

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018**

---

**WEDNESDAY, MARCH 22, 2017**

U.S. SENATE,  
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,  
*Washington, DC.*

The subcommittee met at 10:30 a.m., in room SD-192, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Thad Cochran (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Cochran, Shelby, Collins, Murkowski, Graham, Blunt, Daines, Moran, Durbin, Leahy, Reed, Tester, Udall, Schatz, and Baldwin.

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE**

**DEFENSE READINESS AND BUDGET UPDATE**

**STATEMENT OF THE HON. JAMES N. MATTIS, SECRETARY OF  
DEFENSE**

**OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN**

Senator COCHRAN. The Subcommittee on Defense Appropriations of the United States Senate will come to order.

Today, we are receiving an update on military readiness and defense budget matters. We are pleased to welcome to the committee the Honorable James N. Mattis, Secretary of Defense, and General Joseph Dunford, Jr., Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense appropriations agreement has been approved by the other body, the House of Representatives, and I look forward to our completing work on that bill in the coming weeks. We are well into the fiscal year, and members of the subcommittee understand the importance of enacting defense appropriations legislation.

As we complete our work on the 2017 defense appropriations agreement, we also recognize that a request for additional appropriations in fiscal year 2017 has been submitted to the Congress. We welcome comments from our panel, as well as on the submission for 2018.

It is a distinct honor to have the Secretary of Defense before us in his first appearance as Secretary. I also am pleased to welcome General Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, before the committee.

We look forward to hearing more about your priorities and efforts to increase military readiness and strengthen the Department of Defense.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR THAD COCHRAN

The Subcommittee on Defense will come to order. Today we are receiving an update on military readiness and defense budget matters. We are pleased to welcome the Honorable James N. Mattis, Secretary of Defense and General Joseph F. Dunford, Jr., Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff.

The fiscal year 2017 Department of Defense Appropriations agreement has been approved by the House of Representatives, and I look forward to the Senate completing work on that bill in the coming weeks. We are well into the fiscal year, and members of this Subcommittee understand the importance of enacting defense appropriations legislation.

As we complete our work on the 2017 defense appropriations agreement, we also recognize that a request for additional appropriations in fiscal year 2017 has been submitted to Congress. We welcome comments from our panel on the budget amendment, as well as the submission for fiscal year 2018.

It is a distinct honor to have the Secretary of Defense before us in his first appearance as Secretary. I am also pleased to welcome back the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff before the Subcommittee.

We look forward to hearing more about your priorities and efforts to increase military readiness and strengthen the Department of Defense.

I now turn to the Vice Chairman, Senator Durbin, for his opening remarks. Thank you.

Senator COCHRAN. I now turn to the Vice Chairman, Senator Durbin, for any opening remarks he has.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD J. DURBIN

Senator DURBIN. Thanks, Chairman Cochran. I am pleased to join you in welcoming Secretary Mattis and General Dunford. I have tremendous respect for both of these outstanding leaders, and give special welcome to Secretary Mattis in his first appearance before the Defense Subcommittee.

Our Nation has been at war for nearly 16 years, and the toll of these conflicts can be measured in many ways. More than 6,900 Americans have given their lives in Iraq and Afghanistan, more than 52,000 wounded. Our VA clinics and hospitals are serving more than 2.5 million veterans of these wars. Our taxpayers have provided \$1.8 trillion to support the men and women who continue to serve overseas.

It is not surprising we find our Armed Forces are currently under strain, but the evidence is mounting that it is not necessarily a decade and a half of war that is straining our military, but instead, a self-inflicted congressional wound, called "sequestration."

Sequestration cuts in 2013 eliminated \$35 billion from the Department of Defense's base budget virtually overnight. The shockwave of these cuts, which were never ever supposed to happen, rippled through the training, maintenance, and readiness of our military such that the military Services have estimated it will take until nearly 2020 to fully recover from sequestration.

We could tick off through sequestration's impact the jobs and our economic growth just as easily, because it hit just as hard on domestic spending.

The Administration has proposed \$30 billion in additional defense spending, \$25 billion to build readiness, \$5 billion to increase spending on Afghanistan, and a counter ISIL (Islamic State of Iraq and the Levant) campaign.

I have four concerns. First, their proposal appears to do very little to restore readiness of our Armed Forces in the short term. Congress had already addressed \$5 billion of the requested funds in the pending defense appropriations bill.

Of the remaining funding, only about \$8 billion—\$8 billion—is for near term training and maintenance. In addition, we are not being told this package will accelerate the time line for the services to fully recover their readiness.

Number two. The \$5 billion in overseas contingency operations funding is being requested without a strategy to support it. In fact, the President's new counter ISIL strategy may not be presented to Congress until May of this year.

Secretary Mattis and General Dunford, I hope you can provide insights on what this strategy may be. What are we getting ready for? What are the priorities? That is not a hard question. It is an important question if we are being asked to appropriate this money. In short, it is a readiness package the Department says will not improve readiness and a war request disconnected from a strategy.

Third. The Administration's package proposes \$18 billion in cuts to non-defense programs to offset the increased military spending. The Administration has provided no detail on these cuts, but we all know what is on the chopping block.

The White House is already proposing extremely reckless cuts to agencies like the State Department for the next year, which would jeopardize our Nation's ability to deal with crises without resorting to arms.

I wish the White House had listened to then General Jim Mattis' views on the State Department. In 2013, as Commander of the U.S. Central Command, General Mattis stated "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition ultimately."

The harm will go well beyond hurting our national security. Some of the cuts could cut into medical research, something that many of us on this panel feel very strongly about. Education, and everything in between.

Our Armed Forces depend on a healthy, well-educated American workforce to sign up and serve our country. Cutting these programs will ultimately shrink the pool of Americans who can serve in our military, making these proposals today and in the long term very shortsighted.

Finally, the Administration does nothing about sequestration. If Congress enacted this package tomorrow as is, OMB (Office of Management and Budget) had submitted it, it would trigger an immediate across the board sequestration of military programs. Can you believe it? More money, triggering a cut.

OMB is asking to spend more than the law allows for defense, but it did not ask for us to change this underlying mendacious sequestration law. OMB is asking to spend more than the law allows, and we need to do something about it.

Previous administrations did this frequently when they made these requests, but not this Administration. President Trump's proposal is incomplete, and it really does not address this issue in a serious way.

Mr. Secretary, General Dunford, we all recognize there are holes in our Armed Forces that need to be fixed. I hope you go further in your testimony to explain these.

Congress needs to know why you think this is a spending package that needs to be passed, considering the problems with this proposal, the cuts to domestic and diplomatic spending, the lack of a new counter ISIL strategy, the modest funding for increased training, and the lack of any fix to sequestration. It appears that Congress may need to consider significant changes.

Let me say as I close, one floor up, I am in the Judiciary Committee on a hearing with the Supreme Court nominee, and I will be on the docket in just a few minutes. Excuse me if I am gone. I promise to return.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. Welcome to the committee. We appreciate you being here. We will now hear from the Secretary of Defense, James Mattis.

#### SUMMARY STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES N. MATTIS

Secretary MATTIS. Chairman Cochran, Vice Chairman Durbin, distinguished Senators: I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in support of the President's request for additional funding and any other matters of interest to the committee.

Mr. Chairman, I request the committee accept my statement for the record.

Senator COCHRAN. Without objection.

Secretary MATTIS. Thank you, sir. As you know, the President is committed to strengthening our military. The security situation facing our country has become more challenging; the looming threats have outstripped the level of resources we have been allocating to defense.

We in the Department are keenly aware of the sacrifices made by the American people in the form of the additional \$30 billion budget request. We take seriously the responsibility to spend this money wisely, and to enhance the protection of our Nation against emerging threats.

We also recognize that hesitation now to invest in defense would deepen the strategic mismatch between our future security and the military means to protect our people and freedoms.

Our military must ensure that the President and our diplomats always negotiate from a position of strength. Global threats require a global response, applying the full weight of our own and our allies' powers, allies which are also increasing their defense outlays.

Diplomatic solutions will remain our preferred options, although we cannot deny the role of our military in setting the conditions for diplomatic progress. Military deterrence is only credible if military strength is sufficiently formidable that our allies can confidently align with us in tempering adversaries' designs.

We must look reality in the eye. We see Russia and China seeking veto power over the economic, diplomatic, and security decisions of nations on their periphery.

Terrorist groups murder the innocent and threaten peace in many regions, and target us. North Korea's reckless rhetoric and provocative actions continue, despite United Nations' censure and sanctions.

This situation calls for our Department to maintain a safe and secure nuclear deterrent and a decisive conventional force that can also fight irregular enemies, since our military must be able to counter all threats facing us.

I am here today to request your support for the additional \$30 billion request for fiscal year 2017. General Dunford and I will outline what this additional funding will do for our Nation's defense, but the reason we are appearing here cannot be considered in isolation.

While some might prefer a larger amount, several compelling factors convinced us to limit the request. It is late in this fiscal year, and the \$30 billion is the number we believe we can execute responsibly.

In concert with this budget request, we must also have continuity of effort that is not possible under another continuing resolution. Only a fiscal year 2017 appropriations bill can permit us to spend the American taxpayers' money judiciously, and start us on the long road back to military readiness, and ensure we can fight effectively.

I must note there are specific readiness gaps across our forces, which I would prefer to address in closed session, so as not to embolden our enemies.

The request before you represents the first step in a three-phased multiyear effort to restore readiness. Phase one is this year's budget appropriation, including the \$30 billion request for additional appropriations for fiscal year 2017, to get our aircraft back in the air, our ships back to sea, and our troops back in the field with refurbished or new equipment and proper training. We based this request on a realistic appreciation of the capacity we need to fight and win on the battlefield.

Phase two starts with our fiscal year 2018 budget request to balance the defense program. This funding will allow us to acquire capabilities we do not have or cannot execute this fiscal year, and it will allow us to adapt to the changing character of war by providing cyber, space, and electronic warfare capabilities.

Phase three looks beyond 2018. We will work with the Congress and this committee to integrate our fiscal year 2019 to 2023 budget within a coherent strategy.

To ensure our strategy is fit for its time, we have initiated the Defense Strategy Review directed by this Congress to reimagine our strategic concepts in all areas, and we will complete the review by this fall to ensure a new framework informs our long-term planning.

I know we will have to make hard choices. With the help of the Congress, I believe we can build a force that is more lethal without placing undue burden on the American economy. This will require a sustained commitment from the Congress in the form of additional funding and regular on time budgets.

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 and to keep our Armed Forces second to none, and I welcome your questions. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HON. JAMES N. MATTIS

Chairman Cochran, Vice Chairman Durbin, distinguished Senators, I appreciate the opportunity to testify today in support of the President's request for additional funding and other matters of interest to the committee. Mr. Chairman, I request the committee accept my statement for the record.

As you know, the President is committed to strengthening our military. The security situation facing our country has become more challenging; the looming threats have outstripped the level of resources we have been allocating to defense.

I wish to state at the outset of this hearing that we in the Department of Defense are keenly aware of the sacrifices made by the American people in the form of the additional \$30 billion budget request in fiscal year 2017. We take seriously the responsibility to spend wisely this money to enhance the protection of our Nation against emerging threats. This increase in funding will help address the worsening security situation confronting us around the globe. We must recognize that hesitation now to invest in defense would deepen the strategic mismatch between our future security and the military means to protect our people and freedoms.

Our military must ensure that the President and our diplomats always negotiate from a position of strength. Global threats require a global response applying the full weight of our own and our Allies' power, Allies which are also increasing their defense outlays.

Diplomatic solutions will remain our preferred options but we cannot deny the role of our military in setting the conditions for diplomatic progress: military deterrence is only credible if the military strength is sufficiently formidable that Allies can confidently align with us in tempering adversaries' designs.

We must look reality in the eye: we see Russia and China seeking veto power over the economic, diplomatic, and security decisions of nations on their periphery. Terrorist groups murder the innocent and threaten peace in many regions and target us. North Korea's reckless rhetoric and provocative actions continue despite United Nations censure and sanctions. This situation calls for our Department to maintain a safe and secure nuclear deterrent and a decisive conventional force that can also fight irregular enemies, since our military must be able to counter all threats facing us.

I'm here today to request your support for the additional \$30 billion request for fiscal year 2017. General Dunford and I will outline what this additional funding will do for our Nation's defense. But the reason we are appearing here cannot be considered in isolation. While some might prefer a larger amount, several compelling factors convinced us to limit the request. It is late in this fiscal year and this \$30 billion is the number we believe we can execute responsibly. We want to do everything we can to ensure wise allocation of these funds. In concert with this budget request, we must also have continuity of effort that is not possible under another continuing resolution. Only an fiscal year 2017 appropriations bill can permit us to spend the American taxpayers' money judiciously and start us on the long road back to military readiness to ensure we can fight effectively. The last 6 years of sequester's effects, budget cuts, and repeated Continuing Resolutions have damaged our readiness to a degree that will take time to recover.

The request before you represents the first step in a three-phased multi-year effort to restore readiness. In fiscal year 2017, we will fill in readiness gaps that must be initiated this year. In fiscal year 2018, we will seek to balance the force with a budget that precludes further damage stemming from Continuing Resolutions and sequestration. By fiscal year 2019, I expect our force growth will be on track and sustained with high quality troops supported by equipment programs, permitting us to adapt to the changing character of modern war.

I must note there are specific readiness gaps across our forces, which I prefer to address in closed session so as not to embolden our enemies.

Phase one is this year's defense appropriation, including the \$30 billion request for additional appropriations for fiscal year 2017, to get our aircraft back in the air, our ships back to sea, and our troops back in the field with refurbished or new equipment and proper training. This is a necessary investment to ensure our military is ready to fight today.

The request represents a consolidated effort to fill current warfighting readiness needs, including \$25 billion of additional funding for maintenance, spare parts, training time, flying hours, munitions stocks, and manpower, as well as funding to support the Services' highest-priority unfunded requirements. The request also includes \$5 billion to accelerate the campaign to defeat ISIS, address emerging requirements for Operation Freedom's Sentinel, and provide support to other global

counterterrorism operations. We are confident we can efficiently allocate this increase and spend it responsibly in the months remaining in the fiscal year.

Consistent with my initial budget guidance to the Department, we based this request on a realistic appreciation of the capacity we need to fight and win on the battlefield. Beginning to fill readiness needs and field a ready joint force in the future requires more than just closing a gap in Operation and Maintenance funding in fiscal year 2017. The reality is that we cannot repair our way out of this problem: we cannot stay ready only with the equipment we have today, much of which is hard used and beyond its useful life. In some cases, we need to acquire new equipment to increase the inventory of forces that are ready to deploy. I have imposed rigorous oversight of the budget process, ensuring the Services have tied their requests solely to readiness needs—and I have a personal responsibility to discipline our requests moving forward.

—The Army’s request includes funding for the additional 28,000 Soldiers approved in the fiscal year 2017 National Defense Authorization Act; for additional training and flight hours across all components; for munitions and ammunition production capabilities; and for equipment and modernization, including aircraft, unmanned aerial systems, and air defense systems.

—The Navy’s request includes funding for the additional 3,592 Sailors and 2,426 Marines. It includes funding for increases in ship maintenance costs; for pilot training, including additional tactical and student flight hours; for additional aviation spare and repair parts; for an additional 24 F/A–18 E/F Super Hornet aircraft to support continuing need for combat aircraft; and for ground combat and communications equipment for Marine Corps operating forces.

—The Air Force’s request includes funding for the additional 4,000 Airmen approved in the fiscal year 2017 NDAA. It includes funding for increasing the number of pilots in the Air Force; for sustainment of weapons systems to increase aircraft availability; for additional F–35A, MC–130J, and HC–130J aircraft; for modification, upgrades, and life-extension efforts on F–15, F–16, and other aircraft; and for the support of flight line and maintenance operations, including investments in facility operations, restoration, and modernization.

Phase two starts with our fiscal year 2018 budget request to balance the defense program and prepare for sustained growth. This funding will allow us to acquire capabilities we do not have or cannot execute this year, and it will allow us to adapt to the changing character of war by providing cyber, space, and electronic warfare capabilities.

The Department will work in concert with congressional leaders to reverse sequestration. This would return Congress to its active oversight role instead of relying on non-strategic and self-destructive cuts. Failure to reverse sequestration would bring about the need to recalibrate our approach to asserting U.S. influence around the world.

Phase three looks beyond fiscal year 2018. We will work with the Congress and this committee to integrate our fiscal year 2019–2023 budget request within a coherent strategy. We recognize we must address urgent threats like North Korea and violent jihadist terrorists in transnational organizations. But we cannot focus solely on urgent threats when other countries with far greater potential to threaten our future security continue to expand their military capability.

To ensure our strategy is fit for its time, we have initiated the Defense Strategy Review directed by the Congress to reimagine our strategic concepts in all areas. We will complete the review by this fall to ensure a new framework informs our long-term planning, matches resources to our strategic commitments, and avoids the hubris that we can predict the threats of the future. We will also work with the President and the Congress to ensure the budget we present is sustainable and that it provides the Commander-in-Chief with viable military options.

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. I know we will have to make hard choices as we develop our new defense strategy and shape the fiscal year 2019–2023 defense program. With the help of Congress, I believe we can build a force that is more lethal without placing undue burden on the American economy. This will require sustained commitment from the Congress in the form of additional funding and regular, on-time appropriations informed by a common set of assumptions.

I have examined each Service’s requirements and recommendations, and I am working with the Military Department Secretaries, our Service Chiefs, and the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to develop recommendations on current and future end strength plans consistent with the President’s emerging national security strategy.

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 and to keep our Armed Forces second-to-none. I welcome your questions.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. General Joseph Dunford, Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, is here today. We welcome you, and ask you to make any opening statement you wish.

**STATEMENT OF GENERAL JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR., USMC, CHAIRMAN, JOINT CHIEFS OF STAFF**

General DUNFORD. Chairman Cochran, Ranking Member Durbin, distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to join General Mattis in appearing before you. Chairman, I have also submitted a written statement that I would request you accept for the record.

Senator COCHRAN. It will be printed in the record. Thank you.

General DUNFORD. I am honored to represent your men and women in uniform, and it is because of our soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and your support that I can begin this morning by saying with confidence that your Joint Forces can defend the homeland and our way of life. We can meet our alliance commitments, and maintain an overall competitive advantage over any potential adversary.

I think that is an important point to begin with, and a point that should not be lost on our adversaries, our allies and partners, or on the American people.

However, while we have a competitive advantage today, sustained operational commitments, budget instability, and advances by our adversaries have eroded that advantage. Fifteen years of war have also taken a toll on our people and our equipment. Many of our men and women continue to deploy as much as they are home.

Similarly, our platforms, weapons, and equipment are showing signs of wear. In many cases, we have far exceeded the planned service life for our vehicles, our aircraft, and our ships.

Additionally, 8 years of continuing resolutions and the absence of predictable funding has forced the Department to prioritize near term readiness at the expense of modernization and advanced capability development.

We now face what has been described as the "bow wave" of modernization requirements for both our nuclear and our conventional forces. Meanwhile, potential adversaries have accelerated capability development and they challenge our advantage in critical areas such as space, cyber, electronic warfare, and missile defense. It is important that we reverse that trend.

The fiscal year 2017 budget request is a much needed first step. It helps the Joint Forces address our most urgent near term readiness concerns by funding current operations, addressing personnel shortfalls, resourcing training, and improving our maintenance. The additional request for resources also allows us to procure limited quantities of needed equipment to fill holes in our deploying units.

Looking forward in fiscal year 2018 and beyond, sufficient and predictable funding will be required to fully recover readiness, bal-

ance our inventory of capabilities, and maintain our competitive advantage.

Thank you once again for the opportunity to appear before you this morning, and I look forward to your questions.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF GENERAL JOSEPH DUNFORD, JR.

Chairman Cochran, Ranking Member Durbin, distinguished Senators of this committee, thank you for the opportunity to join Secretary Mattis in appearing before you today.

I am honored to represent the men and women of the Joint Force and want to begin by assuring you that our Joint Force is the most capable military in the world today. We can defend the Homeland, meet our alliance commitments, and maintain a competitive advantage over any adversary we face. That is an important point that should not be lost on our adversaries, our Allies and partners, or the American people.

I am confident in saying this for three fundamental reasons. First, Congress has provided our Service Members with support for the last 15 years of war. Second, the creative and talented professionals in American industry continue to deliver world-class warfighting solutions to our force. Third, and most importantly, the extraordinary young men and women who serve our country in uniform make the Joint Force the most capable military in the world.

However, while we have a competitive advantage today, sustained operational commitments, budgetary instability, and advances by our adversaries have eroded our competitive advantage.

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 Joint Force. They serve as a benchmark for Joint Force posture, the size of the force, capability development, and risk management.

Over the past several years, Russia has invested in a full-range of capabilities designed to limit our ability to project power and meet our alliance commitments. These include long-range conventional strike, cyber, space, electronic warfare, and undersea capabilities. Russia is also modernizing nearly all elements of its nuclear force. These capabilities allow Russia to counter U.S. and NATO power projection and undermine the credibility 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, and ballistic missiles. China is also investing heavily in 5th generation fighters, air-to-air missiles, and air defense systems to limit our ability to project power in the Pacific, operate freely, and meet our alliance commitments.

North Korea's two nuclear tests in 2016, combined with continued efforts to build a viable nuclear-capable ballistic missile threaten the security of the homeland and our Allies. Over the past year, North Korea conducted 38 missile tests, an 81 percent increase from the previous year. 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. forces and our allies.

Iran continues to support international terrorist organizations, actively seeks to destabilize its neighbors, and employs naval capabilities that threaten freedom of navigation. At the same time, they are modernizing an array of ballistic missiles, 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 generational struggle that requires the Joint Force to work with USG and coalition partners to disrupt external attacks and dismantle their capabilities wherever they emerge.

A review of the 4 + 1 framework indicates that the Joint Force requires a balanced inventory of capabilities and capacities 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.

## STATE OF THE JOINT FORCE TODAY

Today, the Joint Force is challenged to meet operational requirements and sustain investment in capabilities to preserve our competitive advantage. Examples in each of the Services highlight these challenges.

Based on current operational demand and budget instability, the Army has been forced to prioritize near-term readiness at the expense of future readiness and modernization. As a result, the Army faces a shortage of critical capabilities in armor, air defense, artillery, and aviation. These deficiencies are exacerbated by manpower shortfalls and a lack of training resources. Consequently, the Army is limited in its ability to man, train, and equip fully-ready Brigade Combat Teams (BCT).

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 ordinance, and aging infrastructure limit the Navy's ability to conduct integrated training. As a result, the Navy is limited in its ability to meet the demand for maritime capability.

The Air Force is also challenged to balance current operational demand and invest for the future. Today, the Air Force has a shortfall of almost 1,500 pilots, including 800 fighter pilots, and more than 3,400 maintainers across the active, guard, and reserve. 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 key modernization programs.

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 inhibits its ability to meet operational demands.

These readiness challenges are exacerbated by the high operational tempo we continue to maintain. Particular stress is found in high-demand/low-density specialties such as missile defense systems, naval expeditionary forces, special operations forces, global precision strike units, and cyber forces. And, over the past 2 years, munitions expenditures in ongoing operations against Violent Extremist Organizations have exacerbated existing shortfalls.

Reversing these trends and ensuring a ready Joint Force is my number one priority as Chairman. To meet Combatant Command demand, and provide viable options to the President and Secretary of Defense, the Joint Force must develop and maintain Comprehensive Joint Readiness: the ability of the Joint Force to deploy, employ, and sustain itself and to maintain the flexibility to transition from one crisis to another, across the range of military operations.

## FISCAL YEAR 2017 BUDGET PRIORITIES

The fiscal year 2017 request for additional appropriations helps the Joint Force address our most urgent near-term readiness concerns by funding current operations, addressing personnel shortfalls, resourcing full-spectrum training, and improving maintenance. It also addresses deferred modernization in a way that can be executed responsibly within the remainder of fiscal year 2017.

The additional fiscal year 2017 request includes critical funding for overseas contingency operations, accelerating the plan to defeat the Islamic State and funding emerging requirements for operations in Iraq and Syria. It is critical that we not lose momentum in our operations against ISIS.

The request addresses critical personnel shortfalls in all Services by providing \$5.7 billion for targeted growth. This growth allows the Army to fill gaps in both operational units and in the generating force, convert one Infantry BCT to an Armor BCT, enhance fires capability, and build two security force assistance brigades. Additional Navy personnel will mitigate the backlog in shipyards and support surface ship and submarine deployments. The Air Force will address shortfalls in critical skill sets such as nuclear, cyber, pilots, maintainers, and remotely piloted aircraft. The Marines will fill shortfalls in operational units and meet emerging requirements such as cyberspace operations. The resources that underpin this growth must be sustained in future budgets to enable full-spectrum readiness recovery.

The additional fiscal year 2017 request also enhances full-spectrum training across the force. With these funds, the Army will increase home station training and Combat Training Center rotations that support armored brigades rotating to Korea

and Europe. The Navy will provide flying hours that support training to enhance aviation readiness and precludes curtailing flight operations in the second half of fiscal year 2017. The Air Force will invest in training required to improve 4th and 5th generation warfighting capability. The Marine Corps will focus on aviation and ground training exercises to improve combined arms proficiency for operations across the spectrum of conflict. Funding for training also enables Combatant Commands to execute critical training for Counter-Weapons of Mass Destruction and Special Operations Forces missions.

Maintenance resources included in the additional fiscal year 2017 request also improve readiness. The Army will increase maintenance for key ground and aviation systems, reducing time for overhaul and increasing the number of available systems to train and deploy. The Navy will fund maintenance and spare parts to accelerate flight line repairs and execute necessary depot maintenance. The Air Force will improve aviation depot maintenance and weapons systems sustainment, increasing the number of ready aircraft. The Marine Corps will increase the number of spares for crisis and contingency response.

The request also allows the Joint Force to address deferred modernization through investments in tactical aircraft and ground combat vehicle. These investments support the Joint Force's readiness recovery by increasing the number of deployable aviation and ground units.

#### IMPACT OF THE FISCAL YEAR 2017 REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATIONS

While not sufficient, in and of itself, to reverse the impacts of under investment over the last 5 years, the additional fiscal year 2017 request yields improvements in near and mid-term warfighting readiness.

Investment in personnel, training, maintenance and modernization help the Army restore critical warfighter readiness across BCTs, improve critical enabler shortfalls, and enhance training at home station and Combat Training Centers. By the end of fiscal year 2017, the Army anticipates an increase of three BCTs at the highest level of readiness. Additionally, with continued stable budgets, the Army can bring five additional BCTs to the highest level of readiness by the end of second quarter of fiscal year 2018.

The Navy will be able increase amphibious capability and deploy five guided missile cruisers that would have otherwise remained in port. The Navy will also be able to fund maintenance for 14 surface ships, enabling them to go to sea to train and deploy on time, and equipped with modern communications and combat systems. Finally, Navy readiness is not just about the number of deployed ships. Fleet wholeness results from ensuring those ships are lethal, survivable and sustainable. That is why the Navy will invest in spare parts, munitions, and platform modernization and recapitalization required to sustain the fleet.

The Air Force will arrest the downward readiness trend, addresses critical pilot shortfalls, and begin to recover from delayed procurement and modernization. End-strength investments allow the Air Force to fully man active and reserve component units and will help grow the pilot training pipeline to create over 1,400 new pilots each year, including 335 new fighter pilots per year. It will also improve cyber resiliency and revitalize space and nuclear capacities, accelerate A-10, F-15, and F-16 aircraft modernization, and begin procurement of five additional F-35s. These investments begin to fill manpower shortages, increase full-spectrum training, replenish parts, and deliver more deployable combat capability to the field.

The Marine Corps will address current readiness shortfalls, mitigate critical gaps in combat power, and enhance operating and generating force capacity. End-strength growth will fill gaps in critical specialties. Funding for the flying hour program will enable sufficient training for aircrews. Procurement of two MV-22s will enhance responsiveness of Special Purpose Marine Air-Ground Task Forces and drive down the cost of sustaining the MV-22 fleet. Purchase of munitions will begin to fill critical shortfalls. These investments improve flexibility and enable the Marine Corps to be better postured to support Combatant Commanders.

#### PRIORITIES FOR INVESTMENT IN FISCAL YEAR 2018 AND BEYOND

The fiscal year 2017 request for additional resources provides needed investments in near and midterm readiness and addresses the Service's most urgent modernization requirements. However, sufficient and predictable funding is required to continue to improve readiness, balance the program, and sustainably grow the force to deliver a more capable and more lethal Joint Force in the years to come. Specific investment in fiscal year 2018, and beyond, is required to complete nuclear recapitalization, continue conventional modernization, and sustain dominance in all do-

mains. These investments are required to place the Joint Force on a path toward restoring our eroded competitive advantage.

Continuing to maintain a secure and effective nuclear deterrent is essential to defending the homeland. All three legs of our nuclear triad are approaching critical modernization decision points that require significant investment in time, money, and resources to execute. Over the coming decades DoD will replace its ballistic missile submarines, Inter-Continental Ballistic Missiles, strategic bombers, and Command and Control Centers.

Conventional modernization also requires capital intensive investment in tactical aviation, shipbuilding, munitions, and ground tactical vehicles. We must ensure the right mix of 4th and 5th generation aircraft and preserve our ability to project power in anti-access, area-denial environments. Recapitalization is needed to preserve a globally-present, modern, and agile Navy. Additional investment is required to develop new, highly capable munitions, and adapt our processes to make the most effective use of the inventory we currently have. Upgrades to ground tactical vehicles are necessary to improve mobility, lethality, and survivability. These investments ensure the Joint Force retains its ability to execute required missions against any potential adversary, across the range of military operations.

Finally, we must continue investment to sustain Joint Force dominance in all domains. ISR, cyber, and space are essential to providing command and control to a geographically dispersed force. We rely on ISR to provide information to decision makers at all levels and must be able to do so in contested battlespace. To protect critical infrastructure and improve offensive cyber capability, we must continue to invest in our Cyber Mission Forces and their training, provide them with effective tools, and maintain a responsive, nimble cyber infrastructure. These investments are essential to maintaining our competitive advantage in rapidly changing domains.

#### CONCLUSION

Today, despite the challenges facing us, our Joint Force is the most capable military in the world. But the strategic landscape is changing and our investment in future capabilities, capacity, and readiness must keep pace to ensure our men and women in uniform never face a fair fight.

#### READINESS

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you for your statements. Let me ask you about our time line and what are the pressures that we face in bringing this bill to the attention of all of our members of the committee and the Senate.

In your judgment, what is the impact, and this is for both of you, if Congress does not approve the additional \$5.1 billion for overseas contingency operations? Would you have the funding flexibility to conduct an accelerated counter-ISIS fight, for example?

Secretary MATTIS. Chairman, obviously, we will keep the forces in the field at the top of their capability. That is not only a military obligation, it is a moral obligation, and we can continue the fight.

The problem is it would eat into our readiness again and would deepen the hole that we are in, leaving us in an even worse situation, and it will cost even more to get out of it in the future.

We have done this for several years now, where we have continued to maintain the operational tempo, but without the backdrop of sufficient readiness funds to keep the forces back here at home at the top of their game, it is going to worsen as we go on.

Let me pass this to the chairman for his thoughts.

General DUNFORD. Chairman, thank you. I think there are two things that we look to do moving forward. One is to accelerate our campaign, and the other is to position ourselves to seize opportunities, and from my perspective, not having the OCO (Overseas Contingency Operations) money will restrict our ability actually to ac-

celerate the campaign and seize opportunities. We will lose some flexibility.

As Secretary Mattis has said, we will make sure that those men and women who deploy in harm's way have the wherewithal to accomplish the mission, but what we will not be postured to do is have the flexibility needed for a very dynamic threatening enemy.

#### RUSSIA

Senator COCHRAN. Mr. Secretary, what is your assessment of the Russian aggression in Europe, and the investments that we will need to reassure our European allies of our ability to function?

Secretary MATTIS. Chairman, Russia has decided to become a strategic competitor with us, and as I mentioned in my opening statement, to try to achieve a veto authority over the diplomatic, economic, and security interests of the nations along their periphery.

So, what we have to do is ensure that the NATO (North Atlantic Treaty Organization) Alliance stands firm, it stands united, and stands unambiguously for a unified response to any kind of Russian adventurism, such as we have seen in Crimea and the Ukraine, and with the mischief they are causing inside the elections in Europe that are ongoing.

If we do not have the funding to maintain the reassurance initiative, then frankly the reassurance goes away. It is as if we are denying a reality that has been pretty revealed to us over these last several years.

So, I strongly endorse the European Reassurance Initiative, and I noticed the NATO Alliance has reversed its reduced funding, and overall the funding has risen for the first time this last year. So, they are also on line to maintain their level of commitment.

Senator COCHRAN. I now recognize the distinguished Senator, Mr. Durbin.

#### SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

Senator DURBIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I asked my staff to explain this to me twice because I wanted to make sure I understood it. Under the Budget Control Act, if we give you—let's put OCO over here—if we give you \$25 billion more in the Department of Defense, in the supplemental request, the Budget Control Act will require the Department of Defense do a 5 percent across the board cut in order to make up for that \$25 billion that is being sent to you. That, of course, makes no sense whatsoever. I cannot imagine that you would want to go through that exercise.

So, my question to you is this: did you consult with OMB before this supplemental request was made to Congress?

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, we consulted extensively with them on our requirements. The mechanism for how to actually address this is, as you point out, complicated, and I would take no issue with how you characterized the Budget Control Act and the effects of sequestration.

I am aware of it, Senator. It is not something I can give you a solution for from my position in the Executive Branch of the Department of Defense, but I share your assessment, and I take no issue with how you have characterized it.

Senator DURBIN. Thanks, Mr. Secretary. I do not blame you for this. This is OMB's job. I do not know why they are playing this game with us. They need to waive the Budget Control Act, if they truly want to provide more money to the Department of Defense for the safety and security of the United States, and if they do not, I do not even know why we are wasting our time with this hearing.

#### CIVILIAN HIRING FREEZE

Secondly, let me ask you about the civilian hiring freeze announced by the President. This hiring freeze affects civilian workers at the Department of Defense. We estimate there are 742,000 civilian workers, 1.3 million active duty men and women.

On January 23, 2017, President Trump issued a hiring freeze of the Federal civilian workforce at the Department of Defense. How has this hiring freeze impacted the Department's day-to-day operations?

What impact does it have on the resources you will have available when it comes to readiness and the investments which you believe are necessary for our national defense, and are we hiring contractors to avoid this freeze?

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, we are not right now hiring contractors. I think that would violate the spirit of the President's Order. However, I have been given and I have delegated liberal exception authorities, waivers, frankly, in order to keep shipyard workers, depot, airport, aircraft depot workers on the job, everything right down to daycare workers, so that our troops can drop their kids off and be at work on time.

So, we have to do a rather liberal waiver policy in order to address this, and so far it has kept us out of any extremis.

Senator DURBIN. I know a hiring freeze is a great headline. This is not the first President who has tried it, but when it comes to a hiring freeze in the Department of Defense at the same time we are being told to give \$30 billion more because we need more resources to get ready to protect America, it does not work. It does not work.

The civilian employees, I hope you will agree with me, are an important part of our national defense. I am glad to hear you are being given these exemptions. I hope that is adequate, and I hope you do not turn to dramatically more expensive contractors to fill in the voids.

Let me ask you this question: when I went to Europe a month ago to visit in Poland, in Lithuania, in Ukraine, they are very worried. They were encouraged by statements that you made and statements by Vice President Pence in Munich that seemed to give them some relief in their belief that NATO was still alive and well.

You talked about Russian adventurism or however you characterized it, and they live it every day. They can look across the border at the planned military exercises in September of 100,000 Russian troops in Belarus, and see some real threats to the borders of the countries I just named.

## EUROPEAN REASSURANCE INITIATIVE

So, I want to know why in your supplemental request there is not money also being set aside, more money set aside, for the European Reassurance Initiative.

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, we prioritized the request for what we could execute this year. That was one point.

A second point is that as you know, there are four NATO nations, the United States included, Canada, Germany, et cetera, that are actually mounting reinforced battalion combat teams to some of the nations you visited, Poland, Lithuania, Estonia, Latvia, to make a clear demonstration of NATO's firm and unified response to any further adventurism by Russia.

This is a time when miscalculations can occur, and we need to make certain that Moscow does not miscalculate, and we believe we have led with the right sort of firm unified action out of Brussels that permits us to send a clear and unambiguous message to the Russians.

Senator DURBIN. Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you. I now recognize the distinguished Senator from Alabama, Mr. Shelby.

## STRATEGIC CHALLENGES

Senator SHELBY. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary, and Mr. Secretary was a general, and always a general, we just have a few minutes here. Would you briefly sum up our strategic challenges, if you can? Our challenges asymmetrically, and how do we meet them?

You are in the right committee, and we have had a history of supporting the defense, and I believe we will here, but I think the American people really need to know the challenges that you face as our Secretary of Defense out there.

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, I think the most important issue I deal with is how we keep a high-quality force, all volunteer force, fully capable of carrying out its responsibilities.

The strategic challenges, I would lay them out in a couple of different packages. One is where we have great powers, Russia and China, very different powers, adopting different modes, but challenging the international situation, such as we have put together to create an environment for peace and prosperity, and you see it with both of their efforts to revoke or veto the security, the economic, and diplomatic interests of nations on their periphery.

In Russia, we see it with little green men passing out passports to Russian speaking people in other countries, undercutting Democratic processes. In the South China Sea, we see China shredding trust as they adopt a tribute nation kind of approach, where all other nations have to pay tribute or acquiescence to the more powerful nation, the larger nation.

We also see in the case of North Korea and Iran a proliferation issue, one that has been delayed in Iran, but we see the reckless behavior north of the DMZ (Demilitarized Zone) on the Korean Peninsula as unsettling the Northwestern Pacific/East Asia area.

Then we deal with the terrorist threat, and this, we are going to be dealing with for a long time to come. We are in an era of fre-

quent scrimmaging, but that would be in a thumbnail how I see the strategic challenges, sir.

#### CYBER CHALLENGE

Senator SHELBY. What about the cyber challenge? That is something we have to get our hands on. If we do not, we will pay dearly, will we not?

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, cyber cuts across all three aspects of warfighting. That is nuclear command and control that is conventional warfighting, and irregular warfighting, space operations, cyber operations, and electronic warfare. These are inherent to everything we do today.

#### TROOPS COMBAT READY

Senator SHELBY. General, what are we going to have to do to keep all of our troops combat ready? You need flexibility. You mentioned this earlier, but you also need resources, do you not?

General DUNFORD. We do, Senator. There are a few things that this budget submission begins to get after. First of all, we have used the equipment at a much higher level than we had planned, so we need to maintain it. We are short of spare parts.

One of the other critical areas we need is ammunition. You will begin to see the services add people to reduce some of the stress I spoke about. We really do have many of our people that are home about an equal amount of time to the time they are deployed.

I visited one U.S. Navy ship last September. They were underway in a previous 12 months 70 percent of the time, they were at sea because of an important ballistic missile defense capability. So, that is an indicator of parts of the force that are really running pretty hard.

The other thing, Senator, and we have asked for some equipment in this particular submission, in some cases, we do not any longer have the equipment to maintain, so there are literally shadows in the ramp.

So, in addition to resources to maintain the equipment that we have, get the spare parts back up to where they need to be, have the ammunition we need for continuous response, we actually need to replace equipment, and we see that particularly in the case of the aviation enterprise where units have fewer aircraft than they rate.

That creates two problems. One is they do not have what they need to go to war. The other is they do not have sufficient aircraft to train, so our pilots also have degraded readiness as a result of not having sufficient aircraft.

Senator SHELBY. Is the bottom line we cannot be accountable to the American people with a defense that is second to none on the cheap, we have to pay for it, do we not, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary MATTIS. Well, we do, Senator Shelby. The bottom line is America can afford survival. My priorities going into the Department are to strengthen the American military, to strengthen our allies, so the full burden is not being carried by our American taxpayers, the American troops, and to reform the business practices so I can come in front of you and confidently say we are spending

the money that you are giving, that the American people are giving us, in a responsible way.

So, we cannot do it on the cheap, but we also owe you an audit of the Defense Department. We also owe you some very strong internal processes to make certain we are not wasting money.

Senator SHELBY. Thank you.

Senator COCHRAN. The time of the Senator has expired. The distinguished Senator from Rhode Island, Mr. Reed.

#### SEQUESTRATION

Senator REED. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Secretary, and General Dunford, thank you for your service and your testimony today.

Senator Durbin made two, I think, important points. First, with \$18 billion in unspecified cuts to the domestic side of the ledger, how can we make a decision if we do not know what the specific cuts will be? I do not assume you know either. That is something we would have to know before we could make, I think, a judgment.

The second point is on sequestration. We are literally giving and taking simultaneously. One small point about sequestration is OCO does not trigger the cap, but once the cap is exceeded, I understand OCO funds would also be subject to sequestration, so your ability to move money around even into OCO could be limited.

Those two factors, unspecified domestic cuts plus a giving and taking because no attempt has been made to deal with the issue of sequestration, they do not undermine your credibility and seriousness, but they certainly undermine the proposal, I think, in terms of its credibility and seriousness.

So, having said that let me ask a specific question. One of the issues that you have made very clear, Mr. Secretary, is that you suggested—not suggested, but directed that these programs be executable in this very short window from now until October 1.

#### BENCHMARKS/READINESS

What specific sort of benchmarks did you give out in terms of executability?

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, we had to analyze what we could actually get under contract and appropriately, not just throw money at problems, but monitor to make certain it turned into a readiness result, and we had specific benchmarks.

For example, I think we will double the number of deployable Army brigades at top levels of readiness. We actually got into that level of detail to make certain that what we walk away from here with, if you support it, will deliver a readiness that helps us should we have to fight.

Senator REED. Again, and this question is for both the General and yourself, there are some things that just stick right out in terms of readiness, flying hours, parts and equipment for platforms that you already have, and then you start moving into new platforms. You alluded to some of the new platforms.

Can you give us an idea of where that line is between near term readiness, you know, flying hours, versus longer term? We have to build the force up, which will take probably a year or more to recruit. Perhaps, General, you could comment.

General DUNFORD. Senator, thanks. I mean we are at the point now in my judgment that we have deferred modernization to the point where in some ways there is a distinction without a difference between flight hours and new equipment.

I will give you an example, Senator. I have asked around to each of the services for examples of why do we need new helicopters, why do we need F-18s, and how do I explain to the committee that these are directly related to readiness.

What you find is that a squadron, for example, a Navy squadron, down at Naval Air Station Oceana, that rates 10 aircraft, actually only has five really basic aircraft in the squadron. Again, you cannot go to war with 5 or 10 aircraft, but as importantly, you cannot get pilots the right level of training proficiency on those five aircraft, which has two effects. One, a readiness effect, the other is over time, it is a morale issue. We see the same thing with helicopters in the Army.

So, Senator, I think what we are seeing now is as a result of the last 5, 6, or 7 years. I have a much broader definition of “readiness.” To me, it is about what actions are necessary to make units whole, to allow them to be combat effective and deployable.

So, today, it is a combination not only of maintaining equipment that we have, not only addressing the spare parts shortfall, but actually—I called it “shadows in the ramp”—actually now replacing shadows in the ramp where equipment does not physically exist in a unit in a material condition that would allow us to deploy it.

So, both of those actions in my judgment are necessary now, in 2017, and I think the consequences of not addressing it in 2017, because we do not realize an immediate effect in 2017, simply continues what we have been doing over the last several years, which is push to the right our readiness recovery.

So, admittedly, some of these initiatives will not realize a readiness benefit until 2019 or 2020, but if we do not take the action in 2017, that will simply become 2021 or 2022.

Senator REED. Thank you. Gentlemen, I think we do all appreciate the readiness challenges after more than a decade at war and constant efforts. We want to address those but we have these huge issues of what to pay for in terms of not only the \$18 billion of domestic spending, but are we really going to pay for this?

Frankly, we have been at war now for 16 years, and we have not devoted any revenue, significant revenue, to pay for preparedness, readiness, personnel, et cetera. The other side is the sequestration issue which is hugely complicated and challenging. It could end up taking as much as it gives you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator COCHRAN. The Senator’s time has expired. The distinguished Senator from Maine, Ms. Collins.

#### NAVY SHIPS

Senator COLLINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary and General, first let me begin by thanking you both for your lifelong commitment of service to our country. It is much appreciated.

The Navy recently updated its force structure assessment goals to 355 ships, which is a significant increase from the previous

goals, to address the increasingly complex military threats facing our Nation today.

In addition, there have been other independent studies, the MITRE study, and the Center for Strategic and Budgetary Assessments that have also recommended significant increases.

Following up on the concerns raised by my colleagues, what impact does the Budget Control Act have on the ability of the Department to fulfill the President's promise to build the larger fleet that the Navy and these other independent studies have found to be necessary? Mr. Secretary.

Secretary MATTIS. Senator Collins, I can find nothing in the Budget Control Act that helps our national security, and you have brought up one of the most direct impacts. It is all negative. I believe it also sidelines the Congress.

I think it puts you in a spectator role when we need you in an oversight role in the Department because it is your knowledge of what we are doing and understanding the strategy that allows you to commit American dollars to the defense of this country.

As it is now, we are all watching as this—I would call it “near senseless approach to budgeting”—goes on its automatic pilot, and we all stand there mute saying there is no way you can dignify it.

We are going to need to build more ships. We are going to have a more maritime strategy in the future. It is clear this is the case. Right now, it does not help us at all. It hurts us in terms of readiness and in terms of long term capability to defend the country.

#### SHIPYARD DRYDOCK RECAPITALIZATION

Senator COLLINS. Thank you. I completely agree with you, it is an abdication of responsibility, and I hope it is something that whatever the Administration does, our committee deals with and the Congress deals with.

General, Maine is home to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. That is one of our public shipyards. It has been called the “gold standard,” which we are very proud of. That shipyard, indeed, all of our public shipyards, have major infrastructure needs to prevent significant negative impacts to fleet readiness and operational availability over the next 30 years.

It is my understanding that the Navy is developing a plan for shipyard dry dock recapitalization. Could you give us some sense of when we can expect to receive that plan?

General DUNFORD. Senator, thank you. I know and I think you know personally that both the current CNO (Chief of Naval Operations) and the previous CNO have made several trips to your State to fully appreciate the infrastructure issue you spoke about.

I think we all realize that the strength of our shipyards is going to be inextricably linked to the ability to do what you spoke about a minute ago, which is not only to grow the fleet, but to sustain the fleet that we have.

I know Admiral Richardson is focused on doing this as soon as possible, Senator, and I would like to get back to you for the record on exactly when he expects to complete that study.

[The information follows:]

## MAINE SHIPYARDS

The Navy is preparing a dry-dock recapitalization plan for our Naval Shipyards. The plan is based on a study being developed regarding Naval Shipyard dry-dock capacity and survivability. Navy expects the plan to be complete by the end of fiscal year 2017. When it is finalized, Navy will brief Senator Collins on the specifics of the plan, if requested to do so.

General DUNFORD. We have had several conversations about this, and I can assure you within the Department of the Navy, both for Acting Secretary Stackley as well as Admiral Richardson, making sure that our shipyards have the wherewithal to support the growth of the Navy and the maintenance of the Navy that we have is the number one priority.

## F-35

Senator COLLINS. Thank you. General, international partners and allies on the F-35 program play a critical role in helping to drive down the costs of that aircraft, as well as ensuring interoperability with our NATO allies.

Could you tell us where the program stands with our international partners, and can you quantify the role that they play in reducing the overall costs of the F-35 for our government?

General DUNFORD. Senator, you know, I cannot quantify exactly the cost difference as a result of allies and partners, but I can absolutely state before the committee that there is a significant advantage to our foreign military sales of the F-35 in driving down the cost to the United States.

We reviewed our national military strategy over the past year, and one of the key questions we asked is, what is the source of strength for the United States military.

The first source is strengthening the strategic level with the network of allies and partners that we have developed over the past 70 years, and a key element of those relationships is interoperability, commonality of parts, commonality of equipment, and so forth, so that we can when necessary integrate our capabilities in a fight.

So, for the two reasons you have identified, making sure our most capable partners have access to the F-35, and we include them in foreign military sales is absolutely critical.

Senator COLLINS. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator COCHRAN. The time of the Senator has expired. I now recognize the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, Mr. Udall.

## AUMF/SYRIA

Senator UDALL. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman, and Secretary Mattis and General Dunford. Thank you for your time, and thank you for your service.

I have submitted additional questions to you for the record on some of the military bases and issues in New Mexico, so we hope you will give us timely answers there. They are questions that are important to me.

I wanted to focus on one of the issues that Senator Durbin brought up in terms of the war in Iraq and the war in Syria. The President is asking Congress for a defense supplemental appropriation for fiscal year 2017, and a significant increase in defense

spending in 2018. I want to discuss these requests in the context of our current war against ISIL in both Syria and Iraq.

In the last couple of weeks, the American people have read public reports that additional marines and other U.S. forces have been deployed to Syria, up to 1,000 troops. The American people are being told that they are there to help counter ISIL.

To paraphrase St. Thomas Aquinas, one of the first and most important requirements to wage a just war is the war must be ordered by a legitimate authority.

Alexander Hamilton and other founders argued strenuously to ensure that this power was granted to Congress rather than the Executive, in order to prevent the President from engaging in risky overseas ventures.

As you know, the responsibility to make decisions about war and peace is one of the most important powers given to Congress under the Constitution.

When the Iraq war first began, we were not an invited force, but an invasion force, an invasion force that required an Authorization for Use of Military Force from the Congress. Fourteen years later, we still have United States forces in Iraq serving in a train and assist role, and they have been invited by the Iraqi government to support its efforts to counter ISIL.

The 2003 invasion of Iraq required an AUMF (Authorization for the Use of Military Force) specific to Iraq, but in Syria, the U.S. has not been invited by the government. U.S. military vehicles and heavy artillery have been seen in Syria, and it is easy to argue the United States has effectively invaded Northern Syria, violating the sovereignty of a country in the Middle East, which is a de facto declaration of war.

Secretary Mattis, are you concerned that Congress has not approved an AUMF specific to Syria granting the President the legal power to invade Syria?

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, I would not characterize it as an invasion, but I do not want to spend time on that aspect. I think we have to play the ball where it lies right now.

The clear and present danger of ISIS that bulldozed the border in their supposed geographic caliphate, and actually removed the border between the two nations, was a reality in terms of the war that we had to deal with. We could not draw that imaginary line in the midst of an enemy and say on one side, he is safe, on the other side, we can take him on.

I think what we have to do is look at this changing character of this enemy threat, and I would take no issue with the Congress stepping forward with an AUMF. I think it would be a statement of the American people's resolve if you did so.

I thought the same thing for the last several years, I might add, and have not understood why the Congress has not come forward with this, at least a debate, because I believe it is a clear and present danger that we face. I have dealt with this enemy for many, many years. I do not patronize them. They mean every word that they say.

So, in light of that, the Commander-in-Chief, the elected Commander-in-Chief, both the last Administration and the current Ad-

ministration, I think, have a duty to protect the American people and what we stand for from this enemy.

Senator UDALL. Thank you very much. General Dunford, do you have a comment on that?

General DUNFORD. Senator, I do, quickly. We have been participating in several reviews of this issue. While we do assess that we have the legal authority to do what we are doing right now, in accordance with the Authorization for Use of Military Force that was provided in the wake of 9/11, I agree with the Secretary.

I think not only would it be a sign of the American people's resolve, but truly I think our men and women would benefit from an Authorization for Use of Military Force that would let them know that the American people in the form of their Congress were fully supportive of what they are doing out there every day as they put their lives in harm's way.

Senator UDALL. Thank you very much. I have additional questions on what you would recommend in terms of limitations and things like that, but my time is up, so I will submit those for the record. Thank you.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. The distinguished Senator from Missouri, Mr. Blunt, is recognized.

#### SUPER HORNET

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. General Dunford and Secretary Mattis, I want to talk about airplanes for a minute. We have talked about aircraft carriers. That is an important part of being ready. You have to have enough planes on those aircraft carriers.

I see in the supplemental that the Super Hornets have been sort of at the top of the non-requested list for a long time, and are now on the requested list.

I know there are a lot of people that argue readiness issues need to be addressed by being sure we have pilot training time and maintenance hours, but also we have to have a line of planes coming along with that.

Just a response maybe on how important it is for you to have both the equipment and the training time that you need.

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, the Super Hornet, the ones that we are requesting restore squadrons to the full number of aircraft complement that they need to have in order to fight.

Ultimately, we will have a mix of Super Hornets and F-35s on the carrier decks, so this not only contributes to immediate readiness, it also contributes to the longer term readiness of keeping the carrier air wings fully capable.

Senator BLUNT. Well, I think the committee has been pretty effective for a while in making those planes available, but as I have talked to both of you about it, it is important to ask for them and not say here is what we would like to have, we are not asking for it because we are pretty sure you will get it for us anyway, but seeing that line stay open is really important, and it allows the Growler plane also that is part of any future flying package to be there.

## MILITARY FAMILIES

I do not have a lot of time, so I think I am going to move on to another topic, which is a bill that we had in our defense authorization bill last year that really would address the needs of families when someone is being reassigned, to create not just the option that you might be able to get a way that your family could stay a little longer at the post you are currently at or go a little earlier, but actually a requirement that if the person serving was willing to deal with their own amount of expense to either go early or stay, that the family would have an option that families now do not have.

I know that both of you believe that families are the backbone of the military. I am hoping if we get that legislation in the bill again this time, we will have the support of the Pentagon and the Joint Chiefs.

There is no cost the way that bill is currently written, because again, the person serving makes the decision that they can either find quarters available to a single individual as their family moves earlier, or they can find quarters similarly available if they move earlier, or they can simply just decide it is so important that my family be able to stay until my spouse's job transitions properly, my kids finish this year of school, or the reverse of that, that they do that.

I know, General Mattis, you and I talked about this, and you were immediately encouraging in your support of that kind of change. I would like you both to talk about that.

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, we had a good talk in your office. I went back and checked on it. Apparently, it is not budget neutral because of entitlements, so we may have to come in and get legislative relief, which I am fully committed to doing if that is what it takes, so we do not have to run two different payments for maintaining two households.

I am not certain why we need legislative relief, and I have the staff researching it now. I am in complete agreement with the program. It is just how, do we do it in a way that is consistent with your view of budget neutral, and we will get there.

Senator BLUNT. I am sure we can get the budget neutral, if that is the kind of legislative relief you need, we will see that happens.

General Dunford, just a quick story. I was hosting a breakfast for Fort Leonard Wood a year ago, 2 years ago, when I filed this bill, sat down at a table with General Selva and his wife, and General Perkins from TRADOC, and a retired Sergeant Major, and I mentioned I had filed this bill. Every one of them had a story when this would have made an incredible difference to their families.

General DUNFORD. I executed, I think, in excess of 20 PCS moves and navigated my spouse's employment and education for our children and so forth.

I do appreciate what you are trying to do here, and without talking about the specific challenges of this piece of legislation, I think allowing the services to have the kind of flexibility that you are suggesting would absolutely be helpful, and I know we would have full support.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you. Thank you, Chairman.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. The Senator's time has expired. I now recognize the distinguished Senator from Vermont, Senator Leahy.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Mattis, the first time I have been able to call you "Secretary," and not "General." Nice to have you here.

General, my school mate, different years, but we both have degrees from Saint Michael's and from Georgetown, and I know in Vermont, they are excited you are going to be coming to Saint Michael's next month—no, in May.

Mr. Chairman, I want to put my statement in the record.  
[The statement follows:]

#### PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

Thank you, Chairman Cochran and Ranking Member Durbin, for holding this important hearing to review the budget and readiness of the Department of Defense.

The 2017 supplemental that President Trump has proposed for the Department of Defense would exceed the spending caps for defense set in the Budget Control Act, triggering sequestration and across-the-board cuts for the Department of Defense, in just 10 weeks, if the law is not changed. I believe all Members of this Subcommittee should work cooperatively to avoid that outcome, but cooperation is a two-way street.

Since 2012, the sequestration law has forced Congress to enact budget cuts in both defense and non-defense spending that will have negative consequences for a generation. Today, only one-third of army combat units are ready to be deployed. For two consecutive years, the Navy has faced annual shortfalls in excess of \$700 million in ship maintenance, which have resulted in critical maintenance periods being canceled. But sequestration has produced terrible consequences for the average American as well—our infrastructure is failing, investment in job training and employment are down, and education funding lags behind. All of this impacts national security and makes us less safe.

A failing infrastructure undermines our national security by weakening economic growth and creating vulnerabilities in our bridges, our water systems, and our electrical grid. Cuts in programs that invest in job training, in innovation, in education, and in nutrition, hurt our economy in the long run, and cripple our ability to provide our armed forces with men and women capable of serving. Reduced funding for medical research and disease prevention makes America less healthy.

Slashing non-defense programs to pay for an increase in defense spending is not a solution and would not make our Nation safer. National security is not solely the mission of the Department of Defense. The President says he prefers "hard" power to "soft" power, but the notion that "soft" power is weak or wasteful is mindless. Failing to invest in America, and cutting programs that feed millions, prevent AIDS or treat tuberculosis and malaria, will make the world less stable, and make your job more difficult. Secretary Mattis, you have even said that if we do not fully fund the State Department, we should be prepared to buy more ammunition for the military. That is not a trade I am willing to accept.

While we must ensure that we do not have a "hollow force," we must also avoid a "hollow country." That is precisely what President Trump's budget proposes. Sequestration has already had devastating consequences that will take a generation to recover from. The President's proposal seeks to add even further draconian cuts to non-defense programs. This, I believe, would leave us with a hollow force and a hollow country.

#### ECONOMY/NATIONAL SECURITY

Senator LEAHY. But I note that since 2012, the sequestration law has forced Congress to enact budget cuts in both defense and non-defense. It is going to have consequences for generations.

Today, only one-third of Army combat units are ready to be deployed. For 2 years in a row, the Navy has faced annual shortfalls in excess of \$700 million in ship maintenance, which results in critical maintenance periods being cancelled.

Sequestration has produced terrible consequences for the average American as well, infrastructure, investment in job training and employment are down. Education funding lags behind. That impacts our national security, too.

Failing infrastructure weakens economic growth, it creates vulnerabilities in our bridges, our water systems, and our grid. We cut money in nutrition, education, and research. That hurts us. It actually cripples our ability to provide our Armed Forces with the men and women they need in the future. Reduced funding for medical research, disease prevention, makes us less safe.

Slashing non-defense programs to pay for an increase in defense spending is not a solution. National security is not solely the mission of the Department of Defense. The President says he prefers hard power to soft power, but soft power is not weak or wasteful.

Cutting programs worldwide to feed millions, prevent AIDS, treat tuberculosis, malaria, all the things we do worldwide. We cut that, it makes the world less stable. It makes your job more difficult.

Mr. Secretary, you have even said if we do not fully fund the State Department, we should be prepared to buy more ammunition for the military. I do not know if that is a trade you want to have to make. It is not a trade I want to make.

Let me ask this: we know that not all national security comes from DOD. We have to have a healthy population to be secure. Could you both speak about why a strong economy is essential to maintaining a strong military, and what about non-military powers, such as diplomacy or development, what part does that play in our national security? Mr. Secretary?

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, the engine for national security has always been our economy, a strong economy equates to a strong military, and history is pretty compelling. Nations that did not keep their fiscal house in order, their economies strong, lost their military power.

I am here addressing a readiness issue when I came back to the Department in my current role that is severe, and that is why I am here today fighting for this budget addition, the additional \$30 billion, \$25 billion of which goes directly to readiness.

My role is to keep the President and the Secretary of State and our diplomats always negotiating from a position of strength, and it is an obligation that I carry.

I do not take any issue with the way you have characterized the budget sequestration and the effect of sequestration on all of our spending.

I would add we are keenly aware of the sacrifices made by the American people and the other departments in terms of providing the military budget that we are getting, and I owe you a good audit to gain your confidence that we are spending that money wisely.

Right now, I think I want to make certain we have our diplomats in a position of strength when they negotiate in this increasingly perilous world.

Senator COCHRAN. The time of the Senator has expired.

Senator LEAHY. I did not know whether you were going to let General Dunford answer the questions that I asked of both of

them. If not, I will submit it for the record, and I will also submit a number of questions for the record.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. The chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from Montana, Mr. Daines.

#### MODERN LAND-BASED NUCLEAR DETERRENT

Senator DAINES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Mattis, General Dunford, thank you for your service. As a son of a marine from the 150th Rifle Company in Billings, Montana, my dad is very proud that I get to be in the same room with both of you, and thankful for your leadership and service to our country, truly.

Secretary Mattis, I want to welcome you especially at your first hearing as SECDEF, and I want to invite you to come out to Montana and visit Malmstrom Air Force Base in Great Falls. You will see firsthand the hard work our airmen are doing to keep the Minuteman III ready.

We are here today to discuss the state of our military's readiness, which many agree has been neglected over the past 8 years. I am pleased to see President Trump's budget submissions have challenged the status quo, and has caused a refocus on what matters the most, and that is keeping Americans safe.

Secretary Mattis, as you know, Malmstrom Air Force Base in Great Falls, Montana is home to one-third of our Nation's ICBMs (intercontinental ballistic missiles). Most of our current Minuteman III missiles have been in service for almost 50 years. While airmen have diligently maintained this aging system, we must field a modern ground-based strategic deterrent in order to meet 21st century strategic challenges.

Some argue that modernizing our nuclear arsenal is too expensive, but as the CBO has pointed out, the entire nuclear triad accounts for just 6 percent of our total 10-year budget for our national defense.

Secretary Mattis, how valuable do you consider a fully modern land-based nuclear deterrent in your arsenal to keep Americans safe?

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, the need for a nuclear deterrent to ensure those weapons are never used requires a triad.

To determine what level a triad must be at, we have a nuclear posture review that is getting underway, but I would tell you the land-based leg of the triad, the intercontinental ballistic missile, is a very sobering reminder to any enemy that would choose to test us that we could soak up an awful lot of their nuclear weapons in order to take out a single one of those silos. As a result, it is a stabilizing influence to have the ICBM force fully capable in its deterrent role.

Senator DAINES. One of my favorite Commander coins comes from Malmstrom, and it says "Scaring the hell out of America's enemies since 1962." I am proud of the work that they do to keep the world safe.

#### HELICOPTERS

I am concerned that the Air Force is no closer to replacing our Vietnam era Huey's for missile field security response than it was

when I met with Secretary James last year. As a result, our airmen will operate inadequate equipment yet another one.

Secretary Mattis, if the Air Force is given the \$1.8 billion increase you requested for aircraft procurement, when might we expect to see a new and more capable helicopter deployed to our mission fields?

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, I anticipate that the Vietnam era Huey's will be gone and replaced by around 2021. That is my goal right now. I have to get into the budget in detail and look at what years we can get what amounts of money.

I recognize that the security forces need the proper helicopters, the force in the field needs the proper helicopters, and the Huey has done a good job, but it is time for it to go.

#### GUARD AND RESERVE TRAINING

Senator DAINES. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. I want to shift and talk about our Guard and Reserve training. As we look to modernize many of our aging weapons, we want to make sure we do not neglect the readiness of our military families.

Guardsmen and Reservists often travel hundreds of miles to and from their duty locations every month, most are not reimbursed for the costs they incur, and are limited as to what they can claim as business related expenses. I think that is flat out wrong. Service members should not be taxed on money they spend to subsidize their own training.

This afternoon, I will be introducing the Tax Relief for Guard and Reserve Training Act, which will allow Guardsmen and Reservists to deduct travel expenses, including meals and lodging, to ensure they are not penalized for serving their country.

General Dunford, can you speak to the unique challenges that Guardsmen and Reservists face on drill weekends that you observed during your 40 years in uniform?

General DUNFORD. Senator, obviously, not personally. My brother did spend 20 years in the Reserves. I had an opportunity to see him, and obviously, the men and women that I visit with routinely.

They do have a unique challenge. I even tell them when I am speaking to them, you know, I only have one thing I have to worry about, which is being a full time active duty, you have to be a soldier, sailor, marine, whatever you are doing in your personal life, and you are trying to balance a family.

I think when they give up a week, 2 weeks a month, when they go on deployment for a year and they set aside their civilian employment, I think they do have some unique challenges. I appreciate your interest in making sure we can mitigate some of the consequences of those challenges.

Senator DAINES. Thank you, General.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. I now recognize the distinguished Senator from Montana, Mr. Tester.

#### PROCUREMENT PROCESS/HELICOPTERS

Senator TESTER. Back to back. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Mattis, it is good to see you again, I appreciate our conversation last week, and it goes without saying, thank you for your service and your willingness to continue to serve.

Like you, I fully support ensuring that our troops have everything they need to make this Nation safe. The President's budget, however, goes about it in what I believe is the wrong way.

While gutting the budgets of other agencies is critical to preventing conflict, the President's budget continues the trend of putting military operations on a credit card, and it ultimately forces our kids and grandkids to pay for this increase.

We should certainly not take away food from our seniors who are hungry to pay for increased military activity across the globe.

Some folks equate American military interventions with American leadership. For the record, I do not. In my opinion, our Nation's strength is only reflected by the size and capability of our military. It is also reflected in the strength of our schools, our healthcare system, our Nation's infrastructure.

Our strength is reflected in our economic security and national security, as you have already pointed out. It is about time that our priorities, investments, and conversations reflect that reality.

I want to dove tail on just a little bit of what Senator Daines said that has to do with the helicopters that are coming into Malmstrom Air Force Base. As pointed out, these are Vietnam era helicopters that we currently are using, far past their expected time of usefulness.

We were told time and time again on this committee that they would be replaced by 2019. I just heard you say they would probably move to 2021. I believe if I went back and looked at my notes, they were probably due to be in long before 2019 even.

We worked on military construction, making sure they have the housing. We got that done. So, we are ready for them. I checked back on what we did last budgetary cycle. We actually plussed up the President's request for replacement on this committee. It was due to the work, I believe, that Senator Daines and I and other members on this committee did that we were able to do that.

The question is it really money or is it the procurement process, or is it something else that we need to fix to make sure those helicopters get there? Quite frankly, it is important.

Secretary MATTIS. Well, it is absolutely important, sir, for the rotation of the crews, the launch crews, as well as the security forces. I cannot tell you how we got into this position in past years.

I can tell you that the impact of budget sequestration ripples through everything we do, and not always do we maintain the process that we come up and testify on when other dynamic issues accrue, and now we have an alarm on keeping our B-52s in the air. We have an alarm on ships that cannot go to sea, and we have to back up and reprogram, and all the chaos.

Again, it is a ripple coming out of a budget process that I think has frustrated the House and the Senate as much as it has frustrated the Department of Defense and our military services. I intend to have this solved, sir.

Senator TESTER. Okay.

Secretary MATTIS. And I will work it.

Senator TESTER. I would just tell you, and I know you guys need continuity in budgets for predictability, and it is really the only way you can plan for the future, but we budgeted around seques-

tration last year. We took it off the table. We are going to have to do it again. Then we plussed up what the President was asking for.

I would just ask you to take a look at that. You are a solid man, and I know for all the right reasons. I just bring this up just to make sure it is on your radar screen.

#### NATO

On Saturday, President Trump tweeted that Germany owes vast sums of money to NATO and the United States. I have been arguing for years that we need our NATO allies to contribute more, that we cannot continue to fund the whole ball of wax. We have shared security priorities with your friends in Europe.

In your opinion, are we owed money by Germany and other NATO allies for our military presence in Europe?

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, the alliance owes full commitment by each member nation. I cannot give you an accounting for past money owed because that is not the way we do that in NATO. We do it through capabilities. That is the commitment each nation makes.

However, we are seeing Germany is committed to going to the two percent. That has been reinforced by their Minister of Defense when I spoke with her, and also by the Chancellor, and I think they are on the right track to lead the development of the 2 percent budgets across the alliance.

Right now, there are five nations making it. I anticipate four more in the next 12 months. We will see more nations coming on line assuming their economies can hold together the way they are right now or improve.

Senator TESTER. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. The Senator's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the distinguished Senator from Kansas, Mr. Moran.

#### RUSSIA

Senator MORAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Gentlemen, thank you both on behalf of Kansans for your service to our Nation.

You both in your testimony, in your written testimony, talk about the threats, a number of threats, but one of them that you both mentioned is Russia. I want to focus a moment on Russia and its role in Syria.

We have learned within the last week, and it has become clear that an organization, a militia group, called Syrian Kurdish YPG Militia, has formed a bilateral relationship with Russia in the process of building some kind of military facility in Northwest Syria.

This, I believe, is one of the groups that we are supporting in our assist and train funding efforts. Your budget request includes an additional \$600 million for the counter-ISIS train and equip fund that I believe includes funding for this organization.

My question is both broad and specific. What do you see as the role of Russia in our efforts to have success in Syria, and how do we make certain that the money that we provide to militia groups are in support of that effort, and what kind of consequence is there with a relationship to Russia?

Secretary MATTIS. Very quickly, and I will let the chairman address this specific group. YPG has actually got two different areas, one of them, the Afrin Kurds, the one you are referring to, that Russia has developed a relationship with, but right now, we are in a position to have deconfliction with Russia. We do not coordinate with Russia.

Let me have the chairman get into the details of your specific question.

Senator MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

General DUNFORD. Senator, I can confirm for you that the specific group that is being supported by the Russians is not a group that has received training, equipment, resources from us in the Northwest part of Syria.

To the Secretary's point, we are very clear that we do not have political alignment with Russia in Syria, so at the military level, and we are also very clear as to what the NDAA (National Defense Authorization Act) specifies with regard to not being able to cooperate with Russia.

So, on the ground in Syria right now, what we are working very hard to do is just make sure that our people on the ground are safe, that our aviators are safe, and we are able to prosecute the campaign in Syria, deconflicting our operations with those being conducted by Russia.

The specific groups that we do provide support to, and the ones we have asked to provide additional support to, we do have a very detailed vetting process that we use to mitigate the risk of weapons or equipment falling in the wrong hands.

Senator MORAN. What about the relationship between those groups that we may assist and their relationship with Russia? Is that a component of the vetting process?

General DUNFORD. It is a component of the vetting process, Senator, and I am going to be quite honest with you, the group that we are supporting, certainly at the political level, has been engaged in Russia. The YPG has a political office in Moscow itself. The groups that we are providing support to on the ground are not being supported directly by Russian military forces.

Senator MORAN. Thank you. We are expecting a report, a strategy, from the Department of Defense in regard to our efforts in Syria. Is that soon forthcoming?

Secretary MATTIS. It is, Senator. We have the skeleton plan put together. We are flushing it out. It is an interagency developed report where it embraces economic, diplomatic, military covert means, and we should have this done in the next couple of months, if that long. It may not even take us another month. We are still putting it together, sir.

#### GUANTANAMO BAY

Senator MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary. This budget amendment includes some military construction funding that we are anxious to also take a look at in our subcommittee.

One of those areas that you are requesting funding in is the military construction project at Guantanamo Bay, that is designed to redesign new barracks for our enlisted men and women, men I believe in this case, for the detention operations at Guantanamo Bay.

Would you like to highlight the value of why those dollars are included in this request, and what they mean? We had a Kansas National Guard unit that deployed to GTMO for providing security services.

A long list of military officials have decried the conditions of the facilities at Guantanamo Bay. I wanted to give you the opportunity to make certain we know why that is included and its value.

General DUNFORD. I have in the last few months been down to visit our men and women down in Guantanamo Bay, and as you can appreciate, I think that is as arduous and demanding work as we have going on inside the Department of Defense.

They are living in facilities that are old, well past their time. I believe for right now, we do need to provide them with suitable living facilities and a new barracks, and that is the reason it is part of the request.

Senator MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. The chair now recognizes the distinguished Senator from Hawaii, Mr. Schatz.

#### DEPARTMENT OF STATE 28 PERCENT REDUCTION

Senator SCHATZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Mattis, thank you for being here. I would like to follow up on a couple of questions that were asked earlier in the hearing.

Can you walk me through what a 28 percent cut to the Department of State would mean for the Department of Defense?

Secretary MATTIS. Just off the top of my head, sir, it would probably replicate what has been going on with the Department for several years in terms of the impact on readiness and why I am here in front of you right now.

A 28 percent cut to the Department of Defense—

Senator SCHATZ. Excuse me. A 28 percent cut to the State Department, which is being proposed by the Administration, how would that impact your department?

Secretary MATTIS. That, I cannot quantify right now. I would have to look at the specific programs being cut, and try to translate that into impact on our operations.

I would have to look at—I have not looked at it line by line to see which programs are being cut and what might be the impact.

Senator SCHATZ. Let me ask the question another way. How critical is your partnership with the Department of State in terms of, for instance, the Asia-Pacific Rebalance?

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, I worked very close with Secretary Tillerson. We get together at least once a week. We are on the phone 3 or 4 times a week. His officers, Foreign Service officers, are in our building helping us craft policy.

It is absolutely a team effort as we tie diplomacy and military means together, so when we walk into security staff meetings, State and Defense are aligned. It is a critical team effort, and we intend to keep it that way.

#### COAST GUARD CUTS

Senator SCHATZ. OMB has put us on a course for some substantial cuts to the Coast Guard, and I am wondering whether you can

talk about the partnership between the Coast Guard and the Department of Defense.

My own judgment is that the Coast Guard is incorrectly categorized as non-defense spending, when at least some portion of it are certainly expenditures that are in partnership with the Department of Defense. I would like you to flush that out for me.

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, the Coast Guard's efforts, for example, in maritime control along our coasts, beyond search and rescue, I am talking about interdiction of drugs, interdiction of human trafficking, and certainly in the cases like in the Arab Gulf, the Persian Gulf, where the Coast Guard vessels are deployed alongside our Navy vessels, it is a good team.

We need them for the special role they have, which includes law enforcement. As you know, we do not do those kinds of things, arrest, that sort of thing. If we have to do that with a U.S. Navy ship, we bring law enforcement teams from the Coast Guard on board our ships to maintain that red line that the U.S. military not engage in that kind of activity.

So, it is a good relationship. It is a strong relationship in terms of cross fertilization, and looking out for America's interests. I hope that answers your question.

Senator SCHATZ. It does. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your first if not maybe one of your first overseas trips as Secretary in the Asia-Pacific region. Thank you for your clear reassurance to our allies and your message to our adversaries in the region.

#### ASIA-PACIFIC

The Asia-Pacific Stability Initiative is something Senator McCain has put forward to support PACOM's needs in the face of Chinese military modernization. I am wondering if you can talk about whether you support the idea, and how that is impacting your 2018 planning.

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, the Asia-Pacific region will be a priority region. We obviously have worldwide responsibilities, but we have five states that are Pacific Ocean states, have coast lines there. We have interests that endure in the Pacific.

The reason I made my first overseas trip out there was based on CIA estimates of where we faced the biggest, immediate challenge, and to reassure our allies that we were with them. I thought it was necessary at that point.

I fully support what I have read. I do not understand all the details in Senator McCain's plan, but I support the themes that he outlined and the importance he assigns to that region.

Senator SCHATZ. In the interest of time, I will submit this one for the record. I would just like your view on whether we are still on track with EDCA, given the politics in the Philippines, and your ability to retain a relationship with the Defense Minister in the Philippines as well. Thank you.

Senator COCHRAN. The time of the Senator has expired. The chair now recognizes the distinguished Senator from Alaska, Ms. Murkowski.

Senator MURKOWSKI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Secretary and General Dunford, welcome, and thank you for your leadership.

My first question is directed to you, Secretary Mattis, regarding the F-35s and the bed down in Eielson, near Fairbanks, Alaska. This is the first F-35 basing location in PACAF (Pacific Air Forces), we are anticipating the receipt of those F-35s in 2020.

The military construction has been appropriated but the procurement dollars for the F-35 buy have not yet been appropriated. Can you tell me what the plan is to budget for the procurement of the 54 F-35s that are coming to Eielson, and do you anticipate any impediments to a timely bed down?

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, there are F-35s in this additional budget request, but I am going to have to take that for the record and get back to you on those specific airframes that will support that one unit. I do not know that right now, but I will get back to you on that.

[Information follows:]

#### F-35 PROCUREMENT—EIELSON

The first aircraft arrival for Eielson is still scheduled for early 2020 and that year's aircraft are on track for delivery. We don't anticipate any issue with a timely bed down at Eielson, with the last aircraft arriving in 2022.

Senator MURKOWSKI. I would appreciate clarification. As I am sure you are aware, the folks in the Interior are following this very, very carefully, and just wanting to ensure we are on track with the timing.

#### RUSSIA/ARCTIC

I would like to also raise a question regarding Russia, as several of my colleagues have. General Dunford, during your confirmation hearings back in 2015, you indicated at that time, "If you want to talk about a nation that could pose an existential threat to the United States, you would have to point to Russia." At that time, you characterized their behavior as nothing short of alarming.

Of course, we in Alaska are watching our neighbors to the East very carefully. We have 57 miles that separate Alaska from Russia over the Bering Straits. We are concerned by what we see as military build-up there in the Russian Far East.

This morning, I would ask a question as to whether or not you still see Russia's behavior as alarming. What do you make of the military activities in the Arctic?

Then if you can speak to the issue in the Arctic of defense cooperation in certain areas, certainly in the areas of search and rescue. That is something that as the Arctic nations are working and collaborating, we look to that as an opportunity, but again, you have a tension, if you will, between what we see as a military build-up juxtaposed to the other issues that we are facing in the Arctic.

General DUNFORD. Senator, thank you. First, on my overall assessment of Russia, my assessment of their capabilities and their behavior has not changed since 2015.

In fact, I think if you look at our request in 2017, and I think anticipating what we will ask for in 2018, 2019, and 2020, a good part of it is benchmarked against Russia as a peer competitor in the areas of cyber, space, maritime capability, undersea warfare, electronic warfare, and the full range of capabilities. My assessment has not changed.

In terms of what they are trying to do, I think they are trying to do two simple things. At the strategic level, they are trying to undermine the credibility of our alliances and our ability to meet our alliance commitments.

Secondly, when you look at the military capabilities, whether they are in the Arctic or in Europe, what they are trying to do is prevent us from being able to move military power into the region or operate freely within the region. Again, connected to our ability to meet our alliance commitments.

So, I think they are very clear about what our strength is, which are our allies and partners, and our ability to project power when and where needed to advance our national interests, and I look at their political activity, what we really call “adversarial competition” that has a military dimension, but it falls short of warfare.

As they combine economic and political influence on conventional warfare cyber capabilities, it gets after again, trying to erode our allies, and then when we look at their military posture, whether it is in the Arctic or in Europe, their intent is to keep us from projecting power.

I do see increasing concern by Arctic nations to work together, to mitigate the effects of Russian capability development and behavior, and I think the importance that we place on the Arctic is reflected in the fact that the Department rewrote the strategy for the Arctic in 2013, and I think without me turning to the Secretary of Defense guidance that he will give us soon, I anticipate the Arctic will be a critical part of that.

Senator MURKOWSKI. My time has expired, Mr. Chairman. I would submit a question to you, Secretary Mattis, along the same lines of the interest in the Arctic, the investments in the Arctic, in terms of equipment necessary to defend the country in this very changing and very dynamic world up North.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. I now recognize the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin, Ms. Baldwin.

#### ISIS AND DEPARTMENT OF STATE REDUCTIONS

Senator BALDWIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Welcome, Mr. Secretary, General Dunford.

You have received several questions already about the partnership between State and Defense, and the potential impact on the Defense Department with regard to cuts that are contemplated at this point in the State Department.

I want to look at that a little more closely, and I want to start with General Dunford. Part of the mission of Operation Inherent Resolve is to enable whole of coalition government action to increase regional stability, defeat the ideology of ISIL, and stem the global flow of foreign fighters.

According to that mission statement, that means enabling America and coalition nations to counter ISIL with the full might of their national power. Here, I am quoting directly, "Including diplomatic, informational, economic, law enforcement, and other aspects of national power."

General Dunford, in your professional military judgment, would it be strategically wise to reduce funding and staffing levels for civilian agencies like State and USAID, and as we review these budgets, can you point out any particularly important aspects of the partnership in the fight against ISIL that we should keep a close eye on in terms of fighting maybe to restore some of the funding that has been proposed to be cut?

General DUNFORD. Senator thanks. First of all, with regard to ISIS, we really have nine areas that we have identified that are critical to our strategy, and although we are in the process of revising our strategy, I think the relative distribution of labor across the government will not change.

The Department of Defense leads on two of those nine, and other elements of the government lead, and you identified some areas where the State Department or other elements of our government will lead, but if you look at what must be done to deal with the ISIS threat, we do have to deal with the flow of foreign fighters, we do have to address the resources, we do have to undermine the credibility of the narrative. Those are three of the most important tasks.

The leads for dealing with all of those three are other elements of the government. Although I cannot talk to the adequate levels of funding for any other element of the government, what I can say is in order for us to be successful against ISIS or any of the threats that we face right now, it will be important for us to fully leverage all the capabilities our Nation has, diplomatically, economically, and militarily, and now in the 21st century and information space as well.

Senator BALDWIN. I know the policy is under revision, but can you tick off really quickly the two elements of Defense and the other seven?

General DUNFORD. Sure. Good governance is one; dealing with foreign fighters is another. Addressing the resources is another. Dealing with the narrative is another. Building the capacity of our partners on the ground is another. Denying the enemy sanctuary is another, and then the economic tools that we have would be the last.

#### ISIS/AUMF

Senator BALDWIN. Thank you. Secretary Mattis, you had a question from Senator Udall already about the lack of an ISIL specific Authorization for Use of Military Force. Nonetheless, you are in the process of revising, if you have not already concluded the process of revising the elements of the operation to defeat ISIL.

Can you give us details of how you plan to spend the \$2 billion that you are requesting specifically for acceleration of the defeat of ISIS? For example, can you give us any early detail about additional troops that you would be sending to Iraq and Syria with this funding?

I recognize that some things need to be shared in closed settings, in classified settings. I do think it is important, especially if you are encouraging us to engage in public debate about a new Authorization for Use of Military Force, which by the way, I support, and criticized the previous Administration for not pursuing that more aggressively, so some information does need to be shared in an open setting in order for us to have that debate.

Secretary MATTIS. Senator Baldwin, when I leave here today, I go over to Foggy Bottom where Secretary Tillerson has 68 nations, senior representatives, his counterparts, gathered, where we are talking about the very issues you have just brought up.

We are talking about how we are actually going to orchestrate the international community's efforts against them. When you switch over to the AUMF issue, again, I think a firm statement by the U.S. Congress would hearten our allies as well as give our troops a sense of purpose.

On the \$2 billion, I would tell you we are going to confront the enemy with an increased number of fights in various locations so they have cascading problems, to collapse them as quickly as possible.

The idea being right now, Senator, that they have eminent operations to attack our allies overseas. In other words, what they call their "external operations." We intend to throw them on their back foot.

As far as any additional troops, I would have to see the specific military problem we are working by, with, and through allies where it requires our troops. I am not at that point right now. The few troops that have been added have been for fire support or for monitoring, that sort of thing.

These are the kinds of things that only we can do, at least with the kind of time line we are on right now, but they are not there permanently. We remain with a by, with, and through our allies' approach.

This money will permit us to accelerate the operations I just referenced, if that is helpful.

Senator BALDWIN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Senator COCHRAN. The time of the Senator has expired. The chair recognizes the distinguished Senator from South Carolina, Mr. Graham.

#### AUMF

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Marine Corps should be honored, speaks well of the Marine Corps that both of you are here.

I am going to get through as much as I can, I know we just have five minutes. If you were going to do an Authorization for Use of Military Force, Secretary Mattis, by the Congress, would you suggest that we limit the authorization to a particular period of time?

Secretary MATTIS. No, Senator, I do not.

Senator GRAHAM. What about geography? We can only fight the enemy in certain places?

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, due to the nature of this enemy's threat that would only work to help the enemy.

Senator GRAHAM. Take means off the table, take away from you the ability to deploy means? How you would fight them.

Secretary MATTIS. Senator, I think it would be best if the Congress would say what they want us to accomplish. I have no reservation about sharing in closed session with you how we would carry that out.

Senator GRAHAM. Got you. My view is if you want to destroy ISIL, you should not limit yourself to time, geography, or means. You should just destroy them.

#### SOFT POWER

To destroy them, do you agree that soft power is an essential ingredient in winning the war on terror? Both of you.

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, America has two fundamental powers, the power of intimidation and the power of inspiration. Soft power is largely found in the power of inspiration, and it is part and parcel of how we defeat this enemy.

Senator GRAHAM. Do you agree with that, General Dunford?

General DUNFORD. I do, General, and at the end of the day, we are involved in a war of ideas and undermining the credibility of the narrative of the threat is going to be critical to our success. I think that has been defined as "soft power."

Senator GRAHAM. I admire you both because it is true, you will never win this war just by killing terrorists. You have to do more in my view.

#### RESIDUAL FORCE IN IRAQ

Let's look forward in Iraq. The day that Mosul falls, and I am sure it will, would you support a residual force staying in Iraq to make sure that ISIL does not come back, if the Iraqis would accept one? Secretary Mattis.

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, I believe it is in our national interest that we keep the Iraqi security forces in a position to keep our enemies on their back foot, our mutual enemies on their back foot.

Senator GRAHAM. General Dunford.

General DUNFORD. I agree with that, Senator Graham, and I believe that the Iraqi security force is clearly going to need that kind of support for some time to come.

#### IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION

Senator GRAHAM. I heard from the Iraqi Prime Minister yesterday that to reconstruct Anbar Province and now Mosul is about \$50 billion.

Do you agree just as important as having troops there as a residual force, we should probably come up with a game plan to reconstruct Iraq so we would have leverage in Baghdad, not just troops, but an assistance plan for the Iraqi's?

Secretary MATTIS. Secretary Tillerson's meeting today does address this issue. It is going to be an international effort. It should not be carried wholly by the U.S. taxpayers.

Senator GRAHAM. We should be part of that?

Secretary MATTIS. We certainly should be part of it, yes.

Senator GRAHAM. Do you believe it is in the taxpayers' interest for us to stay involved in Iraq in terms of reconstruction, to regain influence that we may have lost in Baghdad?

Secretary MATTIS. I do not see any reason to pull out again and find the same lesson.

Senator GRAHAM. Do you agree with that, General Dunford?

General DUNFORD. I do agree, Senator that we need to remain decisively engaged in Iraq and in the region.

#### LIFT BCA CAPS ON DEFENSE

Senator GRAHAM. Do both of you agree that we should lift BCA caps on defense spending forever?

Secretary MATTIS. I have seen no value to the BCA caps in the past years, so I certainly would not take issue, Senator.

General DUNFORD. I think I can concur with that without hesitation, Senator.

#### SEQUESTRATION

Senator GRAHAM. Is it fair to say that the sequestration has done a lot of damage to our military capabilities and readiness?

Secretary MATTIS. It has done more damage to our readiness, sir, than the enemies in the field.

General DUNFORD. Senator, it has not only done damage to our readiness, but I think it also has been very inefficient use of resources that the taxpayers have given us.

Senator GRAHAM. I am glad you all did not beat around the bush. 2018 is 603 for defense by the Trump Administration. Senator McCain has a defense budget of 640. Who is right? Secretary Mattis.

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, if you think I am going to pick a fight with the chairman of the Senate Armed Services Committee—

[Laughter.]

Senator GRAHAM. Let's put it this way, no, I do not, I would not want to do that myself.

[Laughter.]

Senator GRAHAM. The point is that more defense spending is needed but what are the limitations on increased defense spending?

Secretary MATTIS. Sir, we have to make certain what we ask for is executable and that we can sustain it, but what I need to do, Senator, is complete the strategy review that I am doing right now so I can come to you with a compelling reason why the American people have to sacrifice this money out of their pockets for national defense.

#### BUDGET BASED ON THREATS

Senator GRAHAM. General Dunford, in 10 seconds, you can take a little longer, do you not agree that we need a budget based on the threats of the day, the potential threats of tomorrow, to win the wars we may engage in, and deter wars that we may never have to fight? That is what the budget should be about, not a number.

General DUNFORD. Senator, I agree. The one thing in the context of the previous question, I work very close with the Secretary to make sure this is exactly what we deliver. We owe you the right

prioritization of capabilities that we need to have within the top line that we have been given, in the context of exactly the dynamic you just described.

Senator GRAHAM. Both of you feel we can spend \$30 billion wisely between now and the end of September?

Secretary MATTIS. We do, sir.

General DUNFORD. Senator, I am confident we can.

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you both.

#### ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Senator. Thank you all, our distinguished panel of witnesses, members of the committee, and staff who have helped us with this hearing.

We hope you will respond to any written questions that we may have as follow up, following the hearing today. We would request that you would respond to such a request in a reasonable time.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing:]

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO HON. JAMES N. MATTIS

##### QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR SUSAN M. COLLINS

###### MONTENEGRO'S ACCESSION INTO NATO

*Question.* Since Montenegro received its invitation to join NATO last year, 25 of 28 NATO legislatures have ratified Montenegro's accession into NATO. The Senate has not yet done so, though I believe there is strong support for Montenegro's bid to join NATO. Maine's National Guard has assisted the Ministry of Defense there to make progress towards meeting NATO standards for the past decade. Do you believe that Montenegro's accession into NATO could help impede Russian efforts to diminish the role of NATO and divide the West?

*Answer.* Montenegro is 800 miles from Russia and poses no geopolitical threat to that country. Despite this, Russia has actively opposed Montenegro's NATO bid and has taken measures to shape public opinion against NATO throughout the Western Balkan region. Russia also interfered in Montenegro's October 2016 national elections. Montenegro's NATO membership would provide a powerful rebuke to Russia's malign influence in the Western Balkans and would demonstrate that no third country has a veto over NATO's decision to admit new members. Montenegro's NATO membership would also confirm that all nations in the region are free to choose their own alliances and partnerships without fear of outside coercion and intimidation.

##### QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROY BLUNT

###### ACTIVE PROTECTION SYSTEMS (APS)/EASTERN EUROPE & RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

*Question.* Secretary Mattis and General Dunford, as you are well aware, Russian aggression in Eastern Europe is a top concern among many of our allies in the region. The Army has been working on active protection systems (APS) to meet current threats by our troops. In April 2016—the Army responded to a letter from me that it was “moving rapidly to evaluate selected mature” APS technologies on an “accelerated timeline.” APS technology is already fielded and combat tested, with the Israelis successfully deploying the Trophy APS system. However, according to open source and Army statements, the current APS developmental program of record, (Modular Active Protection Systems or MAPS), is on a timeline to try and field a system in 5–10 years. Thus, I am concerned that we are way behind the threat. There was no funding requested in the fiscal year 2017 Supplemental submitted last week. My interest is to help the Army achieve its stated objective to field these systems as rapidly as possible—we cannot wait any longer given the threat in multiple theaters. I appreciate your support in general for meeting the threat,

but we really must work to field this as soon as possible. Given this reality, what is the plan to transition from testing these systems to procuring them this year?

*Answer.* Prior to any procurement fielding decisions, the Army must conduct additional tests assessing APS impacts to overall platform performance, interactions with other Army systems, and all relevant safety conditions. The Army is currently conducting an expedited NonDevelopmental Item (NDI) risk reduction effort to install and characterize three different APS and will make a decision on how to proceed in September 2017.

---

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR STEVE DAINES

CYBER CAPABILITY IN THE NATIONAL GUARD

*Question.* U.S. Cyber Command has developed a robust capability to defend DoD networks that far surpasses the rest of the Federal Government and the private sector. It seems that the National Guard may be uniquely positioned to bring some of that cybersecurity expertise to the nation's critical infrastructure sectors under Title 32 authority. Secretary Mattis, do either your fiscal year 2017 supplement or fiscal year 2018 budget requests include funding to increase defensive cyber-capacity within the National Guard?

*Answer.* DoD's fiscal year 2017 budget supplemental request includes \$22 million for collective training and sustainment for the Cyber Mission Force, which includes elements of the Air National Guard. I cannot yet speak to the Department's fiscal year 2018 budget request as it is still being finalized.

FRAUD, WASTE, AND ABUSE

*Question.* An internal DoD report surfaced in December that identified \$125 billion in potential savings over 5 years, that was scuttled in early 2015. The projected savings, if thoughtfully pursued, might have precluded our current need for a budget supplement to rebuild military readiness. Peace through strength starts with efficiency, the kind of efficiency that maximizes the lethality of every dollar spent. Secretary Mattis, how do you plan to promote efficiency and transparency within your Department in order to ensure that every appropriated dollar is responsibly spent?

*Answer.* Management Reform is one of my top three initiatives. As announced on January 31, 2017, the fiscal year 2019–2023 Defense Program review will concentrate on an ambitious reform agenda, which will include horizontal integration across Department of Defense components to improve efficiency and take advantage of economies of scale. I have tasked the Deputy Secretary of Defense to assemble appropriate cross-functional teams to identify and build plans for continuing to reform DoD business practices and to generate funds that can be used to support my top priority of building a more lethal and effective force to support the nation's priorities. I expect to see efficiencies beyond those already put in place to be addressed in the Department's fiscal year 2019 budget submission. I have also reasserted to the staff that the Department will commence Department-wide audits beginning in fiscal year 2018, as a means of demonstrating both within the Department, and to those outside the Department, that the Department is managing the taxpayers' money with credibility. The Department of Defense has undertaken numerous efficiency efforts since 2010 in response to both internal direction from the previous Secretaries of Defense and in response to Congressional direction to achieve savings and redirect resources to higher priority missions. During the fiscal year 2017 programming cycle, the Department identified an additional \$7.9 billion in efficiencies. The Department is continuing to focus on those efforts to ensure we achieve the goals set. Both the new and past efforts build on recommendations consistent with the 2015 Defense Business Board (DBB) study. The framework laid out in the study has become a lens through which the Department views its lines of support activities. In addition to the six core business functions identified in the DBB study (human resources management; healthcare management; financial flow management (to include improvements in cost accounting); supply chain and logistics management; acquisition and procurement management; and real property management), the Department added base services (including retail operations, base lodging, and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation services) and information technology management as business focus areas. Long-term, sustained savings and reform requires the support of and endorsement from Members of Congress. To date, members have sometimes limited savings opportunities (e.g., declining to enter into another Base Realignment and Closure round) for a variety of reasons. Candidly, the institutional reforms that are needed to effect additional savings are going to reduce jobs and spending across the United States in some activities, while the reallocation of funds

to readiness and recapitalization will in turn open up new jobs and opportunities in others. I will remain hopeful that the Members will work with the Department to effect the necessary changes.

---

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JERRY MORAN

CYBER FORCES

*Question.* Cyber force missions are growing, and it is clear that cyber forces need to increase throughout the services. Unfortunately, there exists a training backlog that prevents cyber warriors from getting the training they need in a timely manner. What options are being pursued to alleviate this backlog? Additionally there are so few training spots available that this backlog becomes worse in the Guard and Reserve components—are you considering making more training opportunities available for those serving in the Guard and Reserve who wish to pursue cyber missions?

*Answer.* In late February 2017, the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD), Office of the Principal Cyber Advisor, hosted a senior leader review with the Military Services focusing on manning and training of the cyber workforce. The Services reported on various initiatives and indicated no challenges or major training backlogs in meeting mission requirements. However, a delay currently exists in acquiring the appropriate clearances for personnel attended training, which extends the military cyber training timeline. Despite this challenge, the Cyber Mission Force (CMF) training pipeline has been resourced and scaled to support 133 CMF teams reaching full operational capability by 2018. United States Cyber Command established the Joint cyber training standards and defined individual work roles to which all Joint cyber forces will be trained. The result of this work ensures Military Service training capabilities and capacity meet the requirements for individual feeder courses, foundation courses, and position specific training across the CMF training model continuum. The most common delay for commencing training is misaligned prerequisites for National Security Agency sponsored courses. One example of this delay is the time needed for inbound students to complete the required security in-processing for the scheduled training. We are working closely with all the Services to ensure adequate training and opportunities, including for the Guard and Reserves, and addressing existing backlogs.

AIR FLEET MODERNIZATION

*Question.* Secretary Mattis, one of your priorities is modernizing the air fleet. Are you considering options such as low-cost light-attack platforms to meet that objective? How do you intend to leverage industry research and development for use by the U.S. Armed Forces as it relates to procurement?

*Answer.* Yes. The Air Force is pursuing a non-developmental, off the shelf light attack aircraft intended for fielding within 2 years. The OA-X is anticipated to be an off-the-shelf aircraft, fleet additive, cost-effective and intended for permissive environment capability. Envisioned Counterland missions include Close Air Support, Interdiction, Forward Air Controller, Combat Search and Rescue, Strike Coordination and Reconnaissance, Armed Reconnaissance, and other missions. The OA-X will relieve some enduring counterterrorism mission costs and operational demand; allows 4th/5th generation aircraft to train for highly contested fights, and preserves 4th/5th gen service life; will increase JTAC training support aircraft availability, security cooperation/building partnership capacity opportunities, and increase Combat Air Force fleet size providing more cockpits for fighter pilot absorption.

---

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY

NATO REASSURANCE

*Question.* For the last few years, the United States has invested considerable funding and efforts in the European Reassurance Initiative, in response to Russia's aggressive behavior in Europe. How important is it for U.S. officials to publically reassure our allies when seeking to counter influence campaigns and deter future aggressive actions, do the President's statements, including "tweets" that criticize or misrepresent positions of NATO Members, concern or confuse our European allies, and how should we be prepared for Russian intelligence services to make use of those "tweets" to execute their information operations strategies over the next few years?

*Answer.* Russia seeks to create and exploit political divisions within Western societies and the Euro-Atlantic community in an attempt to "divide and conquer." In

response, our Allies look to the United States for an enduring defense commitment. This steady commitment helps to reassure our Allies and also assists them in justifying their own defense investments in difficult domestic political environments. Mixed or critical messages from U.S. leadership can be of great concern for Allies, especially those that feel most threatened by Russia. Russia will seize upon any mixed messaging it can to chip away at NATO solidarity. The \$3.4 billion 2017 European Reassurance Initiative (ERI) funding request is a clear and visible demonstration of the United States' commitment to NATO, European security, and deterring Russian aggression. It is critical that we maintain consistent messaging to signal our resolve and maximize the impact of these investments.

#### ISIS STRATEGY

*Question.* You are charged with putting together and executing a strategic plan to destroy ISIS. When discussing the Department's plan, Pentagon Spokesman Captain Jeff Davis said that it, "will address ISIS globally, and it is not just a DoD plan . . . We're charged with leading the development of the plan, but it absolutely calls upon the capabilities of other departments." How important will the military's civilian partners like USAID and the Department of State be in the fight against global terrorism, and how do you plan to integrate them into your counter-ISIS strategy?

*Answer.* The preliminary plan to defeat ISIS represents the United States Government plan, and included inputs from the State Department, the Department of Homeland Security, the Treasury Department, the Department of Justice, and the Intelligence Community. This plan identified both civilian and military efforts central to achieving the defeat of ISIS. Only a balanced approach that identifies and adequately resources military and civilian-led efforts will yield enduring success. The Defense Department will continue to work closely with our interagency partners to refine and implement a strategy to defeat ISIS.

#### INTERAGENCY COOPERATION IN THE FIELD

*Question.* In recent testimony on Capitol Hill, both General Votel and General Waldhauser highlighted the importance of collaboration between the military and the State Department and USAID in promoting U.S. national security interests abroad. General Waldhauser specifically praised our civilian agencies, stating that "to protect and promote U.S. national security interests . . . diplomacy and development are key efforts, and our partnership with the Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) is key to achieve enduring success." Can you share any examples from your personal experience illustrating why the partnership between our military and its civilian counterparts works and is so important to advancing U.S. national security interests?

*Answer.* Although our military is unparalleled in combat operations, effecting the critical transition to host-nation civilian governance and building institutions require skills and capabilities principally found in the civilian departments and agencies. We are witnessing this challenge in Afghanistan. In addition, the civilian functions of development and diplomacy play a key role in countering extremism, strengthening justice systems and delivery, advocating for human rights, and enhancing adherence to the rule of law. The Department of State and the U.S. Agency for International Development, among others, engage globally on these issues on a daily basis. Their work is critical in helping the United States avoid combat operations and in transitioning to peace.

---

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DIANNE FEINSTEIN

##### NORTH KOREA

*Question.* Secretary Mattis and General Dunford, North Korea has conducted five nuclear weapons tests and is developing ballistic missiles capable of hitting the United States and our allies with nuclear weapons.

Secretary Mattis, do you believe that Kim Jung-un is willing to negotiate away North Korea's nuclear weapons and ballistic missile programs? [If yes], what do you believe North Korea would require of the United States and our allies in such a negotiation? [If no], given his refusal to negotiate, how can the United States and our allies deter aggression by the North? Secretary Mattis, would you support returning U.S. nuclear weapons to South Korea to deter the North?

*Answer.* We will provide you a fuller answer separately in classified channels. In general, however, North Korea's nuclear weapons are prohibited under multiple United Nations Security Council resolutions. The United States has been clear and

consistent that North Korea's actions are counterproductive to the ends Kim Jong Un seeks. The United States will not be deterred from the defense of the Republic of Korea and our other allies and partners. North Korea's nuclear capabilities will not provide North Korea the freedom of action it seeks. North Korea's current course is dangerous and counterproductive and will only lead to further isolation. We have successfully deterred a large-scale North Korean attack on the Republic of Korea through a robust military posture on the Korean Peninsula and in the region, regular defensive exercises, and overwhelming military capabilities. We have made clear to North Korea on multiple occasions that any attack on our allies will be met with an effective and overwhelming response. In regard to your question about deploying nuclear weapons to the Korean Peninsula, we do not discuss the location of our strategic deterrent. We remain firmly committed to our extended deterrence commitments to the Republic of Korea.

#### DEFENSE DEPARTMENT EXPENDITURES FOR TRUMP ADULT CHILDREN TRIPS

*Question.* According to a recent Washington Post article, the Secret Service and the State Department paid nearly \$100,000 in hotel bills alone to support a recent Trump Organization promotional trip by the President's son, Eric, to Uruguay. This cost does not include U.S. Government personnel costs, per diem, transportation or other incidental costs. It also does not cover the cost of any support the military may have provided, including the use of military aircraft.

Secretary Mattis, has the Department of Defense provided any support, including the use of military aircraft, to Eric or Donald Trump Jr. in the course their travel on behalf of or related to the Trump Organization? [If yes,] what support has the military provided? Can you give us a rough sense of how much this cost? [If yes,] can you tell me all trips taken by Eric or Donald Jr. for which the military provided support? [If yes,] has the Department had to decline or delay other travel requests because of trips being taken by the President's adult children? [If yes,] during these trips, have Eric or Donald Jr. been accompanied by individuals who do not work for the government? Secretary Mattis, are there any policies in place under the current Administration concerning Department of Defense support for non-official business trips by members of the president's family? [If yes,] does that policy require any member of the President's family to reimburse the government for costs incurred by the government in support of non-official business?

*Answer.* The Department of Defense has not provided any support for Eric or Donald Trump Jr. in the course of their travel on behalf of or related to the Trump Organization. We are not aware of any specific policies in place under the current administration concerning Department of Defense support for non-official business trips by members of the president's family. Travel undertaken with the president on military aircraft is controlled directly by the White House.

#### NEW NUCLEAR CRUISE MISSILE

*Question.* General Mattis, I am deeply concerned by the Air Force's program to build a new nuclear cruise missile, known as the Long Range Stand-Off weapon (LRSO). During your confirmation hearings, you said you wanted to study the role this new nuclear weapon would play in maintaining deterrence.

General Mattis, do you believe that building a new nuclear cruise missile is essential for maintaining deterrence? Do you believe our ground- and submarine-launched ICBM's, as well as air-dropped gravity bombs, are insufficient to preserve deterrence in the absence of an air-launched cruise missile? During a House Armed Services Committee hearing on March 8, 2017, General Selva, the Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, argued that the United States should build a new nuclear cruise missile in order to have something that the U.S. could trade away in any future negotiations with our adversaries. Secretary Mattis, would you support an air-launched cruise missile ban as alluded to by General Selva?

*Answer.* The United States' nuclear deterrent remains the bedrock of our national security. A fundamental role of nuclear weapons is to deter a nuclear attack against the United States, our allies, and partners. Such an attack poses the only existential threat to the Nation. In addition to deterring a nuclear attack, a robust, flexible, and survivable U.S. nuclear arsenal underpins the U.S. ability to deploy conventional forces worldwide; provides the President with credible response options to strengthen deterrence; and supports U.S. nonproliferation goals by extending deterrence to allies and partners, thereby dissuading them from developing their own nuclear weapons. The current recapitalization plans for all three legs of the Triad, and for associated command and control systems, are intended to provide the forces and capabilities necessary to achieve these important national security objectives in a cost-effective manner.

We are currently conducting a Nuclear Posture Review. This review will account for a range of views, and will consider issues pertaining to each leg of the Triad, including the LRSO program. I cannot support a hypothetical arms control treaty regarding air launched cruise missiles because the details would matter. Any such treaty would have to serve U.S. national security interests—a determination that is contingent upon the answers to questions that are context-specific, such as whether the treaty would be effectively verifiable. I will say that we would have zero leverage to bring other countries to the negotiating table if we weren't moving forward with the Long-Range Standoff Weapon. But ultimately the rationale for retaining an air-launched cruise missile in the nuclear triad is the unique and important role it plays in deterring nuclear attack, reassuring allies, and achieving U.S. objectives if deterrence fails.

#### NEW START IMPLEMENTATION

*Question.* The New START treaty requires the United States and Russia to draw down to no more than 1,550 deployed warheads and 800 total launchers by February 5, 2018. The Treaty expires in 2021, but it can be extended by 5 years if both sides agree to do so. Secretary Mattis, do you believe that compliance with New START is in our strategic interest? Secretary Mattis, would you support extending New START to 2021 as permitted by the treaty?

*Answer.* I believe that compliance with the New START Treaty is in our strategic interest. However, like any arms control agreement, we should continually assess Russian compliance and whether the agreement remains in our national interest. We are conducting a Nuclear Posture Review to ensure that our nuclear deterrent is modern, robust, flexible, resilient, ready, and appropriately tailored to deter 21st-century threats and reassure our allies. This review will account for a range of views, and will consider issues such as the possible extension of the New START Treaty. Even so, the United States cannot extend the Treaty by itself. Extension will require Russia's agreement and its continued compliance.

#### DEFENSE SCIENCE BOARD REPORT

*Question.* Secretary Mattis, I recently joined 12 other Senators in sending a letter to you concerning a report by the Defense Science Board entitled, "Seven Defense Priorities for the New Administration." The report recommended "a more flexible nuclear enterprise that could produce, if needed, a rapid, tailored nuclear option for limited use." The Board also suggested that it may be necessary to resume nuclear weapons testing. The United States already has so-called "low-yield" nuclear weapons. In fact, right now we are modernizing the B61 gravity bomb at an estimated cost of \$10 billion.

Secretary Mattis, do you believe that the United States needs additional "low-yield" nuclear weapons to preserve deterrence? The directors of our three nuclear weapons labs stated in 2015 that the U.S. is in a better position to maintain the nuclear arsenal now than it was during the era of nuclear testing, which ended more than 20 years ago. Secretary Mattis, do you have any reason to believe that the United States should resume testing?

*Answer.* Effective nuclear deterrence is the Department's highest priority mission. The ability to deter nuclear attacks is integral to the central objective of defending our vital interests. I believe our nuclear deterrent must be flexible and capable to respond to a wide range of threats. We are conducting a Nuclear Posture Review to ensure that our nuclear deterrent is modern, robust, flexible, resilient, ready, and appropriately tailored to deter 21st-century threats and reassure our allies and partners. This review will inform any future changes to our nuclear policy, strategy, and capabilities. I do not have any reason to believe we should resume nuclear testing at this time. The Stockpile Stewardship Program (SSP) is a robust scientific program intended to sustain and assess the nuclear weapons stockpile without the use of underground nuclear tests and has enabled a U.S. nuclear test moratorium for more than 24 years.

#### NUCLEAR POSTURE REVIEW

*Question.* Secretary Mattis, President Trump's memorandum on "Rebuilding the U.S. Armed Forces" requires you to undertake a new Nuclear Posture Review. Quite frankly, I am troubled by recent assertions by the Defense Science Board and Obama Administration officials like Frank Kendall that there is even such a thing as a "limited use of nuclear weapons."

Secretary Mattis, do you believe the United States should unequivocally state that the sole purpose of nuclear weapons is to deter their use by others? Secretary Mattis, do you believe it is possible to fight and win a "limited" nuclear war?

*Answer.* We are currently conducting a Nuclear Posture Review. This review will account for a range of views, and will consider the roles of nuclear weapons in our national security strategy and issues pertaining to U.S. declaratory policy. Our policy is not to fight and win limited nuclear wars, it is to deter nuclear attack. The current threat environment presents a complex set of challenges which includes the need to deter both large-scale nuclear attacks and attacks in which an adversary would employ only a small portion of its nuclear weapons while withholding its remaining arsenal to threaten further attacks. An effective and prudent strategy capable of deterring both limited and large-scale attacks requires that we ensure the President has a range of effective response options. If deterrence fails, in a limited way we will need response options that can restore deterrence of nuclear use.

FISCAL YEAR 2017 DEFENSE SUPPLEMENTAL REQUEST

*Question.* Secretary Mattis, the supplemental request includes \$2 billion to implement a “new counter-ISIS strategy.” Secretary Mattis and General Dunford, can you please detail what the President’s new strategy is, given this request for new funds? Secretary Mattis, this supplemental request would partially offset \$30 billion in increases in defense spending by decreasing non-defense programs by \$18 billion this year. Secretary Mattis, do you support increasing “defense” spending at the expense of “non-defense” spending? Do you believe that spending designated as “non-defense” plays any role in protecting our national security?

As this Committee begins to discuss funding for fiscal year 2018 and the President’s request to move \$54 billion from non-defense to defense, how would you recommend that we balance the needs of your Department vs. others like the State Department or domestic law enforcement? Secretary Mattis, the supplemental request includes \$25 billion in additional fiscal year 2017 base funding for the Department of Defense. Of that amount, approximately half (\$15.6 billion) would be for the procurement of major weapons systems as well as research and development. It was my understanding that the military had immediate warfighting and readiness needs that exceeded the funding currently available to the Department. If this supplemental request is so time-sensitive and critical that it could not wait for the fiscal year 2018 Budget, why does it include funding for longer term procurement and research priorities?

*Answer.* The proposed strategic framework to defeat ISIS, drafted in response to National Security Presidential Memorandum—3 directing the development of a preliminary draft strategy and plan to defeat ISIS, draws upon all elements of national power—diplomatic, military, financial, cyber, intelligence, and public diplomacy—with a focus on applying simultaneous pressure on ISIS globally. It commits to a “by, with, and through” approach to defeat ISIS in Iraq and Syria and its global branches and networks. Specific details of the interagency plan are pending final approval. Effective, integrated, and sustainable U.S. Government solutions to complex security problems require a balance of resourcing across defense and non-defense spending. The Department’s request for additional funding reflects the fact that the security situation facing our country has become more challenging and that our military needs additional resources to meet the demands of that emerging environment. I certainly do. Around the world, diplomacy and development solutions remain our preferred options to secure our national security interests, but we must be capable of prioritizing those efforts that relate to our security. Non-defense efforts can reduce the need for our military forces to be employed. The military plays a complementary role by providing needed stability that enables diplomatic and economic options.

I defer to the Office of Management and Budget on the necessary balance of resources across agency total obligating authorities. Effective, integrated U.S. Government solutions to complex security problems require exactly that—a balance of resourcing across the diplomatic, development, defense, law enforcement, and other security-related functions of our national security apparatus. Secretary Mattis, the supplemental request includes \$25 billion in additional fiscal year 2017 base funding for the Department of Defense. Of that amount, approximately half (\$15.6 billion) would be for the procurement of major weapons systems as well as research and development. It was my understanding that the military had immediate warfighting and readiness needs that exceeded the funding currently available to the Department. Resourcing readiness and fielding a healthy joint force require more than just closing near-term gaps in areas such as training and maintenance. We also must address longer-term shortfalls. In some cases, we need to acquire new equipment to increase the inventory of forces that are ready to deploy. Fiscal constraints have prevented the Services from addressing their long-term readiness con-

cerns for years, and delaying the start of this effort will continue to exacerbate both near- and long-term readiness.

---

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TOM UDALL

AUTHORIZATION FOR USE OF MILITARY FORCE

*Question.* If Congress were to approve an AUMF (Authorization for use of Military Force), what would you recommend we focus on for the goal of the mission and the endgame of U.S. military action inside Syria? Are we going to engage in another risky round of regime change, a proposal that could lead to direct conflict with Russia, or would engagement be limited to counterterrorism against ISIL? Or ISIL and other terrorist groups? Or a mixture of both regime change and counterterrorism?

*Answer.* I believe the 2001 AUMF provides sufficient authority for the Department to use force in response to the terrorist threats we are confronted with, including against ISIS. The defeat of ISIS remains the U.S. objective in Syria, and the Department of Defense will continue to focus our efforts on achieving that objective. However, enacting a new or updated AUMF that expressly includes ISIS in addition to al-Qa'ida and the Taliban would provide a helpful validation of the American people's resolve and would demonstrate that Congress remains committed in this fight."

SYRIA STRATEGY DEVELOPMENT

*Question.* What role has Steve Bannon played in developing a strategy in Syria? Do you speak with him regularly, and have any of his opinions overridden the professional military advice given by yourself or other professionals at the Pentagon?

*Answer.* We defer to the White House on Mr. Bannon's specific role in developing strategy.

NATIONAL SECURITY DECISION MAKING

*Question.* Do you believe that political strategists like Steve Bannon should be a regular part of national security decisionmaking, and given a permanent, formal role within the National Security Council?

*Answer.* We defer to the White House on Mr. Bannon's specific role in national security decisionmaking.

WHITE HOUSE ADVISORS

*Question.* What is your relationship to your—as the Washington Post put it—"commissar"—a White House appointed advisor in each cabinet agency? What is the role of this White House advisor to oversee your work and have that person in any way tried to constrain your ability to carry out your legal duties.

*Answer.* The relationship with the Senior White House Advisor is a positive one. He supports White House and DoD policy, program, and personnel efforts and serves as a representative of the Secretary of Defense to the White House and other executive organizations. The White House Advisor position does not constrain the ability to perform my legal duties.

FISCAL YEAR 2017 ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION REQUEST

*Question.* Does the fiscal year 2017 supplemental address the unmanned aerial vehicle or UAV threat from terrorist organizations, including the use of off-the-shelf UAVs, many manufactured in China, to conduct ISR and other activities against allied troops?

*Answer.* Yes, there is a total of \$404.1 million requested in the fiscal year 2017 supplemental to support Counter-small Unmanned Aerial Vehicle initiatives in response to Urgent Operational Needs for ongoing operations and for locations in the United States. The Department is already investing over \$425 million in reprogrammed and specifically provided funds to aggressively pursue several efforts to defeat enemy Unmanned Aerial Vehicles threats and protect sensitive areas within the United States and critical operations of U.S. forces abroad. The additionally requested funding allows us to continue these investments and provide more capability to fulfill recently validated requirements.

DIRECTED ENERGY WEAPONS

*Question.* Is the Department of Defense considering increased use of directed energy weapons, both kinetic and non-kinetic, to address the threat [of the use of off-the-shelf UAVs]?

*Answer.* Countering the commercial-off-the-shelf small-UAS threat is a high priority within the Department of Defense (DoD). Recently, the Joint Improvised-threat Defeat Organization (JIDO) conducted a small-UAS Hard-Kill Challenge (HKC) to evaluate current industry and DoD technologies that could be fielded to address this threat. Several high energy laser systems were evaluated as part of the HKC. JIDO will publish the HKC findings in a final report by the end of May 2017. The Services and JIDO are also working to develop and demonstrate other directed energy systems that may have potential for defeating swarms of small-UAS. DoD will evaluate the maturity of these technologies along with their ability to meet urgent needs and service requirements.

#### DIUX PROGRAM

*Question.* How is the Department of Defense utilizing the DIUx program to address these [off-the-shelf UAV] threats?

*Answer.* Counter-Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS) is a priority focus within Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUx) autonomy efforts. The commercial sector has much to offer in the protection of public venues, and in other technology that can help defeat the UAS threat. DIUx is partnering with several Department of Defense (DoD) entities to quickly identify, evaluate, and field commercial solutions to respond to the wide variety of scenarios and environments that DoD faces. For instance, DIUx is leveraging unique radio frequency sensors to be paired on an M-RZR utility vehicle to provide Marines advanced warning of UAS threats. The mobile system will be capable of passively identifying, tracking, and defeating threats posed by UAS during the day and night, in all weather conditions.

#### SYRIA AND IRAQ IN THE FUTURE

*Question.* How are the Department of Defense, the White House, and the State Department preparing for a post-ISIL Syria and Iraq?

*Answer.* We are working in close coordination with the State Department and White House to prepare for post-ISIS Syria and Iraq. Military victory alone will not achieve the lasting defeat of ISIS. In Syria, the Department of Defense supports State Department-led stabilization efforts to work through local partners on governance and security after Raqqa is liberated. In Iraq, DoD coordinates with the Government of Iraq and United Nations to plan for the stabilization and governance of Mosul and other liberated areas.

#### STATE DEPARTMENT CUTS

*Question.* With the administration proposing major cuts to the State Department, does the Department of Defense plan to fill this void to help create conditions on the ground to sustain military efforts?

*Answer.* DoD is not resourced to make up shortfalls in foreign military assistance but will work collaboratively with the Department of State to determine how to prioritize security sector assistance available under the authorities and appropriations of the Departments of Defense and State.

#### VIOLENCE IN SYRIA AND IRAQ

*Question.* Who is leading the effort to work with the various interested parties in the region to prevent a relapse of violence in Syria and Iraq?

*Answer.* The Department of State leads the U.S. approach in the places where we support stabilization efforts in Iraq and Syria. Military victory alone will not achieve the lasting defeat of ISIS. Preventing a relapse of violence in Iraq is the responsibility of the Government of Iraq, and when appropriate, with the assistance of the United Nations, the Coalition and the United States. In Syria, we will continue to work with our local partners and the Coalition to consolidate gains and build resilience against ISIS reemergence. Both Iraq and Syria will require a whole of government effort working by, with, and through local partners who take ownership of their own communities.

#### NUCLEAR POLICY REVIEW

*Question.* I understand that a new nuclear policy review will be undertaken soon. Will you voice support with the NNSA continued funding for the life extension projects and stockpile stewardship program while that review is being undertaken?

*Answer.* Yes. The life extension projects and Stockpile Stewardship Program are essential to ensuring that U.S. nuclear weapons remain safe, secure, and effective.

## FUNDING FOR THE DOD'S OWN NUCLEAR MODERNIZATION PROGRAMS

*Question.* Will you also support robust funding for the DoD's own nuclear modernization programs?

*Answer.* Yes. The United States' nuclear deterrent remains the bedrock of our national security and is DoD's top priority. Funding our modernization program is essential.

## SPACE PROGRAM FUNDING

*Question.* Do you support robust funding for Air Force space programs, including research and development?

*Answer.* The Department supports research and development (R&D) funding of space programs to enable joint Warfighter effectiveness and preserve U.S. national security. The Department invests in R&D as appropriate to improve capability, reduce cost, and to check adversary efforts as they field their own advanced space-based capabilities to counter or defeat ours. We must stay ahead of these threats and continue to preserve our decisive warfighting advantage in space as well as all other domains. The Department carefully considers every dollar spent to determine how to best address readiness and lethality of the Joint Force, the changing nature of warfare, and perceived future challenges to our capabilities. Our budget requests reflect the output of a deliberative process that is aimed at striking the proper balance among competing budgetary priorities. We appreciate your continued support of these efforts.

## CONTESTED SPACE

*Question.* Space has become increasingly contested. What is the Department's plan to ensure we can replace space assets quickly if needed?

*Answer.* DoD's space mission assurance strategy uses reconstitution of assets, resilient architectures, and defensive operations to ensure warfighters have the space-based capabilities they require to perform mission essential functions in any operating environment or condition. DoD aims to take advantage of new innovations in military and commercial space, such as small satellites and commercial launch, that are making reconstitution on operational timelines more realistic for some capabilities.

## SMALL SATELLITES

*Question.* Does the Department of Defense support the use of small satellites, such as those developed by AFRL Operational Responsive Space, which can be launched relatively quickly compared to traditional satellite programs?

*Answer.* Yes.

## RADIATION HARDENED ELECTRONICS

*Question.* Will the fiscal year 2017 supplemental or fiscal year 2018 budget include funding for the development of new radiation hardened electronics, including microchips made from unique materials such as graphene?

*Answer.* The Department of Defense (DoD) sponsors and performs research and development (R&D) in radiation hardened electronics. The list of DoD sponsors include the Defense Threat Reduction Agency (DTRA), the National Reconnaissance Office (NRO), the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL), and the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) Trust and Assurance Microelectronics Program, amongst others. DTRA, in collaboration with the Naval Research Laboratory, has an applied research effort looking at beyond silicon applications in radiation hardened electronics. This work will continue in fiscal year 2018 to mature the radiation hardening of these non-silicon technologies. NRO is also funding research in new radiation hardened electronics, including microchips made from Carbon Nano-tube microelectronics, and advanced silicon based microelectronics. In addition, AFRL is partnering with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration's Jet Propulsion Laboratory for the development of the next generation High Performance Space Computing "chiplet" to address future space mission microprocessor needs.

## LASER COMMUNICATIONS

*Question.* Is the Department of Defense exploring laser communications for secure satellite communications or communications with UAVs?

*Answer.* Yes, the Department of Defense is exploring laser communications for secure satellite communications, or communications with Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs). Below is a summary of these efforts. The Office of Naval Research is con-

ducting applied research in laser communications payloads for small satellites in a partnership with the Naval Research Laboratory. This research effort is funded through fiscal year 2018 and will contribute to the Office of Naval Research Future Naval Capability project on Anti-Access, Area Denial Communications Operations using Nanosats. The Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) is investigating laser communications for secure, low latency, GEO-to ground communications. This work leverages COLT (Compact Lasercom Terminal), a previous Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL) experiment, which was demonstrated in 2015 by AFRL ANGELS (Automated Navigation and Guidance Experiment for Local Space) spacecraft in near-Geosynchronous orbit. DARPA has fiscal year 2017 funding to continue improvements to the COLT system on active steering and bidirectional communications.

#### DIUX PROGRAM

*Question.* Do you support continuing the DIUX program, also known as the 3rd offset, started by your predecessors?

*Answer.* Yes, I do. Accelerating the development, procurement, and integration of commercially-derived capabilities is a critical concern of the Department of Defense and the fulltime mission of Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUX). DIUX provides access to high-tech companies and their leading edge technologies, not only in Silicon Valley, but across the Nation.

#### DIUX AND NATIONAL LABS

*Question.* I have asked DIUX to leverage the work done by our national labs and the businesses that support them as well as the private sector. This committee also passed language to encourage DoD to do the aforementioned as well. Will you work with the DIUX leadership to ensure they work with our national labs to develop R&D which could benefit the future force?

*Answer.* Yes. Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUX) is already exploring partnerships with Department of Defense service labs. Members of the laboratories' technical staff are co-located at DIUX and participate in program development and project execution, a scientist-in-residence activity. In addition, DIUX regularly calls upon subject-matter experts at the national labs, federally Funded Research and Development Centers, and University Affiliated Research Centers to help evaluate the technical feasibility of solutions proposed to address DoD customer problems. These efforts will continue.

#### DIUX FOOTPRINT

*Question.* DIUX, through the leadership of Raj Shah has begun to make the type of business to military connections originally envisioned. I have been working to expand the footprint of DIUX to other communities that are rich in research and development. For example, Albuquerque, NM, which is home to Sandia National Labs and multiple businesses that support it is an ideal location for DIUX expansion. How would an increase in funding to \$90m allow DIUX to grow its capabilities and would you support such an increase in order to multiply efforts as part of the 3rd offset?

*Answer.* With a larger budget, Defense Innovation Unit Experimental (DIUX) could develop and test more diverse technologies in key commercial areas of interest, such as artificial intelligence, autonomy, information technology, human systems, and space. In addition, DIUX could expand its efforts in additional locations.

#### STATE FOREIGN OPERATIONS BUDGET

*Question.* Do you think the proposed cuts to the State Foreign Operations Budget will harm our national security?

*Answer.* The proposed reductions will have to be managed with great care. Foreign military assistance builds lasting relationships with the United States. It supports the U.S. industrial base by enabling partners to procure U.S. equipment and platforms. It deepens interoperability and enables partners to manage their own security challenges. Current discussions propose to shift some grant aid to loans. Many countries may not qualify for loans and may look to other countries for assistance. The United States must be willing to assume risk in lending to less credit-worthy partners. Reduced grant aid may cause some countries to make choices that are not in the best interests of the United States.

## FOREIGN POLICY CALCULUS

*Question.* Do you believe that diplomacy and aid should still be a major part of our overall national security and foreign policy calculus?

*Answer.* I do. Our military has tremendous capability to prevail in conflict. However, we rely significantly on the efforts of U.S. development and assistance professionals and our diplomats to minimize the causes of conflict. They play the key role in helping countries transition to legitimate civilian authority. Our government has rightly worked in recent years to tie defense, diplomacy, and development together to ensure that we benefit from these communities' comparative advantages, and to leverage the right skills for each foreign policy task.

## STATE DEPARTMENT COOPERATION WITH FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS

*Question.* Are you concerned that cuts to the State Department's budget will impact our diplomats' ability to aid Department of Defense efforts with foreign governments?

*Answer.* I am. I believe that any reductions will have to be managed to ensure that the critical skills found in our Department of State and other supporting departments and agencies are sustained at levels that adequately support our foreign policy and security goals and objectives. Rigorous prioritization of the most critical efforts will be required.

## OP-TEMPO IMPACT

*Question.* One of the complaints I have heard is that op-tempo due to U.S. commitments overseas is having a negative impact on readiness, and one reason for the emphasis on readiness in the fiscal year 2017 supplemental and the skinny budget. Given those concerns, do increased troop levels in Syria harm future readiness and prevent the U.S. military from investing in the R&D and other efforts to ensure near peer competitors do not overtake us militarily?

*Answer.* Global operational demand over the past 15 years has put a strain on the readiness of our Military Services as a whole. Although operational demands in certain situations, and for specific force elements, can adversely affect our readiness, at this time and in this scenario, I do not believe increased troop levels in Syria will specifically harm future readiness or prevent the U.S. military from continued investment in the R&D and other efforts to ensure near peer competitors do not overtake us militarily.

## MOVEMENT IN THE MEDITERRANEAN

*Question.* What is the overall cost to U.S. freedom of movement in the Mediterranean if Russia is able to secure Syria and build up its basing and anti-access area denial capabilities in the region?

*Answer.* As a legal matter, the presence of a Russian base in Syria would not change any of our navigational rights or freedoms. As an operational matter, we would not tolerate—and would challenge—any attempt to restrict our freedom of movement in the Mediterranean Sea, just as we do throughout the world. Regardless, we continue to monitor Russian deployments and operations in Syria very closely.

## RUSSIA'S MILITARY AND POLITICAL FOOTPRINT

*Question.* Do you agree with assessments that Putin is attempting to challenge the U.S. and our allies by increasing Russia's military and political footprint in the region?

*Answer.* Yes. President Putin seeks to return Russia to great power status and has chosen to pursue that perception through a zero-sum, unconstructive approach. Russia uses malign activities, including information operations and cyber activities, to undermine confidence in Western institutions and governments and meddle in democratic processes. Russia also has shown a willingness to use armed force against its neighbors for political gains, violating the tenets of sovereignty and territorial integrity and undermining the fabric of global security. These actions are a direct challenge to the global norms that the United States and our Allies have developed to ensure the security of all nations.

## WEAPONS DEPLOYMENT IN KOREA

*Question.* Are there any plans or discussions to deploy nuclear weapons to the Korean peninsula for deterrence purposes?

*Answer.* We have made clear to North Korea on multiple occasions that any attack on the United States, or our allies or partners, will be met with a response that is both effective and overwhelming. The United States and our regional allies and partners will continue to explore the full range of alliance capabilities to strengthen our deterrence posture and defense forces, as needed, and evaluate our military posture as the threat from North Korea evolves.

#### NORTH KOREAN NUCLEAR THREAT

*Question.* When Secretary Tillerson said diplomacy has failed, and that military options were on the table with regards to the North Korean nuclear threat, were you given orders by the President or National Security Council to develop war plans or other potential kinetic strikes against North Korea?

*Answer.* The President has stated clearly that North Korea is a top priority for this Administration. Although we would prefer a diplomatic solution to the North Korean threat, the Department of Defense consistently plans for contingencies so that options are available should the President need to act. We are exploring the full range of diplomatic, security, and economic options, as well as military options, to convince North Korea that a stable, peaceful, and prosperous future does not arise from its current dangerous course, and to compel it to change its behaviors. We will continue to develop a comprehensive set of capabilities to counter the North Korean threat.

#### WHITE SANDS MISSILE RANGE

*Question.* I have heard from commanders at White Sands Missile Range that the range is in need of serious maintenance and investment in order to carry out its long term testing mission. How does DoD rate the testing capabilities across our ranges, and what are the priority needs for anti-ballistic missile and missile defense testing at WSMR and other ranges?

*Answer.* The Department of Defense (DoD) rates the test and evaluation (T&E) capabilities across our ranges through its biennial Strategic Plan for DoD T&E Resources. The Test Resource Management Center (TRMC) assesses core Major Range and Test Facility Base (MRTFB) capabilities and resources from the aspect of four major elements: workforce, funding, infrastructure, and range sustainability. Data sources for this assessment include the annual MRTFB budget exhibits, the adequacy of the Component T&E budgets, the TRMC-chaired annual Infrastructure Readiness Reviews, and MRTFB site visits. White Sands Missile Range (WSMR) T&E capabilities are adequate for today's missile T&E mission set; however, current investments buttressed against T&E range modernization requirements, driven by the development of more advanced weapon system capabilities, may soon render today's capabilities insufficient to test and evaluate tomorrow's systems. The Department's prioritized anti-ballistic missile and missile defense testing needs are maintenance and investments in radar and optical tracking and telemetry system modernization, launch complex revitalization, power upgrades, and communications modernization. Financial resources are committed at WSMR to address capability gaps in radar and optical tracking modernization and a MILCON infrastructure investment in a new Network Enterprise Center. However, the delivery and execution of these modernization projects and investments are being outpaced by obsolescence, consumption, and expected deterioration and capital depreciation. Other ranges (e.g., Reagan Test Site, Pacific Missile Range Facility, and the Western Range) have similar priority needs for maintenance and investment in range infrastructure, including optical, radar, telemetry, flight termination, and mobile instrumentation capabilities critical to ballistic missile defense flight test and evaluation.

#### UAV'S WITH DIRECTED ENERGY

*Question.* Is DoD looking to employ UAV's with directed energy capabilities to take out ballistic threats during the launch phase? What would be the cost of employing this type of defense system and how much testing would be required before you are ready to deploy such a capability?

*Answer.* Laser equipped Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) offer a potential cost effective solution to tracking and disabling the ever-increasing number and types of adversary ballistic threats. UAVs are becoming more common in Department of Defense (DoD) operations, and there are a number of promising electric-laser technologies. Lasers currently exist that are small enough to be carried onboard UAVs. The output power level of electric lasers available today would need to increase significantly to be operationally effective for launch or boost-phase defense against ballistic threats. Just as important, today's laser efficiency and packaging, as well as UAV endurance and payload, do not meet boost-phase mission requirements. In a

2016 Boost Phase Defense System Report to Congress, the Missile Defense Agency estimated a moderate risk boost phase intercept capability could be in place by 2030 for slightly under \$3 billion. The program included a demonstration UAV in fiscal year 2026, 3 production laser UAVs by the end of fiscal year 2029, and 6 by the end of 2030. Other current DoD programs to develop and field laser equipped platforms and the continued evolution of UAVs could reduce the cost and risk of a future boost phase capability.

#### CLOUD COMPUTING

*Question.* What are DoD's plans in fiscal year 2017 and fiscal year 2018 to continue IT efforts to move more capabilities to cloud computing.

- Answer.* The Department plans to move more capabilities to cloud computing by:
- Updating the Department's Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide (CC SRG) to address cybersecurity challenges and emergent requirements for secure operations in cloud computing environments. Additionally, the DoD's Secure Cloud Computing Architecture prototype is anticipated to reach initial operational capability by the end of 2017, which will extend DoD cyber defenses and protections into the commercial cloud environment.
  - Streamlining the DoD Provisional Authorization process to improve the speed at which commercial cloud services are DoD-approved by leveraging the new Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program's (FedRAMP) accelerated processes and readiness assessments.
  - Establishing cloud contracts to pilot the delivery of market-leading commercial cloud solutions on DoD premises. The pilot Contractor-Owned/Contractor Operated (COCO) on-premises cloud environments include DoD's On-Site Managed Services (OMS) and the Army Private Cloud Enterprise (APCE). These environments are anticipated to be fully operational by the end of this calendar year.
  - Establishing standardized cybersecurity/network defense methodologies and approaches to facilitate migration of DoD systems and applications to commercial clouds by providing needed on-going application protection. To accelerate this work, the Department will engage industry to identify innovative approaches and technologies that can help establish and maintain more efficient ways of providing cybersecurity in support of DoD applications migrating and operating within the cloud.
  - Providing training on cloud computing acquisition and contracting for DoD Mission Owners, Program Managers/Functional Service Managers, and contracting specialists. DoD is working collaboratively with Defense Acquisition University to develop online training, to produce content which is accessible online for Program Managers, and to integrate cloud computing related content into Level 3 acquisition courses on a continuous basis.

#### SECURITY CERTIFICATIONS

*Question.* Will DoD be assessing commercial providers for increased security certifications in the near future?

*Answer.* Presently, the Department of Defense (DoD), in association with the Federal Risk and Authorization Management Program (FedRAMP), has improved the overall security posture of commercial Cloud Service Providers (CSPs) by establishing, managing, and verifying consistent standards for authorizing commercial Cloud Service Offerings (CSOs) for use within the DoD. As cyber-based threats evolve and through rigorous Continuous Monitoring of authorized CSOs, the partnership between the Federal Government and industry will help to ensure the identification of new threats and the maintenance of a rigorous cybersecurity posture. Commercial CSPs undergo rigorous security and compliance audits required by various industries (Payment Card Industry, Sarbanes-Oxley, etc.), in addition to what is required by the DoD and FedRAMP. Studying the overlap of these various industry compliance and security audits may reveal opportunities to streamline DoD's authorization process and to increase the level of security for CSPs.

#### COMMERCIAL CLOUD COMPUTING

*Question.* How much has the Department of Defense saved by utilizing commercial cloud computing versus acquiring its own cloud space and "stacking and racking" servers?

*Answer.* Determining tangible cost savings for utilizing cloud services is a challenge. There is substantial variety of multi-generational systems and applications that have evolved throughout the Department. Because of this, understanding the complexity of the component costs that must be taken into account to utilize cloud services is significant. These component costs include the planning, integration/re-

engineering, migration, and cybersecurity operations. Further, many DoD systems/applications are mission critical, National Security Systems (NSS) and as such, require DoD on-premises hosting. This requires that DoD establish and maintain a hybrid environment of commercial cloud options and its own dedicated cloud space. To date, DoD is seeing evidence of second order benefits achieved in efficiencies not directly related to cost. These include efficiencies gained by reductions in workforce required to operate and maintain the infrastructure, allowing the shift of this manpower to more critical activities (e.g., cybersecurity). DoD anticipates additional savings as utilization increases with more DoD workloads transitioning to cloud computing services.

#### CLOUD COMPUTING

*Question.* Please provide an assessment of each branch of service regarding their adoption and use of cloud computing, and what percent is currently DoD cloudspace versus commercial cloud space.

*Answer.* Our Services have been leaning forward in their adoption and use of cloud computing. Each Service has established “cloud support” organizations (i.e., the Army Application Migration Business Office (AAMBO), U.S. Navy’s Program Executive Office for Enterprise Information Systems (PEO EIS)/Data Center and Application Optimization (DCAO) Team, and U.S. Air Force’s Managed Services Organization (MSO)). These organizations have been established to coordinate planned acquisitions for use of commercial cloud services with their respective Service, and provide guidance as the Services plan their transitions to cloud services. The Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) provides the Cloud Support Office for the Department’s “Fourth Estate” to include Agencies and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. The Services’ cloud support organizations are still maturing and determining their respective roles and responsibilities for their constituents. Mission Owners continue to identify data center workloads that are cloud compatible, and determine the migration/re-engineering and integration support necessary to on-board and transition to cloud computing environments. However, most Mission Owners are still in the assessment, planning or initial piloting phases of cloud migration. As Services migrate and adopt cloud solutions, they will register their cloud service use in DISA’s System and Networks Approval Process (SNAP) Cloud Module for Mission Owner Cloud IT Projects in accordance with the March 2017 release of the latest Cloud Computing Security Requirements Guide (CC SRG). The data collected in this system will help quantify the adoption of cloud computing across commercial and DoD providers. With the help of the Services’ Cloud support organizations, sufficient data will be collected and analyzed to assess each branch of service regarding their adoption and use of cloud computing, and what percent is currently DoD cloud space versus commercial cloud space.

*Question.* How can cloud computing help the Department of Defense speed up research and development projects, as well as intel gathering and assessment?

*Answer.* Defense Mission Owners increasingly need the ability to rapidly adapt their systems/applications to emerging mission needs and changing cyber threats, with shortened development time, as well as the need for increased and accelerated intelligence gathering. Cloud environments provide Mission Owners and their developers with ease of access to Platform-as-a-Service (PaaS) cloud service offerings for faster development and testing. PaaS cloud services enable Mission Owners and their developers to deploy a representative environment for mission systems/applications in an agile, repeatable and automated way, known as “Dev-Ops.” Dev-Ops can unify the research, development, test, and production environments within the same cloud. Once acquired, these environments are expected to reduce the resources and delivery time needed due to the integrated, highly automated set of capabilities, and standardized tools and processes they provide. The Department is looking at the big data analytic capabilities that cloud computing provides the Intelligence Community (IC) in its Commercial Computing Services (C2S) contract with its’ commercial cloud service provider. Within DoD, both National Geospatial Agency (NGA) and National Reconnaissance Office (NRO) are preparing to start a Secret C2S (S-C2S) capability that will expand the availability of cloud options for intelligence-related missions within DoD. Using the commercial version of available “big data analytics” tools and programs offered by the IC’s commercial cloud service provider, this S-C2S cloud capability will allow the department to gather, assess, and process large and varied classified data sets.

*Question.* How is cloud computing being used to improve training and assessment of deployable units?

*Answer.* Cloud computing efforts have been initiated to improve the training of deployable units by accelerating the pace and ease at which training is delivered

to deployed warfighters. The Defense Logistics Agency (DLA) is migrating from their legacy in-house training application to an off-premises Software as a Service (SaaS) cloud service offering. DLA employees including deployed military members will have access to all internal DLA training courses via this cloud-based learning management system. It will provide employees with access to a catalog of hundreds of training courses developed by a leading industry provider of courseware. Transition to this SaaS capability is expected to be completed within the next twelve months. The Department's warfighters who are in deployed/tactical environments require Disconnected, Intermittent, and Low-Bandwidth (DIL) capabilities to support their efforts and improved training and assessment is one of the anticipated outcomes of providing cloud computing to these Warfighters. The DoD CIO, Military Services, Defense Information Systems Agency (DISA) and other Agencies, the Joint Staff, and Combatant Commands continue to analyze and assess cloud computing options that can be used for training and assessments of deployed/tactical forces, based on their mission and cybersecurity requirements.

#### FLIGHT TRAINING

*Question.* Holloman Air Force Base was selected for F-16 FTU operations, and it has been assessed that sufficient airspace exists to conduct these operations without restrictions. Also, last October the Air Force directed Holloman Air Force Base to transfer MQ-9 FTU from ACC to AETC (expected completion in fiscal year 2019). As a result Holloman is becoming the largest flying training pipeline in the Air Force. With a shortage of operational pilots, does the Department of Defense plan on investing more resources at AETC bases such as Holloman and the 58th SOW at Kirtland Air Force Base?

*Answer.* In an effort to mitigate the current shortage of operational pilots, the Air Force is taking steps to increase maintenance manpower and simulator instructors to increase pilot throughput at various Undergraduate Pilot Training bases. It is also planning on increasing F-16 FTU capability at Holloman by two additional F-16 FTU squadrons, as well as bringing Kirtland Air Force Base on-line as the training base for the HH-60G replacement. In terms of infrastructure projects, the Air Force has been forced to take risk in military construction for years with the priority on new mission beddowns as we bring on the F-35A and KC-46A aircraft. Kirtland AFB did receive funding in fiscal year 2017 for Combat Rescue Helicopter simulator. Holloman AFB also received funding for a hazardous cargo pad and taxiway in support of its mission. Our outyear planning will no doubt include more such projects as we secure and field a new trainer aircraft or T-X.

#### CYBER-KINETIC TRAINING

*Question.* I have been a strong supporter of developing a cyber-kinetic training capability in the U.S. military and have included language to accomplish this goal in the past two fiscal years appropriations bills. With Russia's use of hybrid warfare, do you believe that developing this training capability should be a high priority for the Department of Defense, and will DoD work with those developing this capability currently to help make this a core capability for our armed forces who may be faced with a cyber-kinetic threat in the future?

*Answer.* As the Department pursues its core missions in cyberspace of protecting DoD information networks, defending the Nation against cyberattacks of significant consequence, and providing integrated cyber capabilities to support military operations, it will continue to enable its cyber forces that focus on producing and defending against physical effects produced through cyberspace. To that end, DoD is leveraging existing cyber test and training ranges, as well as investing in additional cyber ranges to provide needed capacity. The growing use of cyber-enabled hybrid warfare by our adversaries is indeed a significant concern that the Department seeks to address, including through cooperation with partners and allies that have developed capabilities in mitigating this threat. I appreciate your continued support for the Department's efforts in this area.

#### CV-22

*Question.* The CV-22 has become a critical platform for AFSOC due to its speed, range, cargo capacity, and vertical takeoff ability. As the demand signal for special operations continues to grow, are there plans to purchase additional CV-22s to support ongoing and future operations in the Middle East and specifically Africa?

*Answer.* The Air Force Special Operations Command CV-22 continues to prove itself world-wide as highly effective and survivable for operations, including those in the Middle East and Africa. The Air Force does not currently have plans to purchase additional CV-22s, and has not allocated funding toward doing so.

## RESERVE CV-22S

*Question.* Does AFSOC have sufficient attrition reserve CV-22s in its inventory to ensure operations are not negatively effected in the event of a loss of an aircraft?

*Answer.* The Air Force recently increased its requirement for reserve attrition aircraft from one to four aircraft, which gets closer to historical programmatic planning numbers. Two of these attrition aircraft have been funded to date, but none have been fielded since they were procured late in production. We will continue to monitor attrition rates to assess the adequacy of the Air Force's requirement.

## ADDITIONAL CV-22S

*Question.* If funds were allocated to purchase additional CV-22s, would the department assign them to the Air National Guard until they are required for operations?

*Answer.* The Air Force is not programming for any additional CV-22 aircraft. However, the CV-22 CPD was recently updated to increase the program of record from 50 to 54 aircraft to accommodate Congressional adds for attrition reserve aircraft. We have received Congressional adds for two attrition reserve aircraft to date (one in fiscal year 2016 and one in fiscal year 2017).

## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TAMMY BALDWIN

## JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

*Question.* Secretary Mattis and General Dunford, do you think it is in the U.S. interest to continue implementing the Iran nuclear agreement? What are the risks to U.S. national security and our allies' security if the agreement is scrapped? What would you judge to be the impact on Iranian behavior and U.S. security interests of new unilateral U.S. sanctions that—while targeting Tehran's ballistic missile program, support for terrorism, and human rights violations—have the effect of blocking third party companies and financial institutions from doing business in Iran that is allowed under the JCPOA?

*Answer.* Implementation of U.S. commitments to the JCPOA is in the interest of the United States. We must work closely with the other JCPOA participants to enforce strict implementation by Iran. There are three primary risks to U.S. national security and our allies' security if the JCPOA is scrapped. First, the credibility of the United States would be damaged if we walk away from a political arrangement finalized by a president of the United States. Second, the JCPOA is not a bilateral deal between the United States and Iran, and the United States will risk isolating itself among our P5+1 partners, including with our most important allies, if we unilaterally take action to undermine or collapse the deal. This would reduce our effectiveness against Iran and diminish our leverage partner support for other priority policies such as Russia and ISIS. Third, Iran would no longer be compelled to uphold its commitments to limit its nuclear program and could take steps to restore certain activities and capabilities that would lower Iran's breakout timeline to obtaining enough nuclear material for a nuclear weapon. This could prompt an escalatory cycle and provoke conflict. The sum total of these effects lead me to assess that such a step would not be in interest of the United States or its partners. The United States and its allies sanction Iran's Islamic Revolutionary Guard Corps, missile program, support to terror, and human rights abuses under a host of existing unilateral and multilateral authorities. While sanctions remain a critical U.S. foreign policy tool as we push back on Iran, I do not think additional U.S. unilateral sanctions against these areas will have the desired impact. In addition, new sanctions that impede Iran's ability to engage in JCPOA-compliant business activity could put the United States in non-compliance with its commitments. As the Administration completes its Iran strategy review, we will consult with the Congress when and if we collectively assess new sanctions will support our goals.

## NUCLEAR ARSENAL AND NON-PROLIFERATION

*Question.* Secretary Mattis, first, do you believe that the resumption of nuclear testing is required to maintain a safe and secure nuclear deterrent, and if so, do you believe such a resumption would encourage other countries to do the same? Secondly, do you believe that nuclear weapons have a first-strike, offensive purpose or only the sole purpose of deterrence?

*Answer.* Montenegro is 800 miles from Russia and poses no geopolitical threat to that country. Despite this, Russia has actively opposed Montenegro's NATO bid and has taken measures to shape public opinion against NATO throughout the Western

Balkan region. Russia also interfered in Montenegro's October 2016 national elections. Montenegro's NATO membership would provide a powerful rebuke to Russia's malign influence in the Western Balkans and would demonstrate that no third country has a veto over NATO's decision to admit new members. Montenegro's NATO membership would also confirm that all nations in the region are free to choose their own alliances and partnerships without fear of outside coercion and intimidation.

#### NATIONAL GUARD FUNDING

*Question.* In the committee report for the fiscal year 2017 Military Construction and Veterans Affairs appropriations bill, I helped author a provision requiring the Army to submit a plan to increase funding for Army National Guard Readiness Centers, so many of which are in a state of disrepair. I believe we need to do a better job of prioritizing resources—whether it's funding for building improvements, modernizing equipment or training—to our citizen soldiers in the Guard to improve their readiness. Can you talk about how the fiscal year 2017 supplemental and the fiscal year 2018 request will adequately fund the men and women of the Wisconsin National Guard and throughout the country?

*Answer.* The Department's fiscal year 2017 Request for Additional Appropriations (RAA) and fiscal year 2018 budget request focus on improving readiness and balancing the force. The National Guard remains an important component of military readiness, and the additional resources provided in the fiscal year 2017 appropriations act and fiscal year 2018 budget request support members of the National Guard in Wisconsin and across the nation. For the Army National Guard (ARNG), the fiscal year 2017 appropriations act provided \$153.5 million to support the pay and training for the additional 8,000 authorized end strength. In addition, Congress added \$20 million to assist in the ARNG's readiness recovery. Of the Department's RAA, the ARNG received \$87.9 million in additional operation and maintenance funding to conduct additional ground and air training exercises and to repair additional aircraft. The ARNG's fiscal year 2018 operation and maintenance budget request of \$7.307 billion includes an additional \$38 million to improve ground and air readiness by conducting additional training events and flying more hours. Also, there is a \$59 million increase in force protection upgrades to improve off-installation facility security following the 2015 Chattanooga shootings, and \$47 million in additional resources to improve facilities sustainment. For the Air National Guard (ANG), the fiscal year 2017 appropriations act provided an additional \$17 million to improve ANG readiness. Of the Department's RAA, the ANG received \$23 million for weapons system sustainment. The ANG's fiscal year 2018 operation and maintenance budget request of \$6.940 billion includes an additional \$36 million to fund additional contractor logistics support on various aircraft and systems. In addition, there is an increase of \$74 million to repair and modernize ANG facilities.

#### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO GENERAL JOSEPH F. DUNFORD, JR.

##### QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR SUSAN M. COLLINS

#### NATIONAL GUARD READINESS AND THE MAINE AIR NATIONAL GUARD

*Question.* The Maine Air National Guard in particular is in a very strategic location, and has been used as a workhorse of the operational reserve—for example, the 101st Air Refueling Wing in Bangor saw the largest number of pilots or maintainers it has ever deployed last year, as well as the greatest number of flying hours ever, with no slow down in sight due to the ongoing operations in support of defense missions. How does the fiscal year 2017 supplemental submission to maintain the readiness of crucial units like the 101st Air Refueling wing in Bangor, which are operational in a manner that is on par with active duty units?

*Answer.* We appreciate congressional support for the fiscal year 2017 supplemental submission to address readiness shortfalls in the Joint Force. The Maine Air National Guard continues to provide critical mission capability and capacity to meet the ops tempo the Joint Force faces. The Joint Chiefs and I remain committed to ensuring that funding maintains the crucial units in the aviation support field. The Services and National Guard Bureau would be best suited to provide further detail to address your concerns on the Maine Air National Guard.

Following 15 years of supporting contingency operations, Air National Guard (ANG) units face a steady operational tempo similar to that of the active Air Force. Programming submissions, such as that for fiscal year 2017, are calibrated to rectify readiness issues with the goal of facilitating future deployments. Readiness will in-

crease indirectly as a result of the across-the-board funding requests: (1) Increased recruiting and retention funds (\$67 million), will permit us to retain existing personnel and recruit replacement personnel as personnel complete service obligations and retire, (2) Increased Civilian and Military pay raises (from 1.6 percent to 2.1 percent) and Medicare-Eligible Retiree Health Care Fund (\$37.0 million) will support retention. The ANG also requested \$40 million in additional funds for sustainment of the ANG KC-135 fleet. Requested increases in upgraded communications infrastructure, facilities construction, support vehicles and peculiar support equipment will ensure that our ANG airmen and technicians have adequate support to do their jobs efficiently and effectively. The presence of OCO funding allows the Air Force to directly fund many of the additional costs of using the Air National Guard as an operational reserve and the high operational tempo at the 101st Air Refueling Wing. Adequate OCO funds reduce the possibility that local unit readiness funds will be siphoned off to support operations mission.

NAVAL SHIPYARDS

*Question.* General, Maine is home to the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. That's one of our public shipyards. And it's been called the gold standard, which we're very proud of. And that shipyard, and indeed all of our public shipyards, have major infrastructure needs to prevent significant negative impacts to fleet readiness and operational availability over the next 30 years. It's my understanding that the Navy is developing a plan for shipyard dry-dock recapitalization. Could you give us some sense of when we can expect to receive that plan?

*Answer.* The Navy is currently investing in improving productivity and maintaining capability across all public shipyards. While each shipyard has a specific recapitalization plan, Naval Sea Systems Command (NAVSEA) is working on a consolidated master shipyard plan and is estimating a delivery date to Navy in the fall of 2017 for review and approval. Once approved, this plan will be delivered to members of Congress.

---

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROY BLUNT

ACTIVE PROTECTION SYSTEMS (APS)/EASTERN EUROPE & RUSSIAN AGGRESSION

*Question.* Secretary Mattis and General Dunford, as you are well aware, Russian aggression in Eastern Europe is a top concern among many of our allies in the region. The Army has been working on active protection systems (APS) to meet current threats by our troops. In April 2016—the Army responded to a letter from me that it was “moving rapidly to evaluate selected mature” APS technologies on an “accelerated timeline.” APS technology is already fielded and combat tested, with the Israelis successfully deploying the Trophy APS system. However, according to open source and Army statements, the current APS developmental program of record, (Modular Active Protection Systems or MAPS), is on a timeline to try and field a system in 5–10 years. Thus, I am concerned that we are way behind the threat. There was no funding requested in the fiscal year 2017 Supplemental submitted last week. My interest is to help the Army achieve its stated objective to field these systems as rapidly as possible—we cannot wait any longer given the threat in multiple theaters. I appreciate your support in general for meeting the threat, but we really must work to field this as soon as possible. Given this reality, what is the plan to transition from testing these systems to procuring them this year?

*Answer.* The Army anticipates initial fielding of an ABCT APS capability by fiscal year 2020. The Army is assessing technical maturity, performance, and suitability of three Non-Developmental Item APS in order to support a 1Q fiscal year 2018 decision on whether to pursue an accelerated timeline.

---

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JERRY MORAN

CYBER FORCES

*Question.* Cyber force missions are growing, and it is clear that cyber forces need to increase throughout the services. Unfortunately, there exists a training backlog that prevents cyber warriors from getting the training they need in a timely manner. What options are being pursued to alleviate this backlog? Additionally there are so few training spots available that this backlog becomes worse in the Guard and Reserve components—are you considering making more training opportunities available for those serving in the Guard and Reserve who wish to pursue cyber missions?

*Answer.* The Department requested an additional \$22.1 million in its amended fiscal year 2017 budget request to address cyber training capacity shortfalls. These resources will allow USCYBERCOM and the Services to address training capacity requirements and readiness of forces. In the longer term, the Department is implementing a Cyber Mission Force (CMF) Training Transition Plan which will shift CMF individual work role training from U.S. Cyber Command to the Services over the next three fiscal years. This plan takes advantage of cyber training pipeline growth currently underway in each of the Services and includes optimizations such as enhanced equivalency credit opportunities for pre-existing expertise that are of particular value to Guard and Reserve forces who can directly access expertise in the private sector. Cyber training opportunities for Reserve Component and National Guard members will continue. In fact, the Army and Air Force are building additional training capacity to accommodate increase Reserve/Guard participation. The National Guard Bureau expects to have adequate growth in their training capacity to sustain their cyber requirements.

---

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PATRICK J. LEAHY  
INFORMATION WARFARE

*Question.* How serious of a threat is state-sponsored information warfare to our own national security and that of NATO members? In what ways can an adversary benefit from fierce division within American politics?

*Answer.* State-sponsored information warfare is a serious concern for our national security, as well as that of our NATO Allies. A number of countries around the world, especially Russia and China, have developed the doctrine, strategies, and tools to conduct information warfare. There is a strong awareness around the world that advanced societies, especially the U.S., are heavily dependent on open, and potentially vulnerable information systems. Our connectivity and ever growing dependence on technology will make us increasingly vulnerable to a variety of information warfare. The use of information warfare in spreading propaganda creates the ability for foreign powers to create division within our governing systems.

NATIONAL GUARD

*Question.* The Vermont Air National Guard's F-16s returned from U.S. Central Command at the end of last month, having deployed to support coalition operations against ISIS. We Vermonters are very proud that they answered the nation's call very quickly and with great success. Can you address what it means to have an "operational reserve" where the National Guard performs pre-planned combat missions alongside active forces rather than trains as a "strategic reserve," and will future requests from the Department plan and budget for deployment of the reserves?

*Answer.* The Vermont Air National Guard is most certainly in the fight. Since 2004, the Vermont Air National Guard has had five successful combat deployments in addition to providing forces supporting military operations. The contributions of our National Guard are critical to the nation's defense both at home, and abroad. The National Guard will remain an integral part of the Total Force and is prepared to support both large-scale and contingency operations as required. The DoD intends to continue both planning, and budgeting, to ensure responsive, and ready, guard forces.

COMPREHENSIVE FOREIGN POLICY APPROACH

*Question.* One of your predecessors as Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff—Admiral Mike Mullen—frequently warned about an over-reliance on the military in U.S. foreign policy. While serving as Chairman, Admiral Mullen took the extraordinary step of sending a letter to Congressional leadership warning about budget cuts to international affairs, with a handwritten note at the end stating, "The more significant the cuts, the longer military operations will take, and the more and more lives are at risk!" Do you share Admiral Mullen's commitment to a comprehensive approach to foreign policy that includes strongly funding the State Department and USAID alongside the U.S. military?

*Answer.* The United States is a global power because of all elements of our national power, not just one or even a few. I believe ADM Mullen correctly observed that our foreign policy is most effective when we apply our national power comprehensively, which means utilizing our diplomatic and economic clout as well as our military capabilities. I do share his commitment to a comprehensive approach to U.S. foreign policy and his observation of the importance in fully resourcing the State Department and USAID.

## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TOM UDALL

## DISCUSSIONS WITH RUSSIA

*Question.* It was reported that earlier this year that you met with your Russian counterpart in Azerbaijan, and that follow-up discussions occurred on March 7th. What was discussed during those and any subsequent meetings?—Did you or your counterparts discuss partnering in Syria?—Did you or your counterparts discuss any issues regarding any nuclear treaties, including the INF and New START treaties?—Was there any discussion about a future political solution in Syria and the future of Assad in any potential political solution?

*Answer.* During my initial meeting with General Gerasimov in Baku, Azerbaijan and follow on meeting in Antalya, Turkey, we discussed a range of issues pertaining to enhancing operational safety and military deconfliction. These interactions have contributed to military safety, mutual understanding, and minimizing the prospects for misperception and unintended consequences, to include in our respective Syria operations. We did not address nuclear arms control compliance issues. We also did not discuss partnering in Syria or political solutions for Syria.

## NETWORKED UAVS

*Question.* Does the Department of Defense have any intelligence about whether these [off-the-shelf] UAVs could be networked to conduct hive attacks against U.S. or coalition assets?

*Answer.* We will provide you a fuller answer separately in classified channels.

## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR TAMMY BALDWIN

## U.S. SANCTIONS ON RUSSIA

*Question.* First, do you support maintaining U.S. sanctions on Russia related to its illegal annexation of Crimea and invasion of Eastern Ukraine until Moscow fully implements its obligations under the Minsk Agreement? Second, given your testimony regarding Russian aggression in the cyber and information domains, do you also support maintaining U.S. sanctions on Russia related to its interference in the 2016 U.S. election? And, finally, what signal would lifting any of the aforementioned sanctions send to Russia about the costs of its illegal behavior and to our allies about our commitment to their security?

*Answer.* I support the implementation of current U.S. policies designed to address Russian malign and destabilizing activities and encourage realignment with long-standing international norms of behavior. I defer to the Department of State to address the prospective foreign policy implications of reversing existing policies.

## JOINT COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF ACTION

*Question.* Secretary Mattis and General Dunford, do you think it is in the U.S. interest to continue implementing the Iran nuclear agreement? What are the risks to U.S. national security and our allies' security if the agreement is scrapped? What would you judge to be the impact on Iranian behavior and U.S. security interests of new unilateral U.S. sanctions that—while targeting Tehran's ballistic missile program, support for terrorism, and human rights violations—have the effect of blocking third party companies and financial institutions from doing business in Iran that is allowed under the JCPOA?

*Answer.* I believe it is in the nation's interests to continue implementing the Iran nuclear agreement. Militarily, the JCPOA remains the most durable means of preventing Iran from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability. If the United States scraps the deal, Iran could respond by re-starting its quest for nuclear weapons. A nuclear armed Iran would further destabilize the entire Middle East and could precipitate a regional nuclear arms race or regional war. I defer to the Department of State to address the prospective foreign policy implications of scrapping the deal.

## DOMESTIC SHIPBUILDING INDUSTRIAL BASE

*Question.* I'm proud to represent the approximately 2,000 workers at Wisconsin's Marinette Marine shipyard, as well as thousands of other hardworking Wisconsinites throughout the supply chain. In this regard, I completely agree with President Trump's mantra of "Buy American, Hire American," and I'd like to work with the administration to carry it out. What is your assessment of the strategic importance of strengthening the domestic shipbuilding industrial base in the near-term to en-

sure that an appropriately skilled workforce, as well as the yard and supplier capacity, is available to help the Navy affordably meet a possible future 355-ship target?

*Answer.* U.S. national strategy relies on a strong and capable Navy and our shipbuilding community has long been a strategic pillar in maintaining our naval fleet. The Navy works closely with the shipbuilding industrial base to level load work, maintain competition, and increase efficiency and affordability. One reason the Navy remains actively engaged with industry is to ensure that an appropriately trained work force, as well as yard and supplier capacity, are maintained. The Department of Defense recognizes that the skills and infrastructure capacities required to support the development and sustainment of our naval force is not developed overnight and, if allowed to atrophy, can take a long time to regenerate. The Navy will continue to actively work with the industrial base to manage an equitable sharing of any future shipbuilding requirements. Although the 2016 Force Structure Assessment validated a requirement for 355 ships, the Navy's first priority is to recover readiness in order to operate and maintain the ships and aircraft we currently have and to ensure they reach the end of their service lives.

#### SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator COCHRAN. Until then, the Defense Subcommittee will reconvene on Wednesday, March 29, at 10:30 a.m., to receive testimony on the Defense Health Program. Until then, the subcommittee stands in recess.

[Whereupon, at 12:10 p.m., Wednesday, March 22, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 10:30 a.m., Wednesday, March 29.]