represent the best of the best in employer support of Reserve Component service.

This year, the following 15 employers were recognized at a Pentagon ceremony for the annual Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award:

1. Accordia Urgent Healthcare & Family Practice of Vidalia, Georgia. Nominator's branch: Air Force Reserve
2. Boston Scientific Corporation of Marlborough, Massachusetts. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard
3. Cargill, Incorporated of Wayzata, Minnesota. Nominator's branch: Army National Guard
4. Comcast NBCUniversal of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard
5. CSI Aviation, Incorporated of Albuquerque, New Mexico. Nominator's branch: Army National Guard
6. Hensel Phelps Construction Company of Greely, Colorado. Nominator's branch: Army Reserve
7. Howard County Fire & Rescue of Columbia, Maryland. Nominator's branch: Coast Guard Reserve
8. Indianapolis Fire Department of Indianapolis, Indiana. Nominator's branch: Air Force Reserve
9. Johnson & Johnson of New Brunswick, New Jersey. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard
10. Mesa Natural Gas Solutions of Casper, Wyoming. Nominator's branch: Army National Guard
11. Office of the District Attorney, 18th Judicial District of Centennial, Colorado. Nominator's branch: Marine Corps Reserve
12. Renown Health of Reno, Nevada. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard
13. Salt River Project of Tempe, Arizona. Nominator's branch: Army National Guard
14. Andeavor (formerly Tesoro) of San Antonio, Texas. Nominator's branch: Army Reserve
15. Zapata, Incorporated of Charlotte, North Carolina. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard

WITNESS: MCCOLLUM, LUKE M.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. Naval Operational Support Center (NOSC) Austin, TX supports 250 Navy Reservists and 9 Navy Reserve units. Many of these service members live and/

or work in Texas' 31st congressional district. The following is a list of major employers of NOSC Austin Reservists.

Company	Mailing Address	City, State, Zip
Ash Chiropractic	3688 Williams Dr, Ste 5	Georgetown, TX 78628
Georgetown ISD	1313 Williams Dr	Georgetown, TX 78628
Discount Tire	2720 E Whitestone Blvd	Cedar Park, TX 78613
City of Round Rock	301 E Main St	Round Rock, TX 78664
Firestone	100 E. Old Settlers Blvd	Round Rock, TX 78664
Mattress One	1208 N. IH35 Suite 900	Round Rock, TX 78664
Dell	2401 Greenlawn Blvd Bldg 7	Round Rock, TX 78664
Baylor Scott and White	2401 S 31st St	Temple, TX 76508
Johnson Controls	1908 Kramer Ln Ste 100	Round Rock, TX 78664
Pacesetter K9 LLC	555 County Road 200	Liberty, Hill, TX 78260
Dell Inc	7215 Alacia Dr	Leander, TX 78641
DFPS	503 Priest Dr	Killeen, TX 76549
Dell Inc	1 Dell Way	Round Rock, TX 78664
TEK Systems/Emerson	1100 Louis Henna Blvd	Round Rock, TX 78681
Baylor Scott & White	2401 S 31st St	Temple, TX 76508
Amplify	202 Walton Way Ste 200	Cedar Park, TX 78613

WITNESS: MCMILLIAN, REX C.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. Information and data collection concerning employers in 47 states, the District of Columbia, and the commonwealth of Puerto Rico that employ Marine Corps reservists is not easily attained or readily available. We are currently reviewing options to satisfactorily respond to this question.

WITNESS: MILLER, MARYANNE

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. The Air Force Reserve does not track employers that employ Service members of any Reserve Components by congressional district. However, Employer Support for the Guard and Reserves (ESGR) provided a listing of employers nominated by Service members for the FY 2017 Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award via the attached listing. These employers in Texas have earned praise from their Service member employees for their support of our reserve component military members. Other interested members can obtain similar data.

WITNESS: LUCKEY, CHARLES D.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. Congressman Carter, we appreciate your support and willingness to contact employers in your district and while the USAR works closely with many employers in communities across the nation, we do not track employer information for each member of the Army Reserve. With that in mind, we believe providing a partial list would potentially be damaging to your overall goal of recognizing all employers who provide employment support to America's Army Reserve Soldiers.

Question. Can you get the information by congressional district of the employers that employ members of any of the Reserve Components—I am going to make the same request of the National Guard—our office will personally send them a letter commending them for their service to their country?

Answer. Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve (ESGR) recognizes outstanding employers on a regular basis through its progressive awards program. Starting with the Patriot Award all the way up to the Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award, ESGR works to build positive employment environments for Reserve Component members and veterans. In Fiscal Year 2016, ESGR presented 10,627 Patriot Awards to supervisors nominated by their Reserve Compo-

nent employees and received 3,064 nominations for the Freedom Award. The Freedom Award is the highest honor given by the U.S. government to employers for their support of employees who serve in the Reserve Components. Started in 1996, the Freedom Award has been presented to a total of only 250 employers (small, large, and public) who represent the best of the best in employer support of Reserve Component service.

This year, the following 15 employers were recognized at a Pentagon ceremony for the annual Secretary of Defense Employer Support Freedom Award:

1. Accordia Urgent Healthcare & Family Practice of Vidalia, Georgia. Nominator's branch: Air Force Reserve
2. Boston Scientific Corporation of Marlborough, Massachusetts. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard
3. Cargill, Incorporated of Wayzata, Minnesota. Nominator's branch: Army National Guard
4. Comcast NBCUniversal of Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard
5. CSI Aviation, Incorporated of Albuquerque, New Mexico. Nominator's branch: Army National Guard
6. Hensel Phelps Construction Company of Greely, Colorado. Nominator's branch: Army Reserve
7. Howard County Fire & Rescue of Columbia, Maryland. Nominator's branch: Coast Guard Reserve
8. Indianapolis Fire Department of Indianapolis, Indiana. Nominator's branch: Air Force Reserve
9. Johnson & Johnson of New Brunswick, New Jersey. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard
10. Mesa Natural Gas Solutions of Casper, Wyoming. Nominator's branch: Army National Guard
11. Office of the District Attorney, 18th Judicial District of Centennial, Colorado. Nominator's branch: Marine Corps Reserve
12. Renown Health of Reno, Nevada. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard
13. Salt River Project of Tempe, Arizona. Nominator's branch: Army National Guard
14. Andeavor (formerly Tesoro) of San Antonio, Texas. Nominator's branch: Army Reserve
15. Zapata, Incorporated of Charlotte, North Carolina. Nominator's branch: Air National Guard

General LUCKEY. I appreciate that, sir.

Ms. GRANGER. I can say the same thing. Thank you.

When you are talking about messaging, if there is—I have a Reserve base, as you mentioned, thank you, in my district—but some way to make sure that we are telling communities how important it is to encourage this with employers. Any ideas, any places where they are doing it really well, if you would pass it on to all of us, then we will encourage that, because that partnership is just vital. Thank you.

Mr. Cuellar.

REMARKS OF CONGRESSMAN CUELLAR

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I don't have any questions except to say thank you for what you all do. We really, really appreciate it. We want to be supportive in any way.

I do associate myself to the questions, to the comments also. I would like to get followup on that. Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. GRANGER. Mrs. Roby.

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you very much.

Thank you all for being here, and a very heartfelt thank you to all of your families for their service and sacrifice as well.

With all the professional military education conducted at Maxwell Air Force Base, I am well aware of the emphasis that the services place on PME, and rightly so. The investments in education and career development are critical to the development of our next generation of military leaders.

That being said, I am very concerned about possible disparities between Reserve and Active Duty servicemembers with regard to pay and benefits as it relates to PME. While a soldier on Active Duty receives full pay and credit toward retirement while attending PME courses, a reservist is often balancing, obviously, a civilian career and completing these courses by correspondence. Not only is the reservist not paid, in many cases, the reservist gets no credit toward their retirement.

And so what needs to happen to fix this disparity, particularly as it relates toward retirement credit, and how quickly can we make this happen? And I will be quiet and let you answer. Thank you very much.

General LUCKEY. So let me jump on that first, if I may, Congresswoman.

So I will just tell you, as a soldier who went to the Army War College and, to your point, spent the better part of 2 years doing it by sort of—some of it was virtual; some of it was paper; some of it was—but it ruined—I won't say it ruined. It consumed weekends for the Luckey family for a couple years. And then we had the summer sessions where I would go to Carlisle for 2 weeks.

I will just tell you that I was completely compensated for the time that I spent at Carlisle by the Army, and I received a master's degree from the Army War College as part of the program. Candidly, while I got retirement points for, if you will, the coursework that I accomplished, I am not going to sit here and tell you that necessarily in some cases I felt that it was—I mean, some of the work was very difficult, frankly.

But I will just tell you, on behalf of the Army, on behalf of America's Army Reserve, I don't think that there is a compensation issue or a credit issue as it pertains to retirement as it pertains to the Professional Military Education program of the Army.

What I will tell you is it is a challenge. My guess is it is true for all the services. It is a challenge for Reserve soldiers to balance all the requirements of their lives. But the reality is I have fantastic soldiers who have support of their families and, by and large, support of their employers. We talked earlier. I didn't touch on this data point, but I think it is relevant. The authorized end strength of the United States Army Reserve, you know, is going back to 199,000, and right now, I am at 198,000 soldiers.

So I guess what I would say is this is not a pressing concern for me. So I respect your question and I appreciate it, but this is not a pressing concern for America's Army Reserve.

Admiral MCCOLLUM. Thank you, ma'am, for that question.

I would say, for the Navy Reserve, it is very similar to what General Luckey just said. The Navy Reserve sailors are motivated, dedicated, and they are awesomely inspiring, and they do have this

complexity of the family and civilian jobs. So it is a little bit different to master from just having one focus of their employment.

Where the conversations generally go regarding AC/RC ends up in the benefits area. In the case, we do have an authority right now, the 12304 bravo, which is basically an authority to let a reservist deploy. So the benefits don't currently match. And I know that work is underway to address that. So that is where I hear more of the work and the questions.

General MCMILLIAN. Great question, ma'am. Thank you for the question. The Commandant of the Marine Corps is focused on building a fifth-generation Marine Corps, highly technical, highly advanced. I need to build a fifth-generation Reserve part of that to augment and reinforce. Along with that comes education. But I am book-ended by readiness. I have 38 training days to train our marines ready to go downrange, as you have heard me talk about, to be ready to go to combat.

So I need to take full advantage—and this is my point—with online training and getting the pay and the benefits between drills, between those 28 days that I don't have them during the month, to bring them up to speed educationally. So we are working towards that, and we have great support in the Marine Corps.

General MILLER. Within the Air Force and the Air Force Reserve, we are moving more toward the virtual. And, with that, you know, our folks just achieve greatness. Many of them, if not all of them, have master's degrees on the officer side. On the enlisted side, those numbers are going up. So this young group coming in just achieve and overachieve, and they are not really concerned about getting compensated for that. They just do it. And the same for the Professional Military Education. It is just a requirement and an expectation that we have had, and we just do it.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you all.

I yield back.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Ryan.

ANTITERRORISM AND FORCE PROTECTION REQUIREMENTS

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I have a question for General Miller, a couple I will try to squeeze in, and, hopefully, you can get to them. And I will make the committee aware that you are a graduate of a small unknown university in Columbus, Ohio, called the Ohio State University. And we are grateful for your service. So thank you very much.

Two quick questions: One, last year, our committee identified in the report that many Reserve facilities do not meet antiterrorism and force protection requirements, and that these deficiencies result in traffic, congestion in surrounding roads. And these congested access points, as we saw recently in the U.K. with the terrorist attack, can be a major issue.

The response from the Air Force Deputy Assistant Secretary of Budget last year stated the requirements would be met in 2022, which, in my estimation, is way too long to wait for those kinds of security measures.

So can you comment on that?

C–130JS

And the other question is with regard to the C–130Js and, specifically, if we have enough with regard to specialty missions. I am concerned that those areas and those planes and the training necessary to deal with the specialty missions, that we are not where we need to be with that.

General MILLER. Regarding the security measures, thank you all for the additional appropriation in 2017 for FSRM. We brought in $65 million. You appropriated $65 million for additions. I just looked at the list. None of those include gates, the security around the installation. So I will go back and see. We do a facilities assessment every year at every base. So I will do a quick review and see where we are lacking in that and get back with you on that specifically.

Regarding the C–130Js, the last recapitalization for the Air Force Reserve for Js was in 2007 at Keesler, and we recapitalized 20, partly for the weather mission there and then the operational mission there at Keesler. That is the last C–130J that the Air Force Reserve received, and there is none programmed in the POM for us. And that is a decision with the Air Force just due to limited funding; that is where we are on that program.

The AMP 1 and AMP 2 on our H model fleet is critical to the longevity of that mission set.

If there were funding that were set aside for the Js for the Air Force Reserve, then I would actually put that in the special missions at Youngstown and the firefighting unit at Peterson. That is where those J models would go, if recapitalized, and there would be 60 needed for that.

But right now, it is not in the program, and there is just no room in the program, given where we need to go for the future fight.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Visclosky.

REMARKS OF MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

I don't have a question, but in response to my colleague's opening remarks, Mr. Ryan, I would point out that, while Ohio State is an incredible athletic institution—the decor of my Washington office is patterned after your colors—in the National Fencing Championship round, it was Notre Dame-1, Ohio State-2.

Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. GRANGER. Thanks for your time, your attention to the committee's concerns. Please feel free at any time to remind us or talk to us more so we can serve you the very best because we respect what you do.

This concludes today's hearing. The subcommittee stands adjourned.

[Questions submitted by Mr. Aderholt and the answers thereto follow:]

HIGH MOBILITY MULTIPURPOSE WHEELED VEHICLES (HMMWVS)

WITNESS: LENGYEL, JOSEPH L.

Question. The Alabama National Guard has about 1,330 High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicles (HMMWV). Almost 60% of them are over 13 years old. To say the least, the HMMWV Modernization Program has been very successful and has brought 124 much needed new vehicles to the Alabama National Guard and over 2,200 nationwide. Does your FY 2018 Budget include funding to continue this program?

Answer. Yes, the FY18 President's Budget included a requirement for $53M to continue modernizing HMMWVs. With Congress' support during the last four years, the ARNG has modernized over 2,788 Up-Armored HMMWVs and HMMWV Ambulances with the most modern operational capabilities and Soldier safety upgrades. The ARNG plans to maintain its readiness through the synchronization of all Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicle modernization and recapitalization efforts in accordance with the Army's Light Tactical Vehicle Modernization Strategy. The ARNG HMMWV modernization improvements is the direct result of year-to-year Congressional Line-Items. To date this funding has been used to accelerate ARNG LTV modernization efforts which has greatly enhanced unit readiness for dual use and contingency operations.

DUAL-STATUS MILITARY TECHNICIANS

WITNESS: LENGYEL, JOSEPH L.

Question. The FY 2016 National Defense Authorization Act directed DoD to convert 20% of administrative, clerical, finance, and office service dual-status military technicians, and all non-dual status technicians to Title 5 federal civilian employees on 1 January 2016, to include Title 32 technicians. To date, our committee has included language in appropriations bills to state that no funds would be used to support this effort. Is this conversion something that you support? What impact would a 20% conversion of technicians to Title 5 federal civilians have on the National Guard Bureau? Also, is there a conversion percentage that you would consider acceptable for your organization?

Answer. As the Chief National Guard Bureau I have an inherent Title 10 responsibility to execute the law as it is written. That said, as previously discussed in my own testimony I favor a smaller conversion number than what is currently called for and would support congressional efforts to reduce the required percentage. A 20% conversion will have a negative impact. As I stated in previous testimony the smaller the conversion number the better when it comes to readiness of the National Guard. I believe, as I have testified that there is some number that can be converted with minimal impact to readiness; I don't believe that number is 20 percent.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Mr. Aderholt. Questions submitted by Ms. Roby and answers thereto follow:]

PROFESSIONAL MILITARY EDUCATION (PME)

WITNESS: LENGYEL, JOSEPH L.

Question. In light of the publication of Department of Defense Instruction 1215.17 in 2013 as well as the increasing use of virtual training for Professional Military Education (PME), does your service provide retirement credit for Reservists completing PME? If not, what steps would be required to provide credit to all reservists who completed PME since the publication of his DODI?

Answer. Title 10 United States Code, § 12732(a)(2) does not permit the awarding of retirement credit for Reserve Component Service members who complete training via distributed electronic methods. This is an issue the Department is examining as part of its review of Reserve Component duty status reform.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Ms. Roby. Questions submitted by Mr. Graves and answers thereto follow:]

DUAL STATUS TECHNICIANS CONVERSION

WITNESS: LENGYEL, JOSEPH L.

Question. It is my understanding that National Guard Bureau has provided information to Congress regarding dual status technician positions identified for conversion per the NDAA requirement. Is this accurate? Were the Adjutants General or the Governors consulted when identifying the positions for conversion?

Answer. (1) It is my understanding that National Guard Bureau has provided information to Congress regarding dual status technician positions identified for conversion per the NDAA requirement. Is this accurate? Answer. Yes, to both the HASC and SASC at different times and at their requests. (2) Were the Adjutants General or the Governors consulted when identifying the positions for conversion? Answer. Yes to both entities. The Adjutants General and National Governor's Council were and continue to be heavily involved in the process. The Adjutant General's provided their best military advice in the Report to Congress directed by NDAA 2016.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Mr. Graves. Questions submitted by Mr. Visclosky and answers thereto follow:]

TACTICAL WHEELED VEHICLE STRATEGY

WITNESS: LENGYEL, JOSEPH L.

Question. The Army intends to maintain a mixed fleet of 104,099 tactical wheeled vehicles, including 50,000 HMMWVs and 49,099 JLTVs. At one point the Army planned to continue operating 100,000 HMMWVs, but that strategy has shifted to maintain a nearly even mix of HMMWVs and JLTVs.—Over the past several fiscal years, this Committee has added significant additional funding to modernize the HMMWV fleets of the Guard and reserve components.—Given that the HMMWV will remain half of Army's light tactical wheeled vehicle fleet beyond 2040, can you share the plan to maintain and modernize the readiness of the National Guard and Reserve HMMWVs? Do you feel that Army leadership is committed to funding this plan?—Please explain the Army's intentions for the nearly 26,000 HMMWVs that are supposedly no longer required? Was there any discussion of repurposing these vehicles for the National Guard dual-purpose mission?

Answer. Congressional support has enabled the Army National Guard (ARNG) to purchase 1,509 HMMWV Ambulances and modernize 1,279 Up-Armored HMMWVs since 2013. As such, the ARNG will replace our entire HMMWV Ambulance fleet by 2019. The Army's Light Tactical Wheeled Vehicle modernization and recapitalization efforts include the National Guard and Reserve. The ARNG supports the Army's HMMWV Modernization Strategy of improving all HMMWVs by recapitalizing existing assets. The Army's HMMWV Modernization Strategy incorporates JLTV deliveries, Up-Armor HMMWV modernization and Un-Armored HMMWV modernization, roles and missions. The Army has fully supported the ARNG's Light Tactical Vehicle modernization strategy with funding. The ARNG's Light Tactical Vehicle modernization strategy is aligned with the Army's overall strategy and also meets the ARNG objectives and requirements for dual-use Light Tactical Vehicles. The ARNG is assisting the Army in developing a plan for HMMWVs which fall outside the JLTV and Up-Armored HMMWV requirements. Although not finalized, ARNG Light Tactical Vehicle dual-use requirements are included in the way-ahead strategy.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Mr. Visclosky. Questions submitted by Ms. Kaptur and answers thereto follow:]

STATE PARTNERSHIP PROGRAM

WITNESS: LENGYEL, JOSEPH L.

Question. With Russia's increasing aggression, how do you plan to enhance the State Partnership Program? What more can the State Partnership Program in Ukraine and Hungary do to enhance the area of civil works/transportation infrastructure in those countries?

Answer. The State Partnership Program began in Europe at the close of the Cold War with the purpose of establishing enduring relationships to reassure our allies, deter aggression, and help our partners provide more effectively for their own security. Currently, the program has partnerships with 12 former Soviet Bloc nations. The State Partnership Program is and will remain an important tool for Combatant

Commanders advancing America's national security interests in Europe and around the globe. In addition to obtaining necessary funding through the Program Objective Memorandum (POM) process to execute a full slate of partnership activities in FY18, the National Guard will continue seeking innovative ways to leverage the unique skills of the Guard's Citizen-Soldiers and-Airmen as well as the strong relationships that Guard members have built over the years to meet emerging security challenges. The Commander, U.S. European Command, the lead U.S. Department of Defense command in both Ukraine and Hungary, will determine the projects undertaken by the State Partnership Program in those countries.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Ms. Kaptur.]

THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2017.

FY 2018 DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE BUDGET OVERVIEW

WITNESSES

HON. JAMES N. MATTIS, SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
GENERAL JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, USMC, CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF
DAVID NORQUIST, UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, COMPTROLLER

OPENING STATEMENT OF CHAIRMAN GRANGER

Ms. GRANGER. The subcommittee will come to order.

Today, we will hear testimony on the fiscal year 2018 budget request for the Department of Defense.

As the incoming chair of the Defense Subcommittee, I said that the defense bill would be based on the needs of our military and the best military advice from our leaders in uniform. Unfortunately, after extensive conversations with our military leaders, I am concerned that the fiscal year 2018 defense budget request is not enough to address the shortfalls and damage caused by years of underfunding. The budget caps have enlarged that problem and must be repealed.

For many years, military leaders have said they would get the mission done no matter the level of funding they received. That is no longer possible, and it is our job to make sure our military has what it needs to face the many threats to our Nation.

All Federal dollars are not the same. During a time when we face threats from Russia, China, North Korea, ISIS and other terrorist groups, we must prioritize our defense funding first. Our adversaries are rapidly advancing their tactics and their capabilities. The fiscal year 2018 appropriations bill must ensure our capabilities remain more advanced and more lethal than our adversaries. The last thing we want to give our enemies is a fair fight.

General Dunford, in 2012, your predecessor, General Dempsey, testified that we were living in the most dangerous era of his lifetime. That was true when he made the statement, and the world is so much more dangerous today.

Unfortunately, I am concerned that the fiscal year budget request doesn't go far enough. Our senior military leaders tell us this is the minimal level needed to stop the deterioration of our military readiness.

As you had said, Secretary Mattis, it will take years of increased funding to get us to where we need to be, and the budget request should be viewed as the first step for what is truly needed to rebuild our national defense.

This fiscal year 2018 budget process is especially complicated, and we have a big job in front of us and little time to complete it. The world isn't standing still, and the threats of today and tomor-

row are not waiting on our budget cycle. It is my hope we can find a bipartisan common ground to give our military the robust support that our service chiefs and combatant commanders tell us they desperately need. This is where our witnesses come in to help us clarify what we need to do.

Before I introduce them, I would like to recognize our ranking member, Mr. Visclosky, for any opening remarks he would like to make.

OPENING REMARKS OF MR. VISCLOSKY

Mr. VISCLOSKY. The only thing I would say, Madam Chair, is thank you for holding the hearing and, gentlemen, for your service, for your testimony today, and I would commend the Secretary of Defense for his very good judgment in bringing aboard Mr. Norquist as Comptroller. Despite the fact that he graduated from the University of Michigan, I think he is eminently qualified for the position given his 6 years of experience as a member of our subcommittee staff, and I am very serious about that.

Good luck to you, David.

Mr. NORQUIST. Thank you, sir.

Ms. GRANGER. I call on Chairman Frelinghuysen.

OPENING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN FRELINGHUYSEN

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

I am going to go through my remarks because I think it is important to say a few things, but, first of all, I want to join on all the members and Chairwoman Granger in thanking you all for being here, especially those brothers in arms that have sat together at this table on a variety of earlier occasions.

Today's hearing is an important part of the oversight duties of this committee. After all, the power of the purse lies in this building. It is the constitutional duty of Congress to make spending decisions on behalf of the people we represent at home.

Secretary Mattis, we gather here this morning to review the budget of the Department of Defense, the posture of our Armed Forces, and to determine how this committee can help our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines meet the many threats and challenges this very dangerous world has produced, because when it comes to the men and women in uniform, their missions are our missions, and we want to hear your clear priorities for making them more successful and safe.

What is our strategy in Syria? What level of success are we having in Iraq and Afghanistan? Even as we have a policy to accelerate and to annihilate ISIS, we also recognize that threats are growing across the globe from Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, transnational jihadists, hackers, and cyberterrorists. Your needs are great, but the current resources available to you are not adequate.

We share your opposition to the BCA, the Budget Control Act. We will work to lift its restrictions, but this hearing is all about an opportunity for you to tell us exactly what you need in the short term and long term.

Mr. Secretary, I have questions also about the devolution of warfighting command authority from our Commander in Chief to subordinates both civilian and military. While we never want the President and the National Security Council to be involved in the minute details of operational decisions, we do have questions about how to strike a proper balance.

Secretary Mattis, I hear the constant drumbeat of concern from field officers and enlisted personnel about the rules of engagement during visits to the Middle East, which all of us feel are important, and even from the perspective of visiting Bethesda and Walter Reed Hospital. Previously, they were too restrictive; now, I am hearing they are confusing.

In another important area, I think I speak on behalf of all of my colleagues when I say we endorse the marriage of hard and soft power, military capability and diplomacy to ensure our national security. As we prepare the defense appropriations bill under Congresswoman Granger's leadership and a State, foreign operations bill, we will ask you to weigh in.

Finally, the general accounting office recently identified five key challenges that significantly affect your Department's ability to accomplish its mission. These include: top of the list, rebuild readiness; secondly, mitigate threats to cyberspace and expand cyber capabilities; thirdly, control the escalating costs of certain weapons systems and, yes, of course, strategically managing your human capital; and, lastly, achieving greater efficiencies in defense business operations.

We do not need a special report to tell us that we have a readiness problem—I am sure you will do that in your statements—or that the Department of Defense has acquisition challenges, but we do look forward to hearing your strategy to address these issues and their recommendations.

And, with that, Madam Chairman, I thank you for the time, and I thank the panel for being here with us again. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Ranking Member Lowey.

OPENING REMARKS OF MRS. LOWEY

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

And I would like to thank Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky for holding this hearing.

And I welcome sincerely Secretary Mattis and General Dunford and Under Secretary—your title now is Under Secretary of Defense—David Norquist. I know many of us sleep better at night in this very difficult world knowing that you are there making decisions. Thank you for appearing before us today.

We do live in such a dangerous world in which the threats emanate from every corner of the globe, including North Korea's belligerence; ISIL's increasingly common attacks in the Middle East and Europe; Boko Haram and Al Shabaab in Africa; Iran's destabilizing activities in the Middle East and state sponsor of terrorism; cyber attacks on U.S. interests at home and overseas; continued Russian aggression in the Ukraine, to name just a few.

The Department of Defense's task to track the quickly changing global security landscape and ensure the defense of our Nation and our allies is both exceedingly challenging and costly.

Secretary Mattis, your fiscal year 2018 budget requests $564.7 billion in the base budget and $63.9 billion in overseas contingency operations funding. The base budget request is $52 billion above DOD's share of the fiscal year 2018 budget cap in current law. The President's corresponding proposal to cut nondefense discretionary funds to pay for it would outright cripple important investments needed here at home.

While I am very pleased that your budget focuses on readiness and strengthening our military, I have serious concerns about how this dynamic world would impact nondefense discretionary funding, which is equally important and contributes to our national security.

Quite simply, the President's budget request forsakes critical nondefense programs, many of which support our men and women in uniform, contribute to national security, and even enable our ability to maintain ready and able Armed Forces.

For example, Major General Jeffrey Snow, the Commanding General of the United States Army Recruiting Command notes that only 3 in 10 recruits can meet the requirements to join the Army. That is an extraordinary statistic. The two things Major General Snow recommended are, and I quote, "something as simple as what our kids are fed in schools," end quote, and the importance of not doing away with physical education programs. And yet this administration would roll back guidelines for healthy school meals and proposes to cut $400 million from education and academic support initiatives, including physical education.

Even retired General Stanley McChrystal has raised concerns, stating that public broadcasting, which this budget proposes to eliminate, makes us, quote, "smarter, stronger, and, yes, safer."

General Mattis, you have said, and I quote, "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition," yet the increases you request come at the expense of the 32-percent reduction in the international affairs budget, which would put American lives in danger, a fact underscored in a recent letter by 120—120—three- and four-star generals, and would abdicate our leadership in the world.

This administration is heading down a dangerous path by proposing increases in defense spending, which I certainly support, while falling short of our obligations for education, healthcare, transportation, support for law enforcement, and first responders and more.

Congress must reject President Trump's misguided budget request and instead pass appropriation bills that support national security and American families alike.

And I just want to say in closing: I have been on this committee a long time, and I am proud to be on this committee because we have always worked constructively in a bipartisan way.

So I am looking forward to this discussion. I look forward to your comments. And I do hope we can approach this budget and all the other essential parts of the budget sincerely and be successful in creating an appropriate balance.

Thank you so much for appearing before us today.

Ms. GRANGER. Chairman Emeritus Rogers.

Mr. ROGERS. Thank you, Chairman, I will forego.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

And I will do the same.

Again, allow me to introduce our witnesses. Secretary of Defense Jim Mattis comes to the civilian leadership of the Department after a long and illustrious career in the Marine Corps in which he served in several senior command positions, including combat commands in Afghanistan and Iraq, before retiring with the rank of general in 2013.

General Joseph Dunford is the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and is making his second appearance before us. Like Secretary Mattis, General Dunford is a Marine with a long and distinguished career and served as Commandant of the Marine Corps prior to becoming Chairman.

Appearing with Secretary Mattis and General Dunford is David Norquist, who recently was sworn in as the new Comptroller of the Department of Defense.

Mr. Norquist, thank you for being here today, also.

Secretary Mattis we will begin with your opening statement, followed by General Dunford. Please summarize your statements so that we are able to get to our questions as quickly as possible.

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY MATTIS

Secretary MATTIS. Well, thank you, Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, and members of the committee. I appreciate this opportunity to testify in support of the President's budget request for fiscal year 2018.

And, Madam Chairman, I request that the committee accept my written statement for the record.

I am joined today by Chairman Dunford and the Comptroller so that, hopefully, if there are detailed questions, we can actually answer them all right here in front of you today. I would like to give an opening statement, chairwoman, because I think I can address some of the issues that have been brought up already, and it should take only a few minutes.

But this budget request does hold me accountable to the men and women of the Department of Defense. Every day, as you know, more than 2 million servicemembers, nearly a million civilians, do their duty, and in doing so, they honor previous generations of veterans and civil servants who have sacrificed for our country, and it is my privilege to be back among them.

We in the Department are keenly aware of the sacrifices made by the American people to fund our military. Many times in the past, we have had as a country to look reality in the eye and meet challenges with the help of congressional leadership building the most capable warfighting force in the world.

There is no room for complacency in the Department of Defense, and we have no God-given right to victory on the battlefield. Each generation of Americans, from the Halls of Congress to the battlefield, earns victory through commitment and sacrifice. And, yet, for 4 years, the Department has been subjected to or threatened by automatic across-the-board cuts as a result of sequester, a mechanism meant to be so injurious to the military, it would never go into effect. But it did go into effect, and as forecast by then-Secretary of Defense Panetta the damage has been severe.

In addition, during 9 of the last 10 years, Congress has enacted separate continuing resolutions to fund the Department of Defense, thus inhibiting our readiness and adaptation to new challenges. We need bipartisan support for this request, as noted by the chairwoman. In the past, by failing to pass a budget on time or to eliminate the threat of sequestration, Congress sidelined itself from its active constitutional oversight role.

Continuing resolutions coupled with sequestrations blocked new programs, prevented service growth, stalled industry's initiatives, and placed troops at greater risk. Despite the tremendous efforts of this committee, Congress as a whole has met the present challenge with lassitude, not leadership.

I retired from military service 3 months after sequestration took effect. Four years later, I have returned to the Department. I am shocked by what I have seen about our readiness to fight. While nothing can compare to the heartache caused by the loss of our troops during these wars, no enemy in the field has done more to harm the combat readiness of our military than sequestration. We have only sustained our ability to meet America's commitments for our security because our troops have stoically shouldered a much greater burden, but our troops' stoic commitment cannot reduce the growing risk.

It took us years to get into this situation, as the Chairwoman noted. It will require years of stable budgets and increased funding to get us out of it. I urge members of this committee and Congress to achieve these goals:

First, fully fund our request, which requires an increase to the defense budget caps.

Second, pass a fiscal year 2018 budget in a timely manner to avoid yet another harmful continuing resolution.

And, third, eliminate the threat of future sequestration cuts to provide a stable budgetary planning horizon.

Stable budgets and increased funding are necessary because of four external factors that are impacting the Department at this time.

The first force acting on us that we must recognize is 16 years of war. When Congress approved the all-volunteer force in 1973, our country never envisioned sending our military to war for more than a decade without pause or conscription. America's long war has placed a heavy burden on men and women in uniform and their families.

And here I will note a few points on Afghanistan that were brought up during the opening remarks by the committee, recognizing there that our military posture is part of a larger regional context in South Asia. Our primary national interest and the international interest in Afghanistan is ensuring it does not become an ungoverned space from which attacks can again be launched against the United States, other nations, or the Afghan people. In this regard, our forces are conducting partnered counterterrorism operations, and we are supporting the NATO-led mission so, in the future, the Afghan people can defend themselves.

This week, President Trump delegated to me the authority to manage troop numbers in Afghanistan. The delegation of this authority, consistent with the authority President Trump granted me

2 months ago for Iraq and Syria, does not at this time change the troop numbers for Afghanistan. Together in the interagency process with Secretary Tillerson's foreign policy guiding us as he implements the President's direction, we will define the way ahead, and I will set the U.S. military commitment consistent with the Commander in Chief's strategic direction and his foreign policy, as dictated by Secretary of State Tillerson. This ensures our Department can facilitate our missions and nimbly align the commitment of troops to the situation on the ground.

Our overall mission in Afghanistan remains the same: to train, advise, and assist the Afghan forces so they can safeguard the Afghan people and terrorists find no haven in Afghanistan for attacking us or others. The revised Afghanistan strategy with a new approach will be presented to the President for his approval in the coming weeks.

The second concurrent force acting on our Department is the worsening global security situation that was mentioned by all members of the committee in their opening remarks. And here we must look reality in the eye. Russia and China are seeking a veto authority over the economic, diplomatic, and security decisions of nations on their periphery. North Korea's reckless rhetoric and provocative actions continue, despite United Nations' censure and sanctions, while Iran remains the largest long-term challenge to Mideast stability. All the while, terrorist groups murder the innocent and threaten peace in many regions while targeting us.

The third force that we have to deal with is adversaries actively contesting America's capabilities. For decades, we enjoyed uncontested or dominant superiority in every operating domain or realm. We could generally deploy our forces when we wanted, assemble them where we wanted, and employ them, operate them as we wanted. Every operating domain today, on the other hand, from outer space to air, sea, undersea, land, and cyberspace is contested.

The fourth concurrent force that we must deal with is rapid technological change. Among the other forces noted thus far, technological change is one that necessitates new investment, innovative approaches, and new program starts that have been denied us by law when we have been forced to operate under continuing resolutions.

Each of these four forces—16 years of war, the worsening security environment, contested operations in multiple domains, and the rapid pace of technological change—requires stable budgets and increased funding to provide for the protection of our citizens and for the survival of our freedoms.

I reiterate that security and solvency are my watchwords as Secretary of Defense. The fundamental responsibility of our government is to defend the American people, providing for our security, and we cannot defend America and help others if our Nation is not both strong and solvent.

So we in the Department of Defense owe it to the American public and the Congress to ensure we spend each dollar wisely. President Trump has nominated for Senate approval specific individuals who will bring proven skills to discipline our Department's fiscal processes and ensure that we do so.

The first step in restoring readiness is underway thanks to Congress' willingness to support the administration's request for an additional $21 billion in resources for fiscal year 2017 to address vital warfighting shortfalls. Your support put more aircraft in the air, more ships at sea, and more troops to training in the field.

However, we all recognize it will take a number of years of higher funding delivered on time to restore readiness, to strengthen the military, and President Trump has requested $639 billion top line for the fiscal year 2018 budget.

There are five priorities here. The first is to improve warfighter readiness, and that was begun in 2017, filling in the tradeoffs made during 16 years of war, 9 years of continuing resolutions, and Budget Control Act caps.

The second priority is increasing capacity and lethality, as noted by the chairwoman, while preparing for future investment, driven then by the results of the defense strategy that we are working on now. Our fiscal year 2018 budget request ensures the Nation's current nuclear deterrent will be sustained and supports continuation of its much-needed modernization process.

The third priority is reforming how the Department does business. I am devoted to gaining full value from every dollar, and we have begun implementation of a range of reform initiatives directed by the 2017 National Defense Authorization Act, and we are on track to enter into a full agencywide financial statement audit, as required by statute.

I urge Congress to support the Department's request for authority to conduct a 2021 Base Realignment and Closure process. I recognize the careful deliberation that members must exercise in considering it, but BRAC has been one of the most successful and significant efficiency programs we have. We have forecast that a properly focused base closure effort could generate $2 billion or more annually, and over a 5-year period, that savings would be enough to buy 300 Apache attack helicopters or 120 Super Hornets.

The fourth priority in the fiscal year 2018 budget is keeping faith with servicemembers and their families, since talented people remain our most valuable asset. But we must balance these requirements with those of investing for other readiness equipment modernization efforts to ensure that our military is the most capable warfighting force in the world and that we bring our folks home alive. Investment in military compensation is essential.

Our fifth priority is support for overseas contingency operations. The 2018 budget requests $64.6 billion focusing on operations in locations you are well aware of. ISIS and other terrorist organizations represent a clear and present danger, and I am encouraged, members of this committee, by the willingness of our allies and partners to help share the burden that we carry.

Moving forward, the 2019 budget will be informed by the National Defense Strategy. I will then have the analytical rigor that I can recommend hard choices as we shape the program for the next 5 years. The Department will work with President Trump, the Congress, and this committee in particular, to ensure future budget requests are sustainable and provide the Commander in Chief with viable military options that support our security.

In summation, I need the BCA caps lifted and a budget, not a continuing resolution, passed on time and elimination of future sequestration cuts so we can provide a stable and adequate way ahead. For those who are concerned that we are not asking for sufficient dollars, please consider the following: For 2017, we asked for $30 billion. The Congress provided $21 billion as a supplemental. Second, this fiscal year, we have requested the amounts I have noted already. This is a 5-percent growth over what national defense was funded for in 2017. This request is admittedly $52 billion above the Budget Control Act defense caps. We have underway at this time a National Security Strategy that will give me the analytical rigor to come back to you for the fiscal year 2019 to 2023 budget request when we want to build up our military to confront the situation that the chairman and I have laid out in our written statements.

I am keenly aware that we have the support of this committee, and we have over many years, but I ask for your help to inform your fellow Members of Congress about the reality facing our military and the need for Congress as a whole to pass a defense budget on time.

Thank you for your strong support over many years. I pledge to collaborate with you.

And, ladies and gentlemen, Chairman Dunford can give some military aspects of this that might give more depth to some of the things I have just stated.

[The written statement of Secretary Mattis follows:]

SECRETARY OF DEFENSE JIM MATTIS
HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS SUBCOMMITTEE ON DEFENSE
WRITTEN STATEMENT FOR THE RECORD
THURSDAY, JUNE 15, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, distinguished members of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to testify in support of the President's budget request for Fiscal Year 2018.

I am pleased to be joined by Chairman Dunford.

This budget request holds me accountable to the men and women of the Department of Defense. Every day, more than two million Service members and nearly one million civilians do their duty, honoring previous generations of veterans and civil servants who have sacrificed for our country. I am mindful of the privilege it is to serve alongside them.

We in the Department of Defense are keenly aware of the sacrifices made by the American people to fund our military. Many times in the past we have looked reality in the eye, met challenges with Congressional leadership, and built the most capable warfighting force in the world. There is no room for complacency and we have no God-given right to victory on the battlefield. Each generation of Americans, from the halls of Congress to the battlefields, earn victory through commitment and sacrifice.

And yet, for four years our military has been subject to or threatened by automatic, across-the-board cuts as a result of sequester – a mechanism meant to be so injurious to the military it would never go into effect. In addition, during nine of the past ten years, Congress has enacted 30 separate Continuing Resolutions to fund the Department of Defense, thus inhibiting our readiness and adaptation to new challenges.

I need bipartisan support for this budget request. In the past, by failing to pass a budget on time or eliminate the threat of sequestration, Congress sidelined itself from its active Constitutional oversight role. It has blocked new programs, prevented service growth, stalled industry initiative, and placed troops at greater risk. Despite the tremendous

efforts of this committee, Congress as a whole has met the present challenge with lassitude, not leadership.

For much of the past decade, my predecessors and prior members of the Joint Chiefs of Staff testified that sequestration and the continued use of Continuing Resolutions would result in a steady erosion of military readiness. In 2013, then-Secretary of Defense Leon Panetta, former Chairman of the House Budget Committee and the former Director of the Office of Management and Budget, testified sequester was "guaranteed to hollow out the force."

I retired from military service three months after sequestration took effect. Four years later, I returned to the Department and I have been shocked by what I've seen with our readiness to fight. For all the heartache caused by the loss of our troops during these wars, no enemy in the field has done more to harm the readiness of our military than sequestration. We have only sustained our ability to meet America's commitments abroad because our troops have stoically shouldered a much greater burden.

It took us years to get into this situation. It will require years of stable budgets and increased funding to get out of it. I urge members of this committee and Congress to achieve three goals:

- First, fully fund our request, which requires an increase to the Defense budget caps;
- Second, pass a FY 2018 budget in a timely manner to avoid yet another harmful Continuing Resolution; and
- Third, eliminate the threat of future sequestration cuts to provide a stable budgetary planning horizon.

Stable budgets and increased funding are necessary because of four external forces acting on the Department at the same time.

The first force we must recognize is 16 years of war. This period represents the longest continuous stretch of armed conflict in our Nation's history. In more than a quarter

century since the end of the Cold War, our country has deployed large-scale forces in active operations for more months than we have been at peace.

When Congress approved the All-Volunteer Force in 1973, our country never envisioned sending our military to war for more than a decade without pause or conscription. America's long war has placed a heavy burden on men and women in uniform and their families.

In recognition of these demands, Congress devoted more resources to recruiting and retaining members of the military. As a result, personnel costs as a fraction of the defense budget have risen over time.

Meanwhile, the war has exhausted our equipment faster than planned. Congress and the Department could not anticipate the accumulated wear and tear of years of continuous combat use. We have had to procure replacement gear and spend more money to keep gear serviceable and extend its service life. Due to this extensive use of our equipment across the force, operations and maintenance costs have also increased, rising faster than the rate of inflation during the past 16 years.

Worn equipment and constrained supplies have forced our personnel to work overtime while deployed or preparing to deploy. That too has placed an added burden on the men and women who serve and on their families. This further degrades readiness in a negative spiral, for those not in the fight are at a standstill, unable to train as their equipment is sent forward to cover shortfalls or returned for extensive rework.

My predecessor, Secretary Gates, stated annualized real defense budget increases and efficiencies of two to three percent above inflation are needed to sustain the All-Volunteer Force in a way that keeps personnel, modernization, and readiness accounts in balance. In the six years since the passage of the Budget Control Act, a period of declining, flat, or modestly increasing budgets, we have not kept this balance.

Not long ago we convinced ourselves that when we pulled out of Iraq and ceased combat operations in Afghanistan, we would take two or three years to "reset and

reconstitute" the force. Today's operations dictate the best we can do is "reset and reconstitute in stride," a reality that imposes its own stress on the Force.

A second concurrent force acting on the Department is the worsening global security situation. Our challenge is characterized by a decline in the long-standing rules-based international order, bringing with it a more volatile security environment than any I have experienced during my four decades of military service.

The most urgent and dangerous threat to peace and security is North Korea. North Korea's continued pursuit of nuclear weapons and the means to deliver them has increased in pace and scope. The regime's nuclear weapons program is a clear and present danger to all, and the regime's provocative actions, manifestly illegal under international law, have not abated despite United Nations' censure and sanctions.

We also look on the prospect of a new era, one governed by today's economic realities and returning once again to a balance of powers. A return to Great Power competition, marked by a resurgent and more aggressive Russian Federation and a rising, more confident, and assertive China, places the international order under assault. Both Russia and China object to key aspects of the international order so painstakingly built since the end of World War II. Both countries are making their objections known by challenging established international norms, such as freedom of the seas and the sovereignty of nations on their periphery.

Moreover, the breakdown of the broader Mideast order has given rise to terrorist groups, including Al-Qaeda and the Islamic State of Iraq and Syria (ISIS). Security vacuums have allowed a revolutionary Iranian regime to sow violence, provoke wider Sunni-Shia confrontation, and pursue regional hegemony. More broadly, this need to preserve our security also requires us to sustain the international presence in Afghanistan to help stabilize the South Asia region and deny terrorists a safe haven.

Instability in the Middle East spills over into other regions. Extremists and extremist ideologies have spread to Europe, Africa, and Asia. Numerous countries are dealing with forced migration of people seeking to escape violence and despair, reminding us

that problems originating in ungoverned or combat torn areas don't remain there. The United States is engaged in the Middle East to help restore order and give the people who live there a more hopeful future, building a better security situation for Americans who want a safer and more prosperous world for our future.

As one observer of the world has noted, we are "faced with two problems: first, how to reduce regional chaos; second, how to create a coherent world order based on agreed-upon principles that are necessary for the operation of the entire system." That observer, Dr. Henry Kissinger, and his fellow members of the Greatest Generation witnessed first-hand the costs of military unpreparedness. They learned the paramount need to prevent hostile states from gaining dominance. And they understood that while there is no way to guarantee peace, the surest way to prevent war is to be prepared to win one.

Under any circumstances, however, reducing regional chaos in tandem with our interagency partners and international allies to help foster a coherent order requires adequate diplomatic and military resources.

Adversaries contesting the United States constitute a third force impacting the Department. For decades the United States enjoyed uncontested or dominant superiority in every operating domain or realm. We could generally deploy our forces when we wanted, assemble them where we wanted, and operate how we wanted. Today, every operating domain is contested.

Outer space, long considered a sanctuary, is now contested. This creates the need to develop capabilities and capacities for more resilient satellites designed to withstand persistent kinetic and non-kinetic attack.

Our dominance of the air is challenged by the proliferation of advanced integrated air defense networks and 5th-generation aircraft. The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program, longer range weapons, and unmanned systems will help us impose our will on potential adversaries while preserving our aircraft and crews in combat.

Our command of the seas is threatened by long-range, land-based guided munitions battle networks designed to attack our ships at increasingly longer ranges. Our undersea superiority, unquestioned since the end of the Cold War, and a key competitive advantage, is challenged by both Russia and China.

Our dominance on land in conventional, high-end combined arms maneuver is threatened by the introduction of long-range air-to-surface and surface-to-surface guided weapons, advanced armored vehicles and anti-tank weapons, and tactical electronic warfare systems.

Cyberspace is now a contested operating realm at the strategic, operational, and tactical levels of war.

Finally, our air, naval, ground and logistics bases are all under threat of accurate, all-weather, day-night guided munitions bombardment. This will complicate our operations and make passive and active base defenses more necessary and urgent.

A fourth concurrent force acting on the Department is rapid technological change. Among the other forces noted thus far, technological change is one that necessitates new investment, innovative approaches, and when necessary, new program starts that have been denied us by law when we have been forced to operate under Continuing Resolutions.

Rapid technological change includes developments in advanced computing, big data analytics, artificial intelligence, autonomy, robotics, miniaturization, additive manufacturing, meta-materials, directed energy, and hypersonics – the very technologies that ensure we will be able to fight and win the wars of the future.

Many of these advances are driven by commercial sector demands and research and development. New commercial technologies will change society, and ultimately, they will change the character of war. The fact that many of these technological developments will come from the commercial sector means that state competitors and

non-state actors will also have access to them, a fact that will continue to erode the conventional overmatch our Nation has grown so accustomed to.

In this competitive environment, the Department must pay much more attention to future readiness, and regaining our Joint Force conventional overmatch over time. We must be willing and able to tap into commercial research, recognize its military potential, and develop new capabilities and the operational and organizational constructs to employ them faster than our competitors.

We must also be prepared to deal with technological, operational, and tactical surprise, which requires changes to the way we train and educate our leaders and our forces, and how we organize for improved Departmental agility.

Improving our future readiness, rapid adoption of off the shelf technologies, and preparing to deal with surprise are critical to modernization efforts, but constrained budgets and acquisition regulations have limited our ability to keep pace with rapid changes and sustain our competitive advantage.

In response to these realities, the Department must develop new weapons and capabilities, adjust concepts of operations, adapt our training, and spend more time war-gaming and exercising to improve our ability to fight and win.

Each of these four forces – 16 years of war, the worsening security environment, contested operations in multiple domains, and the rapid pace of technological change – require stable budgets and increased funding to provide for the protection of our citizens and for the survival of our freedoms. Because as expensive as it is for the American people to fund the military, it is far less costly in lives and treasure than a conventional war that we are unable to deter because we are seen as weak.

I reiterate that security and solvency are my watchwords as Secretary of Defense. The fundamental responsibility of our government is to defend the American people, providing for our security—and we cannot defend America and help others if our Nation is not both strong and solvent. So we in the Department of Defense owe it to the

American public to ensure we spend each dollar wisely. President Trump has nominated for Senate approval specific individuals who will bring proven skills to discipline our Department's fiscal processes to ensure we do so.

This first step to restoring readiness is underway thanks to Congress' willingness to support the Administration's request for additional resources in FY 2017 to rebuild our most urgent needs. Your support of $21 billion in additional resources allowed the Department to address immediate warfighting readiness shortfalls and to help fund the acceleration of the fight against ISIS.

This additional FY 2017 funding addresses vital warfighting readiness shortfalls, a necessary investment to ensure our military is ready to fight today, by putting more aircraft in the air, ships to sea, and troops in the field. Additionally, the funding provided for more maintenance, spare parts, training time, flying hours, munition stocks, and manpower.

We all recognize that it will take a number of years of higher funding delivered on time to restore readiness. To strengthen the military, President Trump requested a $639.1 billion topline for the FY 2018 defense budget. Of this topline, $574.5 billion supports Department of Defense base budget requirements – warfighting readiness and critical program requirements, including intelligence community requirements. The balance, $64.6 billion, supports Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) requirements.

The Department's FY 2018 base budget with its $52 billion increase above the National Defense Budget Control Act cap is the next step to building a larger, more capable, and more lethal joint force. The FY 2018 budget reflects five priorities: restoring and improving warfighter readiness, increasing capacity and lethality, reforming how the Department does business, keeping the faith with Service members and their families, and supporting Overseas Contingency Operations.

The first priority is continuing to improve warfighter readiness begun in FY 2017, filling in the holes from trade-offs made during 16 years of war, and six years of continuing resolutions and Budget Control Act caps. This budget request, as directed by the

National Security Presidential Memorandum "Rebuilding the U.S. Armed Forces" issued on January 27, 2017, identifies and improves shortfalls in readiness, specifically in training, equipment, maintenance, munitions, modernization, and infrastructure.

The 30-Day Readiness Review, completed as part of the development of the FY 2017 Request for Additional Appropriations, identified significant challenges to recovering readiness, including budget uncertainty, high operational tempo, and the time required to rebuild readiness properly. As a result of this review, the Department submitted the FY 2018 budget request to enable the Joint Force to counter national security threats, fulfill steady-state demand, and implement readiness recovery plans.

The Army remains globally engaged with more than 180,000 Soldiers committed to combatant command deterrence and counterterrorism operations. The FY 2018 budget will restore a larger, more capable and lethal modernized force to defeat emerging regional and global near-peer adversaries. Combat Training Center rotations and home station training will help the Army develop capabilities for full-spectrum warfare. Additional Soldiers, training, and equipment will enable the Army to make significant progress towards restoring and sustaining readiness longer.

The Navy will continue implementation of its Optimized Fleet Response Plan, reduce the long-term maintenance backlog, and train to ensure the Fleet is ready to fight. Requested funding provides stable and predictable maintenance and modernization plans, and forces trained to a single full-mission readiness standard. Predictably building readiness with continued implementation of the Optimized Fleet Response Plan will increase aircraft carrier availability, fund ship operations to the anticipated level of required operational days, and improve quality of work and quality of life for Sailors.

The Air Force will restore funding to its Flying Hour Program, increase aircraft sustainment, and grow training resource availability. These steps will enable personnel to regain proficiency in critical skill areas. Investments into training ranges will increase capacity and modernize the simulated threats our young men and women need to overcome to counter adversaries. The Air Force will also invest in home station high-end training, reducing the requirement to deploy for training.

The Marine Corps is committed to remaining capable of responding to crises anywhere around the globe. FY 2018 investments emphasize readiness for deployed and next-to-deploy forces, maintenance for aging platforms, and funding to maintain critical modernization programs. Fully integrated Combined Arms Exercises for all elements of the Marine Air Ground Task Forces will help recover full-spectrum readiness.

The second priority is increasing capacity and lethality while preparing for future investment in the FY2019 budget, driven by results from the National Defense Strategy. The FY 2018 budget request addresses resource gaps in the capabilities, readiness, and capacity needed to project power globally in contested environments, while emphasizing preparedness for future high-end security challenges. The budget request supports this priority through investment in advanced capabilities to reassert our technological edge over potential future adversaries, while having more units ready to fight.

The FY 2018 budget request seeks to fill the holes and achieve program balance before beginning to significantly grow capacity in future years. Part of achieving a more capable force involves pursuing innovative ways to develop the force and concepts of operation to reverse unfavorable cost ratios adversaries would seek to impose on the United States in future warfighting environments. The FY 2018 investments include power projection capabilities, nuclear modernization, a stronger missile defense, space-based systems, and cyberspace operations. Several of these options will expand the competitive space to our advantage vice allowing an adversary to define a conflict. Our budget request also ensures that the nation's current nuclear deterrent will be sustained, and supports continuation of its much needed modernization process.

The third priority is reforming how the department does business. I am devoted to gaining full value from every taxpayer dollar spent on defense, thereby earning the trust of Congress and the American people.
The Department is committed to reforming the acquisition enterprise to improve its ability to be innovative, responsive, and cost effective. The Department has begun implementation of a range of reform initiatives directed by the 2017 NDAA, to include

disestablishment of the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, and the establishment of the Under Secretaries for Research and Engineering, and for Acquisition and Sustainment. Consistent with section 901 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2017, this change will be in effect by February 1, 2018, or sooner if I'm able to set the necessary conditions.

The FY 2018 budget request includes notable reform efforts. I urge Congress to support the Department's request for authority to conduct a 2021 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round, a cornerstone of our efficiencies program. The Department currently has more infrastructure capacity than required for operations - and foreseeable growth scenarios won't appreciably change this. I recognize the severity of BRAC's impact on communities and the careful consideration that members must exercise in considering it. In order to ensure we do not waste taxpayer dollars I would therefore greatly appreciate Congress' willingness to discuss BRAC authorization as an efficiency measure. That authorization is essential to improving our readiness by minimizing wasted resources and accommodating force adjustments. Waste reduction is fundamental to keeping the trust of the American people and is a key element of the efficiency/reform efforts that Congress and the Administration expect of us. Of all the efficiency measures the Department has undertaken over the years, BRAC is one of the most successful and significant – we forecast that a properly focused base closure effort will generate $2 billion or more annually – enough to buy 300 Apache attack helicopters, 120 F/A-18E/F Super Hornets, or four Virginia-class submarines.

During Fiscal Year 2018 the Department is on track to enter into a full, agency-wide financial statement audit as required by statute. As part of this effort, the Department has established a Cost Decision Framework that leverages commercial best practices. This initiative will give decision makers the information they need to make a fully informed, cost-based decision.

The fourth priority is keeping faith with Service members and families. Military and civilian personnel are the foundation of the Department of Defense. The Nation's commitment to these patriots willing to serve our country is built into the FY 2018

budget request and is demonstrated by the number of initiatives and programs to support their professional development and their personal and family lives.

Comprising roughly one-third of the Department of Defense budget, military pay and benefits are the single largest expense category for the Department. I believe providing competitive pay and benefits is a necessity to attract and retain the highly qualified people needed in today's military. The right people are the Department's most valuable asset, but we must continually balance these requirements against other investments critical to readiness, equipment, and modernization to ensure the military is the most capable warfighting force in the world. Balancing resources is particularly important as the Department reshapes the force needed to remain effective in an uncertain future. Investment in military compensation, Blended Retirement, the Military Health System, and family programs are essential to fielding the talent we need to sustain our competitive advantage on the battlefield.

The fifth priority is support for Overseas Contingency Operations. The FY 2018 President's Budget requests $64.6 billion, focusing on Operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and Syria, increasing efforts to sustain NATO's defenses to deter aggression, and global counterterrorism operations. Specifically, ISIS and other terrorist organizations represent a clear and present danger. The U.S. remains united and committed with the 66 nations of the Defeat-ISIS Coalition – plus the European Union, NATO, Arab League, and Interpol – to destroy ISIS. We will continue to support partner nations' diplomatic and military efforts through a security cooperation approach. I am encouraged by the willingness of our allies and partners to share the burden of this campaign.

The FY 2019 budget, informed by the National Defense Strategy, will grow the All-Volunteer Force. The Department will work with President Trump, Congress, and this committee to ensure the budget request we present for FY 2019-2023 is sustainable and that it provides the Commander-in-Chief with viable military options in support of America's security.

Judicious spending of America's public money is critical to ensuring security while maintaining solvency. We already know we face a dilemma between increasing personnel end strength and force structure on the one hand, and investing in equipment as well as research and development on the other hand. These challenges are compounded by the pressing need to recapitalize the nuclear triad and the sealift fleet in the 2020s. The President's Nuclear Posture Review will look at all elements of U.S. nuclear forces to ensure that our nuclear deterrent, including our command, control, and communication systems, are appropriately tailored to deter emerging 21st century threats.

I know we will have to make hard choices as we develop our new defense strategy and shape the FY 2019-2023 defense program. With the help of Congress, I am confident we can build a force that is necessarily more lethal without placing an undue burden on the American economy.

I am keenly aware members of this committee understand the responsibility each of us has to ensuring our military is ready to fight today and in the future. I need your help to inform your fellow members of Congress about the reality facing our military – and the need for Congress as a whole to pass a budget on time.

Thank you for your strong support and for ensuring our troops have the resources and equipment they need to fight and win on the battlefield. I pledge to collaborate closely with you for the defense of our Nation in our joint effort to keep our Armed Forces second-to-none.

Chairman Dunford is prepared to discuss the military dimensions of the budget request.

# # #

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

General Dunford.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL DUNFORD

General DUNFORD. Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, distinguished members of the committee, it is an honor to join Secretary Mattis and Under Secretary Norquist in appearing before you today.

I am honored to represent you men and women in uniform, and it is because of them I can state up front with confidence that we have the most capable U.S. military in the world. However, the competitive advantage that our military has long enjoyed is eroding, and a number of factors have contributed to that erosion, and we have discussed those in previous hearings.

One is an extraordinarily high level of operational tempo since 9/11, which has accelerated the wear and tear of our weapons and equipment. Meanwhile, budget instability and Budget Control Act have forced the Department to operate with far fewer resources than necessary to meet the current strategy of record. As a consequence, we have prioritized near-term readiness at the expense of replacing aged equipment and capability development.

We also maintain a force that consumes readiness as fast as we build it, and we lack sufficient capacity to meet current operational requirements while rebuilding and maintaining what when we describe as full-spectrum readiness. Of course, we are talking there of being able to respond to both Russia on one end and violent extremism on the other end and all the challenges that may fall between. The Secretary and the service chiefs have addressed that dynamic in their testimonies, and I fully concur with their assessments, but beyond current readiness, we are confronted with another significant challenge that I assess today to be near term. While we have been primarily focused on the threat of violent extremism, our adversaries and our potential adversaries have developed advanced capabilities and operational approaches. And these are specifically designed to limit our ability to project power, which we view as our source of strength of the U.S. military. They recognize that our ability to project power is, in fact, necessary to defend the homeland, advance our interests and meet our alliance commitments.

And as Secretary Mattis mentioned, Russia, China and Iran field a wide range of cyberspace, aviation, maritime, and land capabilities specifically designed to limit our ability to deploy the force, employ the force, and sustain the force in combat. Russia and China have also modernized a nuclear arsenal while North Korea has been on a relentless path to field a nuclear-armed ICBM that can reach the United States.

In just a few years, if we don't change the trajectory we are going to lose our qualitative and quantitative competitive advantage, and the consequences will be profound. It is going to affect our ability to deter a nuclear war, a conventional war, and our ability to respond if deterrence fails.

Alternatively, we can maintain our competitive advantage with sustained, sufficient, and predictable funding. To that end, the fiscal year 2018 budget request is an essential step, and it builds on

the fiscal year 2017 supplemental request, as the Secretary mentioned. However, this request alone is not going to fully restore our readiness or arrest the erosion of our competitive advantage. Doing that is going to require sustained investment beyond fiscal year 2018.

As the Secretary mentioned, this took us several years to get into this situation we are in right now, and we assess it will take many years to get out of this situation. Specific recommendation for 2019 and beyond will be informed by the Secretary's forthcoming defense strategy, but we know right now that continued growth in the base budget of at least 3 percent above inflation is necessary just to maintain the relative competitive advantage that we have today. That is not to build a force that we need tomorrow, but simply to maintain the force that we have today.

As we ask for your support, we recognize the responsibility to maintain the trust of the American taxpayer, and we take this responsibility seriously and will continue to eliminate redundancies and achieve efficiencies where possible.

Thank you again for the opportunity to appear before you this morning, and, Chairwoman, more importantly, thank you for all you and the committee do to make sure that, as you said, our young men and women never find themselves in a fair fight.

And, with that, I am prepared to take your questions.

[The written statement of General Dunford follows:]

POSTURE STATEMENT OF

19TH CHAIRMAN OF THE JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF

BEFORE THE 115TH CONGRESS

HOUSE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

DEFENSE

BUDGET HEARING

JUNE 15, 2017

Chairwoman Granger, Ranking Member Visclosky, distinguished members of this committee, thank you for the opportunity to join Secretary Mattis in appearing before you today.

The U.S. military's competitive advantage against potential adversaries is eroding. Over the last decade, sustained operational commitments, budgetary instability, and advances by our adversaries have threatened our ability to project power and we have lost our advantage in key warfighting areas. The FY18 Budget Request will allow the Armed Forces to meet operational requirements, continue rebuilding warfighting readiness, and place the military on a path to balancing the Defense program. However, without sustained, sufficient, and predictable funding, I assess that within 5 years we will lose our ability to project power; the basis of how we defend the homeland, advance U.S. interests, and meet our alliance commitments.

Strategic Environment

In today's strategic environment, five key challenges - Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and Violent Extremist Organizations - most clearly represent the challenges facing the U.S. military. They serve as a benchmark for our global posture, the size of the force, capability development, and risk management.

Over the past several decades, each of these state actors have developed capabilities and operational approaches to counter our strategic and operational centers of gravity. The United States' decisive victory in DESERT STORM in 1991 was a wake-up call for our adversaries. For Russia and China, specifically, the lessons-learned spurred dramatic tactical, operational, and strategic adaptations. Observing the power and efficacy of precision guided munitions and combined arms maneuver, both countries accelerated modernization programs to asymmetrically counter U.S. advantages. They adapted operational constructs to incorporate anti-access technology and

employed new doctrines to leverage high-tech weaponry across all domains. These efforts sought to limit U.S. freedom of navigation, deny our ability to gain and maintain air-superiority, negate the capability of our precision munitions, and limit our ability to employ sophisticated command and control systems.

Today, Russia continues to invest in a full-range of capabilities designed to limit our ability to project power into Europe and meet our alliance commitments to NATO. These capabilities include long-range conventional strike, cyber, space, electronic warfare, ground force and naval capabilities. Russia is also modernizing all elements of its nuclear triad and its non-strategic nuclear weapons. These capabilities are intended to enable Russia to counter U.S. and NATO power projection and undermine the integrity of the NATO alliance.

Similarly, China has embarked on a significant program to modernize and expand strategic and conventional military capabilities. They have expanded their nuclear enterprise and made investments in power projection, space, cyber, hypersonic weapons, cruise missiles, and ballistic missiles – even as they continue to build out their physical presence in the South China Sea. China is also investing heavily in 5th generation fighters, air-to-air missiles, air defense systems, and sea and undersea anti-access technologies to limit our ability to project power, operate freely, and meet our alliance commitments in the Pacific.

Russia and China are not alone in these pursuits. North Korea's nuclear weapons development, combined with efforts to develop a nuclear-capable ballistic missile capability, is specifically intended to threaten the security of the homeland and our Allies in the Pacific. Over the past year, North Korea conducted an unprecedented number of missile tests. Moreover, North Korea has demonstrated a willingness to use malicious cyber tools against

governments and industry. These actions destabilize the region and pose an increasing threat to U.S. and our allies.

Iran seeks to assert itself as the dominant regional power in the Middle East. They continue to support international terrorist organizations like Hezbollah, and support proxies in Syria, Iraq, and Yemen to assert influence and counter the influence of the U.S. and our Allies. They actively seek to destabilize their neighbors, and employ naval capabilities that threaten freedom of navigation. At the same time, they are modernizing an array of ballistic missiles, missile defense, space, cyber, maritime, and cruise missile capabilities.

Finally, Violent Extremist Organizations such as ISIS and al Qaida remain a threat to the homeland, our Allies, and our way of life. Violent extremism is fundamentally a transregional threat and a generational struggle that requires our military to work with interagency and coalition partners to disrupt external attacks, and dismantle their capabilities wherever they emerge. Even with the success of our continued efforts to defeat the Islamic State in Iraq and Syria, the threat of Islamic terrorism will remain.

A review of these five challenges demonstrates that the U.S. military requires a balanced inventory of advanced capabilities and sufficient capacity to act decisively across the range of military operations. As a nation that both thinks and acts globally, we cannot choose between a force that can address ISIS and other Violent Extremist Organizations, and one that can deter and defeat state actors with a full range of capabilities. Nor do we have the luxury of choosing between meeting our current operational requirements and developing capabilities that we will need to meet tomorrow's challenges.

However, as a result of sustained operational tempo and budget instability, today the military is challenged to meet operational requirements and sustain

investment in capabilities required to preserve – or in some cases restore - our competitive advantage.

Sustained operational tempo and demand have forced the Department to prioritize near-term readiness at the expense of modernization. Additionally, a conscious choice was made to limit the size of the force in order to preserve scarce resources necessary for essential investments in immediate upgrades to critical capabilities. As a result, today, demand for high-demand/low-density specialties often outpaces supply. Particular stress is felt in specialties such as ISR, missile defense systems, naval expeditionary forces, special operations forces, global precision strike units, and cyber forces. Additionally, over the past two years, munitions expenditures in ongoing operations against Violent Extremist Organizations exacerbated existing shortfalls.

Making matters worse, for the past five years, the Budget Control Act (BCA) has forced the Department of Defense (DoD) to operate with about $450 billion less than planned and required. These reductions have been aggravated by repeated Continuing Resolutions (CR) which hamper long-term investment and often result in increased costs. For nine of the last ten years, the Department of Defense has operated under some type of CR, delaying critical new starts, deferring installation and infrastructure modernization, and canceling major training events. A year-long FY18 CR would cut $33 billion from the Department's request, further exacerbating these problems.

Based on these factors, the Army has been forced to prioritize near-term readiness and now faces a shortage of critical capabilities and capacities in armor, air defense, artillery, and aviation. These deficiencies are made worse by manpower shortfalls in critical military specialties and training resource constraints. Consequently, the Army is limited in its ability to man, train, and equip fully-ready Brigade Combat Teams (BCT) and other critical enablers

required to deploy, sustain, and protect service members operating around the world.

For similar reasons, the Navy faces readiness challenges in both ships and aircraft. Operational requirements and capacity constraints in shipyards and aircraft depots have increased the time and cost required to conduct major repairs. Maintenance delays, low stocks of spare parts, lack of training ordnance, and aging infrastructure impair the Navy's ability to conduct integrated training. As a result, the Navy is limited in its ability to meet operational demand for maritime capability and power projection, especially in contested environments.

The Air Force is also challenged to balance operational demands and invest for the future. Today, the Air Force is short almost 1,500 pilots, including 800 fighter pilots, and more than 3,400 maintainers across all components. They lack sufficient resources to adequately support both 4th and 5th generation training. And they have delayed investment in 4th generation aircraft modifications while limiting the fielding of 5th generation strike-fighters. The result is fewer trained pilots available to deploy, over-tasked and aging aircraft, and delays in modernization programs required to defeat near-peer adversaries.

Over the last several years, the Marine Corps has been forced to delay planned investments in infrastructure, Command and Control, and ground systems required to build, train, and launch combat ready forces. Today, the Marine Corps lacks sufficient Ready Basic Aircraft for training and deployments and has delayed procurement of the F-35, CH-53K, MV-22, and KC-130J aircraft. These delayed investments limit the Marine Corps' strategic flexibility and inhibit its ability to meet operational demands.

If these trends continue, and the constraints of sequestration are not lifted, the Department will have to cut force structure, as the tradeoffs required to

maintain the capability and capacity of the current force are no longer sustainable. Going forward, the Department of Defense requires sustained, sufficient, and predictable funding to meet current operational requirements, restore readiness shortfalls, and place us on a path toward restoring our eroded competitive advantage.

Impact of FY17 Request for Additional Appropriations (RAA).

Congress' willingness to support the Administration's request for additional resources in FY 2017 was a necessary first step to reverse the impacts of under-investment over the last five years. The FY17 appropriation yielded improvements in immediate warfighting readiness by providing funding for modest increases to end strength that primarily filled holes in existing units, funding full spectrum training, beginning to replenish depleted ammunition stocks, and continuing the restoration and modernization of critical systems.

However, the FY17 Appropriations Bill did not fully address the Department's modernization and procurement requirements and significant, long-term readiness challenges remain. The Services' inability to fully fund procurement of key platforms continues to hamper readiness by limiting the number and types of platforms available for initial entry training, individual proficiency, and collective training. Because of this, the military begins the FY18 budget cycle in a less healthy position than if the FY17 RAA was fully funded, making full and on-time funding of this budget even more critical.

Intent of the FY18 Budget: What does it do?

The FY18 Budget Request builds on the readiness recovery started in FY17, starts to fill the holes created by the BCA, and begins to balance the program. It enables the Department to meet operational requirements, begin rebuilding mid- and long-term readiness, and begin restoring capability and capacity

necessary to improve lethality. These are essential first steps in arresting the erosion of the military's competitive advantage.

In Afghanistan, FY18 investments will reinforce improvements in the Afghan National Defense and Security Forces. In Iraq and Syria, the Budget Request funds emerging requirements and provides sufficient funding and authority for the defeat-ISIS train and equip fund. In Europe, the Budget Request provides a 40 percent increase in funding for the European Reassurance Initiative (ERI) that sustains ongoing assurance efforts, and improve the capability of the U.S. forces and our Allies to deter potential Russian aggression.

To rebuild warfighting readiness, the Army will fully man its combat formation, fund 19 Combat Training Center rotations in FY18, and increase resources for home-station training to ensure units maximize full spectrum readiness. The Navy will provide flying hours and increase depot maintenance to enable integrated air/sea training. The Air Force will invest in training required to improve 4th and 5th generation warfighting capability. The Marines will increase funding for flying hours, logistics, and engineering units, and focus training resources on amphibious and combined arms operations.

Maintenance resources included in the FY18 Budget Request also improve readiness. The Army will prioritize maintenance for equipment coming out of theater in order to prepare it for unit training and refill prepositioned stocks in Europe and the Pacific. The Navy will add critical workforce capacity that reduces ship and aviation depot maintenance backlogs. The Air Force will conduct overdue weapons system sustainment, increase maintenance for inter-theater airlift, and execute recapitalization of critical systems. The Marines will prioritize maintenance for MV-22, rotary wing, and fighter aviation to improve its survivability, mobility, and lethality.

To begin restoring capacity and lethality across the force, the FY18 Budget makes critical investments in Tactical Air (TACAIR), ships, space, and cyberspace, and begins essential nuclear recapitalization efforts. Investments in TACAIR enable the Air Force, Navy, and Marine Corps to continue procurement of 5th generation fighters and fund upgrades to 4th generation fighters that fill shortfalls and begin to grow capacity. The Air Force will procure 46 F-35As and begin upgrades to F-16s. The Navy will procure 4 F-35Cs and 14 F/A-18E/Fs to mitigate its strike fighter shortfall. The Marines will procure 20 F-35Bs. These investments, coupled with investments in modernization of depot maintenance facilities, allow us to begin reversing the impact of delays in TACAIR modernization over the past five years.

The FY18 Budget Request supports the Navy's growth by supporting the procurement of 9 ships and continuing necessary investments to upgrade and modernize nuclear aircraft carriers, destroyers, littoral combat ships, TICONDEROGA-class cruisers, amphibious assault ships, and submarines. These investments are essential to enabling the Navy to project power, ensure forward presence and deterrence, ensure access to the global commons, and provide ballistic missile defense.

Continued improvement in space-based systems enables us to better protect satellites, improve tracking/discrimination capabilities, and continue domestic launch development. Cyberspace investments prioritize hardening information networks, defending against cyber-attacks, and continuing to build, train, and equip cyber mission forces and maturing cyberspace command and control. These advances improve both offensive and defense space and cyberspace capabilities and enhance the resiliency of our systems and networks.

The FY 18 Budget Request also invests in upgrades to the nuclear enterprise, including inter-continental ballistic missiles, nuclear submarines, strategic

bombers, and command and control systems. Continuing to maintain a secure and effective nuclear deterrent is essential to defending the homeland.

However, the FY18 Budget Request alone will not fully restore readiness or arrest the military's eroding competitive advantage. Reversing the impact of the past five years of sustained operational tempo and budget instability requires sustained investment beyond FY18.

What FY18 Budget Request doesn't do: Areas for continued investment.

Specific recommendations for FY19, and beyond, will be informed by the results of the National Defense Strategy. Today, however, we know that continued investment is needed to execute responsible growth in capacity, build advanced capabilities, and restore the long-term readiness. These investments are essential to ensuring our ability to project power and maintain a credible strategic deterrent.

We continue to consume readiness as fast as we build it and lack sufficient capacity to both meet today's operational requirements and rebuild the competencies necessary to defeat near peer adversaries. As a result, our units are training to meet their assigned missions at the expense of training for their designed mission. To break this cycle, we must increase capacity in critical areas such as C4ISR, fighter aircraft, armored BCTs, amphibious ships, and special operations forces. This additional capacity will allow us to meet today's requirements and prepare for tomorrow's.

We must also invest in advanced capabilities required to defeat near-peer adversaries. As we have prioritized readiness for ongoing operations, our adversaries have prioritized investment in technologies that exploit our vulnerabilities and limit our ability to project power. To ensure our competitive advantage, we must accelerate investments in systems that defeat adversary anti-access capabilities at sea and under the sea, improve our ISR resiliency,

guarantee access to space and cyber, and enable us to defeat integrated air defenses. These advanced capabilities are vital to maintaining the U.S. military's competitive advantage in all environments and across all domains. It is also essential that we restore Comprehensive Joint Readiness, the ability of the U.S. military to deploy, employ, and sustain itself anywhere in the world, while maintaining the flexibility to transition from one crisis to another, across the range of military options. This requires sufficient capacity, the necessary capabilities, and iterative training. Our Air Force must possess the right mix of 4th and 5th generation aircraft and have sufficient capacity to conduct integrated training. Our Navy must grow and modernize while preserving a globally-present fleet, capable of sailing and operating anywhere in the world. The Army and Marine Corps must fill unit short-falls and upgrade ground tactical vehicles while expanding full spectrum training. These investments are essential to projecting power in contested environments against any adversary and operating across the spectrum of conflict.

Additionally, we must invest in maintaining a credible strategic deterrent. Due to fiscal constraints, we have delayed modernization of all three legs of the nuclear triad and are now approaching decision points with no remaining schedule margins. Over the coming decades we must recapitalize our inter-continental ballistic missiles, ballistic missile submarines, strategic bombers, and many of our command, control, and communication systems. Recapitalization costs will be significant and can no longer be delayed if the United States wants to maintain a safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrent.

Conclusion

Today, despite the challenges facing us, our military is the most capable military in the world. We need sustained, sufficient, and predictable funding to grow sufficient capacity, develop the correct mix of advanced capabilities, and ensure a ready force. These investments are necessary to ensure our ability to

defend the homeland and project power when and where required. With your help and commitment, we can preserve our competitive advantage and ensure that we never send America's sons and daughters in to a fair fight.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you very much.

We will now proceed to questions observing our usual 5-minute rule, and watch your red light. I am going to forego my questions until the end, but just in response to your opening statements, we request that you reach out to Members that are not on this committee or the authorizing committee and make sure that they understand how very important this is and what your plan is that says we will rebuild to this at this time and then continue for years.

And the question and answers, we have several members who are in either committee, subcommittee hearings that are hearing right now. So I am going to go to Ms. McCollum first because I know you have to leave. Mr. Calvert will be second.

REMARKS OF MS. MCCOLLUM

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Madam Chair. And Mr. Calvert and I will someday repay the kindness that this committee as shared with us.

First, I want to thank you all for being here today and your service to our Nation. I have two questions I am going to submit for the record, but one I am going to just mention what it is because I am very concerned about what appears to be—well, not appears to be—it is a growing problem with pilots across our services reporting symptoms of hypoxia and oxygen deprivation. And I have had some briefings on it, but I want to learn how more this committee can be helpful on that, and then another question for the record on the transgender policy and the way that is unfolding.

But I want to state however, Mr. Secretary, I find this budget to be completely out of balance with the needs of the American people. We do—we do need a strong national defense, but we also must ensure that the needs of the American people here at home are taken care of. The proposed increase for defense will come at the expense of domestic investments for all Americans, including our men and women in uniform, their families, our veterans, and these are services that they all depend on: lifesaving medical research, support for our first responders, educational opportunities for future generations, safe roads and bridges. So this is about making smart choices.

The Pentagon is going to have to be tougher on cutting waste and controlling spending, and I was pleased to hear in your remarks that you are on top of doing just that. And I couldn't agree with you more that we need to participate with the armed services in doing a BRAC. We need to be doing that. So you have my full support and count on me to work with you with that.

STRATEGY FOR AFGHANISTAN

But there is an example of how continued investment after 15 years in Afghanistan has left us in a stalemate. Just let me lay out some statistics here: 2,000 Americans have lost their lives. Over 20,000 have been wounded. Last year alone—last year alone—5,000 Afghanistan troops were killed in action, and the President of Afghanistan said that there is over 11,000 foreign fighters right now operating in country. Corruption continues to run rampant in

Afghanistan. Afghanistan remains foremost a NARCO state, and the cost of our involvement, the U.S. involvement, is $700 billion. That is a staggering amount to spend on a war you said yourself at the time we are not winning, and that is from The Washington Post article on June 13th.

So, Mr. Secretary, now that President Trump has fully delegated all the authority for troop levels on to you, will you be sending more troops to Afghanistan in the calendar year? What do you consider success? And will U.S. troops be fighting in Afghanistan 15 years from now?

Thank you.

Secretary MATTIS. Congresswoman, he has not delegated all authority to me. He maintains strategic oversight. He is an actively engaged and a very hard questioner about what the strategy is. He has delegated the details of forces that will be allocated to support what he approves finally as the strategy, but I assure you this is not a carte blanche for me to come up with numbers that are going into this in interagency, foreign policy-led effort.

As far as what it is that we would be doing in order to bring this to a better conclusion, we have got to recognize that we tried to leave the Afghan forces before they were fully mature without the sufficient air support that would allow them to hold the high ground, to put it in military terms. So we are going to have to look at a more regional strategy, one that takes into account Afghanistan as part of South Asia, not look at it in isolation. It is going to have to be one that marries itself to reality and the current level of support that we could expect out of the leadership in the Afghan forces so that we don't add to their responsibility without preparing them for success, and if that means we have to keep advisors with them a little longer, then 9/11 taught us the cost of not paying attention to this problem. And we will do so.

For right now, we also have to work hard on the countercorruption effort there in order to make this government responsive to the needs of its people, and in that regard, that is why the State Department is an equal partner with me as we put this strategy together. We are not looking at a purely military strategy, and it has got to be one that leads to a reconciliation. All wars come to an end. Our job is to end it as quickly as possible without losing the very mission that we recognized through several administrations was worth putting those young Americans on the line for.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. Calvert.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman.

BUDGET CONTROL ACT

Good morning, Secretary Mattis and General Dunford, Mr. Norquist. Thank you for appearing before our committee. Thank you for your service to our Nation. Most of us, if not all of us, agree and understand that the base on defense must go up and maybe more than the $50 billion that you are asking for.

However, I am going to have a bipartisan moment here—maybe the sobering couple of days that we have had here—but the funding on military cannot be obtained on the back of nondefense discretionary spending. I think all of us here in this room understand

that. It is not going to work. We need a budget agreement. We need the administration, we need the Senate, the House to come to a workable number that we can agree to get rid of the sequestration and the Budget Control Act and come up with realistic numbers both on the discretionary side and the nondiscretionary side. And we need to talk about the entire budget, not just discretionary spending.

So I hope in the coming days that we take this seriously, and that is not just the House and the Senate. That does include the administration. So I think we all need to be working together on that.

CIVILIAN WORKFORCE

One issue, though, that we can do within the Department of Defense—and you, Mr. Secretary, mentioned reforms—is something I know I have been harping on, and some of my friends up here have heard this a number of times, but from 2001 to 2014, the Active-Duty military has shrunk by 4 percent while the number of civilian defense employees has grown by 15 percent. A recent study uncovered by The Washington Post found that there is approximately $125 billion in bureaucratic waste at the DOD.

Now I know many of my colleagues and the service chiefs pointed out the importance of our civilian workforce, especially our maintenance people and civilians who work at the depots. I have got to point that out here. But this report found excess capacity in the bureaucratic overhead, desk jobs, held by civilians and certainly contractors.

Secretary Mattis, I would like to give you both the mandate and the authority to conduct a reduction in force that would place more emphasis on performance and, as you mentioned, the word "lethality." We want to keep the best and the brightest of our civilian workforce while realizing billions in savings that could be redirected back into the Department for readiness, procurement, and end strength. Can you share your thoughts on the size of the civilian workforce within the DOD, and what is the overarching plan to match capability with requirements? Thank you.

Secretary MATTIS. Congressman Calvert, we are on track right now to reduce our headquarters by 30 percent. That is where you find much of the specific jobs that you have highlighted here. I would add that I have met twice now with the authors of the report that found the $125 billion in waste, as they pointed out. I do not agree with everything in the report. I have got real concerns about logistics. I know it doesn't look sexy, but I would tell you that the strength of our forces in deploying around the world is heavily dependent on those logistics elements and just-in-time civilian practices may not work well on a battlefield where the enemy is trying to disrupt your timelines in terms of undercutting our warfighting capability.

But that does not take away in my mind that I need to look carefully at each one of the wastes that they identified and address it. The best way to do this, I believe, is to get the right people into the Pentagon, and I am drawing people from industry, including those who saved programs, big programs that were in big problems, for industry, aircraft programs. This way, they come in with a

background of how to very analytically weigh the quantitative and nonquantitative factors so that we can have a grounding, I would say, a grounding in what the fundamentals are that permit us to revolutionize our business practices.

I have three priorities in the Department: Strengthen our military; strengthen our alliances so we are not carrying the full burden for our security; and to reform the business practices. And I will get these people in. They are being confirmed as we speak. It is ongoing. And once I have them there, I am going to fully empower them along the lines you are talking about.

Mr. CALVERT. Thank you. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Mrs. Lowey.

INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT BUDGET

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Secretary Mattis, during testimony before the Senate Armed Services Committee in 2013, Senator Wicker asked you if you had observed that the international development budget is helpful to us in providing national defense for our country. You responded, and I quote, "If you don't fund the State Department full then I need to buy more ammunition ultimately. So I think it is a cost-benefit ratio. The more that we put into the State Department's diplomacy, hopefully the less we have to put into a military budget as we deal with the outcome of an apparent American withdrawal from the international scene," end quote.

As the ranking member of both the full House Appropriations Committee and the State and Foreign Operations Subcommittee, I frankly am extremely concerned that the fiscal year 2018 budget requests drastic increases in defense spending at the expense of nondefense discretionary priorities, including foreign aid and international development programs.

Mr. Secretary, do you stand by your statements about the importance of the foreign aid budget, and how will these drastic cuts to diplomacy programs impact future DOD expenditures?

Secretary MATTIS. Congresswoman, I believe America has two fundamental powers: the power of intimidation, and that is represented here before the committee today, America's awesome determination to defend ourselves; and the power of inspiration, which is heavily conveyed overseas by our Department of State. Well, they are the lead on it.

I have not reviewed—just getting ready for these hearings consumed my time to understand budgets that are rather extensive. I have not reviewed where the cuts come to Secretary of State Tillerson's budget. So I do not want to speak offhand without having done my homework.

But I would tell you that, as I read about those cuts, I called Secretary of State Tillerson. I meet with him weekly. We talk several times a day, and we agreed to put two of our top-level subordinates together. We are going to look at the priorities for where we need to engage in the world. This committee also gives me development funds, and we have married the two. We will set the priorities together so that we get the best possible use of the dollars allocated to each of the Departments working in concert. So that is my effort to reinforce on that and keep us together, and I am confident this

is also what President Trump expects us to do. So that is my best response to you.

I have not reviewed their budget in any detail, ma'am. So I just can't speak to where the cuts are coming.

Mrs. LOWEY. Well, thank you very much.

Madam Chair, my timer is not on.

Ms. GRANGER. Out of respect, Mrs. Lowey, we don't put a timer on you.

Mrs. LOWEY. Oh, you are so kind. You know, Chairwoman Granger and I have worked together a long time, and there really is outstanding mutual respect.

Well, then I will just take another minute.

Ms. GRANGER. Okay.

CYBER SECURITY

Mrs. LOWEY. Because there is another issue that I am passionately concerned about, and that is cyber security. I am so concerned about the growing cyber threats against the United States' interests and assets both at home and overseas. If you could share with us the primary risk faced by the Department of Defense in the cybersecurity realm. How does the budget request support offense of cyber operations? And along with its elevation to a full unified command, as specified in the fiscal year 2017 NDAA, would Cyber Command benefit from ending the dual-hat relationship with NSA? And what steps is the Department taking to attract and retain these skilled personnel? And I have been so concerned about, once an individual comes to your Department and has gone through extensive training, we hope that we will be able to keep them because this is such a challenge I am aware of from the private sector. So thank you.

Secretary MATTIS. Just quickly, ma'am, I could not agree more about the growing threat. If we had been here 10 years ago, I would have yawned and said: I don't see the big problem.

Right now, it is at $8 billion this year specifically targeted, and actually, there is a lot more going into this, because we are not counting in all the recruiting dollars on—this is just targeted on the cyber capability. I would tell you that growing from basically $3 billion to $8 billion in 5 years shows the priority we are placing on it.

As far as the Cyber Command-NSA split, we intend to make this a split that actually gains more unity of effort from a broader constituency, too, from other elements that are also engaged in the countercyber threat.

And, lastly, I just say that the attracting and keeping key people, the educated, trained people will be very challenging. We recognize it because they can be offered so much more money on the open market than they can be offered in government service. We will have to fight it probably with bonuses but also with a call to their patriotism, which at times is the most compelling, and we keep a lot of young people around based on the fact that we need them to defend the country. But it is going to be a challenge, and I did not hear one word you said on this issue that I take issue with. I agree with you 100 percent. It is a priority effort.

Mrs. LOWEY. Thank you.

And, unfortunately, I have to go to another hearing, too. So thank you, Madam Chair.

And I know we rest better at night knowing that you are in charge of the policy. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Chairman Rogers.

STATE AND FOREIGN OPERATIONS

Mr. ROGERS. Amen to that last remark. We are assured with you in charge.

Let me quickly and briefly take up the matter that Mr. Calvert mentioned and also Mrs. Lowey on the funding for the Department of State. We had Secretary Tillerson here yesterday, and he agreed with the same description of your relationship that you have mentioned here today, and that is great.

But the proposed budget for State and foreign operations has rather draconian cuts. For example, economic assistance to Egypt is cut by a third; Ukraine by half; Pakistan by a third; Iraq by 14 percent; Afghanistan by 9 percent; and the like. That is economic assistance, not to mention the military each side. Those are rather severe, would you not agree?

Secretary MATTIS. I agree, sir.

Mr. ROGERS. Yes. What impact would those kinds of cuts have on your capability to do what you need to do in these various countries?

Secretary MATTIS. Well, in terms of a direct military impact, if I am kept funded, then, obviously, I can keep the military—the purely military—effort ongoing, and that includes the support for protection of our embassies, which is a constant priority for us.

But I think that I would have to look—again, I am not trying to get out of answering the question, Congressman, but I would have to look in detail about what is the capability that they are losing, what is it, and then we would have to do an analysis of what that does.

The concern I would have is sometimes these issues do not relate easily to a quantitative analysis, that there is nonquantitative aspects to our relationship with the world that are more difficult to come up with. They are easier to see, frankly, in the rearview mirror. That is when you see what has happened. But I just don't want to say something right now, sir, that I can't back up with some kind of homework that I have done already so I can give you some authoritative answers.

Mr. ROGERS. When you have time to reflect on that, we would like to hear from you.

Secretary MATTIS. Okay, sir.

BUDGETARY NUMBER

Mr. ROGERS. I have been dealing with these CRs and omnibuses now for many years. And we are headed straight into that rabbit patch again very quickly. I don't recollect a time later in the season that we have gone as far as we have this time. Here it is almost July 4th, and we are nowhere near coming up with a budgetary number that we can sit down and appropriate to on Appropriations Committee.

So I want to encourage you to talk with the White House people, especially OMB, and see if we can negotiate a number that we can appropriate to here on this subcommittee and the other 11. Otherwise, we are headed straight into a CR, with all that contains, or an omnibus, where we don't get what we need to get in defense.

So that is the dilemma that we are in, but it also is the dilemma that you are in. We need desperately a number that both sides have agreed to, and I am here to tell you that I think that is possible, but it does take some elbow work, and it takes some grease work, and it takes some effort.

But on this subcommittee, we understand completely your need for help, and we are there to give it to you. But our hands are tied until we get that number that we can all work under. So let me encourage you to work your magic with the budgeteers at the OMB and other places.

We appreciate your service, all of you. Thank you so much for dedicating your lives to our country. And we feel safe with you in the positions you are in.

I yield.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Visclosky.

NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Thank you very much.

I would just point out to the panel that my understanding is the deadline for the Department to have auditable results is the end of fiscal year 2017, which is fast approaching. I understand from the Under Secretary that that goal will absolutely be met, and I am counting on him.

What I would suggest, Mr. Secretary, is, if we can follow up with your office, as you know, I have an intense interest on the Nuclear Posture Review, the modernization program, and I appreciate your very thoughtful conversation in February. Too often I think people have an instinctive response that we need a triad forever. You suggested that you want to take a very serious look as to what it should be going forward.

I think when people think about the nuclear posture, they also think about nonproliferation, many of the programs being at the Department of Energy, but the third element, from my perspective, are those nonnuclear events or weapons that potentially trigger a nuclear event. Our country, others are working on hypersonic weapons. So we have unstable regimes that what will trigger their nuclear response, absent a nuclear attack of our own?

And I would appreciate sitting down with whoever you think is appropriate from the Department so that I have a clearer understanding and perhaps the chair and others on the subcommittee, how the Department works through preventing that from happening to the best of our Nation's ability, where it is not toe to toe, somebody launches first, but there is some event, there is that new weapons system that is just kinetic, nonnuclear, that triggers that nuclear event. I think it is a very serious issue, and I would like to have that conversation.

Secretary MATTIS. I will find the right people to bring up, sir. I understand the nature of your question, though, and I would just say that I had not put those in my thinking into the Nuclear Pos-

ture Review. So let me reconsider the guidance I have given them. We are working, obviously, the triad: should it be there, which weapon system should constitute each leg, and the nonproliferation. I need to look at this myself. After I get my head wrapped around it right, I will assign some people to come up and brief you and get your thoughts on this.

Mr. VISCLOSKY. I appreciate it, because I do think you have been very thoughtful on this.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. Cole.

NATIONAL SECURITY STRATEGY

Mr. COLE. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

Mr. Secretary and General Dunford, and Mr. Norquist, it is good to have all three of you here. I really thank you for your service. And, quite frankly, it speaks well of the President that you all were nominated in your respective positions and got such strong bipartisan support when the Senate considered you. So I appreciate that.

Second, I couldn't help but laugh, Mr. Secretary, when I read your now famous remark about your sleep habits. And I thought, well, all of us sleep a lot better right now if you happen to be an American thanks to you. So we are very grateful for that.

I want to echo a little bit of what has been said up here several times, because I don't think it can be said often enough. When we look at the approps process, and I focus a lot on that, at the end of the day, there are only one or two outcomes this year. We are either going to have a continuing resolution or we are going to have a negotiated bipartisan agreement. And as you have made crystal clear, the latter is much preferable to the former. And so I really want to emphasize that where my colleagues are concerned and, quite frankly, associate myself with some of my Democratic colleagues' remarks: If we don't get to a good number in the nondefense area, we will inevitably end up doing something that nobody on either side of the aisle wants to do, and that is present you with the kind of dilemma that you have outlined in front of you.

I think, at the end of this day, this committee will give you at least what you ask and probably more. But, again, if we don't get the process right, none of that will matter. You know, they can authorize everything all day long. Until we actually get the numbers where we can appropriate, things don't happen.

I do have a question. I know you are in the last part of really working on the National Security Strategy, and we look forward with a great deal of anticipation to looking at that. But I am curious if you believe—and this may be a little out of your lane. If you don't want to comment on it, that is perfectly fine with me. But some of us up here have been concerned for a long time about the lack of a new Authorization for Use of Force. We are really operating off things that go back to 2001, 2002, 2003. We are fighting a different enemy in a different place than we envisioned at that time.

Would it be helpful for Congress to explicitly have this sort of debate and come to these sorts of conclusions, obviously, with the

guidance from the administration, input from the administration and experts, or is that just a waste of time?

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, I don't believe it is a waste of time at all. The Chairman and I have talked at length about this in our private conversations, and the Congress making a statement like that would hearten our own troops. It would reassure our allies around the world. It would put America out front in terms of a united—or the consensus of the Congress that this is where you think we have to be committed.

I believe it is much preferable to leaving it to be argued about in bits and pieces over specific issues or troop strength or something like this. And the Chairman, I could have him comment, too, but he believes it sends a real statement, sir.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman.

General DUNFORD. Congressman, that is exactly the conversation we had. I think it would send a loud and unmistakable message to our young men and women that are deployed that the people at home in the form of the Congress support what they are doing. And it is a consensus about what they are doing, and what they are doing is important.

Mr. COLE. Well, thank you very much for that because I feel exactly the same way. I think it is a constitutional issue as well. And I think it means a lot when people of your stature tell us that it matters to the men and women that we have put in harm's way to do difficult things for us.

So, Madam Chairman, I would hope, while we all work hard, and I know we will, on getting the appropriate resources so that we have at least the administration's request and perhaps some more, that we also push our respective leadership on both sides of the aisle to stop avoiding a debate that needs to happen.

You know, I have actually worked with my friend, Mr. McGovern from Massachusetts, we probably don't see eye to eye on the issue, but we certainly see eye to eye on the importance of a resolution and a congressional statement. So I think that is part of our job ahead of us, too. It is not just to give you the resources, which we certainly need to do, but to make sure that you have got the clear lines of authority and the unequivocal support of the American people as you go about carrying out the mission we have asked you to do.

I am not going to take the rest of my time. I yield back. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. I certainly agree with you Mr. Cole.

Mr. Ryan.

U.S. ROLE IN THE WORLD

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate it.

I want to make a couple of points, and then have a question with regard to North Korea. One is we just got back from a trip: We were in Bahrain. We were in Norway. We were in Germany. We were in Spain. And as a guy from Youngstown, Ohio, it always inspires me to see the footprint of the young men and women who are under your command, that they take their responsibilities so very seriously. They are so well trained.

The point I want to make is that I don't think we do a good enough job of letting the American people know how important our role in the world is. When you are in the Persian Gulf, when you are in the Middle East, when you are in Europe, you are thinking about what we are doing in Eastern Europe with NATO, the American people just don't quite understand, I think, the prominence and the responsibilities that we carry. And part of that is losing the World War II generation, the people that were engaged in war and all the rest. So all of us—just to make a point because I think all of us need to think about, as we are having these discussions, how we communicate that to the average citizen that is in Gary, Indiana, or Youngstown, Ohio, how important it is for us to be engaged in the world, and you are on the front lines of that. So I wanted to make that point.

NORTH KOREA

Secondly, I would love for either Secretary Mattis or General Dunford to talk to us about North Korea generally. But, in particular, what does it look like should we have to make a decision in the next 12 to 18 months, if you look at the trajectory of where North Korea is going? We have got to come to some determination here about what we are going to do, and whether or not we are okay with them potentially getting the capabilities to be able to launch some attack, not just in U.S. interests, but potentially strike the United States.

I think it would be instructive for the American people to know, kind of not giving away state secrets or getting classified, but just what that would look like if there is a back and forth between, whether it is the United States or an ally that we have in the region, and North Korea, what happens in South Korea, what happens in Seoul, what happens to Japan? Because we hear a lot: Well, just bomb them; just take it out, take out their capabilities.

Can you just illustrate for us what that engagement looks like?

Secretary MATTIS. I can, Congressman Ryan. I would suggest that we will win. It will be a war more serious in terms of human suffering than anything we have seen since 1953. It will involve the massive shelling of an ally's capital, which is one of the most densely packed cities on Earth. It would be a war that fundamentally we don't want. And we would have our allies and us; we would win at great cost.

This is why in one of the most—the highest priority efforts that President Trump has directed, he has brought—invited the President of China to Mar-a-Lago. There were only two issues brought up in Mar-a-Lago, and this was one of them. It was that high a priority.

Secretary Tillerson has this as a priority. We are working through China to ensure that China understands that North Korea is today a strategic burden for them; it is not a strategic asset. And China has actually responded in some ways positively. You saw them vote last week for additional sanctions on North Korea, for example. And I think that we are exhausting all possible diplomatic efforts in this regard.

Next week, Secretary Tillerson and I will meet with our opposite members from Beijing who are flying here to Washington over sev-

eral issues, but this one will loom large. So it would be a serious—it would be a catastrophic war, especially for innocent people in some of our allied countries, to include Japan most likely, but it is also one that we are doing everything possible not to have happen and resolve this through diplomatic means.

ADDITIVE MANUFACTURING

Mr. RYAN. I appreciate that. Thank you.

Just, lastly, one point. When we were in Kuwait a few weeks back, we went to this small little tent where they had 3D printers, and the Marine Corps was printing parts for different things that they needed. I want to engage the Department in the future to make sure that you have the resources that you need. This could be a tremendous capability. But one of the aspects is they almost need like a depot for how to get these parts, get the kind of design, a design depot, to be able to download these parts in places like Kuwait to really, I think, save us a lot of money, Madam Chair. And I know we are putting money into one of President Obama's initiatives for manufacturing innovation institutes, one of which is additive manufacturing, a great capability where you don't have to order a thousand parts of this, that or the other; you can actually print one in the field. And this is a way for us to merge modern technology, to give the warfighter the capabilities that they need. So I just wanted to give you the heads-up. We are going to continue to work on that and I think save the taxpayer a heck of a lot of money in the process. Thank you so much.

Ms. GRANGER. Mrs. Roby.

STRATEGIC DECISIONS AND DEFENSE BUDGET

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you all for being here today. We have learned a lot, and we appreciate your service to our country and that of your families. So, please, pass that along as well.

Secretary Mattis, throughout much of your military career, it was the National Security Strategy of our country to have the ability to fight and win two major conflicts simultaneously. And over time, that strategy has changed to a strategy of being able to win one significant conflict in one theater while having the ability to hold in another until additional resources could be brought to the fight.

Accordingly, Congress has appropriated the necessary resources for force structure, procurement, and research and development to reach those strategic objectives. Today, with the rising threats all over the world, many of which we have already discussed here today, I am concerned that, should a conflict break out in one region, that our adversaries in other regions may use that as an opportunity to take aggressive military action.

At the end of the day, with the President's budget we are discussing today, how capable will we be to simultaneously fight two major conflicts should that become necessary?

Secretary MATTIS. Implementing this budget, Congresswoman, will enable us to be better prepared for this. That is not to say strategic decisions wouldn't have to be made once engaged. And we do assume, however, that—we agree with your thesis that, in the event we are doing something in one place, the potential for some-

body to take advantage of it is a given. So we are completely aligned with you on that.

You can see us right now engaged in Afghanistan, not in a heavy way. The Afghan Army is carrying the bulk of the fighting, but it is still a significant draw on us. You see us engaged in the Middle East in the same way. And we are doing an awful lot of this by, with, and through allies, but your question go to the heart of, what if we have to do most of it? And this budget is designed to better prepare us, but it is going to take years to recover from all the damage, ma'am.

Mrs. ROBY. Thank you.

General DUNFORD. Congresswoman, I would just add, as directed last year, we did a simultaneity drill in the Department so we could understand what really it would take to do two MCOs. We certainly wouldn't want to have that conversation in this venue. But we would be happy to share the details of that with you. We have done the analytic work necessary to really be able to talk about the capabilities and capacity implications of being able to fight in two places at once. And that will very much inform the Secretary's strategy review that is ongoing right now. We will bring that work into the Secretary's strategy review.

ARMY AVIATION AND READINESS

Mrs. ROBY. Well, I would like that. I think we could probably all benefit from having that information in front of us.

Turning to readiness, specifically Army aviation. Of course, our military doesn't go many places without Army aviators. And my concern is that those aviation assets are being stretched pretty thin. Given the global high demand for Army aviation capabilities, I am interested in your thoughts as it relates to increasing readiness.

It is my understanding that we have a shortage of pilots. I know we are short on Apache helicopters, and programs like the Light Utility Helicopter look to be underfunded. So what are your thoughts on increasing Army aviation readiness?

Secretary MATTIS. Since near the end of World War II, we have dominated the skies overhead, almost to the point that we could start taking it for granted, which would be a disaster if we did that. It takes a lot of commitment, sacrifice over many years. There is, for Army aviation alone, over $3 billion in investment. This is building more Black Hawks, Apaches, Chinooks, that sort of thing.

The Chief of Staff of the Air Force and the Chief of Naval Operations, Commandant of the Marine Corps are all working with private industry now because we are not creating enough pilots in this environment right now to serve either the commercial or security interests, service interests. So we are going to have to deal with this as a national level problem. And, you know, we have responded to this sort of thing in the past. We have to dust off the old thinking and find some new ideas in there. But we are working it right now. We just had the meeting with industry here last month with, again, General Goldfein, our Chief of Staff of the Air Force, leading it, but all the service chiefs are engaged.

Mrs. ROBY. Okay. Thank you.

I yield back.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.
Ms. Kaptur.
Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. I think I was next.
Ms. GRANGER. Oh. Mr. Ruppersberger. Pardon me.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Thank you very much. First, Secretary Mattis, or General Mattis, I respect you and worked with you as a General, General Dunford and also Mr. Norquist. You know, you have gotten a lot of accolades, and you deserve it because of who you are and you earned the position. We all talk about sleeping at night, but these are serious times for our country.

I want to quote you, because I am going to make more of a statement, I think, to this committee and to our leadership on the committee. You have said that Congress has failed to show leadership when it comes to funding the Pentagon, and I agree with you on that comment. For years now, since sequestration has passed, we have had four-stars coming in and telling us how it makes it weaker and weaker. And, yet, we really have not done what we need to do to repeal it, both Democrats and Republicans.

Times have changed since sequestration was passed; the world has gotten a lot more dangerous, as you have testified. By the way, when you are one of the last ones to ask questions, you know, a lot of these issues, North Korea and all, have come up. So I am going to maybe make a statement within my time.

And I want to say this to our committee: A lot of us have worked together for years, and I respect each and every one of you on the Republican and Democratic side. But there comes a time when we have to do something, and that is this issue of sequestration. As dangerous as we are and when every single Army, Navy, Air Force, Marine talks about sequestration, and, yet, we have not repealed this at these very, very dangerous times. And I think we have to show some action. I think we can't be concerned about Republican or Democrat or whether we are going to break the Hastert rule. I mean, all of these things are just political, and yet we have an obligation on this committee, Defense Appropriations, to give you the resources. And if sequestration is still there because of idealistic political reasons, whatever that is, or we are not going to give this up if we don't get something else, that is wrong.

So I am asking our leadership and each and every one of us on this committee to really sit down and work a strategy, Republican and Democratic strategy. Now, we are very upset about what happened yesterday. Maybe that is going to be an impetus for us to do something, because we haven't done it, and it is about time we do it.

And my question was going to be, and you have already repeated it: Do you agree with what I said that we need to repeal sequestration?

Secretary MATTIS. I do. And I agree it is nonpartisan. Secretary Panetta was my boss a few years ago, and he was in a Democrat administration. He was a Democrat. And I don't see this as a partisan issue. This is an American issue.

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Whether it is the Speaker or the leader, whatever that is, let's pull together this committee. We know each

other, and we trust each other. I have respect for every single member on this committee, and I know we all feel this way. Let's just get it done. I am an Under Armour guy because of Baltimore, but there is the Nike phrase, "Just Do It." And I think it is about time we really just sit down and take care of that strategy.

NORTH KOREA

The other issue I have—and we have talked North Korea, and I don't want you to repeat yourself—one thing that hasn't come up. I found the subject matter that hasn't come up, and that is the issue of hypersonic missiles. We know that Russia and China have developed hypersonic missiles, which are so fast that they could put, in my opinion, our ships, our aircraft carriers, all at risk. And I am not sure where the Navy is at that point, and if it is classified, I don't want to get into it. But I think this is something that has to be focused on and very quickly.

CYBER SECURITY

You know, we talked about cyber. We are dealing with those issues and all the things that need to be done. But when our aircraft carriers, which are so awesome—look at how many people we have, look at how we use them, and yet they could be at risk. And I want to make sure that we look at the funding and the focus, and that you can report back to this committee where we are on our defense and hypersonic missiles.

Secretary MATTIS. Will do, Congressman. And coming into the job, I have been briefed by holdovers from the last administration and new people coming in now, and your view of the hypersonic threat, the need for defenses, but also to ensure we have hypersonic technology at cutting edge is agreed upon. There is no pushback on it that I found. We have got to move out—we will come back to you showing——

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Most people don't know about the issue, but I would like this, at least personally for me, but I think the committee, too, wants to hear about hypersonic.

Thank you, I yield back.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you. Mr. Carter.

COMBAT VEHICLES

Mr. CARTER. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

And thank all three of you for being here. You are very important to the future of our Nation and we appreciate the good work that you do. And I would like to associate myself with everyone who has discussed the challenges we have trying to put together what we need to do without a number that we need to work with. And anyway you could help us get that fixed is a great idea.

My world is all about the guys on the ground. I represent Fort Hood. I have got kind of a combination question I would like to ask. First and foremost, Secretary Mattis, they are obviously investing very heavily in upgrading many of the combat vehicles. While these upgrades certainly represent increased speed, lethality, and protection, they cannot be characterized as significant leaps forward in capability. As you are aware, our competitors' combat

vehicles are approaching parity with the Army. It seems readily apparent that we should prioritize investing heavily to speed up the development of the next generation of combat vehicles, yet funding levels for this effort has not increased over the last several years.

NATIONAL TRAINING CENTER

Can you share with the committee your sense of our ground combat vehicles and what additional resources you need from this committee to adequately close the capability gap? And I will include with that that I would like to hear an assessment of where we are—of what are the training changes we have to make at the National Training Center to go to high-end warfighting versus the warfighting we have been engaged in for 16 years almost.

So where are we on readiness of our troops, training, and the vehicles that we are sending them to war in? And I would love to hear from both of you.

Secretary MATTIS. Yes, sir. And we probably owe you a more detailed explanation of the program to get us where we need to go, because we are not there today is the bottom line. This is somewhat a result of the funding issues and the distraction of war and the combination of those factors. But we have programs we have put together. The Joint Lightweight Tactical Vehicle is being fielded now to the first Army and Marine units. It is a joint program to get full economies of scale to spend the money wisely. But it is a much broader issue, as you know, with different types of vehicles, from armored vehicles to transport vehicles, and the various levels—types of vehicles that we need to get.

In terms of the training challenges, I will hit that and then turn the two questions to The Chairman. There, what we have to do is adapt to the changing character of war, and Army battalions in the field are now going to have assets that an Army battalion didn't have 10 years ago, for example, surveillance assets, drones. We also have an enemy drone problem, where we don't have the right defenses. Every Army battalion headquartered out there is probably going to come under cyber attack. That didn't happen 10, 20 years ago.

So these new domains, these new technologies highlight the need to avoid a continuing resolution. As you know, under a continuing resolution, I can do zero about new starts to address the changing character of war. Let me turn over to the Chairman.

General DUNFORD. Congressman, you bring up a really important point, and I alluded to it in my opening statement, and that is, I think it is fair to say that the majority of our investment—and if you look at the Army's investment in 2017, even in the supplemental—it was all to maintain the current capability we have. So we made marginal improvements in the capability protection system of the current tanks, for example, but we don't necessarily have as much money in modernizing our armored capability as we would want to have.

And that really is, as the Secretary lays it out, I mean 2018 hits readiness, to include for vehicles. And what we really need to start thinking about, 2019 and beyond, is tomorrow. And we have, for the last 7 or 8 years, one of the most significant challenges of the budget situation, we have discussed here today is we are always

dealing with the current challenges, always dealing with today's readiness, always trying to get today's equipment up to speed.

And now we are at the point where there is actually a distinction without a difference between procurement and current readiness because, in many cases, either units don't have the full complement of the vehicles they have or we are starting to field vehicles that don't have a competitive advantage or the competitive advantage, as you suggest, is reducing. So I think as we look to 2019 and beyond, you know modernizing our ground combat vehicles is something that probably hasn't moved at a pace satisfactory to us.

With regard to training, though, what General Milley has identified as now a requirement, I think your word, Congressman, is all of his brigades will go through the National Training Center. That is exactly to address the dynamic that you spoke about to make sure that we are not only prepared for the current deployments in dealing with violent extremism, but we are full-spectrum ready and that the Army units at Fort Hood, the mechanized units at Fort Hood actually can conduct the full range of mission-essential tasks that those units have been assigned. And he won't certify those brigades as being ready unless they actually have done an NTC rotation. And in this budget in 2018, in the readiness piece, we are addressing increased numbers of NTC rotations to enhance the readiness problem you talked about.

So I think we have a good-news story on maintenance and readiness. I think we have a good-news story on training. And I think the challenge that remains before us to address next year and years after is going to be the modernization challenge because I'm not satisfied that we are actually doing all we can to build the Army of tomorrow.

Mr. CARTER. Thank you. From what little I have been able to figure out, I agree with that assessment and I am worried about it and concerned about it. And I want to make sure we all know that, when the smoke clears, it takes a man with a gun to stop a man with a gun. In fact, we learned that yesterday.

So I wish you well. And I will be raising this issue constantly. Thank you.

I yield back.

Ms. GRANGER. Ms. Kaptur.

INDUSTRIAL BASE

Ms. KAPTUR. Thank you.

Gentlemen, you give great example to the young generation of this country. I thank you for your patriotic service. I am going to read some questions that I will be submitting to the record, and then I will ask each of you two questions that I would like you to verbally respond to. I don't expect you to answer the first issues I am going to talk about.

First of all, I have deep concerns about our industrial base issues, and your testimony does reference that to some extent. I would just like to state the importance of dual sourcing of certain technologies, such as small gas turbine engines. I have concern about that.

Number two, stresses on our U.S. steel industry due to the severe dumping by China, South Korea and Russia.

And, thirdly, real threats to our single-source domestic beryllium capability. I have a letter, actually, on that, Mr. Secretary, that I will give you.

But thank you for mentioning the defense industrial base. Thanks for being aware of it and, in view of a lot of things that have happened with the global economy, why we need to pay attention to it.

Number two, I place a very high priority on U.S. energy independence. We are about 90 percent of the way there. I appreciate what DOD has been doing, particularly Navy and Marine Corps, with significant leadership, both in installation and operational energy efficiency, to move us toward independence. And I will ask you, for the record, to summarize the Department's role in achieving DOD energy independence but also in terms of some of your technological investments, how you are helping America reach that broader goal of energy independence.

My two questions are: General Dunford, three-quarters of a century after World War II, could you summarize for the American people, particularly the younger generation, the nature of the Russian threat and why the European Reassurance Initiative is so vital to liberty and affirmation of our Article 5 commitment.

Secretary Mattis, the question I wish to ask you is: I really particularly gravitated to a sentence in your testimony having to do with the stresses on our troops and the prolonged wars in which we are involved. And I can't seem to put my finger on the sentence on that, but it was right at the beginning. Oh, here: "Our country never envisioned sending our military to war for more than a decade without pause or conscription." The American people ought to reread that sentence.

HEALTH BENEFITS

But my question really is, Mr. Secretary, the GAO released a study on May 16, reporting that of the 91,764 servicemembers who were separated for misconduct between 2011 and 2015, had later been diagnosed with PTSD or TBI, associated with that misconduct, GAO found many, many of them, at least 23 percent, were made ineligible for health benefits from the VA. I would like to just express to you that I have spent a long time trying to get DOD to discharge to care. I have failed in that, though it is getting a little bit better. And I would ask you if you could help us to review the separation policies of the U.S. military in all the branches to assure that servicemembers who need care will receive it. I will also place on the record from a 10-year study we have been conducting with the Ohio Guard and Case Western Reserve University and University of Michigan and University of Toledo, over 3,000 DNA samples from separated servicemembers who voluntarily offered their DNA.

One of the most shocking findings of what we have been investigating has been that the most significant predictor of a servicemember contracting PTSD is not military service but violence experienced by that individual prior to military service which the military service complicates. That is a really important finding and one that should be paid attention to on enlistment. And I just thought I would place it on the record.

So, General Dunford, if you could kindly respond on the Russia question and, Secretary Mattis, on the ability of your Department to discharge to care.

General DUNFORD. Congressman, first, thanks.

And on the Russia question, interesting, we rewrote our National Military Strategy last year, and we took some time to say, what is the source of strength of the United States? And not a surprise to the committee, we went back and we said: Since World War II, the strategic source of strength to the United States is the network of allies and partners that we have built up since World War II. In other words, the friends that we have that we can call upon for a wide range of common challenges is what is critical.

What Russia really is going about doing each and every day is undermining the credibility of our alliance commitment to NATO and our ability to respond to NATO. That is what they are doing. That is the most insidious thing that Russia is doing. So why is it important that we have the European Reassurance Initiative?

First of all, we had an expression in the past that virtual presence is actual absence. It has to be a physical manifestation of our commitment, and the European Reassurance Initiative, which this year is $4.8 billion, gives us three brigade combat teams on a continuous basis in Europe. It gives us additional preposition equipment.

Most importantly, what it does is it assures our allies that we actually are committed, and it deters Russia because they know we have the ability to respond, and they also know that we are committed, which is the linkage between the European Reassurance Initiative and the challenge that we face from Russia.

But in addition to what they do to undermine the credibility of our alliances, of course, Russia possesses the nuclear weapons in the thousands that can destroy our Nation. They also have significant cyber capabilities, and they have been using those on a routine basis against our networks, and we have seen that. So there is a full range of challenges. And I would just say that, in terms of capability as well as behavior, if you look at what Russia has done since the Crimea in the Ukraine and testing Georgia a few years ago, both their behavior and their capabilities would tell me that, of all the nations in the world that could pose an existential threat to our Nation and that could undermine the credibility of our alliances and the international order that we have had and enjoyed since World War II, it would be Russia.

Ms. GRANGER. Before we go further in this—Ms. Kaptur, you used the entire 5 minutes for your question, and we have a hard stop at 11:50. So I am going to ask those on our panel today to answer that in writing or some meeting of Ms. Kaptur, because we have others that are waiting. Thank you.

Mr. Aderholt.

NORTH KOREA

Mr. ADERHOLT. Thank you.

Secretary Mattis, Chairman Dunford, Under Secretary Norquist, welcome, glad to have you here today. And we appreciate your service to our Nation and know that you will pass along that grati-

tude to the men and women who will work throughout the Department of Defense.

I want to follow up on a question that my colleague, Mr. Ryan, had asked. If you go back to Operation Iraqi Freedom, the first 3 days from March 19, 20, and 21 of 2003, 1,700 sorties were launched, including 504 cruise missile strikes.

We all appreciate the candor that a war with North Korea would pose a severe threat to Seoul and, of course, to a lot of most South Korea. However, the concern is that this may be interpreted by North Korea to mean that we are going to allow them to continue to build weapons that are capable of dropping nuclear bombs here on the U.S. territory. If North Korea fails to curb the program and the President were to decide to strike, my question is, are we assembling the resources that we need to cripple the North Korean military in the first 72 hours?

Secretary MATTIS. Our intent, if we had an indicator and warning of war, would be to assemble those resources, sir.

Mr. ADERHOLT. What do you need in order to do that to prevent just mass civilian casualties?

Secretary MATTIS. The best thing, sir, would be to have such a strong military and diplomatic front, including international, that we force Korea to divest of its nuclear program, a policy that both the United States and China share, by the way, of a denuclearized peninsula. So that is the most important thing, is to make certain we don't get to that point.

Mr. ADERHOLT. But you have—currently, do you have the capabilities to assemble the resources that you would need to cripple North Korea within that first 72 hours?

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, due to the nature of the threat, the dug-in nature of the artillery and missile—or our rocket positions within range of Seoul, there is probably an awful lot of damage that is going to be done no matter how much capability we bring to the theater.

CYBER ATTACKS ON POWER GRIDS

Mr. ADERHOLT. Okay. A report was released recently that highlighted the potential for adversaries to conduct cyber attacks on power grids. The article referenced the attack on Ukraine's power grid back in December of 2016. I know this may be classified, but is this area of cybersecurity an area that you are looking at?

Secretary MATTIS. It is an active, very active, area of security we are looking at, sir, in conjunction with Homeland Security—Department of Homeland Security and the Department of Energy and the FBI. And it is active. It is ongoing. We keep a very close eye on it, including this week.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Chairman Dunford, do you have any comments on either one of those issues?

General DUNFORD. The only thing I would say, Congressman, is just go through the priorities and talk about what we do with regard to those challenges to our power grid and so forth. The number one priority we have in the Department is to defend our own DOD information technology network, and then we work in collaboration with the private and public sector to make sure that we

share when there is a vulnerability and the solutions to those vulnerabilities.

Then we play the away game, if you will, and prepare to deal with those threats that are outside the continental United States. So, when the Secretary spoke about the collaboration with the FBI and Homeland Security and so forth, the actual protection of the power grid in the United States is not something that we are responsible for but something we support.

Again, when the United States CYBERCOM identifies vulnerabilities or solutions to address those vulnerabilities, there is a collaboration that takes place. But what we really focus on is our own network and then making sure we have cyber capabilities to take the fight to the enemy.

Mr. ADERHOLT. Thank you.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. Cuellar.

REGIONAL STRATEGY AND AERIAL RESOURCES

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

I also want to say thank you to all three of you for your service. I also join my colleagues that we need to get to a number in a bipartisan way, because we have to find that balance between the defense and the nondefense spending, and I hope we can do this. Otherwise, if we going to CR, I think it is not good for anybody.

I have two questions. Earlier you all had discussed the importance of a regional strategy and aerial resources to the maintaining of the high ground on the operations of Afghanistan.

General Dunford, I know that, in February, you were in Azerbaijan meeting with your counterpart of this year, and I think we know it is a—Azerbaijan is an ally. I think we know the role that they played during the Afghanistan conflict there. Would you all give us—would you give me your thoughts on elevating maybe the facility that you have there in Azerbaijan or maybe some other stable regional ally there, because we know that the Middle East is complicated, and sometimes our ally provides complicated situations to us. That is question number one.

READINESS OF FLIGHT TRAINING UNITS

Number two, in light of the discussion of readiness, can you also discuss the importance of maintenance in supporting force readiness? Specifically, the readiness of flight training units have suffered in Texas because of an incomplete approach to the engine maintenance, and how does your proposed budget attempt to fix this deficiency?

General DUNFORD. Sure, Congressman, let me start with Azerbaijan. As you mentioned, I was there back in February and had the privilege of meeting with their leadership, to include the President, and to thank him for the support they provided in what we call a northern distribution network. We were able to reinforce and resupply our forces in Afghanistan as a result of the access that Azerbaijan provided to us.

And I don't assess today that we need to increase that access. But we appreciate maintaining that access because it has been critical in allowing us to have global reach. And certainly our United

States Transportation Command has a very close partnership with Azerbaijan, and they are very appreciative of the access and the support that we have. And we would like to maintain that relationship.

With regard to readiness, you will see in the Secretary's budget a significant emphasis overall on readiness, a subset of which is the maintenance issue. But, Congressman, I would like to highlight for you an important point. Back in 2013, when we went through sequestration, we laid off a lot of engineers and a lot of artisans and a lot of people that are very critical to maintaining our aircraft. They are critical to the triage of aircraft and identifying what repairs need to be done and making sure in a very systematic way we get the right aircraft in the depot at the right time to turn it around with an acceptable timeline.

We have not recovered from 2013, and many of the people that were laid off as a result of sequestration in 2013 never came back. So the challenge that we have with aviation maintenance—and it is across all the services—the challenge that we have in aviation maintenance can only be fixed—this is another argument for all of us collectively for having sustainable budgets, because we need to have sustainable budgets to recruit and retain a high-quality workforce. And when we talked about civilian workforce earlier, we are very reliant, as you know, in our depots, for a quality civilian force and the right people to work on our aircraft. And predictable budgets and a stable workforce are going to be critical for us to get out of this maintenance trough.

In many cases, what you see is units that actually aren't able to man or unable to field the requisite number of aircraft for that particular unit, for—we call it Primary Aircraft Authorized. In some cases, they rate 12; they only have 6. They rate 20, and they only have 10. So the budget does address the maintenance issue. We are trying to recover from, really, what has happened over the last 3 to 4 years and appreciate your support and focus on that issue.

Mr. CUELLAR. Thank you.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. GRANGER. Thank you.

Mr. Womack.

CONTINUING RESOLUTION

Mr. WOMACK. Thank you. I just got a couple of questions or give you an opportunity to expound just a little bit. As my friend Tom Cole said earlier in his testimony, we are rapidly moving to one of two outcomes in the fiscal year 2018 budget process and appropriations process. We are either going to have a bipartisan omnibus package of some type or we are going to end up with a CR. CR is disastrous.

I want to give both of you an opportunity to—at the risk of sounding like I am piling on the sequester—give us a real idea of what this means if we are headed toward a potential continuing resolution with significant limitations on how we can fund the emerging needs that have been emerging now for a while at the Pentagon.

Secretary MATTIS. Thank you, Congressman.

Just for an example, we cannot do the new starts. So why is that so critical today? Because the changing character of war, which this committee has articulated repeatedly this morning—cyber warfare, space issues, I can go on, counterdrone capability—we cannot start that. We cannot start new starts under the continuing resolution.

We also block service growth. For example, we cannot enlist people in the United States Army, and they need more soldiers; we all recognize that. The world has changed. But if we don't know how we are going to pay them a year from now, the only way we could respond if we didn't have the money next year, if we brought more troops in, for example, if a CR comes into effect, is we have to take the money from operations and maintenance. Now the troops, you are paying them using the money that should have been fixing their gear.

I think, too, just look at—what business would say, "We are going to do short-term contracts, repeated contracts now that we are going to have to put a lot of time into"—you know how extensive government contracts are to prevent any fraud, waste or abuse—"and we are now going to do the same contract for a 3-month period or for a 6-month period"? We get nothing more out of it. We simply pay. We double, triple, quadruple the administrative costs that deliver no combat capability whatsoever. In other words, it did not only cost us adaptation; it actually reduces the result, the effect we can get from the dollars you give us. It goes into administrative air; it doesn't go into combat capability on the ground.

SEQUESTRATION

Mr. WOMACK. And it goes on and on and on, this impact of the sequester, and so what—and I am on the Budget Committee with other members of the Appropriations Committee. So what is the right number for 2018? That seems to be where we are hung out to dry right now in terms of getting a budget agreement out of the Budget Committee and onto the floor of the House.

We certainly know it is not the sequester number, which I believe is 549 on the base. Is it 603? Is it 640 that HASC wants? Is it somewhere in between? Where is that number, so that people like me can have an informed idea of what is possible out of committee?

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, I am going to give you a number: $52 billion over the BCA defense cap. It is $574 billion in our base budget. It is $65 billion in our OCO. But there is also, if you were to go above that, I think our priorities are right in everything that we have given you, but I have reviewed the service secretaries unfunded priorities list, and I agree with the priorities they give if we go beyond the base budget numbers I have given you. In other words, that too is an area where the Congress can exercise its oversight and its purse strings, frankly.

But, right now, the President's budget, which I am defending and I believe is the right step to fix, to reverse—start reversing the damage and get us on the right track as we get a strategy right, is 574 in the base, 65 in the OCO, and there is about $33 billion in the service unfunded priorities lists, sir.

Mr. WOMACK. How impactful is sequester on your planners at the Pentagon, particularly for the FYDP, because when you do your FYDP, you have to look at what current law is, correct?

Secretary MATTIS. We do, sir. We have placeholders as we look further out because we all know that we cannot defend this country unless we withdraw from many of our commitments that we have learned over the years we need to protect our people and our interests. So, right now, it is paralyzing.

Mr. WOMACK. One final thought before my time is up. Impact on the defense industrial base is also something we don't spend a lot of time talking about.

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, the industrial base cannot be expanded to bring us when we know we need more munitions, for example, if they don't know 3 months from now or 9 months from now that they are going to still get a contract for it. In other words, they can't do something that would put the company out of business just on a bet. And so you are highlighting all of our concerns, I will just tell you, sir.

Mr. WOMACK. Yeah, before I yield back, I just want to say we have to fix the issue or else we are going to be right back where we were, and that is with a yearlong CR, and that would just be a disaster.

I yield back.

Ms. GRANGER. Let me clarify one thing.

Mr. Womack, on the numbers that you gave, you also included military construction in that, right? So it is not just our bill; it is the MILCON?

Secretary MATTIS. Yes, ma'am. It is. It is in there, the MILCON.

CLOSING REMARKS OF CHAIRMAN GRANGER

Ms. GRANGER. Okay. Thank you. Thank you. That finishes the question.

I want you to just go away with understanding how much confidence we have in you. You have experience. You are in a position, and so we are—we have great confidence in what you say and what you stand for, but we also have great concerns about readiness. Are we ready—how much damage those cuts have done to us.

We have a concern that we share with you, and that is a continuing resolution, and it is just deadly. It is a horrible situation. And we can't get to what you need with a continuing resolution. So any way you can reach out. You have such presence. People respect you. They look to you for the answers. They have to understand that. If you will reach out to those that are on the committees in both the House and the Senate that are on the committees, the four committees that make these decisions, it would make the possibilities much better.

That concludes today's meeting. Thank you very much.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—Questions submitted by Mr. Aderholt and the answers thereto follow:]

HYPERSONIC WEAPONS SYSTEMS

WITNESS: DUNFORD, JOSEPH

Question. I have long been a supporter of offensive, hypersonic weapons systems. However, our efforts have remained at the research level rather than a true pro-

gram. Our Combatant Commanders have expressed a need for this capability against enemy air defenses, and General Milley before this subcommittee also confirmed the need for this weapon. I don't believe the current budget justification documents create the program we need; I believe the range in the 2013 JROC document is too limited. A land-based system which launches from U.S. territory is needed. Could you please provide a budget outline which would support a limited, early operational capability as soon as possible, and would you consult with General Milley and the Army SMDC to see what that timeline could be?

Answer. The Joint Staff supports hypersonic weapon system development and the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC) recently revalidated the requirements for a Prompt Global Strike capability. The Joint Staff will continue to work with and support the Services to provide a limited or early operational capability within the FYDP, to include exploring basing options for new and existing systems.

TRANSGENDER TROOPS

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. I understand that the Army and Marine Corps have asked for up to a 2-year delay on implementation of the policies regarding transgender troops and the Transgender Training sessions required for all officers, non-commissioned officers, and civilians. While I understand concerns for fairness and related matter, I believe these policies may have been unnecessarily rushed by the previous Administration. Readiness must be your top priority. On a related matter, I also urge you to block any consideration of gender transition therapy requests by detainees at Guantanamo. I don't believe that this is a justifiable use of our taxpayer funds. Are you willing to strongly consider such a delay?

Answer. The Marine Corps supports the Department of Defense Policy regarding Transgender Marines and associated training.

SPACE LAUNCH SYSTEM

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. Let's assume that the NASA fully covers the development costs of the Space Launch System, or SLS. In the event that other launch vehicles are behind schedule or have gone up dramatically in cost, does the SLS present an opportunity for the Department of Defense to launch some of our large national security payloads? B. If NASA creates a production model which allows SLS to be sold on a lower cost basis, are you willing to look at SLS as an occasional launch vehicle for national security payloads?

Answer. The Department of Defense (DoD) does not have any current requirement for this large payload space lift capability. For the most common payload separation orbits, all variants of the SLS provide significantly (at least three times, and upwards of nine times) more capability than operationally required to meet current DoD requirements. Additionally, public law and National Space Policy dictate that the DoD must procure launch services from the commercial marketplace when practicable. The DoD does not have any current requirements that cannot be met with current launch services provided by commercial sources.

SPACE X

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. What are the terms of the lawsuit settlement between the Department of Defense and SpaceX? (SpaceX sued the Air Force over an alleged lack of opportunity to compete). B. Were a specific number of sole-source launches provided to SpaceX as part of the settlement?

Answer. The terms of the lawsuit settlement between the Department of Defense and SpaceX cannot be released due to the confidentiality order of the United States Court of Federal Claims, No. 14–354 C, filed January 23, 2015.

FRIGATE PRODUCTION

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. I believe the distributed lethality concept is more important than ever in locations which involve littoral waters, and that a hybrid ship order would provide stability to the shipyards and an opportunity to test new systems and compo-

nents prior to full-blown Frigate production. Please provide your view on that possibility, and the likely budget needed.

Answer. To allow adequate time to define Frigate (FFG(X)) requirements, thoroughly evaluate design alternatives and mature the design, the Presidents Budget (PB) 2018 submission defers the first year of FFG(X) procurement to Fiscal Year (FY) 2020 with additional Littoral Combat Ships (LCS) being procured in FY 2018 and FY 2019. This approach keeps both LCS shipyards viable ahead of the pending FFG(X) competition, allowing the Navy to leverage past and current investments in our shipyard workforce and infrastructure. The Navy is already pursuing opportunities to forward fit and back fit some FFG(X) capabilities onto LCS to further increase the lethality and survivability of those platforms. Increased magazine protection and shock hardening of auxiliaries along with the addition of a lightweight tow, and space and weight for the Over-The-Horizon Weapon System (OTH–WS) are separately priced options in the Request for Proposal for the three FY 2017 LCS. As the Navy is currently in negotiations for the three FY 2017 LCS, details regarding the cost of those options cannot be provided in accordance with federal regulations. The Navy is also in source selection for OTH–WS which will provide added offensive capabilities to the LCS. The PB 2018 submission includes $8.4M to initiate ship engineering work to include design configuration and installation planning for the LCS platforms. The submission also identifies OTH–WS procurement ($42.3M) and in-service fleet support funding ($15.9M) through the Future Years Defense Plan (FYDP) for the weapon system.

FY 2019 TO FY 2023 FUNDING LEVELS

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. Secretary Mattis, you mentioned a Defense Strategy to determine Defense funding levels for FY 2019 to FY 2023. Do you have a timeframe on when those numbers will be available? Your report on those estimates will be important to this body if we consider repealing or lifting BCA Caps.

Answer. The National Defense Strategy is ongoing and will direct resourcing requirements for the FY 2019–2023 Future Years Defense Program. Funding levels and resourcing decisions will be worked closely with the Office of Management and Budget in preparation for the FY 2019 President's Budget Submission to Congress in February 2018.

EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. Your FY 2018 budget request contains a 40 percent increase in funding for the European Reassurance Initiative. Does this funding pay for equipment, weapons, and systems software for our allied partners? If so, is there funding allocated for maintaining and servicing those items?

Answer. The vast majority of the Department's FY 2018 European Reassurance Initiative request focused on increasing U.S. readiness and responsiveness through increased presence, expanded exercises, and prepositioning of wartime equipment and stocks. The United States prefers to use other programs and authorities, such as Foreign Military Sales and Foreign Military Financing, to provide Allies and partners with equipment, weapons, and systems software. This year, Congress added ERI funding to increase Ukraine's ability to defend its sovereign territory. ERI support to Ukraine will include assistance with command and control capabilities; counter-battery radars; training, equipping, and employment of forces; comprehensive logistics; and advisory efforts.

EUROPEAN ALLIES

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. I think that the European Reassurance Initiative is critically important to deter potential Russian aggression. There was a unit from the California National Guard here recently and they discussed some of the challenges in training their Ukrainian counterparts. These challenges ranged from the Ukrainian forces not having a formalized enlistment and training program, to not having the proper systems to account for personnel and to pay their Soldiers. So, I am interested in how the Department of Defense is assessing the capabilities of our European allies as we continue to rotate units into the European theater. Is there a one to two-page product on each of the allied partner forces that you can provide that gives us a

snapshot of their capabilities, strengths, weaknesses, their overall level of readiness?

Answer. The Department, both unilaterally and in conjunction with Allies, continuously assesses the capabilities, strengths, weaknesses, and overall readiness of our Allies. These assessments are often voluminous and contain classified information. The Department does not produce one- or two page unclassified summaries of these assessments, however my staff would be happy to provide a classified briefing on these matters at your convenience.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Mr. Aderholt. Questions submitted by Mr. Visclosky and the answers thereto follow:]

OVERPRESSURE INJURIES

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. How concerned are your service chiefs about overpressure injuries and what actions are you taking to mitigate exposure to your personnel in the field and training environments? B. Who in your organization is responsible for this occupational hazard? C. It took roughly 40 years of personalized radiation measurement to fully understand the effects of exposure. Measurement was the necessary first step to understanding dose response. Is this a similar situation? Why not deploy blast overpressure surveillance to at least begin to capture the data? D. DARPA has recommended expanding the fielding of the gauge because it "ensures timely evaluation and treatment of TBI." How many of our men and women are using the gauges in the field or in training? Do high-risk units have access to the devices? How many devices have been purchased and where are they today?

Answer. A. How concerned are your service chiefs about overpressure injuries and what actions are you taking to mitigate exposure to your personnel in the field and training environments? Air Force leadership is concerned about the health and safety of all our Airmen and strives to institute appropriate engineering, administrative, or personal protective equipment controls where the evidence supports their effectiveness in preventing workplace injury and illness, regardless of the type of exposure encountered. B. Who in your organization is responsible for this occupational hazard? The Air Force Medical Service's Aerospace Medicine community is responsible for the medical aspects of the occupational health and safety program. They identify and measure workplace hazards and conduct associated medical surveillance of at-risk service members. Numerous medical and line responsibilities are enumerated within DoD Instruction 6490.11, DoD Policy Guidance for Management of mild Traumatic Brain Injury/Concussion in the Deployed Setting. Given the current science regarding overpressure, the only workplace exposures of this type which can be reliably monitored are noise exposures as part of our long-established hearing conservation program. C. It took roughly 40 years of personalized radiation measurement to fully understand the effects of exposure. Measurement was the necessary first step to understanding dose response. Is this a similar situation? Why not deploy blast overpressure surveillance to at least begin to capture the data? The current surveillance science regarding overpressure continues to evolve. However, other than that which is hearing related, surveillance mechanisms are insufficiently reliable to protect against the effects of blast exposures. The key performance element of any such monitoring device or test is its positive predictive value, the ability to associate exposures with outcomes in a reliable, predictable manner. Blast gauges are environmental sensors and have proven particularly deficient in this regard when tested in the field, particularly in their ability to correlate blast exposure with Traumatic Brain Injury. D. DARPA has recommended expanding the fielding of the gauge because it "ensures timely evaluation and treatment of TBI." How many of our men and women are using the gauges in the field or in training? Do high-risk units have access to the devices? How many devices have been purchased and where are they today? Following unsuccessful field testing in the US Central Command theater of operations with various army units, there are no deployed units currently using these devices. The Air Force was not part of that study and currently fields no such devices on our deployed Airmen based upon the lack of evidence regarding their surveillance value based upon those earlier field studies. As the science and technology matures we will re-assess the fielding of these devices for our at-risk Airmen.

Answer. Navy Medicine is dedicated to our mission of optimizing Sailors' and Marines' readiness, health, and keeping them on the job. Navy Medicine is actively engaged in research performed in partnership with other Department of Defense

(DoD) entities. In addition, we are partnering with nongovernmental academic institutions and assessing clinical application of evolving scientific information to develop best practices and policy as part of Navy Medical Department TBI programing. Inquiries regarding acquisition and fielding of specific blast exposure sensors and other related technology is out of Navy Medicine's scope. A. How concerned are your service chiefs about overpressure injuries and what actions are you taking to mitigate exposure to your personnel in the field and training environments? Navy and Marine Corps are aware of and acutely concerned with the risk of overpressure injuries in both training and field environments. Many of the acute risks of exposure to blast overpressure are known. While acute exposure standards do exist for overpressure injury protection for single events, a standard for repetitive exposure has not been established. As an emerging science, dose effect exposure impact and injury pattern research is active but insufficient at present for driving policy to mitigate exposure effects. Monitoring systems and threshold determination for multiple blast overpressure events to accumulate data in a manner similar to cumulative radiation dosimetry is under development as part of an effort funded by Military Operational Medicine Research Program. B. Who in your organization is responsible for this occupational hazard? Leaders at all levels are responsible for the health and safety of Sailors and Marines. Navy Medicine is invested in research to understand risks associated with overpressure exposure, as well as methods to identify and treat possible consequences of overexposure. It should be noted that overpressure exposure is currently considered an emerging occupational hazard, without current nationally recognized established exposure limits or standards, and is still in the research realm. The Naval Medical Research Center (NMRC) is part of a multi-institutional effort to develop exposure standards to repetitive low intensity blast overpressure events. This effort involves research on the assessment of blast effects in DoD operational units (e.g., Breachers, Artillery) and the use of animal models to develop an exposure standard algorithm. The effort is funded under the Defense Health Program. NMRC's collaborative effort is focused on the development of an exposure algorithm. The data from this effort will be shared with DoD operational planners to develop occupational standards and surveillance procedures. Navy Medicine is responsible for the medical readiness of Sailors and Marines, and as such, is actively engaged with the TBI community of interest, including ongoing collaborations with DoD, the other Services, Defense and Veterans Brain Injury Center (DVBIC), National Intrepid Center of Excellence (NICoE), and numerous private research institutions. The collaborations keep Navy Medicine at the cutting edge of science to ensure policies and practices are current with regard to informing policy to reduce exposure to injury, establish appropriate screening and surveillance practices, and to guide interventions to mitigate effects of injuries. As has been stated, this is an area of emerging science, and thus, policies and practices are dynamic, with efforts to continually capture data to advance efficacy of mitigation strategies. C. It took roughly 40 years of personalized radiation measurement to fully understand the effects of exposure. Measurement was the necessary first step to understanding dose response. Is this a similar situation? Why not deploy blast overpressure surveillance to at least begin to capture the data? Accurate measurement of overpressure exposure is critical in protecting Sailors and Marines, and in understanding potential health consequences of exposure. There are several challenges associated with this, including understanding how different devices measure overpressure, how differences in measurement relate to actual physiological and brain exposure, and then what different levels of exposure mean for risk to brain integrity, as well as clinical consequences. Advances have been made in all of these areas. Despite this progress, the current state of science is inconclusive with regard to exposure to sub-concussive events and subsequent injury or symptoms, and there is a need for continued partnerships to advance the science. Efforts to accurately measure and understand overpressure exposure have shifted from wide-scale deployment which had limited utility for understanding effects and development of subsequent policy. In order to better understand overpressure phenomenon, current use of overpressure measurement is in focused, rigorously studied settings. This allows for capture and analysis of data in a systematic way which is contributing to ongoing advancement of understanding of exposure and subsequent policy and practice changes. Navy and Marine Corps are proactively involved in collaborative research including measurement of overpressure exposure in institutional review board controlled trials which will allow for systematic collection and analysis of data in specific environments and applications, which is necessary to answer the questions above. NMRC is aware of several efforts within the DoD medical research and development community to develop and refine blast sensor technology. The Office of Naval Research (ONR) is conducting the Blast Load Assessment Sense and Test (BLAST) program which is developing technologies that quantify the physiological

effects of blast loads on personnel in the field. The objective is to address military-specific blast overpressure induced injury as well as blunt force injury. D. DARPA has recommended expanding the fielding of the gauge because it "ensures timely evaluation and treatment of TBI." How many of our men and women are using the gauges in the field or in training? Do high-risk units have access to the devices? How many devices have been purchased and where are they today? Navy Medicine doesn't manage distribution of blast sensor devices and is not in a position to respond to questions of distribution. However, it should be noted that there is, as of yet, no definitive evidence linking repetitive overpressure exposure to traumatic brain injury. The state of science is emerging, and Navy Medicine stands at the forefront of research to understand these relationships, and to adjust policy and practices as indicated to protect Sailors and Marines.

Answer. A. The Service Chiefs are very concerned about the potential for blast overpressure (BOP) injuries and enforce established occupational health standards and safety procedures to protect personnel who use weapon systems in field and training environments. In parallel, the DoD and the Army have implemented policies to maximize the identification and screening for Service members exposed to BOP. Medical information collected as a result of policy is leveraged for immediate healthcare delivery, while exposure data is shared through Service or department-wide efforts to maximize understanding of BOP. B. DoD-level policies task operational commanders to oversee the safety of training events, and enforce policies and procedures that provide maximal surveillance, mitigation, and treatment of BOP-related injuries. The Army serves as the Executive Agent for coordinating all DoD blast injury research which bridges medical and operational commands. U.S. Army Medical Command (USA MEDCOM) has the lead on occupational health compliance, clinical care for injuries, and development of medical research on occupational hazards related to BOP. C. It is unclear at this time if direct parallels can be drawn between personalized radiation measurement and blast overpressure surveillance. The Army previously deployed a large-scale blast overpressure surveillance program during OEF deployments, which did not produce actionable information. The Army has since moved to a focused approach, involving research level data collection and surveillance from environmental sensors in training. This effort aims to: (1) optimize sensor technologies for surveillance in training environments, (2) understand the health effects of single and repetitive exposure to BOP, (3) establish evidence-based injury thresholds, and (4) provide immediate feedback to Leaders on BOP profiles in training. D. In 2012, the Army procured approximately 108,000 gauges for use in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). The data from this effort did not provide actionable information or insights into the impact of single or cumulative BOP. The Army's effort to understand low-level BOP shifted to a more tailored approach in the training environment. Within the current Army effort (Environmental Sensors in Training (ESiT)), there are 1600 gauges in use on select training ranges: artillery, breacher, mortar, grenade, engineers, and shoulder fired weapons. These gauges are drawn from both existing inventory and purchase of newer designs. The gauges are available to "high-risk units" as commercial off the shelf (COTS) devices.

Blast Overpressure Exposure

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. Scientific studies have linked repetitive blast overpressure exposure to structural changes in the brain, increased risk of PTSD, and age related neurological diseases. A. Why has this research not resulted in blast overpressure surveillance programs that provide actionable exposure data to protect and preserve our warfighters, particularly considering the signature injuries from Iraq and Afghanistan have been TBI and PTSD. B. Given the significant scientific evidence linking blast overpressure exposure and brain injury, how do you explain the hesitation to monitor to fully document exposures and take steps to reduce those exposures?

Answer. The state of science and knowledge associated with overpressure exposure and subsequent health risks is ongoing and advancing. As technology and knowledge increase, awareness of potential risks become known, and policies and practices are adjusted accordingly. Overpressure detection capabilities are in use and have undergone successive iterations as knowledge has increased, with ongoing active research to further improve our ability to protect Sailors and Marines. While there is some emerging indication of a relationship between repetitive overpressure exposure and subsequent health risks, this is also an evolving state of science, and specific correlations are still unknown. As Navy Medicine actively supports ongoing research to better understand overpressure exposure, we continue to implement and

advance evidence based practice to increase detection and treatment to maximize health and readiness of Sailors and Marines. A. Where standards exist, current DoD policy is designed to protect Sailors and Marines from known overpressure risks. However, advances in science in this area have shown that previously established standards may be inadequate, and as of yet, more refined national standards do not exist. The Navy continues to be engaged in collaborative research to improve capability to accurately measure overpressure, as well as increase knowledge related to effects of sub-concussive overpressure effects. Even in advance of publication in peer reviewed publications, DoD proactively acts on emerging data, often developing policies and practices to protect Sailors and Marines. There are active and robust efforts to translate knowledge from research into actionable equipment, practices, and interventions both on the field and in the medical realm. B. As knowledge of exposure dose and cumulative effects evolves, policy and practice is evolving to protect Sailors and Marines from unnecessary exposure, and to evaluate and mitigate effects. As science emerges, policy adapts. Navy Medicine is currently working with leaders in the Naval Special Warfare unit in Southern California to develop a protocol for routine periodic assessment and monitoring that is not triggered by a specific event. This is a step forward in practice. Historically, screenings were triggered by "potentially concussive events"' and did not take into account single or repetitive exposure to "sub-concussive" events. The effects of individual sub-concussive events may be minor and not identified by the Sailor, and may not even be identified with traditional screening tools. However, the effects of repeated exposures may be cumulative, and because an individual event may not trigger a screening protocol, establishing routine reassessment is expected to enable identification of cumulative effects which will allow for earlier intervention and mitigation. As mentioned above, ongoing research efforts with our partners will improve ability to accurately monitor exposure, as well as possible medical consequences of exposure, which will increase ability to mitigate effects and enhance readiness.

Answer. A. The DoD has surveillance programs to protect our warfighters from exposure to BOP which are based on prior research efforts and the current scientific understanding. In accordance with occupational health standards, the BOP programs are managed within the DoD Auditory community and coordinated with the TBI community as appropriate. The link between low-threshold repetitive blast overpressure (BOP) exposure to "structural changes in the brain, increased risk of PTSD, and age related neurological diseases," is currently debated in the medical and scientific communities (internal and external to the DoD) and remains a topic of research rather than settled science. B. The link between low-threshold repetitive blast overpressure (BOP) exposure to "structural changes in the brain, increased risk of PTSD, and age related neurological diseases," is currently debated in the medical and scientific communities (internal and external to the DoD) and remains a topic of research rather than settled science. The DoD has taken actions to improve our understanding of BOP through the analysis of retrospective and prospective human exposure data from the training and operational environment while simultaneously implementing policies to monitor, protect, screen, diagnose, document and treat not just diagnosed TBls, but also potentially concussive events. Through event-driven screening for exposures, and early medical evaluation and documentation, the Army is the lead for the DoD and is maximizing the identification and treatment of Service members with injuries.

EXPOSURES IN TRAINING WITH WEAPONS SYSTEMS

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. DoD research studies have shown exposures in training with weapon systems that are routinely above currently established safe overpressure exposure limits. Monitoring revealed these exposures, and can help to identify and reduce repetitive exposures in the future. A. Why have the services failed to institute formal overpressure monitoring programs in areas where existing safety standards are routinely violated? B. Repetitive blast overpressure exposure and mild TBI impact unit readiness. Given the hidden nature of brain injury and the overlap of mild TBI symptoms with those commonly experienced by servicemembers (headache, sleep disturbance, etc), isn't monitoring essential to maintaining unit readiness? C. Marine Corps System Command has invested over $1 million in a Phase I and Phase II SBlR to develop a blast overpressure measurement system which was delivered in September 2016. Is this technology being used to monitor exposures for at risk personnel? If no, why not?

Answer. A. The DoD uses a combination of environmental monitoring, in select higher risk training environments, with connections to active medical research pro-

tocols. The output of these efforts are improving environmental sensor capabilities and honing our understanding of BOP and the potential short-term or long-term clinical outcomes. The Army protects personnel by assessing health risks associated with the use of weapon systems prior to rollout and by implementing evidence based safety standards that are enforced by operational commanders. The Army no longer uses universal monitoring of blast overpressures (BOP) exposures in combat because this program did not produce actionable information. However, the Army does employ a targeted monitoring effort to protect personnel. B. The DoD maintains readiness through policy, education, and standardized clinical care to produce an educated force trained and prepared to recognize potential for risk and provide early recognition, treatment and tracking of concussive injuries to protect Service member health. The DoD is also funding research efforts with the goal of validating exposure thresholds. C. Since the development of the blast gauge, the Army, USSOCOM, DARPA and the USMC have all purchased and used blast gauges in varying capacities. The Army's Environmental Sensors in Training (ESiT) program is primarily using the earlier generation 6 gauges. However, the DoD through Walter Reed Army Institute of Research is actively working to assess and improve the gauges including the generation 7.

Answer. The state of science and knowledge associated with overpressure exposure and subsequent health risks is ongoing and advancing. As technology and knowledge increase, awareness of potential risks become known, and policies and practices are adjusted accordingly. Overpressure detection capabilities are in use and have undergone successive iterations as knowledge has increased, with ongoing active research to further improve our ability to protect Sailors and Marines. While there is some emerging indication of a relationship between repetitive overpressure exposure and subsequent health risks, this is also an evolving state of science, and specific correlations are still unknown. As Navy Medicine actively supports ongoing research to better understand overpressure exposure, we continue to implement and advance evidence based practice to increase detection and treatment to maximize health and readiness of Sailors and Marines. A. Where standards exist, current DoD policy is designed to protect Sailors and Marines from known overpressure risks. However, advances in science in this area have shown that previously established standards may be inadequate, and as of yet, more refined national standards do not exist. The Navy continues to be engaged in collaborative research to improve capability to accurately measure overpressure, as well as increase knowledge related to effects of sub-concussive overpressure effects. Even in advance of publication in peer reviewed publications, DoD proactively acts on emerging data, often developing policies and practices to protect Sailors and Marines. There are active and robust efforts to translate knowledge from research into actionable equipment, practices, and interventions both on the field and in the medical realm. B. As knowledge of exposure dose and cumulative effects evolves, policy and practice is evolving to protect Sailors and Marines from unnecessary exposure, and to evaluate and mitigate effects. As science emerges, policy adapts. Navy Medicine is currently working with leaders in the Naval Special Warfare unit in Southern California to develop a protocol for routine periodic assessment and monitoring that is not triggered by a specific event. This is a step forward in practice. Historically, screenings were triggered by "potentially concussive events" and did not take into account single or repetitive exposure to "sub-concussive" events. The effects of individual sub-concussive events may be minor and not identified by the Sailor, and may not even be identified with traditional screening tools. However, the effects of repeated exposures may be cumulative, and because an individual event may not trigger a screening protocol, establishing routine reassessment is expected to enable identification of cumulative effects which will allow for earlier intervention and mitigation. As mentioned above, ongoing research efforts with our partners will improve ability to accurately monitor exposure, as well as possible medical consequences of exposure, which will increase ability to mitigate effects and enhance readiness. C. Yes, the GEN 7 B3 sensor developed to measure blast overpressure in the Phase I and Phase II SMIR is currently being used by researchers for monitoring personnel exposures to blast. Current users include Naval Research Laboratory Walter Reed Army Institute of Research, Office of Naval Research and Special Operations Command. We are currently working with our Training and Education Command and Walter Reed to get the system sensors approved for use at the Weapons Training Schools. Anticipated deployment is late FY18.

Answer. The state of science and knowledge associated with overpressure exposure and subsequent health risks is ongoing and advancing. As technology and knowledge increase, awareness of potential risks become known, and policies and practices are adjusted accordingly. Overpressure detection capabilities are in use and have undergone successive iterations as knowledge has increased, with ongoing

active research to further improve our ability to protect Sailors and Marines. While there is some emerging indication of a relationship between repetitive overpressure exposure and subsequent health risks, this is also an evolving state of science, and specific correlations are still unknown. As Navy Medicine actively supports ongoing research to better understand overpressure exposure, we continue to implement and advance evidence based practice to increase detection and treatment to maximize health and readiness of Sailors and Marines. A. Why have the services failed to institute formal overpressure monitoring programs in areas where existing safety standards are routinely violated? Where standards exist, current DoD policy is designed to protect Sailors and Marines from known overpressure risks. However, advances in science in this area have shown that previously established standards may be inadequate, and as of yet, more refined national standards do not exist. The Navy continues to be engaged in collaborative research to improve capability to accurately measure overpressure, as well as increase knowledge related to effects of sub-concussive overpressure effects. Even in advance of publication in peer reviewed publications, DoD proactively acts on emerging data, often developing policies and practices to protect Sailors and Marines. There are active and robust efforts to translate knowledge from research into actionable equipment, practices, and interventions both on the field and in the medical realm. B. Repetitive blast overpressure exposure and mild TBI impact unit readiness. Given the hidden nature of brain injury and the overlap of mild TBI symptons with those commonly experienced by service members (headache, sleep disturbance, etc), isn't monitoring essential to maintaining unit readiness? As knowledge of exposure dose and cumulative effects evolves, policy and practice is evolving to protect Sailors and Marines from unnecessary exposure, and to evaluate and mitigate effects. As science emerges, policy adapts. Navy Medicine is currently working with leaders in the Naval Special Warfare unit in Southern California to develop aprotocol for routine periodic assessment and monitoring that is not triggered by a specific event. This is a step forward in practice. Historically, screenings were triggered by "potentially concussive events" and did not take into account single or repetitive exposure to "sub-concussive" events. The effects of individual sub-concussive events may be minor and not identified by the Sailor, and may not even be identified with traditional screening tools. However, the effects of repeated exposures may be cumulative, and because an individual event may not trigger a screening protocol, establishing routine reassessment is expected to enable identification of cumulative effects which will allow for earlier intervention and mitigation. As mentioned above, ongoing research efforts with our partners will improve ability to accurately monitor exposure, as well as possible medical consequences of exposure, which will increase ability to mitigate effects and enhance readiness. C. Marine Corps System Command has invested over $1 million in a Phase I and Phase II SBIR to develop a blast overpressure measurement system which was delivered in September 2016. Is this technology being used to monitor exposures for at risk personnel? If no, why not? Defer to Marine Corps Systems Command.

Answer. A. Why have the services failed to institute formal overpressure monitoring programs in areas where existing safety standards are routinely violated? While operational guidelines exist for safe distancing from acute blast sources, we are not aware of existing overpressure standards from the Occupational Health and Safety Administration, the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists, the American National Standards Institute, or other recognized certifying standards organization, that characterize and establish exposure limits for repetitive or sustained blast exposures. B. Repetitive blast overpressure exposure and mild TBI impact unit readiness. Given the hidden nature of brain injury and the overlap of mild T81 symptoms with those commonly experienced by servicemembers (headache, sleep disturbance, etc), isn't monitoring essential to maintaining unit readiness? The current surveillance science regarding overpressure continues to evolve, but is currently not sufficiently reliable to protect against the effects of such exposures. The key performance element of any such monitoring device or test is its positive predictive value, the ability to associate exposures with outcomes in a reliable, predictable manner. The devices which are environmental sensors, have proven particularly deficient in this regard when tested in the field, particularly in their ability to correlate blast events to Traumatic Brain Injury. Until such time as better sensors are available, we will continue to maintain readiness through policy, education, and standardized clinical care to provide early recognition, treatment, and tracking of all concussive injuries. C. Marine Corps System Command has invested over $1 million in a Phase I and Phase 11 SBIR to develop a blast overpressure measurement system which was delivered in September 2016. Is this technology being used to monitor exposures for at risk personnel? If no, why not? The Air Force has not procured any elements of the system for use within the Air Force.

Though this is a Generation 7 gauge, its extremely low detection threshold results in high sensing variability, thus limiting its effectiveness as a reliable surveillance device.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Mr. Visclosky. Questions submitted by Ms. Roby and the answers thereto follow:]

SEA HAWK HELICOPTER

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. As you both know, the Sea Hawk Helicopter is the workhorse of the Navy as we have sustained a very high OPTEMPO for many years. The current Seahawk fleet of 555 aircraft is based on a five year old Force Structure Assessment that was updated in December 2016 from 308 to 355 ships. If this plan is carried out, the Navy will need a corresponding increase in helicopters. Meanwhile the Service Life Extension program will ultimately take roughly 50 aircraft out of service each year. Procuring additional aircraft now will help address these needs as well as prevent a key production line from going cold. What are the Navy's plans for procurement of the Seahawk in the coming years?

Answer. The Department is committed to building the capability and capacity in our Fleet, and Seahawk helicopters play a vital role in accomplishing these goals. The Navy operates nearly 600 MH–60 helicopters around the world, and intends to modernize and sustain MH–60 inventory via planned Service Life Extension Program and/or Mid-Life Upgrade initiatives. These programs will ensure the capabilities of these aircraft remain relevant well into the future. Although the current fleet of Seahawks is fulfilling our needs, we need to consider airframe delivery schedules relative to future ship delivery timelines before committing to purchasing additional Seahawks. The decision to procure or recapitalize the current MH–60 in the face of increasing threats will be considered alongside all of our warfighting priorities. Thank you for your continued support of the Navy and in particular, Naval Aviation.

STRYKER

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. 203 Members of Congress and 10 Members of this Subcommittee wrote a letter to the Army earlier this year urging funding both for Stryker lethality and survivability upgrades. I was surprised to see no funding for either modernization programs in the President's FY18 Budget request. Given that we know that Strykers are critical to the 21st Century Army, what would the Army choose such a path? What is the impact on the industrial base?

Answer. Although the Army has not specifically requested funding for Stryker lethality and survivability upgrades, the Army requested $97.6 million for Stryker modifications in Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18). This funding will support procurement of Stryker Training Aids; Devices; Simulators and Simulations (TADSS); Stryker Lethality hardware; fielding support (wholesale parts); and various Stryker fleet-wide modifications including addressing Command, Control, Communication,, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C41SR) obsolescence. The Army will field the 2nd Cavalry Regiment's 30 millimeter Strykers in 4th Quarter FY18 but has yet to determine the solution for the entire fleet. The Army is solidifying requirements for improving the lethality of the remaining eight Stryker Brigade Combat Teams and is scheduled to present options in October of this year to the Chief of Staff of the Army to determine lethality and survivability options moving forward. These options all include near-term lethality upgrades to the Stryker fleet. Although the Army's fourth Double V Hull (DVH) Stryker brigade is on the Chief of Staff of the Army's FY18 Unfunded Requirements List, the Army continues to modernize the DVH fleet. The DVH vehicles that have been procured beyond the current three DVH Brigades come equipped with the latest upgrades that include engine, suspension, and electrical network. These Strykers will go into the current DVH brigades to allow older DVH vehicles opportunity for these upgrades. The Army is aware of a potential impacts to the Stryker industrial base, and has developed options to mitigate any production gap between completion of DVH production and upgrades to current DVH Strykers.

MUNITIONS

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. I am concerned about our stockpiles of key munitions like the Hellfire. What else can we do to ensure that our munitions stockpiles are at a sufficient level? I also noticed that funding for THAAD looked a bit light. I would think that we would be ramping that up with the increasing ballistic threats from Iran and North Korea.

Answer. The Army continues to place emphasis on ensuring critical munitions are being produced, stockpiled and positioned appropriately to support world-wide contingencies. For example, the HELLFIRE missile is currently being produced at its maximum rate of 6,000 missiles per year.

Additionally, a $77M investment in the HELLFIRE production line in FY17 will increase capacity from 6,000 missiles in FY16 to 11,000 missiles in FY19. The Army will see results from this investment but deliveries of HELLFIRE missiles take place approximately 24 months after they are put on contract. The Army is a user of the THAAD system, but procurement for THAAD interceptors is programmed by the Missile Defense Agency using Defense Wide Funds. The FY18 budget request procures 34 THAAD interceptors out of a potential maximum production capacity of 96.

LCS

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. Could you please provide an update on the transition from the Littoral Combat Ship to the Frigate? B. What are the priorities for the development of the Frigate and how will it improve upon the current Littoral Combat Ship? C. Is the Navy still planning to down-select between the two current vendors in FY19 or has that been pushed to FY20? Given the vulnerability of the shipbuilding industrial base, what would be the benefits of keeping the contract split between the two vendors?

Answer. A. The 2016 Force Structure Assessment (FSA) validated the requirement for 52 Small Surface Combatants. To date, nine LCS have been commissioned into the Fleet and 19 are under contract (LCS 27 & 28 were awarded in June 2017), with 11 of these 19 LCS in various stages of construction. A total of 30 LCS are planned to be procured. FY19 LCS quantities are under review and will be provided with the FY19 budget submission, following completion of the Defense Strategy Review. The Navy recognizes the critical nature of maintaining the shipbuilding industrial base while transitioning from LCS to Frigate and will weigh this factor in the FY19 budget submission. For FFG(X), the Navy will consider multiple proposed designs for a lethal, multi-mission ship capable of integrated strike group operations and operating independently in contested environments while incorporating Navy standard combat system elements. The Navy is evaluating capability and cost trade space associated with FFG(X) requirements through a Request for Information from industry. Additionally, a competitive industry environment will contribute to maturing multiple designs during the Conceptual Design phase with an anticipated FY20 contract award for Detail Design and Construction. B. FFG(X) priorities for development include improved lethality and survivability beyond that of LCS and the previous Frigate baseline. The FFG(X) will include improved radar, combat systems, launchers, weapons, and electronic warfare, and add capability in the electromagnetic maneuver warfare area that LCS does not currently possess. These improvements will make the FFG(X) a blue-water capable, multi-mission ship capable of operating in contested environments with robust self-defense. LCS was designed to be a focused-mission ship with limited self-defense. FFG(X) will have the ability to protect itself and potentially others with improved air defense capability and shock-hardened systems for decreased vulnerability.The FFG(X) will be capable of simultaneous multi-mission execution in Surface Warfare (SLJW), Anti-Submarine Warfare (ASW), Electromagnetic Maneuver Warfare (EMW), and unmanned intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. It will implement Navy standard combat system elements to achieve commonality, decreasing development risk while ensuring required capability, lowering life cycle costs, and streamlining sparing, training, and maintenance requirements. These improvements over LCS will enable FFG(X) to support Distributed Maritime Operations by extending the Fleet tactical grid with improved EMW, Electronic Warfare (EW), unmanned, and Command, Control, Communications, Computer, and Information (C4I) systems and provide relief for large surface combatants to conduct missions for which they are uniquely qualified. FFG(X) requirements will be refined and finalized based on industry feedback on

the feasibility of meeting the desired performance levels and accommodating common Navy standard systems in the various ship designs in a cost effective manner. C. The Navy does not plan to down-select between the two current LCS shipbuilders, but instead will hold a full and open competition for the FFG(X) utilizing existing designs. The Navy is evaluating trade space associated with FFG(X) requirements through a Request for Information from industry that maximizes capability at the appropriate cost. Additionally, a competitive industry environment will contribute to maturing multiple designs during the Conceptual Design phase with an anticipated FY20 contract award for Detail Design and Construction.

ARMY FIXED WING AIRCRAFT

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. Can you please provide your thoughts on cost savings that can be achieved through the Army's replacement of the C12?

Answer. The Army is in the process of replacing the legacy C–12 fleet with a commercially available aircraft and expects to award a procurement contract in 3QFY18. With an estimated savings of approximately $100M in operation and sustainment costs over the life of the aircraft. These savings estimates are based on costs of similar, currently available, commercial aircraft.

CYBER

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. With so much happening in the Cyber domain, I was hopeful That you could share your vision regarding DOD's increasing role in this fight and what additional resources may be required. How can we recruit and retain the type of cyber warriors we need for this fight?

Answer. In addition to defending DoD's network, data, and weapons platforms, our cyberspace operations provide commanders with options across all domains to apply combined arms maneuver, create dilemmas for the enemy, complicate adversaries' strategic calculus, and ultimately gain the advantage on the battlefield for the Joint Force to win. The Army continues to grow its specialized fields and recruit much needed cyber skills, recently accessing 30 officers into the established Cyber branch. Both the Army's Cadet Command (USACC) and the US Military Academy (USMA) have been mentoring cadets to consider degrees in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) fields for the last several years. As a result, the STEM degree average rose to 26% of FY17 new lieutenants commissioned through ROTC, from 15.5% in FY12. USMA conducts STEM outreach for diverse youth as part of its recruiting strategy, and its Cyber Research Center and Cyber Center of Excellence prepares cadets in the acquisition, use, management, and protection of information. The Army is also executing a direct commissioning pilot program into cyber specialties to uniquely skilled and experienced individuals who meet program requirements. On the enlisted side, many of our highest level enlistment and reenlistment incentives are dedicated to cyber and other information technology fields. The Army also offers a variety of compensation incentives to recruit quality civilian talent into the cyber workforce, including up to 25% of the annual rate of basic pay for newly appointed employees, a higher pay rate through the Superior Qualifications and Special Needs Pay-Setting Authority, and up to $60,000 to repay student loans for a highly qualified employee. The Army retention program retains sufficient numbers of retention-eligible Soldiers consistent with fluctuating end strength requirements. The Army developed Special Duty (SD) and Assignment Incentive Pay (AIP) incentives to focus on Soldiers serving in critical cyber work roles, which complement the professional development and training benefits that also enhance the ability to recruit and retain quality personnel. The Army offers its civilian cyber workforce similar opportunities for career growth and formal training, as well as retention and relocation incentives to retain high performing employees.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Ms. Roby. Questions submitted by Ms. McCollum and the answers thereto follow:]

FIGHTER OXYGEN DEPRIVATION

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. Gentlemen, I want to ask you about what appears to be a growing problem in which pilots across our services are reporting symptoms of hypoxia and oxygen deprivation. In the past few months, Senior Navy officials have reported a ris-

ing rate of psychological episodes experienced by F–18 pilots during flights. The Navy also halted the entire fleet of T–45 trainer jets because of pilots' breathing concerns. And then just last week the Air Force temporarily stopped flying F–35 fighter jets at Luke Air Force Base due to a number of incidents where pilots were reporting symptoms of hypoxia. It seems like we have a serious problem that is not unique to one fleet and extends across the services. Safety of flight is non-negotiable, and the increasing number of pilots suffering from oxygen deprivation is simply unacceptable. Gentlemen, how concerned are you about these reports and what is being done right now to ensure that our pilots are operating in a safe environment?

Answer. The DOD and the Services are extremely concerned about aircrew safety related to hypoxia and oxygen deprivation. This is the number one safety issue, with the utmost priority to fix. All available assets (e.g. laboratories, specialists and test facilities across DOD and Industry) and expertise (e.g., NASA, Industry and Academia) are being utilized to assess, isolate and correct root cause(s). As the scientific and engineering investigations work toward determining the root causes, the Services are concentrating on four major pillars of action: to alert, monitor, protect and prevent hypoxia and oxygen deprivation. Although aircraft oxygen systems vary in complexity, there are two major potential contributors to hypoxia and oxygen deprivation that are common: the oxygen system not providing sufficient oxygen to the aircrew and cockpit pressure fluctuations. There are multiple technical paths being pursued, to include aircraft system hardware re-designs and component improvements; maintenance and support process implementation and modification; interim operational limitations and modified flight procedures; aircrew and aircraft sensor integration; aircrew flight gear modifications; and aircrew awareness and training—to name a few. The department has deemed this a resources unconstrained approach and will continue to receive maximum attention and prioritization until the risks of hypoxia and oxygen deprivation are resolved.

DoD Transgender Policy

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. Mr. Secretary, we are approaching the July 1st deadline for the Defense Department to implement the policy that lifted the ban on transgender personnel from serving in the military. Is the Pentagon considering delaying this decision and if this is the case, was this a decision that was made internally at the Pentagon or was this direction that came from the White House?

Answer. STATEMENT OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ON MILITARY SERVICE BY TRANSGENDER INDIVIDUALS: The Department of Defense has received the Presidential Memorandum, dated August 25, 2017, entitled "Military Service by Transgender Individuals." The Department will carry out the President's policy direction, in consultation with the Department of Homeland Security. As directed, we will develop a study and implementation plan, which will contain the steps that will promote military readiness, lethality, and unit cohesion, with due regard for budgetary constraints and consistent with applicable law. The soon arriving senior civilian leadership of DoD will play an important role in this effort. The implementation plan will address accessions of transgender individuals and transgender individuals currently serving in the United States military. Our focus must always be on what is best for the military's combat effectiveness leading to victory on the battlefield. To that end, I will establish a panel of experts serving within the Departments of Defense and Homeland Security to provide advice and recommendations on the implementation of the President's direction. Panel members will bring mature experience, most notably in combat and deployed operations, and seasoned judgment to this task. The panel will assemble and thoroughly analyze all pertinent data, quantifiable and non-quantifiable. Further information on the panel will be forthcoming. Once the panel reports its recommendations and following my consultation with the Secretary of Homeland Security, I will provide my advice to the President concerning implementation of his policy direction. In the interim, current policy with respect to currently serving members will remain in place. I expect to issue interim guidance to the force concerning the President's direction, including any necessary interim adjustments to procedures, to ensure the continued combat readiness of the force until our final policy on this subject is issued.

[Clerk's note.—End of questions submitted by Ms. McCollum. Questions submitted by Mr. Ryan and the answers thereto follow:]

F–35

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. For such an expensive aircraft, I'm concerned about our pilots having to self-limit their flying in this way. How long do we anticipate having this issue with the F–35? Are we concerned about adversaries exploiting this weakness by adjusting their tactics against the F–35? B. Do you anticipate further slippage in the F–35 schedule?

Answer. A. The restriction on the weapons bay doors was removed in March 2016 as a result of further analysis, test, and requalification of the limiting component, which was the Remote Input/Output unit within the weapons bay. With this restriction lifted there are no concerns related to adversary exploitation. B. Since the flight restriction related to excessive weapons bay temperature was lifted in March 2016, the F–35 program does not anticipate any related schedule slippages. In a broader context, the F–35 program continues to make steady progress toward the completion of its System Development and Demonstration (SDD) phase and delivery of full Block 3F capability. Following the 2011 re-baseline, the program of record estimate for the end of developmental flight test was October 31, 2017. Since the time of this re-baseline, the F–35 Joint Program Office has recognized a 3 to 4 month risk associated with this date, putting the end of SDD flight test in early CY 2018. The program is tracking to completion of SDD flight test in that timeframe. Delivery of full Block 3F capability remains on track as well; current estimates for delivery of full Block 3F capability by variant are shown in the table below.

FULL BLOCK 3F CAPABILITY DELIVERY

2011 Post Nunn-McCurdy APB Dates	Current Estimate
Objective: August 2017	F–35A: October 2017 (w/o AIM–9X). November 2017 (w/AIM–9X). F–35B: November 2017 (1.3 Mach). May 2018 (1.6 Mach).
Threshold: February 2018	F–35C: January 2018 (1.3 Mach). February 2018 (1.6 Mach).

The delivery of full capability for all 3 variants falls within the 2011 Acquisition Program Baseline dates with the exception of the B-model envelope between 1.3 and 1.6 Mach. This is due to the fact that only one B-model test aircraft (BF–3) has been properly instrumented for the testing needed to reach 1.6 Mach.

Weaponized Drones

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. Do you have adequate funding and authorizations to deal with emerging threats, such as weaponized drones? How can Congress support you better?

Answer. The Department has adequate authorities to respond to emerging threats, such as weaponized drones, in zones of active conflict overseas. For instance, Rapid Acquisition Authority (RAA) provided under section 806 (c) of Public Law 107–314, enables the Secretary or Deputy Secretary to waive certain laws, and, with certain limitations, permit the use of any funds available to the Secretary, in order to respond quickly to Urgent Operational Needs and to expedite delivery of capabilities to the warfighter. DoD authorities to counter potential (weaponized) drone threats in the homeland are constrained by provisions of Federal law. Congress—in the FY2017 NDAA—established section 130i of title 10, U.S. Code, which authorized the Secretary to mitigate threats posed by drones to the safety or security of facilities and assets related to three DoD mission areas, including nuclear deterrence, missile defense, and the national security space. DoD is seeking a modest expansion of this authority in the FY2018 NDAA to, in part, incrementally expand the covered missions detailed in the authority. The Department will continue to plan for and resource capabilities to counter weaponized small unmanned aircraft consistent with the risks these threats pose and their overall priority in future President's Budget requests.

ADDITIVE MANUFACTURING

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. How are we empowering our servicemembers to use additive manufacturing? Are you receiving sufficient funding? B. Is there work to include contractual requirements for the manufacturing base to provide MILSPECS for additive manufacturing parts when they cease carrying existing product lines?

Answer. For several years the DoD Manufacturing Technology programs, under the collaborative umbrella of the Joint Defense Manufacturing Technology Panel, have been working to enhance standards for technical data packages (TDPs). A TDP is "a technical description of an item adequate for supporting an acquisition strategy, production, engineering, and logistics support. The description defines the required design configuration and procedures to ensure adequacy of item performance. It consists of all applicable technical data such as drawings, associated lists, specifications, standards, performance requirements, quality assurance (QA) provisions, and packaging details." Citation needed. Although TDPs are applicable to all types of manufacturing (not just additive manufacturing), their widespread use would greatly enhance DoD's ability to make parts after the original manufacturer has ceased production. Regardless of whether parts are made additively or otherwise, each acquisition program office is responsible for deciding whether to include delivery of TDPs as part of the contract deliverables. While providing TDPs benefits DoD by providing information needed to make the parts indefinitely, industry's concerns include: (1) TDPs are often considered proprietary, and manufacturers may only agree to document and deliver the data at a significant expense to the DOD; (2) the packaging and delivery of TDPs may require special handling which adds further expense; and (3) there is a wide variance in the capabilities of the acquiring organizations to validate and store TDPs. Through the DoD-wide AM Business Model Wargame working group, the Department is working with industry to address the concerns with acquisition contract language related to technical data. The various efforts in this area hope to address both concerns of industry and the needs of the Department.

TRANSLATORS AND VISAS

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. Can you comment on the impact of our translators to the safety of our military forces? B. Can you discuss how strengthening our ties with allied citizens in these regions and honoring our commitment to our translators preserves the safety of our forces? C. Do you recommend that we continue to authorize and appropriate Special Immigrant Visas?

Answer. Translators provide a valuable service to our military forces serving overseas, particularly in areas of active combat. I agree that our translators should be well compensated for their service in order to promote continued support amongst our partners. The authorization and appropriation of Special Immigrant Visas however, needs to be weighed in the larger context of visa authorizations as determined by the State Department.

INF TREATY

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. From your perspective as the senior military advisor are Russian treaty violations a risk to US Forces and commitments? Are we unduly constrained by treaties which only our nation is complying with, such as the INF Treaty? B. Do you find our defense unduly constrained by the INF Treaty given that we appear to be the only nation in compliance with this agreement? C. One additional area the General Dunford acknowledges as a risk to our strategic advantage are mounting global ballistic missile threats. I am aware that growth in missile defense capabilities for the United States have been paused while the administration conducts a Ballistic Missile Defense Review. Do you have an anticipated timeline for completion of the BMDR?

Answer. Currently, we are able to satisfy our military requirements while remaining in compliance with the INF Treaty. However, any treaty violation that could allow Russia to unlawfully gain a military capability advantage poses a potential threat to U.S. forces. With respect to the INF Treaty, I believe the status quo, in which the United States remains in compliance with the Treaty and the Russians are in violation of it, is untenable. The INF Treaty is in our national security interest if all parties comply with their Treaty obligations. We will continue to engage

Russia—directly and together with our allies—to urge Russia to return to full and verifiable compliance with its Treaty obligations, but our patience is not unlimited. Regarding missile defense, our goal is to complete the Ballistic Missile Defense Review in the October timeframe. However, I would like to assure you that our development of missile defense capabilities is not on hold during this process. The approximately $8 billion fiscal year 2018 budget request for the Missile Defense Agency (MDA) missile defense programs includes funding for completing construction of the Aegis Ashore site in Poland, continuing development of the redesigned kill vehicle, developing a long-range discriminating radar, beginning work on a new radar in Hawaii, and continuing funding for advanced discrimination sensor technology and space-based kill assessment programs. We also remain on track to complete the deployment of 8 more interceptors in Alaska by the end of this year, bringing the total to 44, and we are moving forward with efforts to bolster our defenses against advanced cruise missiles.

INDUSTRIAL BASE

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. Is reliance on non-American-made products a risk to our national security? B. Could your share where you feel the Department will find its biggest challenges in the industrial base? What can Congress do to help you build up these lost industries? Is the solution more funding or more time?

Answer. The Department understands there may be security concerns in some key technology and production areas that support maintaining our technical dominance. These security concerns might be associated with critical technology areas such as microelectronics, robotics, artificial intelligence, and virtual reality, or security-of-supply concerns resulting from foreign dependency on products from adversarial nations. However, reliance on non-American made products is necessary to take advantage of the cost and technology benefits offered by access to global suppliers and many of our non-American made products are provided by trusted allies. The Department continues to identify and address risks related to supply-chain disruption, counterfeit parts, sabotage, and theft of critical American defense technology. Our job is to create a balance that allows us to benefit from global markets without putting at risk our national security. The biggest industrial base challenge the Department is facing is to sustain a healthy and resilient industrial base. DoD is concerned about the viability of critical elements of the supply chain at the lower-tiers for defense-unique markets and heavily commercial markets where DoD has very limited participation. On July 21, the President signed an Executive Order requesting the Department, in coordination with Commerce, Labor, Energy, and Homeland Security, to provide a report assessing the products and materials essential to national security and the resiliency of the manufacturing and defense industrial base and supply chains to support national security needs. In the next months, we will be working with multiple government agencies and industry to do the required assessment and provide recommendations to mitigate identified issues. The solutions to mitigate industrial base risks involve both adequate funding and time to implement them. The Department thanks you for your continuous support to the programs and authorities that allow us to sustain an innovative and healthy defense industrial base. Programs like the Manufacturing Institutes, the Industrial Base Analysis and Sustainment Funds, Defense Production Act Title Ill, and ManTech are helping us to work with industry to identify and reduce supply-chain risks. We ask you to continue supporting sufficient and timely investments to sustain the industrial base.

AAFES AND NEXCOM

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. A. What is the status of healthy, convenient food options for our servicemembers? Are you getting the support necessary from AAFES and NEXCOM to provide healthy choices for our servicemembers? B. What can we do to encourage a healthy style of eating that will support our servicemembers career and fitness needs? For example, would it help if every base has a Nutrition Coordinator to help unify the efforts of dining facilities and convenience food outlets elsewhere on base?

Answer. A. Healthy, convenient food options continue to expand Army wide. Building on the success of the DoD Healthy Base Initiative, the Healthy Army Communities (HAC) program commenced as a coordinated Army-wide program to improve the health and wellness of the total Army community, including active duty, reservists, families, civilians and retirees. The program focuses on changing the environment to make the healthy choice easier while helping individuals change their

behavior towards healthier lifestyles. This includes the reshaping of Army garrison communities to be healthier places to live, learn, eat, work, play and shop. AAFES is a very committed partner with HAC and has already begun identifying brand transition opportunities and contract timelines to consider brands with healthier offerings. AAFES also provides for healthier options through the "Be Fit" program of vetted healthy nutritional criteria that's highlighted in the Express locations with Healthy Only item end caps and new refrigerated island coolers featuring healthy only grab and go products. The program is more than just food, but also aligns with active wear and fitness equipment to promote overall health and wellness. Additionally, AAFES is actively participating in the development and implementation of the Military Nutritional Environment Assessment Tool (m-NEAT 2.0) and working with the DoD Food and Nutrition Subcommittee. B. We believe HAC and the newly launched Army Holistic Health and Fitness Initiative are the most effective way ahead to promote healthy eating, increased physical activity, improved sleep and the reduction of tobacco products in the total Army community. Stakeholders are in the process of coordinating and developing action plans with short and long-term initiatives. These plans will be used as a foundation for implementing both short and long-term improvements. In FY18, ten Army Installations will conduct Innovation Demonstrations that will highlight and measure many of the efforts and initiatives developed to encourage and promote health and wellness to the total community. These demonstrations will take full advantage of the many programs and support structures already in place to support the community and will increase education and awareness.

Answer. A. Healthy food options are generally available to Sailors who, depending on their messing status, have a variety of choices for where they obtain their food. For the approximately 70% of Sailors who live off-base and receive a basic allowance for subsistence (and those who live on base but are authorized to mess separately) food options include the base or ships galley, the commissary, civilian grocery stores, NEXCOM mini-markets, and both on-base and off-base restaurants. Sailors provided subsistence in kind are entitled to take all of their meals at the galley, which always provides healthy options, but are free to use their income to purchase food at commercial establishments if they desire. NEXCOM supports healthy eating across the spectrum of food sales. The food and merchandising experts, with the guidance of the staff dietician, work to ensure a balance of eating options at each installation. As part of NEXCOM's "A Better You Program," exercise and healthy lifestyle products and information are promoted, and healthy eating is addressed through: 1. Food Service—NEXCOM provides name-brand food service as a complement to government dining facilities (where available) and home eating. Food service contracts include a clause requiring food partners to post nutritional information on their food offerings. The Subway chain represents approximately 20% of NEXCOM's fast food portfolio and is widely recognized as an industry leading healthy brand, and each restaurant is encouraged to provide healthy menu options. As new or existing spaces become available, new partners that promote healthier eating are pursued. 2. Retail—NEXCOM has extended a Fresh Food Initiative to 87 locations such as minimarts and micromarkets, across CONUS and OCONUS. These locations feature a full assortment of grab-and-go healthy options such as whole and cut fruits, gourmet wraps, salads, sandwiches, vegetables and yogurt. B. Providing for the optimal nutritional fitness and well-being of Service members, without unreasonably infringing on their personal liberties, is a priority for the Navy. Optimized nutrition is a significant component of preventive health strategies with potentially significant pay back in maintaining mission readiness, long-term health, and well-being while reducing personnel losses, subsequent accessions and training, and direct health treatment costs. Sailor's food choices are affected by taste, price, convenience, and nutritional literacy. The Navy has several programs to improve nutritional literacy, including "Go For Green" food labeling in the galleys and the Navy Operational Fitness and Fueling Series (NOFFS). However, while Sailors are generally aware of the healthy food choice, they often choose less nutritious options because of taste, price or convenience. The proposed example of a Nutrition Coordinator on every base is likely to have a low return on investment because of the challenge posed by complex mix of appropriated, non-appropriated and off-base food options and the vastly different business imperatives they face.

Answer. A. Marine Corps Manpower and Reserve Affairs' (M&RA) Business & Support Services Division (MR) encompasses the Marine Corps Exchange (MCX), Marine Marts, Vending, Tactical Field Exchanges and MWR Food Operations (clubs, food courts, snack bars, and restaurants). These are valued non-appropriated fund (NAF) entities that provide critical financial support to a myriad of MWR, and Family Readiness programs. These venues provide a variety of items geared towards the promotion of an active healthy lifestyle. Our MCX has increased the number of

healthy grab-and-go offerings at Marine Marts, highlighting "Better for You" products including beverages, fresh fruits, yogurts, smoothies, boiled eggs, snack foods, sandwiches, salads, as well as, creatively packaged lunch kits designed as portion-controlled convenience offerings. Similarly, Marine Corps NAF food courts, snack bars and restaurants feature several healthier concepts such as Wheatfields, LifeJuice, Panera Bread, Chopz and Jamba Juice. Additionally, many Marine Corps clubs offer reduced portion sizes, expanded salad bars, and alternative sides such as fruit or steamed vegetables. B. The Marine Corps actively participates in several DoD-led programs to develop new ways to promote healthy lifestyles for Marines and their families, including: DoD's Total Force Fitness initiative, which is a framework for building and maintaining health, readiness and performance; Operation Live Well, a DoD wellness campaign, aimed to make healthy living an easy choice for service members, retirees, civilians and their families; and DoD's Nutrition Committee. We have also partnered with Cornell University, the National Association of Convenience Stores, and Pepsi & Coca-Cola to test new ways of promoting healthy consumption choices. A mandated education component by credentialed nutritional educators would assist in demystifying purported "healthy" items. Transforming available food options on the installations by nutritionally educated Marines who choose to spend their food dollars on healthy options, rather than on less healthy options.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Mr. Ryan. Questions submitted by Ms. Kaptur and the answers thereto follow:]

DOMESTIC SMALL GAS TURBINE ENGINES

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. What steps are the DoD taking to preserve a dual domestic source for procurement and maintenance of small gas turbine engines (the type used to power Harpoon and F–107 missiles)?

Answer. Small gas turbine engines power the U.S. Navy Harpoon, Standoff Land-Attack Missile-Expanded Response (SLAM–ER) and Tomahawk weapons. The Harpoon and SLAM–ER are powered by J402 engines, which Teledyne Technologies manufactures. Tomahawks are powered by F107 and F415 engines manufactured by Williams International. Both Teledyne Technologies and Williams International are domestic companies. Currently, these weapons are in production for the U.S. Navy or foreign military sales. Additionally, there are maintenance activities for sustainment that include tasks performed by these engine companies. Looking to the future, Williams International, Teledyne Technologies, and Florida Turbine Technologies (also a domestic company) are individually partnered with the Department of Defense under the Versatile Affordable Advanced Turbine Engine (VAATE) Consortium. This consortium aligns technology investments with projected requirements of future programs. The domestic industrial base for small gas turbines is assessed as healthy. This position is supported by participation of two domestic engine companies in production and maintenance activities of current weapon systems along with membership/involvement of three domestic sources in technology advancement of small gas turbines. This level of participation and interest is providing an innovative environment that includes competitive pressure.

U.S. STEEL INDUSTRY

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. What are the DoD's concerns as related to our national security due to the stresses on our U.S. Steel Industry caused by severe dumping by China, South Korea and Russia?

Answer. The Department's concerns related to our national security resulting from stresses caused by excess foreign production capacity on the U.S. Steel Industry are generally associated with potential adverse impacts and negative effects on the viability of U.S. steel producers. DoD needs a healthy U.S. steel industry, but military uses of steel represent approximately three percent of U.S. steel demand. Therefore, the Department believes that DoD programs will be able to acquire the steel necessary to meet national defense requirements.

BERYLLIUM

WITNESS: MATTIS, JAMES

Question. What is the DoD doing to preserve our single source of domestic Beryllium?

Answer. In 2005, the Department of Defense (DoD) executed and successfully completed a 9-year beryllium domestic-production, capacity-development project. The project's purpose was to establish and preserve an assured supply of beryllium for U.S. defense requirements. The Department is undertaking a refreshed industrial base assessment of beryllium. The purposes of this assessment are to identify any new unmet U.S. defense requirements for beryllium, and if so, the potential need for further industrial base investment by the Department in related areas. We expect to complete this assessment during 2018.

RUSSIAN THREAT

WITNESS: DUNFORD, JOSEPH

Question. Please summarize the nature of the Russian threat.

Answer. Russia presents the greatest array of military challenges and remains the only potential existential threat to the United States. They continue to invest in a full-range of capabilities designed to limit our ability to project power into Europe and meet our alliance commitments to NATO. These capabilities include long-range conventional strike, cyber, space, electronic warfare, ground force and undersea capabilities. Russia is also modernizing all elements of its nuclear triad. These modernization efforts must also be viewed in the context of their activities in the Ukraine, Crimea, and Syria. Russia's operations, capability development, and asymmetric doctrinal and strategic approaches are designed to counter NATO and U.S. power projection capability, and undermine the credibility of the NATO alliance.

ARTICLE 5

WITNESS: DUNFORD, JOSEPH

Question. Please state for the record, why are the European Reassurance Initiative and affirmation of our Article 5 commitment so critical to democracy?

Answer. The North Atlantic Treaty is founded on the principles of democracy, individual liberty, and the rule of law. The Treaty reflects the commitment of all NATO Allies to safeguard the freedom, common heritage and civilization of their people, to promote stability and well-being in the North Atlantic area, and to unite their efforts for the preservation of peace and security and for collective defense. Article 5 is the foundation on which this commitment is based, and has ensured the security of the Euro-Atlantic area since 1949. The U.S. commitment to Article 5 not only reassures our NATO Allies that the U.S. will take action, in the event of an armed attack against one of more of them, to restore and maintain the security of the North Atlantic area; but it also serves to deter any potential aggressor from conducting an armed attack against any NATO nation, knowing the U.S. will respond, in accordance with Article 5. The 2014 Russian occupation and annexation of Crimea, and subsequent Russian backed and led fighting in the Donbass, has shown Russia's willingness to use force to achieve its objectives, and disregard for the sovereignty of independent nations. These Russian actions have led to concern and uncertainty in many of the democratic nations of Europe. The European Reassurance Initiative is a tangible demonstration of our commitment to democracy in Europe, reassures our democratic allies that we are committed to their sovereignty, and shows Russia that their efforts to undermine democracy in Europe will not be tolerated, and will be met with force if needed.

[CLERK'S NOTE.—End of questions submitted by Ms. Kaptur.]

PUBLIC WITNESS STATEMENTS

The Neurofibromatosis Network

National Multiple Sclerosis Society

The Michael J. Fox Foundation

Human Factors and Ergonomics Society

Public Witness Testimony
Submitted to the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense
By Kim Bischoff, Executive Director
The Neurofibromatosis Network

Thank you for the opportunity to submit testimony to the Subcommittee on the importance of continued funding for the Department of Defense's Peer-reviewed Neurofibromatosis (NF) Research Program (NFRP). NF is a terrible genetic disorder closely linked to many common diseases widespread among the American population. The highly successful Neurofibromatosis Research Program has shown tangible results and direct military application with broad implications for the general population.

On behalf of the Neurofibromatosis (NF) Network, a national organization of NF advocacy groups, I speak on behalf of the 120,000 Americans who suffer from NF as well as approximately 175 million Americans who suffer from diseases and conditions linked to NF such as cancer, brain tumors, heart disease, memory loss, bone abnormalities, deafness, blindness, and psychosocial disabilities, such as autism and learning disabilities. Thanks in large part to this Subcommittee's strong support, scientists have made enormous progress since the discovery of the NF1 gene in 1990 resulting in clinical trials now being undertaken by the NFRP.

In Fiscal Year 2018, we are requesting **$15 million to continue the Army's highly successful Neurofibromatosis Research Program (NFRP).** The NFRP is now conducting clinical trials at nation-wide clinical trials centers created by NFRP funding. These clinical trials involve drugs that have already succeeded in eliminating tumors in humans and rescuing learning deficits in mice. Administrators of the Army program have stated that the number of high-quality scientific applications justify a much larger program.

What is Neurofibromatosis (NF)?
NF is an unpredictable genetic disorder of the nervous system that affects almost every organ system in the body. There are three types of NF: NF1, which is more common, NF2, which initially involves tumors causing deafness and balance problems, and Schwannomatosis, the hallmark of which is severe pain. NF causes tumors to grow along nerves including in the skin, just below the skin, and in the brain and spinal cord. NF is the most common neurological disorder caused by a single gene and affects more people than Cystic Fibrosis, hereditary Muscular Dystrophy, Huntington's disease and Tay Sachs combined. It strikes worldwide, without regard to gender, race or ethnicity. Approximately 50 percent of new NF cases result from a spontaneous mutation in an individual's genes and 50 percent are inherited.

NF can cause a myriad of devastating clinical problems including nerve and brain tumors; disfiguring skin growths; inability to heal after bone fracture, which may ultimately require amputation; psychosocial disabilities, including autism and learning disabilities; unmanageable chronic pain; deafness; blindness; cardiovascular defects; vascular disease; muscle weakness; and paralysis. NF gene mutations are also important 'drivers' of cancers in the lungs, liver, brain and breast.

NF's Connection to the Military
Neurofibromatosis (NF) has become a clinical 'model' for advancing medical research. The genetic information learned from NF holds the key to understanding a number of health issues that benefit the war fighter, as well as the general population, including cancer, bone fracture and repair, vascular disease, wound healing and nerve regeneration, behavior and psychosocial issues, muscle weakness, and pain.

The Neurofibromatosis Research Program (NFRP) is providing critical research that directly benefits the War Fighter including:

Bone Repair - At least a quarter of children with NF1 have abnormal bone growth in any part of the skeleton. In the legs, the long bones are weak, prone to fracture and unable to heal properly; this can require amputation at a young age. Adults with NF1 also have low bone mineral density, placing them at risk of skeletal weakness and injury. The NFRP is a strong supporter of NF1 bone defects research and as a result this field has made significant progress in the past few years. Bone fractures sustained by the war fighter and how to repair them is of interest to the military. Research studies will identify new information about understanding bone biology and repair, and will pave the way to new strategies to enhancing bone health and facilitating repair.

Pain Management - Severe and unmanageable pain is seen in all forms of NF, particularly in schwannomatosis, and significantly impacts quality of life. NF research has shown similarities between NF pain and phantom limb pain. NFRP funding has been critical in supporting this. Chronic pain, and how to treat it effectively, is one of the most poorly understood areas of medicine, but has very high relevance to those in the military recovering from service-related injuries. NF Research in this area could help identify new ways to target pain effectively with the right drugs or therapies.

Vascular Disease and Wound Healing - NF1 elevates the risk of vascular disease including aneurysm, stroke and vessel occlusive disease. This can cause premature death, particularly in younger patients. In addition NF1 seems to make small blood vessels around wounds less able to heal. This research will help develop markers for early detection of vascular changes that can predict those at risk of potential forthcoming cardiovascular events as well as developing treatments for this and to increase wound healing capacity which is of great relevance to the warfighter.

Psychosocial Disabilities - In the last couple of years, NFRP research has revealed common threads between NF1 learning disabilities, autism and other related disabilities. Research being done within the NF Clinical Trials Consortium, NFRP created clinical centers, has led to important findings and expanded research in this area. This research contributes to our broadening understanding of how brain signaling can impact on behavior and psychosocial difficulties. Members of the military returning from service can suffer from psychological trauma and it is not easy to understand how this can be effectively treated. As we learn more from the NF population about psychosocial function, we will be able to shed light on this area for the benefit of the military.

Muscle Weakness - There is growing evidence that children with NF1 have inherent low muscle tone and muscle weakness which impacts on quality of life. This emerging area of NF research

has potentially broad relevance. This research opens up a new area of NF research and has potential broader application for recovery from military injuries in particular restoring optimal muscle function.

The Army's Contribution to NF Research
While other federal agencies support medical research, the Department of Defense (DOD) fills a special role by providing peer-reviewed funding for innovative and rewarding medical research through the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program (CDMRP). CDMRP research grants are awarded to researchers in every state in the country through a competitive two-tier review process. These well-executed and efficient programs, including the NFRP, demonstrate the government's responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.

Recognizing NF's importance to both the military and to the general population, Congress has given the Army's NF Research Program strong bipartisan support. From FY96 through FY16 funding for the NFRP has amounted to $302.85 million, in addition to the original $8 million appropriated in FY92. In addition, between FY96 and FY15, 353 awards have been granted to researchers across the country.

The Army program funds innovative, groundbreaking research which would not otherwise have been pursued, and has produced major advances in NF research, including conducting clinical trials in a nation-wide clinical trials infrastructure created by NFRP funding, development of advanced animal models, and preclinical therapeutic experimentation. Because of the enormous advances that have been made as a result of the Army's NF Research Program, research in NF has truly become one of the great success stories in the current revolution in molecular genetics. In addition, the program has brought new researchers into the field of NF. However, despite this progress, Army officials administering the program have indicated that they could easily fund more applications if funding were available because of the high quality of the research applications received.

In order to ensure maximum efficiency, the Army collaborates closely with other federal agencies that are involved in NF research, such as the National Institutes of Health (NIH). Senior program staff from the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS), for example, sit on the Army's NF Research Program Integration Panel which sets the long-term vision and funding strategies for the program. This assures the highest scientific standard for research funding, efficiency and coordination while avoiding duplication or overlapping of research efforts.

Thanks in large measure to this Subcommittee's support; scientists have made enormous progress since the discovery of the NF1 gene. Major advances in just the past few years have ushered in an exciting era of clinical and translational research in NF with broad implications for the general population. These recent advances have included:

- Phase II and Phase III clinical trials involving new drug therapies for both cancer, hearing tumors, vision tumors, bone graft and cognitive disorders;
- Establishment of the Neurofibromatosis Clinical Trial Consortium which includes an operation center and 19 clinical sites. Allows for partnerships with well-established NF

Centers, pooling expertise and resources, quicker turn arounds of scientific reviews and regulatory approvals, leveraged work with pharmaceutical companies all towards the common goal of new treatments and a cure for Neurofibromatosis;

- Successful elimination of tumors in NF1 and NF2 mice with the same drug;
- Development of advanced mouse models showing human symptoms;
- Rescue of learning deficits in mice with an already existing well known drug;
- Determination of the biochemical, molecular function of the NF genes and gene products;
- Connection of NF to numerous diseases because of NF's impact on many body functions.

Fiscal Year 2018 Request

The Army's highly successful NF Research Program has shown tangible results and direct military application with broad implications for the general population. The program has now advanced to the translational and clinical research stages, which are the most promising, yet the most expensive direction that NF research has taken. Therefore, continued funding is needed to continue to build on the successes of this program, and to fund this promising research thereby continuing the enormous return on the taxpayers' investment.

We respectfully request that you include $15 million in the Fiscal Year 2018 Department of Defense Appropriations bill for the Peer-reviewed Neurofibromatosis Research Program. With this subcommittee's continued support, we will prevail. Thank you for your support.

[Insert Subcommittee Name Here]

Witness Disclosure Form

Clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires non-governmental witnesses to disclose to the Committee the following information. A non-governmental witness is any witness appearing on behalf of himself/herself or on behalf of an organization other than a federal agency, or a state, local or tribal government.

Your Name, Business Address, and Telephone Number:
Kim Bischoff
213 S. Wheaton Ave.
Wheaton, IL 60187

1. Are you appearing on behalf of yourself or a non-governmental organization? Please list organization(s) you are representing.

   Neurofibromatosis Network

2. Have you or any organization you are representing received any Federal grants or contracts (including any subgrants or subcontracts) since October 1, 2012 related to the agencies or programs funded by the Subcommittee?

   Yes (No)

3. Have you or any organization you are representing received any contracts or payments originating with a foreign government since October 1, 2012 related to the agencies or programs funded by the Subcommittee?

   Yes (No)

4. If your response to question #2 and/or #3 is "Yes", please list the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), and/or the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract originating with a foreign government. Please also indicate whether the recipient was you or the organization(s) you are representing.

Signature: Kimberly Bischoff Date: 4/5/17

National
Multiple Sclerosis
Society

Leslie Ritter
Senior Director, Federal Government Relations
National Multiple Sclerosis Society
Email: Leslie.Ritter@nmss.org

Before the United States House of Representatives, Committee on Appropriations, Subcommittee on Defense

Madam Chairwoman and Members of the Subcommittee, thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of the National Multiple Sclerosis Society (Society) regarding Department of Defense Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 and to discuss the importance of federal research programs that impact those affected by multiple sclerosis (MS). **As you consider priorities for FY2018, we urge the Subcommittee to provide $10 million in discretionary spending for the MS Research Program (MSRP) within the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs (CDMRP).**

MS is an unpredictable, often disabling disease of the central nervous system that interrupts the flow of information within the brain, and between the brain and body. Symptoms range from numbness and tingling to blindness and paralysis. The progress, severity, and specific symptoms of MS in any one person cannot yet be predicted. Most people with MS are diagnosed between the ages of 20 and 50, with at least two to three times more women than men being diagnosed with the disease.

The Society works to provide solutions to the challenges of multiple sclerosis (MS) so that everyone affected by this disease can live their best lives. To fulfill this mission, we fund cutting edge research, drive change through advocacy, facilitate professional education, collaborate with MS organizations around the world, and provide services designed to help people affected by MS move their lives forward. We see ourselves as a fundamental partner to the U.S. government in many critical areas – particular in the field of MS research. Last year, we dedicated approximately $40 million in MS research that are complementary to research funded by the federal government, including the MSRP within the CDMRP.

The CDMRP is a peer-reviewed program funded through the Department of Defense via the Defense Appropriations Act. Importantly, individual programs like the MSRP are funded at the direction of Congress and fill research gaps by funding high impact, high-risk and high gain projects that other research agencies- like the NIH, may not venture to fund. The CDMRPs are distinctive in that they involve active participation of people living with the program disease area. These patients and patient representatives are highly coveted roles, as they are involved in all areas of the program- from establishing the mission/vision of the program, to reviewing applications and making recommendations for funding, and evaluating the impact of the program. People living with MS value these opportunities within the MSRP as a way they can engage in the research process. Further, the Society applauds the way MSRP's design and believes that it aligns with the direction of patient centered drug development and care.

National
Multiple Sclerosis
Society

MS and military service
In the United States, there are approximately 32,870 veterans living with diagnosed MS. Out of that number, over 11,000 have MS that is deemed service-connected, meaning that their MS was incurred or aggravated during their military service. Each year, the Veterans Health Administration provides care to more than 20,000 veterans living with MS.

MS is considered a presumptive condition and veterans who have symptoms of MS in the military or within seven years after honorable discharge are eligible for the service-connected status. An advisory committee by the Veterans Administration recently recommended further study into the potential link between combat service and increased risk of developing MS. As the underlying cause of MS is still unknown, it is imperative that the federal government fund basic research to help answer fundamental question, and research to help improve the lives of those serving in the military who may be called upon to service in areas and environments that may increase the risk of developing diseases like MS later in life. Research into the underlying causes of MS and improving methods of diagnosing, treating and potentially curing MS is critical to improving the lives of our military servicemen and servicewomen and all of those living with MS.

Multiple Sclerosis Research Program
The MS Research Program (MSRP) was established by Congress in 2009. Its vision is to prevent, cure, reverse, or slow the progression, and lessen the personal and societal impact of MS. Like many of the other programs within the CDMRP, the MSRP specifically encourages applications that address critical needs of the MS community and concentrate on: the biological basis of disease progression, risk factors leading to the prevention of MS, drug discovery and biomarkers for preclinical detection of MS. To date, Congress has appropriated approximately $40 million dollars to the MSRP, including $6 million in 2017. From those appropriations, the MSRP has funded 74 awards that have funded studies that examine gap in MS from basic science to rehabilitation research. As this is a relatively new program, many studies are still in the publication process as biomarkers and other discoveries move through the scientific process and are incorporated into the drug discovery process.

A particular area of interest in MS research is imaging technology, as diagnosis of MS and tracking disease progression remains challenging, both for active duty military personnel, veterans and civilians. MRI's are often used by health care providers to track disease activity. Currently, MRI findings are not accepted by the Food and Drug Administration as indicators of clinical meaningfulness in the drug development and approval process and more research is needed in the form of more long-term studies correlating brain MRI with disability progression.

This is a critical body of research that will improve the drug development process, the ability of the healthcare system to better track disease progression and activity, and allow healthcare providers to better anticipate the needs of people living with MS. The National Institutes of Health, the nation's preeminent biomedical research facility, also conducts imaging research within the National Institute of Biomedical Imaging and Bioengineering: however, the emphasis

National
Multiple Sclerosis
Society

on the research performed at that Agency is on technical development rather than detailed applications to specific diseases. The clinical application of the research done at MSRP is particularly important for those who are living with MS and diagnosed in the military, as it will facilitate better conversations surrounding troop readiness and the ability of an individual to deploy.

The MSRP has funded many studies that have examined methods to improve imaging technology to better track disease progression and to allow for direct detection and quantification of myelin changes in people living with MS. Two innovative ways that imaging improvements are being explored are summarized below:

- Researchers at Case Western Reserve University were funded by the MSRP in 2009 to examine in vivo imaging of myelination for drug discovery. Their goal was to develop novel therapeutics for MS. These researchers developed a myelin-imaging agent, Case Imaging Compound (CIC), which penetrates the blood-brain barrier and attaches to myelinated regions of the brain. CIC has been used for positron emission tomography (PET) imaging that allows for direct imaging of myelin changes in vivo. These studies indicate that this type of imaging could be used as an imaging marker of can be used as an imaging marker of myelination, which has the potential to be translated into clinical studies in MS and other myelin-related diseases for early diagnosis, sub-typing, and efficacious evaluation of therapeutic treatments aimed at myelin repair. The researchers plan to utilize this imaging to examine the efficacy of therapeutic agents in animal models of MS. Results from this study, and subsequent follow up studies, have been published in Journal of Neuroscience and the Annals of Neurology.

- A MSRP funded study that is currently underway at Vanderbilt University is examining ways to improve magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) techniques to quantifiably measure underlying tissue abnormality in brain gray matter areas that results in decreased cognitive performance. Conventional MRI methods are not well suited to measure tissue damage and lesions in the gray matter of the brain, if successful, this study may improve the ability of the healthcare community to diagnose, understand and treat cognitive issues. This study could be transformative for people living with MS, but also for individuals who suffer from other diseases and conditions that result in cognitive impairment.

Because of the tremendous impact the MS CDMRP has on research and development of potential therapies for MS, **the National MS Society requests that Congress provide $10 million in discretionary appropriations.** This funding will allow the CDMRP to continue the innovative research that will improve the lives of those living with MS. Because of limited funding, on average, fewer than 15% of research applications submitted to the MSRP were able to be funded annually between fiscal years 2009-2014.

National
Multiple Sclerosis
Society

The Society thanks the Committee for its investment in the CDMRP, and in particular the MSRP. We appreciate the opportunity to provide written testimony and our recommendations for FY2018 appropriations for the program. The MS CDMRP is of vital importance to people living with MS and we look forward to continuing to working with the Committee to help move us closer to a world free of MS.

[Insert Subcommittee Name Here]

Witness Disclosure Form

Clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires non-governmental witnesses to disclose to the Committee the following information. A non-governmental witness is any witness appearing on behalf of himself/herself or on behalf of an organization other than a federal agency, or a state, local or tribal government.

Your Name, Business Address, and Telephone Number:
Leslie Ritter
1100 New York Ave, NW
Suite 440-E
Washington, D.C. 20005

1. Are you appearing on behalf of yourself or a non-governmental organization? Please list organization(s) you are representing.
National Multiple Sclerosis Society

2. Have you or any organization you are representing received any Federal grants or contracts (including any subgrants or subcontracts) since October 1, 2012 related to the agencies or programs funded by the Subcommittee?

Yes No

3. Have you or any organization you are representing received any contracts or payments originating with a foreign government since October 1, 2012 related to the agencies or programs funded by the Subcommittee?

Yes No

4. If your response to question #2 and/or #3 is "Yes", please list the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), and/or the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract originating with a foreign government. Please also indicate whether the recipient was you or the organization(s) you are representing.

Signature: Leslie Ritter Date: 5/2/17

Testimony of The Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research
United States House of Representatives
Fiscal Year 2018 Appropriations
Subcommittee on Defense, Congressionally Directed Medical Research Programs

The Michael J. Fox Foundation for Parkinson's Research (MJFF) appreciates the opportunity to comment on Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 appropriations for the U.S. Department of Defense. Our comments focus on the importance of federal investment in biomedical research at the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program (CDMRP). **MJFF supports appropriation of at least $20 million to the CDMRP Parkinson's Research Program (PRP)** – which will go part of the way toward recovering money lost since 2010, when the program was funded at $25 million – and bring us closer to better treatments and a cure for Parkinson's disease (PD).

As the world's largest nonprofit funder of PD research, MJFF is dedicated to accelerating a cure for Parkinson's and developing improved therapies for those living with the disease today. In providing more than $700 million in PD research to date, the Foundation has fundamentally altered the trajectory of progress toward a cure. However, MJFF investments are a complement to, rather than a substitute for, federally funded research. With critically needed Parkinson's breakthroughs on the horizon, robust and reliable federal funding is imperative to drive progress. Currently, there is no therapy to slow, stop or reverse the progression of PD. Additionally, existing treatments are limited in their abilities to address patients' medical needs and remain effective over time.

An estimated 80,000 veterans and one million people overall live in the United States with PD, the second most common neurodegenerative disease after Alzheimer's disease. Parkinson's results in an estimated annual economic burden of $19.8 billion to $26.4 billion. Investing in research on the front end to develop innovative therapies and cures can lower back-end costs. New treatments would relieve the burden on Medicare, Medicaid and the Department of Veteran Affairs.

PRP: Efforts to Prevent and Stop Parkinson's Progression

Started in 1997, the CDMRP's Parkinson's Research Program aims to identify and understand risk factors associated with PD (such as chemical exposures, psychological stress and traumatic brain injury) in order to prevent or delay the onset of symptoms, as well as advance the development of new treatments. The program has granted more than 250 awards to investigate a variety of mechanisms of and factors influencing disease progression.

In recent years, program funding has significantly decreased (from $25 million in FY10 to $16 million in FY16). Reinstating funding at previous budget levels will ensure scientific progress of importance to our nation's service members can continue.

For example, PRP-funded research has identified several PD risk factors of interest to the military community and the greater population. Previous studies have implicated exposure to chemicals, such as pesticides and solvents, common in rural communities as associated with the disease. Building on this idea, in 2015, Caroline Tanner, MD, PhD, of the University of California, San Francisco analyzed data and samples from Alaska natives with and without Parkinson's disease and found higher blood levels of hexachlorobenzene and PCBs in people with Parkinson's

disease. However, some people without PD also had high levels of the chemicals in their blood, leading Dr. Tanner to hypothesize a combination of susceptibility and environmental exposure contributes to Parkinson's disease. Understanding possible environmental causes of the disease will help the military reduce exposure through protective equipment or other mitigations and help civilians take measures to reduce their risk.

CDMRP: Unique Research with Reach Beyond the Military

The research portfolio supported by the Congressionally Directed Medical Research Program fuels scientific discovery by propelling exploration of revolutionary ideas and concepts with potential impact for support and treatment for members of the military and the greater national population. The CDMRP funds highly innovative projects — for which support is typically limited or unavailable — from research teams at top universities and medical centers.

It is important to note, as well, Department of Defense programs neither duplicate nor supplant National Institutes of Health (NIH) research programs, but rather enhance those efforts. NIH-funded basic research serves as a foundation for groundbreaking, disorder-targeted research at the DoD. NIH and DoD program officers meet to ensure collaboration and prevent duplication.

The well-executed and efficient programs within the defense health research programs demonstrate responsible government stewardship of taxpayer dollars and benefit current and former military service members, the general patient population, and our nation's economy. DoD's biomedical research funding has led to many significant breakthroughs and achievements, contributing to national security and the health and welfare of U.S. Armed Forces personnel and their dependents.

Please continue investment in Americans' health and wellbeing by allocating $20 million dollars for the PRP in FY2018 and supporting CDMRP programs generally. Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony.

Todd Sherer
Chief Executive Officer

[Insert Subcommittee Name Here]

DoD

Witness Disclosure Form

Clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires non-governmental witnesses to disclose to the Committee the following information. A non-governmental witness is any witness appearing on behalf of himself/herself or on behalf of an organization other than a federal agency, or a state, local or tribal government.

Your Name, Business Address, and Telephone Number:
The Michael J. Fox Foundation
Grand Central Station
P.O. Box 4777
New York, New York 10163-4777 1800-708-7644

1. Are you appearing on behalf of yourself or a non-governmental organization? Please list organization(s) you are representing.

   The Michael J. Fox Foundation

2. Have you or any organization you are representing received any Federal grants or contracts (including any subgrants or subcontracts) since October 1, 2012 related to the agencies or programs funded by the Subcommittee?

   Yes (No)

3. Have you or any organization you are representing received any contracts or payments originating with a foreign government since October 1, 2012 related to the agencies or programs funded by the Subcommittee?

   Yes (No)

4. If your response to question #2 and/or #3 is "Yes", please list the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), and/or the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract originating with a foreign government. Please also indicate whether the recipient was you or the organization(s) you are representing.

Signature: Brittany Weyer

Date: 05/02/17

**Human Factors
and Ergonomics
Society**

**Official Written Testimony in Support of
Fiscal Year 2018 Science and Research Funding**

Submitted to the House Subcommittee on Defense, and Related Agencies
Committee on Appropriations
United States House of Representatives
June 6, 2017

Submitted by
Nancy J. Cooke, Ph.D., President, Human Factors and Ergonomics Society
Lynn Strother, Executive Director, Human Factors and Ergonomics Society

On behalf of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society (HFES), we are pleased to provide this written testimony to the House Subcommittee on Defense and Related Agencies for the official record. **HFES urges the Subcommittee to provide robust funding levels for Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation (RDT&E) at the Department of Defense (DOD) in the fiscal year (FY) 2018 appropriations process. Specifically, we urge the Subcommittee to direct DOD to identify opportunities to transition human performance research to defense acquisition programs to reduce cost, strengthen force protection, reduce potential for re-engineering, and enhance training.**

HFES and its members recognize and appreciate the challenging fiscal environment in which we as a nation currently find ourselves; however, we believe strongly that investment in scientific research serves as an important driver for innovation and the economy and for maintaining American global competitiveness. We thank the Subcommittee for its longtime recognition of the value of scientific and engineering research and its contribution to innovation in the U.S.

The Value of Human Factors and Ergonomics Science

HFES is a multidisciplinary professional association with over 4,500 individual members worldwide, including psychologists and other scientists, engineers, and designers, all with a common interest in designing safe and effective systems and equipment that maximize and adapt to human capabilities.

For over 50 years, the U.S. federal government has funded scientists and engineers to explore and better understand the relationship between humans, technology, and the environment. Originally stemming from urgent needs to improve the performance of humans using complex systems such as aircraft during World War II, the field of human factors and ergonomics (HF/E) works to develop safe, effective, and practical human use of technology. HF/E does this by developing scientific approaches for understanding this complex interface, also known as

"human-systems integration." Today, HF/E is applied to fields as diverse as transportation, architecture, environmental design, consumer products, electronics and computers, energy systems, medical devices, manufacturing, office automation, organizational design and management, aging, farming, health, sports and recreation, oil field operations, mining, forensics, and education.

With increasing reliance by federal agencies and the private sector on technology-aided decision-making, HF/E is vital to effectively achieving our national objectives. While a large proportion of HF/E research exists at the intersection of science and practice—that is, HF/E is often viewed more at the "applied" end of the science continuum—the field also contributes to advancing "fundamental" scientific understanding of the interface between human decision-making, engineering, design, technology, and the world around us. The reach of HF/E is profound, touching nearly all aspects of human life from the health care sector, to the ways we travel, to the hand-held devices we use every day.

Human Factors and Ergonomics at the Department of Defense

HFES and its members believe strongly that federal investment in DOD will have a direct and positive impact on the U.S. economy, national security, and the safety and well-being of Americans. It is for these reasons that HFES supports robust funding for DOD, especially for the Army Human Factors Engineering Technology applied research program and the Navy Personnel, Training, Simulation, and Human Factors program within Engineering and Manufacturing Development to encourage further advancements in the fields of technology, safety, and human factors, among others.

DOD has openly acknowledged the significance of human factors research and the potential for interagency collaboration through the creation of the Department of Defense Human Factors Engineering Technical Group (DOD HFE TAG). Composed of representatives from DOD, National Aeronautical and Space Association (NASA), Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), and the Department of Homeland Security (DHS), the scope of this working group is broad and its benefits are diverse.

In particular, the goals of DOD HFE TAG are to:

- Provide a mechanism for the timely exchange of technical information in the development and application of human factors engineering.
- Enhance coordination among government agencies involved in HF/E technology research, development, and application.
- Assist in the preparation and coordination of tri-service documents, and sponsor in-depth interaction, which aids in identifying HF/E technical issues and technology gaps.

This research undoubtedly affects the safety and well-being of American citizens and it is for this reason that we request robust funding levels for human factors research in DOD in FY 2018.

Conclusion

Given DOD's critical role in supporting fundamental research and development across defense and engineering disciplines, HFES supports robust funding levels for DOD RDT&E programs, especially those that specifically fund human factors, in FY 2018 as well as improvements to the inclusion of human systems integration in acquisition programs. These investments fund important research studies, enabling an evidence base, methodology, and measurements for improving organizational function, performance, and design across sectors and disciplines.

On behalf of the HFES, we would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony. Please do not hesitate to contact us should you have any questions about HFES or HF/E research. HFES truly appreciates the Subcommittee's long history of support for scientific research and innovation.

P.O. Box 1369, Santa Monica, CA 90403-1369, USA
310/394-1811 • Fax 310/394-2410
Email: info@hfes.org Web site: http://www.hfes.org

Subcommittee on Defense, and Related Agencies

[Insert Subcommittee Name Here]

Witness Disclosure Form

Clause 2(g) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives requires non-governmental witnesses to disclose to the Committee the following information. A non-governmental witness is any witness appearing on behalf of himself/herself or on behalf of an organization other than a federal agency, or a state, local or tribal government.

Your Name, Business Address, and Telephone Number: (202) 289-7475
Jason Gallagher, HFES Government Relations
440 1st St. NW, Suite 700 Washington, DC 20001

1. Are you appearing on behalf of yourself or a non-governmental organization? Please list organization(s) you are representing.

The Human Factors and Ergonomics Society

2. Have you or any organization you are representing received any Federal grants or contracts (including any subgrants or subcontracts) since October 1, 2012 related to the agencies or programs funded by the Subcommittee?

Yes (No)

3. Have you or any organization you are representing received any contracts or payments originating with a foreign government since October 1, 2012 related to the agencies or programs funded by the Subcommittee?

Yes (No)

4. If your response to question #2 and/or #3 is "Yes", please list the amount and source (by agency and program) of each Federal grant (or subgrant thereof) or contract (or subcontract thereof), and/or the amount and country of origin of any payment or contract originating with a foreign government. Please also indicate whether the recipient was you or the organization(s) you are representing.

Signature: Date: 6/6/2017

WITNESSES

	Page
Arrington, Hon. Jodey C.	187
Bischoff, Kim	530
Blumenauer, Hon. Earl	110
Bordallo, Hon. Madeleine Z.	2
Bridenstine, Hon. Jim	10
Byrne, Hon. Bradley	90
Cartwright, Hon. Matt	161
Clay, Hon. Wm. Lacy	69
Cook, Hon. Paul	99
Cooke, Nancy J.	543
Davidson, Hon. Warren	169
Dunford, General Joseph F.	473
Fitzpatrick, Hon. Brian K.	16
Franks, Hon. Trent	117
Gaetz, Hon. Matt	64
Gallagher, Hon. Mike	175
Hanabusa, Hon. Colleen	52
Harris, Admiral Harry B., Jr	282
Hartzler, Hon. Vicky	149
Hunter, Hon. Duncan	78
Johnson, Hon. Mike	123
Kelly, Hon. Trent	136
Knight, Hon. Steve	140
Langevin, Hon. James R.	45
Lengyel, General Joseph L.	319
Lieu, Hon. Ted	107
Luckey, Lieutenant General Charles	349
Lujan Grisham, Hon. Michelle	73
Mattis, Hon. James N.	455
McCollum, Vice Admiral Luke	363
McGovern, Hon. James P.	143
McMillian, Lieutenant General Rex	387
McSally, Hon. Martha	28
Meehan, Hon. Patrick	35
Miller, Lieutenant General Maryanne	415
Norquist, David	451
Panetta, Hon. Jimmy	39
Radewagen, Hon. Auma Amata Coleman	103
Ritter, Leslie	535
Scaparrotti, General Curtis M.	259
Sherer, Todd	540
Stivers, Hon. Steve	84
Strother, Lynn	543

Page
Suozzi, Hon. Thomas R. 59
Tenney, Hon. Claudia 131
Thompson, Hon. Glenn 6
Votel, General James 189
Wagner, Hon. Ann 165
Webster, Hon. Daniel 182
Wenstrup, Hon. Brad 154
Williams, Hon. Roger 20
Wilson, Hon. Joe 24

○