

[H.A.S.C. No. 116-39]

HEARING  
ON  
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020  
AND  
OVERSIGHT OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED  
PROGRAMS  
BEFORE THE  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES  
ONE HUNDRED SIXTEENTH CONGRESS  
FIRST SESSION  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS HEARING  
ON  
**FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST  
FOR MILITARY READINESS**

HEARING HELD  
MAY 9, 2019



U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

37-515

WASHINGTON : 2020

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

JOHN GARAMENDI, California, *Chairman*

TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii	DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
ANDY KIM, New Jersey, <i>Vice Chair</i>	AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
KENDRA S. HORN, Oklahoma	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
CHRISSEY HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania	ROB BISHOP, Utah
JASON CROW, Colorado	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
XOCHITL TORRES SMALL, New Mexico	MO BROOKS, Alabama
ELISSA SLOTKIN, Michigan	ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York
VERONICA ESCOBAR, Texas	JACK BERGMAN, Michigan
DEBRA A. HAALAND, New Mexico	

BRIAN GARRETT, *Professional Staff Member*

TOM HAWLEY, *Professional Staff Member*

MEGAN HANDAL, *Clerk*

# CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS	
Garamendi, Hon. John, a Representative from California, Chairman, Subcommittee on Readiness .....	1
Lamborn, Hon. Doug, a Representative from Colorado, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Readiness .....	3
WITNESSES	
McConville, GEN James C., USA, Vice Chief of Staff of the Army .....	4
Moran, ADM William F., USN, Vice Chief of Naval Operations .....	5
Thomas, Gen Gary L., USMC, Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps ....	6
Wilson, Gen Stephen W., USAF, Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force .....	6
APPENDIX	
PREPARED STATEMENTS:	
Garamendi, Hon. John .....	37
McConville, GEN James C. ....	39
Moran, ADM William F. ....	45
Thomas, Gen Gary L. ....	53
Wilson, Gen Stephen W. ....	62
DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:	
[There were no Documents submitted.]	
WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:	
[There were no Questions submitted during the hearing.]	
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:	
Mr. Scott .....	73



**FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST FOR  
MILITARY READINESS**

---

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS,  
*Washington, DC, Thursday, May 9, 2019.*

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 10:05 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. John Garamendi (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN GARAMENDI, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM CALIFORNIA, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS**

Mr. GARAMENDI. Good morning. We will now call the Readiness Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to order.

Today the subcommittee will hear from the service Vice Chiefs regarding the state of military readiness and how the fiscal 2020 operation and maintenance budgets requested support the military training, weapons systems maintenance, and efforts to meet full-spectrum readiness and the requirements in aligning to the National Defense Strategy.

This year, the subcommittee has held events covering a range of topics, including quarterly readiness report, the mobility and logistics enterprises, the impacts of climate change on national security, military family housing, surface Navy readiness, and the budget requests for military installations.

Those briefings and hearings have touched on important issues that affect the military readiness. But I think it is appropriate that we have witnesses here today to help inform us on the readiness challenges their individual services face, and the initiatives that they have in place to mitigate those challenges, and finally, how the 2020 budget request meets those efforts and supports those efforts.

For the past several years, we have heard the services raise concerns about the state of the military's full-spectrum readiness after more than a decade of focusing on counterterrorism and counter-insurgency missions. With a 2-year budget agreement in place and additional resources available to the Department [of Defense], the fiscal 2018 was touted as the year to arrest the decline of readiness, and fiscal year 2019 would begin the readiness recovery.

Is it so? Well, that is a question I am sure our witnesses would want to answer.

I hope that today the witnesses can discuss how these additional resources have been executed by the Department and where we

have seen readiness and progress in readiness and areas that still may require additional attention.

As we look to the 2020 budget request, which represents a significant increase in defense spending, I am concerned that the Department is once again overly focused on the long-term readiness that is someday out in the future through their various modernization programs and is not placing enough emphasis investing in the near term—that is, next year and this year—to support the training and sustainment of the existing weapon systems and the personnel.

For example, the budget request only addresses 94 percent of the Navy ship depot maintenance requirement and 90 percent of the Air Force weapons system sustainment and 82 percent of the Marine Corps ground depot maintenance. I hope that today our witnesses can explain how their respective services view the balance between sustainment and modernization and how this budget request will affect the near-term readiness as their efforts go forward.

Relating to the budget request, there are a number of programs and areas that have caught our subcommittee's attention that impact the readiness of the force. For example, the GAO [Government Accountability Office] has found that since 2015 nearly 64 percent of the public and private shipyard availabilities either have been or are expected to be behind schedule. That obviously affects the Navy and Marine Corps training and readiness.

The aviation community has shortfalls in pilot and maintenance personnel, mission capability rates below standards, and the number of challenges with the operation and sustainment of that famous F-35 fleet. The continued demand on Army forces, combined with the lack of sufficient time for home station training and proper equipment maintenance, challenge its readiness recoveries.

And did I forget to mention border? I think I did. Hmm.

And of course, climate change presents a myriad of readiness challenges both at home and abroad. It is not only a future threat, but it is impacting the resiliency of our installations and operations today as we have seen all too sadly at the Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune and Tyndall Air Force Base and Offutt Air Force Base.

I hope that, gentlemen, you will address how you view these issues and the actions you are taking or plan to take in an effort to address them.

Finally, I hope that you will talk about areas where you are pursuing innovation as a means to improve the delivery of readiness, for example, things like condition-based maintenance plus, the adoption of commercial industrial best practices in supply chain management, additive manufacturing, and the use of live, virtual, constructive training.

We are interested in how these innovations can improve efficiency, reduce costs, while supporting a more ready and capable force.

Mr. Lamborn, it is your turn.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Garamendi can be found in the Appendix on page 37.]

**STATEMENT OF HON. DOUG LAMBORN, A REPRESENTATIVE  
FROM COLORADO, RANKING MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE ON  
READINESS**

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

It is fitting that the Readiness Subcommittee's final budget review hearing before markup is on the vital topic of military readiness. In short, are the operational units of the military services prepared to execute their combat missions when asked?

Put another way, are the Armed Forces of the United States prepared to fulfill their constitutional duty to provide for the common defense?

Although a simple question, building effective military units is an extraordinarily complex task requiring time, skilled personnel, resources, and maneuver area. I am glad that senior military leaders are here to provide us their candid assessment of the state of their respective services.

I welcome our witnesses, the four military service Vice Chiefs, and note that General McConville has been nominated to be the Army's Chief of Staff and Admiral Moran has been nominated to be Chief of Naval Operations.

I wish you both speedy confirmation in the other body. Too bad we don't have any say in that.

We all recognize that readiness suffered during several years of underfunding following the 2011 enactment of the Budget Control Act, as well as constant use of the Armed Forces for a multitude of missions. Two years ago, the situation began to improve, starting with an infusion of funds in the spring of 2017, followed by healthy appropriations for fiscal years 2018 and 2019.

All of us would like to understand how this steady funding has improved readiness with specific examples, what remains to be done, and what would be the consequences if we fail to support the level of funding requested in this year's request.

We recognize that readiness is built piece by piece until a commander is convinced his or her unit has the people, equipment, and training repetitions necessary to perform the mission assigned. Naturally our discussion today will concentrate on specific parts of that equation. Do we have enough pilots, parts, ammunition, and so on?

It is important to understand in detail how the money provided has been expended and how it contributes to readiness. And that is what I will be looking for from each of your presentations.

As we have those discussions, I ask our witnesses and colleagues to keep the big picture in mind. What overall funding, what top-line number must we maintain to ensure that our troops are trained and ready when called upon?

What do we do as a Congress to provide for the common defense?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I yield back.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I thank you, Mr. Lamborn.

We will now turn to our witnesses.

And as I do, I want to follow on the introductions and the comments that you made, Mr. Lamborn. We have before us a couple of gentlemen who are, assuming the Senate agrees, going to take new jobs.

General McConville, congratulations on your appointment and passage of the Senate hearing.

And, Admiral Moran, the same. Both of you will, I suspect very shortly, have new jobs as Chief of Staff and Chief of Naval Operations.

General Thomas, we thank you for joining us. I am quite sure that someday we will also carry on as I just did, but at the moment, welcome, thank you so very much.

And General Wilson, thank you for joining us.

As Vice Chiefs and Assistant Commandant in the Marine Corps and Vice Chief, we welcome you.

Now let us have at your testimony.

Let us start with General McConville.

**STATEMENT OF GEN JAMES C. McCONVILLE, USA, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY**

General McCONVILLE. Well, good afternoon, Chairman Garamendi, Ranking Member Lamborn, and distinguished members of the subcommittee.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and also for your continued support of our Army, our soldiers, families, and civilians.

The Army remains ready to fight and win our nation's wars. Currently we have nearly 180,000 soldiers in 140 countries around the world defending our nation's freedom. Timely, adequate, predictable, and sustained funding over the last 2 years from all of you has significantly increased the number of our brigade combat teams at the highest levels. Our nondeployables have dropped from 15 percent in 2015 to 6 percent today.

In training, we have improved our unit readiness and lethality by fully funding our home station training and combat training center rotations. We are increasing our soldiers' readiness with a new Army combat fitness test and by embedding physical therapists, strength coaches, dietitians, and occupational therapists within our units.

In line with the National Defense Strategy, we have shifted our focus from irregular warfare to great power competition. And while we have been focused on irregular warfare, our competitors have been innovating and investing in sophisticated anti-access and aerial denial systems, enhanced missile systems, and unmanned capabilities. To maintain overmatch, we must modernize the Army.

Our modernization efforts include developing the multi-domains operations concept echelon, executing our six modernization priorities, and implementing a 21st century talent management system. The Army has established the Army's Futures Command and has prioritized resources for our six modernization priorities, which will enable us to grow Army readiness for the future.

Army's Futures Command and cross-functional teams will continue to produce rapid and innovative solutions to make our soldiers the most lethal warfighters on the battlefield. Soldiers are our greatest strength and our most important weapons system. We will continue the modest growth of the Army and our focus will be on recruiting and retaining high-quality soldiers.

We are implementing a 21st century talent management system which will transform our personnel management process from the



industrial age to the information age. The system will maximize talent within the force and preserve our ability to recruit and retain soldiers who are ready to meet any challenges now and in the future.

Thank you for your time and thank for your support of our men and women in uniform. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General McConville can be found in the Appendix on page 39.]

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, General.

Admiral Moran.

**STATEMENT OF ADM WILLIAM F. MORAN, USN, VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS**

Admiral MORAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Lamborn, distinguished members of the committee, for the opportunity to appear before you to testify about our great sailors that are employed all over the globe today.

Today we have over 65,000 young men and women serving on ships at sea and in foreign lands across many parts of the world, conducting everything from freedom of navigation operations in the Pacific to planning and delivering combat operations in the Middle East, supporting NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] allies in parts of the world like the Mediterranean, the Baltic, and Black Seas, and building closer partnerships with whoever is willing to partner with us around the globe.

Your Navy is confidently meeting these challenges while preparing for those of tomorrow. However, as this committee understands, the Armed Forces have maintained a high operational tempo over the last 18 years. And while the demand for combat-ready naval forces has remained high, a substantial backlog in maintenance and modernization has accrued.

Thanks to your continuing support over the past 2 years by providing stable and predictable funding, we have arrested that decline in readiness, but we have also found ourselves on a steady path to recovery in the last year.

But this recovery is fragile and it is perishable. And your continued support is vital to our success.

The President's fiscal year 2020 budget request sustains our commitments to readiness, and it reflects a balanced approach to investments in people, procurement, modernization, and infrastructure. It provides your sailors with more time at sea, more time in the air, and more depth on the bench, everything from ammunition to spare parts to training, and as important is proficiency of the jobs they have been asked to do.

With past as a prologue, if we revert back to more continuing resolutions or go as far as sequestration, the burden will be carried once again on the backs of our men and women, both uniformed and civilian, as well as our depot workers in public and private yards throughout the country.

As you know, today's All-Volunteer Force is a rich blend of the finest young men and women this country has to offer. Supported by their dedicated families, they are working hard to achieve improved readiness for a world that is more complex, more contested than we have seen in many decades.

And our sailors are keenly aware of their essential place at this strategic inflection point. They understand that increased naval strength matters now and far into the future in order to sustain our way of life in a prosperity and security of America. It is on their behalf that I thank you for the opportunity to appear before you and I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Moran can be found in the Appendix on page 45.]

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Admiral.  
General Thomas.

**STATEMENT OF GEN GARY L. THOMAS, USMC, ASSISTANT  
COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS**

General THOMAS. Chairman Garamendi, Ranking Member Lamborn, and distinguished members of this subcommittee, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

The Marine Corps is manned, trained, and equipped to be the world's premier naval expeditionary force. We are ready to respond to crisis and conflict across a full range of military operations in every clime and place.

As a member of the Navy and Marine Corps team, we stand together as part of the contact and blunt layers and the global operating model forward deployed to deter our adversaries and able to fight and win should deterrence fail.

To maintain this capability, the Marine Corps requires sustained, adequate, and predictable funding to achieve required readiness levels and make prudent investments in preparation for the future operating environment.

The support of Congress over the past 2 years has played a key role in allowing the Marine Corps to make significant gains in readiness and move towards the modernization of the force.

As we approach fiscal year 2020, your continued support remains critical. Over the last year, Hurricane Florence and Michael caused massive damage to our facilities at Camp Lejeune and other places. The effects of these storms will impact Marine Corps readiness for years to come due to the financial burden of \$3.7 billion in damages.

We greatly appreciate Congress approving our \$400 million reprogramming request, allowing us to begin addressing our most pressing infrastructure requirements.

Despite these concerns, your Marines will continue to maximize the precious resources that have been entrusted to us. With your assistance, we will ensure that the Marine Corps is a ready, modern force that is prepared for a changing strategic environment.

I look forward to answering your questions.

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. General Wilson.

**STATEMENT OF GEN STEPHEN W. WILSON, USAF, VICE CHIEF  
OF STAFF OF THE AIR FORCE**

General WILSON. Chairman Garamendi, Ranking Member Lamborn, distinguished members of this committee, it is an honor to be appearing before you with my joint teammates here today.

With my prepared statement in the record, let me briefly summarize a few things. First and foremost, thank you for your help. Without it, we would not have been able to move the ball forward, and we have. We continue to build a more lethal and ready force while fielding tomorrow's Air Force faster and smarter.

Air Force-wide readiness is up 17 percent. Our pacing unit readiness is up 33 percent. Ninety percent of our lead force packages are ready to fight tonight. All of that was made possible by your support.

Unfortunately, the weather was not supportive. We have had devastating impacts at Tyndall Air Force Base and at Offutt Air Force Base. At Tyndall Air Force Base alone, \$4.7 billion dollars of damage; 95 percent of the facilities were either destroyed or damaged.

We have covered those costs within our accounts to date, but that is not supportable. As a result, we are asking for your help. You are our insurance policy for natural disasters.

We need additional disaster relief support, and we also need to continue with fiscal order. Without it, 2 years of steady progress will erode. We can prevent that and protect America's vital national interests, but again, we need stable, adequate, and predictable funding.

I urge us to not self-select second place. I know nobody in that room wants that. Together we can come together and find a way forward. Thank you for your continued support of all of our airmen and their families. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Wilson can be found in the Appendix on page 62.]

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, General Wilson. And for—request unanimous consent of the committee to put the written statements of the gentlemen in the record. Without objection, so ordered.

I will now go to questions. And I will lead off here, and followed by Mr. Lamborn. Then as is the normal, 5 minutes back and forth across the divide here. There is no divide.

In my opening statement, I expressed concerns about how you are balancing the planning and programming of modernization which supports long-term readiness at the expense of funding sustainment, maintenance, and training in the near term.

Each of your O&M [operations and maintenance] budget requests appear by the numbers to underinvest in sustainment when compared to the identified requirement.

Please discuss how this apparent discrepancy is dealt with. We will begin in the same order.

General McConville, feel free.

General McCONVILLE. Yes, Mr. Chairman. And our Secretary and Chief have determined our number one priority is readiness. And we have a good historical example of last year, where we had timely, adequate, predictable, and sustainable funding.

We saw a great improvement in our overall readiness. And this year, the budget that we asked for is the budget we need. We have an 8 percent increase in aviation, a 3 percent increase in ground, and a 3 percent increase in what we are applying to depots.

And we are going to take a look to make sure that is the right amount as we go through the year. We will assess that. If we don't have that correct, we will make adjustments.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Admiral.

Admiral MORAN. Mr. Chairman, a very similar response from the Navy. We, too, program to what we think is max executable, so that includes—while the requirement may be very high, the capacity and capability to achieve that full requirement on a given year is often in question. It depends on how much backlog has occurred, especially in ship depot maintenance and issues like that.

So we have funded it at the highest levels we have in my memory, and that is due to the support we have received from Congress and the President in his budget request.

So we are on a good trajectory. And we will assess it early in the year, and if we need to make adjustments at mid-year, we will.

Mr. GARAMENDI. General Thomas.

General THOMAS. Chairman, we believe that we have a reasonable balance in terms of investments vis-a-vis modernization and readiness.

One of the things that we do is, as all of our teammates do, is we balance risk across the entire portfolio, but the measures that we look at is how we are doing in terms of readiness and as we meet those risk decisions.

And all of our readiness metrics are up. We have specific service goals that we are striving for, and we anticipate to meet all those goals in fiscal year 2020.

Mr. GARAMENDI. General Wilson.

General WILSON. Chairman, just like my teammates here, it is much the same story as we balance both modernization and readiness.

First and foremost, we think readiness is about people, and we have grown the force 24,500 people since 2015. But it is more than just the people. It is also the equipment, the training, the support infrastructure, the parts, the depots.

And we think we have the right balance going forward between near-term readiness and long-term readiness. Because as you have said, today's readiness is tomorrow's modernization, and we have got to get that right in the balance.

Mr. GARAMENDI. All of you produce a quarterly report, and as I recall, that quarterly report has certain goals and objectives. Is that correct? So I hear all of you say—nodding your head yes.

When is the next quarterly report for the current fiscal year due? Do we call that?

Well, I raised the question because we are going to observe your quarterly reports. We are going to observe the—every quarter the goals that you have set, the objectives that you had set, and should you be falling short in some area, we will observe it, but we would like to know ahead of time so that if there is a need for reprogramming or some change along the way, we can work together to achieve it.

We are intensely interested in your success. And you should recognize that our interest is one of cooperation, or whatever else might be necessary, okay?

Admiral Moran, you have an unfunded priority request for additional funding for submarine and ship maintenance. The USS *Boise*—

Admiral MORAN. *Boise*.

Mr. GARAMENDI [continuing]. *Boise, Boise*, the city thereof, has been an issue for quite some time.

Can you discuss why we are now seeing it in your unfunded list as opposed to it is in the budget request specifically?

Admiral MORAN. Sir, in my opening, I discussed the accrual of ship maintenance over the last decade. And we have begun to dig our way out of that in both public and private yards.

One of the more challenging areas of this recovery path, though, has been in our nuclear maintenance, both public and private.

And our prioritization in going after that maintenance is for our SSBN [ballistic missile submarine] force for all the reasons you can imagine, followed by our nuclear aircraft carriers, and a third priority is our SSN [attack submarine] force.

Mixed into all that are what we call moored training ships or submarines. There is two of those that replace our prototype capabilities in Charleston and in New York. They have taken priority.

So this is a symptom of those prioritizations kicking the next guy down in order. And *Boise*, unfortunately, has been at the tail end of that for the last 4 years. And we are short again in this current budget environment depot maintenance and capacity in the yards to be able to take *Boise* in. So we have deferred her until 2020, and we hope to start her at the very beginning of the fiscal year.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We have had a discussion about the yards and the \$21 billion over the next 6, 7 years—

Admiral MORAN. Twenty-one over twenty, yes, sir.

Mr. GARAMENDI [continuing]. Twenty-one over twenty to redesign and repurpose those yards. Again, we would expect to be updated on a semiannual basis on the success that you are having in that process.

Also the plans that we have had that discussion last year, would want to go back and review it again, as those plans have been updated with regard to the yards. We recognize that there is a problem in the capacity and also the balance between the public and the private yards and how you propose to balance availability in private yards that may have come in the recent days available, for example, the Philly yard. So if you will keep that in mind.

I think many other questions. I am going to defer them, and we will come back on maybe a second round of questions along the way.

Mr. Lamborn, if you would like to take it up.

Mr. LAMBORN. Sure. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to have a specific question for General Wilson and then a general question for everybody on what would be the effects on readiness if you don't get the funding that you have asked for.

General Wilson, we know that the Department intends to create a Space Force/Space Corps within the Department of the Air Force.

How is that effort progressing? And what do you need from Congress to help?

General WILSON. Thank you, Mr. Lamborn.

The Air Force has been committed to the Space Force. We know and our adversaries know we are the best in the world at space and we are committed to that. So over this last year, we have been working hard to grow our warfighting aspects of the Space Force in terms of the training and the development of the people who make that up.

We are also committed to standing up a United States Space Command. We have nominated General Jay Raymond to be the commander of that, and they are anxious to put that forward as a combatant command.

Mr. LAMBORN. An excellent choice.

General WILSON. He's a fantastic airman, and no one more capable to lead that new command. We are also working to—with that to look at the steps and where that headquarters would be. And we are working with Congress on the legislative proposal to stand up the new independent Space Force, which will be underneath the United States Air Force.

We think those—we have got a team working inside the Pentagon with all the sister services to build that Space Force, and we think that is important moving forward for the future.

Mr. LAMBORN. Okay, thank you. And we stand by ready to help however we can on that effort.

Now for each one of you, the years following enactment of the Budget Control Act had a detrimental effect on readiness. What are the consequences on readiness if the proposed levels of funding in your budget request are not maintained?

And we will just go down the line here. General McConville.

General MCCONVILLE. Yes, Congressman. And from the levels, what we asked for is what we need.

If we went back to a sequestration-type level, it would be absolutely devastating. All the readiness gains we made would be lost. We would not be able to modernize the Army. We would have to reduce the end strength and we would hurt the quality of life for all our soldiers.

Admiral MORAN. Sir, I would completely agree that going back to sequester levels next year would be devastating on the force.

Certainly the money and investment we have made in our yards and our depots hiring people, ship workers, welders, artisans who take 5 years to build that skill before they are proficient and effective, in many cases, you lose all that, because the yards are going to have to—private yards and in many of your districts are going to have to be laid off. They are going to have to lay off workers to be able to balance the difference with canceled avails [maintenance availabilities].

We are talking on the order of 10 to 15 avails that would have to be canceled or deferred. That is important work. And again, that backlog of maintenance I talked about that took 10 years to get there and in the last 4 or 5 years of working really hard to bring that back, we are going to revert back to where we were.

So that and, of course, naval aviation and improvements in readiness in the aviation force has really come—hitting stride here in the last year. And that is due in large part to the added funding and stable funding that you all have provided.

So going to sequester levels, we are going to have to make hard choices about the number of people we bring on, the number of deployments we do or don't do, and the kind of maintenance we are going to be able to get done.

Thank you.

General THOMAS. Congressman, I would echo the comments of my teammates.

I would just emphasize from a Marine Corps perspective the readiness gains that we have made over the past 2 years, you know, a fairly rapid reversal of those gains. You know, we have talked about the balance between readiness and modernization, but it would also slow our modernization efforts.

You know, some of our key pieces of equipment are 30 or 40 years old, and we have a plan to address those, but any reduction in—a significant reduction in funding would significantly slow those efforts.

And then, finally, our efforts to respond to our hurricane recovery would be greatly hampered. We would attend to those most immediate needs. That, of course, would even further exacerbate some of the other funds that we would use for training, maintenance of equipment, et cetera.

General WILSON. Congressman, the military has been engaged almost continuously for almost the last 30 years. No adversary can do to us what fiscal disorder could do to us.

Going back to budget level BCA [Budget Control Act] caps and sequestration level would devastate the United States Air Force. As a point in fact, when we went to sequestration in 2013, we had to find about \$7.5 billion.

If we went to sequestration levels again, it would be four times that. That is the equivalent we would stop flying for the United States Air Force for the year, and that would only cover a partial piece of that. We would shut down all the modernization programs and we would erase every bit of the gains that we have had in the last 2 years.

So again, I think all of our teammates here would agree that the most important thing is a predictable, adequate, stable budget moving forward.

Mr. LAMBORN. So it sounds like it wouldn't just be devastating to our men and women in uniform, but it would send a horrible signal to potential adversaries that they could make trouble and we would be in a lesser of a position to respond?

It would be destabilizing? Is that your assessment?

General WILSON. Yes, it would be.

Mr. LAMBORN. Okay, thank you. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. Lamborn.

We are now going to follow the rules and the order. We are going to go back to the clock. It will be 5 minutes in total, both Q&A.

And so, gentlemen, if you will keep that in mind, and I don't need to remind my colleagues here.

Let's see. We have Ms. Torres Small. You get to start us off.

Ms. TORRES SMALL. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

General McConville, congratulations on your new post, and very best of luck as Chief of Staff. My first question is for you.

New Mexico's Second Congressional District, which I represent, is home to the Army's White Sands Missile Range and Test Facility, which is the largest military installation in the United States, and it allows the Department of Defense and allied partners to do open-air testing, research, evaluation, and training.

From a testing perspective, can you discuss the current and future strategies the Army is implementing to keep testing costs competitive at White Sands Missile Range?

General MCCONVILLE. Yes, I can, Congresswoman. As you said, White Sands is a tremendous testing area. It is a huge facility. And we are investing in that right now. We have got to put some new radars in, and some new telemetry-type systems.

The Army's number one priority is long-range precision fires, so we are going to be doing things that have much longer range, with future vertical lift, and we need a place to adequately test them, and we also need to adjust our systems so we can do the proper tests, and White Sands is going to be one of those places that we are going to use.

Ms. TORRES SMALL. Great.

Also, what is the Army doing to attract more allied partners to test at White Sands?

General MCCONVILLE. Well, one of the things that we are doing with our partners, both in testing and really in foreign military sales, is one of the ways we can reduce costs, make things cheaper, and keep the not only organic industrial base but the testing base going is working with our partners, so we have kind of got an effort to do that.

We haven't done a whole bunch of that before, but we are starting to realize the value in doing those type things.

Ms. TORRES SMALL. Great, thank you.

The next question is for General Wilson. The New Mexico Air National Guard is the only Guard in the country without an operational flying mission and one of three States without its own aircraft. Yet the Air National Guard enterprise is based on established capstone principles that set the foundational framework for mission set application throughout the 54 States and territories.

Specifically, one of these capstone principles is to allocate at least one unit equipped wing and flying squadron to each State.

General, you spoke about that readiness is about people, and I tell you that the people in New Mexico Air National Guard are hungry for their own aircraft.

Do you believe States that are currently able to align with these core principles due to divestiture of aircraft in the past impacts the readiness of the units and the Air Force?

General WILSON. It comes from—obviously, when the Taco Guard left New Mexico was a big impact, and it was felt. So we look to match the missions with the Guard units, and we are committed to working with you moving forward to find the right mission for New Mexico.

I think—our Secretary was asked about that during testimony, too, and she committed to that, also. So we are going to continue to partner with you to make sure we have got the right mission for the New Mexico Air National Guard moving forward.

Ms. TORRES SMALL. Thank you, General Wilson.



Should these States be given priority for these new mission opportunities?

General WILSON. Yes, ma'am. We are going to look to see, again, how do we match that best mission with the people there? And again, probably some opportunities to look at some Active partnerships, with local Active units and see where we can do that. And again, we are committed to working with you moving forward.

Ms. TORRES SMALL. Thank you, General.

This question is also for General McConville. The most recent estimate provided to Congress indicates that Army support to the U.S. southern border operations will cost nearly \$100 million in fiscal year 2019 Army operations and maintenance funds.

Now, each one of you spoke incredibly strongly about the importance of predictable, adequate funding.

As these operations and the funding requirements were unplanned, can you please discuss any impacts to Army readiness?

General MCCONVILLE. Yes, Congresswoman. Right now we have 2,300 soldiers, title 10 soldiers on the border, about 2,000 National Guard. That is about 4,300, at the—I would say at the Army level, 1 million, I wouldn't say that is a huge impact on readiness.

And what we are trying to do to mitigate that is, the soldiers that are going down to the borders are doing the tasks they would do most like in the military, so the engineers are doing engineer work. The aviators are actually flying their helicopters. The logisticians are doing resupply operation.

We are also trying to limit the time they are down there, you know, maybe 90 days so they can get back and get back to their military mission.

Ms. TORRES SMALL. Thank you. Please also speak to the activities being deferred due to this reallocation.

General MCCONVILLE. Well, we really have not had any major exercises deployed, as far as what those units were going to be used for. If you talk to some of the troops, they might have said they might want to train. But at the Army level, the units that we are sending to the border did not have another mission that they are being taken away or a major exercise like a combat training center rotation by executing the operations on the border.

Ms. TORRES SMALL. Thank you. I yield my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you. I now turn to Mr. Scott.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Wilson, I received your letter—appreciate you getting that to us in a timely manner—about the action impact update regarding the steps that you are having to take due to lack of a supplemental disaster bill storms that hit last year.

If I am correct, you stopped all new work at Tyndall Air Force Base effective the first of the month. That had to be stopped. Deferring any recovering efforts at Offutt will have to start in July. You also created a plan to eliminate more than 18,000 training flying hours that will start in a few months, all while attempting to man the current tempo overseas and potential future engagements overseas.

What impact does the loss of 18,000 flying hours have on our readiness, our capabilities, and our morale in the Air Force?

General WILSON. Congressman, you hit the nail on the head about the importance of additional disaster relief funding.

So currently, as you have mentioned, we stopped new work at Tyndall. On the 15th of May we are going to stop some of our depot inputs, which again will have a long-term impact. In June we will have to start cancelling some of our major exercises. In July we will stop new work at Offutt Air Force Base. And in September we think we will have to cut up to 18,000 flying hours.

Any of that creates a big impact and will ripple through not just this year, but in the future readiness. And that is why we have been so insistent upon additional disaster supplemental funding.

Mr. SCOTT. General, any time I have seen damage from a storm, the longer you take to clean that damage up, the worse it gets. The mold grows. The rot, the other things, it just gets worse, and it costs you more the longer you wait to repair it. And then in some cases some things that could be repaired had it been done in a timely manner now must be totally taken down and rebuilt.

General WILSON. Congressman, you are exactly right.

So today we just now are moving people out of tents at Tyndall Air Force Base from a storm that happened in early October. Realizing that we have had four Category 5 storms hit the United States in our recorded history, right, and this was a direct impact to Tyndall and the surrounding community, if you go there—and people have visited—it looks like a war zone. Ninety-five percent of the facilities have been damaged or destroyed.

So we want to bring Tyndall back, and we want to bring Tyndall back as quickly as we can, and to do that, we are going to need additional disaster relief support.

Mr. SCOTT. It looks like a war zone where I live, too.

General WILSON. Yes.

Mr. SCOTT. Unfortunately for us, it was our crops that were destroyed, and where I live, if the farmers aren't making money, nobody is making money.

It is the tax base for the cities, the counties, the school systems, and the lack of disaster assistance, the lack of timeliness is going to lead in many cases to bankruptcies, where that wouldn't have had—that didn't have to happen. The gamesmanship up here has caused part of that.

General Thomas, before I go to you, I do want to mention that to date I do not believe the Office of Management and Budget has submitted a request for disaster assistance for the storms of 2018.

General Thomas, Camp Lejeune, if I am not mistaken, one-third of the United States Marine Corps firepower operates out of Camp Lejeune. And how are things there?

General THOMAS. Thank you, Congressman. It is an operational platform for the United States Marine Corps. It is one of our major facilities, as you, you know, described. The \$3.7 billion in damage is easy to see. The chairman was down there. Appreciate the chairman and the ranking member taking a look at that.

You know, just if I were to paint a picture, and what you have got is 800 buildings that were severely damaged. Many of those buildings are old. You know, they are decades old. We continue to operate in what I would consider a little bit of an expeditionary en-

vironment. I visited the tank battalion. I saw a young Marine sitting at a desk where the wall was open to the outside air.

We have an aircrew doing their mission planning, you know, in the hangar, you know, a place where they can guarantee it is dry. You know, Marines do what you would expect Marines, soldiers, sailors, and airmen to do. They have cleaned up. It is neat. But when it rains, you know, all those buildings are covered in water.

So it has a significant impact on us. And I think as we go forward without additional relief what we are going to be forced to do is take some of those funds from our training, maintenance of equipment, and infrastructure elsewhere in the Corps to address the problem.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, my time is expired, but I do want to—you know, the last hopeful report I saw was maybe by Memorial Day. You know, this is ridiculous. I mean, it is not your fault. I would tell you that any additional assistance that you can give us and getting the public the information about the damage that is being done by Congress and the White House not being—not getting a disaster relief bill done I think would help you get this done sooner rather than later.

And I think the difference in getting it done next week and getting it done at Memorial Day or after Memorial Day is huge. And so I appreciate your service. I have to step to another committee meeting, but I look forward to being part of the solution.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Scott, thank you. You are consistently banging this drum, and appropriately so.

Mr. Lamborn and I did have the opportunity to visit both Cherry Point as well as Camp Lejeune. The members of the committee—it is my intention this month to visit Tyndall. And I would welcome any members of the committee that would want to join on that, date to be determined. So we will try to figure out when we might be able to accomplish that.

I would just—I will forego the opportunity to make additional comments on this. I think the gentleman—I think many of the team here is aware. I will point out that the House is now reprocessing—or processing once again an emergency disaster appropriation bill. The Senate has not moved it.

The House bill will be similar with some modifications, particularly dealing with the two issues that have been put forth here with Lejeune and Tyndall and Offutt and Cherry Point. That is in process, and perhaps that will cause the Senate to get a little more active or complete its task.

I now turn to Ms. Houlahan.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and thank you, gentlemen, for being here today. My questions are—the first set of questions for General McConville have to do with the Chinook Block II upgrade, which is part of my community. I am just outside of Philadelphia.

And I have asked other senior Army officers and leaders about this decision recently to pull back on that Block II upgrade in this coming fiscal year's budget. And I would like to have a three-part question for you today that has to do with the impact on that decision in terms of readiness.

So if the Chinooks that are currently in service are not replaced with the Block IIs, as is the proposed solution right now, what is the plan for sustaining them in that fleet into the 2030s and 2040s?

So that is my first question.

Do you want me to give them one at a time or would you prefer me to give them all together?

General MCCONVILLE. Congressman, whichever way you want, I can do.

Ms. HOULAHAN. So maybe it would be best to do it all at one time in case they fold into one another. And so should we expect to see increased funding for the Chinook sustainment in next year's budget and beyond? And reflecting that decision not to pursue the Block II procurement strategy.

And the third question has to do with sort of supply chain issues. I am a supply chain person and an entrepreneur myself. And when you make decisions like this decision to no longer fund the Block II upgrades, you have made decisions down the chain, the supply chain, as well.

Do you anticipate that there will be any supply chain implications, small businesses or suppliers going out of business? And what would be the plan if that were the case to make sure that you could sustain the existing fleet?

General MCCONVILLE. Yes, Congresswoman. And in fact, we just met with Boeing on that very same issue. I am very, very concerned about the organic industrial base, the ability to maintain that capability.

What the Army right now is committed to doing is we are buying CH-47 Foxes and Block IIs for our special operations regiments. So that is going to start—they will be converted to Golfs.

And the other thing we are working with—and this gets back to my earlier answer about foreign military sales—we are working with our partners. We think the CH-47 Foxtrot is a great aircraft. The Secretary and the Chief had to make some tough decisions as far as modernization.

We want to produce the future attack reconnaissance aircraft along with the future long-range assault aircraft, which Boeing is competing for, and what we want to do is keep the line going for the next couple of years and then we will be in a position to make a decision on how we—either do we recap Block I's or Block II's? Do we sustain them or do we come up with a new way of doing that mission in the future?

Ms. HOULAHAN. And what do you think, if any, of the implications of that decision are for downstream suppliers?

General MCCONVILLE. Well, I think—I would hope that they look at that is the future. I mean, what we are doing right now is we are kind of in the place of where we were in in the 1970s, coming out of Vietnam, and we had a thing called the big five, where we came up with the Abrams tank, the Bradley, the Apache helicopter, the Black Hawk, and the Patriot. We see the same thing right now.

So what we are recommending to industry is listen to what we are saying, produce these aircrafts, compete for these new systems that come in place, and that is what is going to drive the subs and everything else for the next 20, 30, 40, 50 years.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you. I certainly hope so. With the remainder of my time, this question is for anyone who would like to weigh in. On April the 26th of this year, the CMO [Chief Management Officer] of the DOD [Department of Defense] published a report on the reforming of the business operations of DOD.

And in the report it specifically addressed our need to reduce delays in recruiting of civilians, which can result in managers substituting more expensive military or contractor personnel in place of less costly contractors.

In addition to that budget effect of this substitution, what happens when a military service member is working outside of their specialty for which they were trained and are performing a civilian job function? And what are the effects of this substitution on the force as it relates to retention? This question is for any of you.

General WILSON. Congresswoman, let me jump in on that. Getting the right force and getting them onboarded fast is one of those things that we have got to compete and win it for. If we compete with—we can't compete on money, so we are competing on mission and talent. So we have to have a way to bring people on board fast, and not doing so just hurts us in the long run.

Once we get them on board, if we get them the right clearances and things, we find that they are really empowered, they like what they are doing, they are doing things that they can't do anywhere else, specifically in the cyber workforce. So we have to be able to continue to do that.

And I would also ask that we look for, how do we make it permeable so in the future somebody—the basic questions we ask them, do you want to be full-time or part-time, do you want to be in uniform or civilian, and find a way that people can work in the government, maybe go back to industry, spend time in industry, and then decide, you know what, I liked what I was doing back in government, and be able to come back in quickly and easily with their security clearance. And I think that would be very helpful moving forward.

Ms. HOULAHAN. I would love it if we might be able to get some information or data from you guys later on about how frequently this is occurring, where we are substituting military personnel in for civilian jobs. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Ms. Houlahan.

Mr. Brooks.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General McConville, in your written testimony you mentioned the, quote, recent surge in enemy ballistic missile, hypersonic, cruise missile, and unmanned aircraft capabilities, end quote. How will efforts that increase the ability of systems to communicate with each other, such as integrated air and missile defense battle command system, address this changing threat environment and improve Army readiness?

General McCONVILLE. Yes, Congressman. I think, you know, as we move into great power competition, where we will be contested in every single domain—and by domain I mean on the land, in the sea, in the air, in space, in cyber—we must have systems—and IBCS [Integrated Battle Command System], we are looking forward to getting that in the hands of our soldiers, because what that is

going to do is it is going to tie together different shooters that can actually take those missiles or air systems down that are protecting our soldiers with the sensors.

So we are looking forward to getting that into the hands of our soldiers and moving ahead on that system.

Mr. BROOKS. Thank you. In the time that remains, Admiral Moran, General Thomas, and General Wilson, clearly increasing interoperability and communication between sensor platforms such as radars, fires, and command and control is not a challenge for the Army alone. Will each of you please speak to the efforts your organizations are making to meet this challenge? And we will start with Admiral Moran and work our way across.

Admiral MORAN. Congressman, thanks for the question. I think we—the four of us talk about this all the time. We have got our folks working at multiple levels in each of our organizations collaboratively together to solve this. None of us want to spend money on something somebody else is already fixing, so it is to our benefit to collaborate with our sister services to make sure that we are taking full advantage.

We know we are going to fight in the future just like we are today, as a joint force. And in the environment you just described, speed is important, speed of decision, speed of orientation, all important, and we are going to have to do this together, so we have got to be able to put a system together that can talk to each other without interruption.

Mr. BROOKS. General Thomas.

General THOMAS. Congressman, a key aspect of this discussion is standards and making sure that those standards are agreed upon across all the services. We think that we are making significant progress in those areas.

And then when you enter the acquisition process, you know that whatever you are building is not a stovepipe. I don't want to be Pollyannaish. I think there is a long way to go. But I think in terms of the discussions across the services, it is also—I think we have made progress in that area.

And the last thing I would say is, you know, this is a key aspect of our CONOPs [concept of operations] in a great power competition. So this is something that we have to get correct.

Mr. BROOKS. General Wilson.

General WILSON. All my battle buddies here—and I talk about this all the time, too—it is something that is vitally important in the future, because this is what is going to win in a future fight. It is beyond the technology and the warfighting concept. It has to connect in the command and control.

So any platform, any sensor, we have to be able to connect, share, and learn. And so we are working that—all the service secretaries have signed memos that said anything we build new has to be the same standard.

We have got teams working together. For example, we will have a partnership to stop talking about this and admiring the problem and make it real, going out to Nellis Air Force Base, to the Shadow Ops [Operations] Center, to bring together a team with the right developers, with the right joint teammates, with DARPA [Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency], with industry, to be able to

get after this problem, because this is our asymmetric advantage. This will be the thing that makes the United States win in the future.

Mr. BROOKS. Generals, Admiral, thank you for your service. And Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. Brooks.

We now turn to Ms. Escobar.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Thank you, Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you so much not just for your testimony today, but for your service. I am very, very grateful.

I represent El Paso, Texas, home of Fort Bliss and the Texas 16th Congressional District. So I would like to ask you about something that is a priority for my district. And this question goes to General McConville.

As you know, Fort Bliss makes a major contribution to readiness as one of just two active mobilization force generation installations [MFGIs] for the Army. We support key mobilization capabilities for regular and contingency operations, for units and individuals, and we are the only installation conducting the CONUS [continental United States] replacement center mission, which supports missions across five continents.

Fort Bliss leadership has identified railyard improvements as a key readiness initiative and a necessary upgrade to support the MFGI mission. I was very disappointed to see that it didn't make the cut in the fiscal year 2020 budget.

As we look ahead and considering the importance of being able to rapidly mobilize personnel and equipment when prepositioned stock are not available, it is clear we need to invest today to be ready for the conflicts of tomorrow, something you all have been saying over and over again.

What risks do we take by not beginning this work in fiscal year 2020? When can we expect to see progress on this critical project, do you think?

General MCCONVILLE. Yes, Congresswoman. And you know, the point you make about the importance of railyards and the ability to get critical equipment to the ports is the way we pretty much deploy the United States Army, especially with an organization that has those critical capabilities. And not having a modernized railyard slows down the deployment capability. Certainly, you know, that is not stopping them from deploying, but they certainly can do it better.

You know, for us, it is a matter of priorities. We have to take a look at all the priorities that come in. We have other places and other forts that have the same concerns. And we go through a process to take a look at, what organization needs it the most at the time, giving the funds that we got? And we make that decision. So that will be in the decision-making process. We will take a hard look at that and provide you some feedback over the next year.

Ms. ESCOBAR. I appreciate that. Between training and mobilization, Fort Bliss interacts with units from every single U.S. State and territory, as you know. So—

General MCCONVILLE. It is a wonderful place.

Ms. ESCOBAR. It is. It is fantastic. So to my next question, to General Wilson and General Thomas, this is about resiliency. I

know that many of my colleagues on this committee are closely tracking repairs and recovery at Tyndall Air Force Base and Camp Lejeune. I mean, I know that that is a key priority for all of us. We stand with you. You have our support.

But I want to know going forward, because I am very, very concerned about what I believe is an existential crisis with climate change, how can we best plan proactively to protect our military personnel and resources from the challenges that come from climate change? Is resilience planning required? And standardization, should that be required, as well, across all installations? Would love to know your thoughts.

General WILSON. Yes, Congresswoman, there is no safe place for weather. If we look at this last year, we had earthquakes, we had forest fires, we had tornadoes, we had flooding, we had hurricanes. We have to plan for resilience at our bases.

Our bases are our warfighting power projection platform. And so we need to look at the requirements. We need to make sure we have got resiliency built in. And we also have to—to use Tyndall as an example—use that as an opportunity to design the base of the future, with the right infrastructure and the right resiliency built into it. And we need to do that broadly across all of our bases and infrastructure.

General THOMAS. Congresswoman, one of the things that we have seen as we have kind of gone through this last several months is just the importance of making sure that our buildings are up to modern code. What we saw again in the 800 buildings that were damaged at Camp Lejeune, the newer buildings that were up to code did pretty well. It is the older buildings that suffered the most damage. And so that is a key aspect of it.

I think also within the footprint of the base itself, we have got to look at where we are placing, you know, new buildings, if water levels are at a certain area, to mitigate that.

And then, you know, at a strategic look, we look across all of our bases across the entire portfolio and making sure that we are postured for the next 50 years. And so that is a discussion that is ongoing, as well.

Ms. ESCOBAR. Thank you, Chairman.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Ms. Escobar.

Gentlemen, I will come back to this issue in the second round of questions. I now turn to Mr. Bergman.

Mr. BERGMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And congratulations, General McConville and Admiral Moran. Looks like within the next few months we are going to have three new heads of services, with General Berger coming in as the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and I guess within a year after that, the Air Force will have a new Chief of Staff, as well. So literally within the next 12 to 14 months, four new heads of services.

Like anything, when you are coming in, I am telling you what you already know, when you come in as the new Chief, you get to make your mark. That is the way it works historically. You all have done great. We talk about readiness, unit readiness, equipment readiness, personnel readiness, family readiness. Some things are finite, time and money, okay?



And the point is, I would like you all to take this for the record, not to be answered now, because as we and our committee sit here and try to figure out and decipher the budgets, you know, the programs that you send to us, it is important to see where we need to fund warfighting readiness at all levels.

The challenge that we all have as organizations is where do we stop putting O&M dollars into areas that either are legacy, but probably more important bureaucratic processes—anybody remember DIMHRS [Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System]? Okay, we can all smile at that, because the point is, as we look at the technological side of how you are going to run your service, we have an opportunity here under your command, I believe, to make the bureaucratic administrative changes necessary that is going to allow us to leverage those finite dollars so then you can have more money to put where you know you need it, okay?

And this is a little bit of a challenge, but it is an opportunity I think that we have right now to do this, because what that does—let's face it, what is our goal in warfighting? Well, it is to win, but the ideal goal is to make sure our potential adversaries don't engage us in the first place because they know they are going to lose.

And for us to be able to show that we are looking at how we fight our wars from a 360-degree perspective, and that is taking those dollars that maybe went down an administrative hole and we put them into ammunition, that sends a real strong signal as to how we are moving forward.

So I guess I would just say, we will be your partners. You know, one of the leadership of the subcommittee here in readiness is how we evaluate that, but I believe we are going to have an opportunity here to move forward on showing where we can, again, decrease some of the spending.

And it is not necessarily wasteful. It is just kind of unintended consequences, because we have been doing it this way for so long. So I guess this is more of a statement—than asking questions, but I would—if you could for the record—sometime in the next month or so—give this committee an example of where you did it jointly or within your service of cutting some behind-the-times bureaucratic administrative costs, that you said, no, we looked at this and we said, nope, we are not going to spend money on this before.

This would I believe be helpful for the committee. So with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

[The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. Bergman. A very good question. And we will expect to get that answer, certainly pass it around to the members of the committee.

Ms. Haaland, I notice you are here. Your turn, thank you.

Ms. HAALAND. Thank you very much, Chairman.

My first question is for General Wilson. And I just wanted to follow up on a question that my colleague, Ms. Torres Small, asked earlier. And so it is, are there opportunities within the existing budget request to achieve this capstone principle of allocating at least one unit equipped wing and flying squadron in each of the 54?

General WILSON. Congresswoman, we will certainly look into what is in the art of the possible, working with New Mexico moving forward.

Ms. HAALAND. Thank you so much. And my next question, I think it—like each one of you can answer this. It has to do with energy, resiliency, and renewables. The Defense Science Board Task Force on Survivable Logistics made recommendations on the urgent need to modernize our military's joint logistics enterprise. They recommended that the military departments focus any RTD&E [research, testing, development, and evaluation] funds on fuel demand reduction, local generation of electricity, increasing battery storage, and decreasing battery weight, and to establish a logistics RTD&E board to synchronize RTD&E investments in these spaces.

Do you plan to implement this recommendation? And would the services benefit from more coordination across the services? And we can start and go down the line.

General MCCONVILLE. Yes, Congresswoman. We understand the importance of energy conservation. You mentioned batteries. And I need to go out to Fort Carson, Colorado, which I did not know until I started taking a look at this, but we have supposedly the biggest battery in the Federal service. And there is a huge battery that we are using out there that is helping us give energy resilience. It is also helping us work with the private company out there to reduce the spikes in energy.

So we are getting resilience, and we are also getting some savings, and we are also helping them out as far as spikes go. So we are looking for those type of things along with what everyone else is doing to get more energy-efficient buildings that are resilient and also save energy.

And just one final idea, as we build new systems, we are doing an improved turbine engine program, and we are getting efficiencies to that. We are getting, you know, a lot better horsepower out of the ends, but we are also getting better utilization of energy to power those engines.

Ms. HAALAND. Thank you.

Admiral MORAN. I would say the same for the Navy in terms of infrastructure. As we put new buildings out, we replace housing units, there is a lot of opportunity there in the energy savings.

But on a broader operational front, I would say that for the Navy, we have a great interest in trying to be energy efficient so that we have to refuel less, whether we are talking about aircraft or we are talking about ships. So looking at hybrid electric, integrated electric drives that don't rely as much on fuel, especially when we are in places where we don't have to move at high speed.

Ms. HAALAND. Excellent.

General THOMAS. Congresswoman, I would, like my colleagues, emphasize the importance of when we are looking at infrastructure across our bases, any times we are building something new, there is tremendous opportunity to employ energy efficiency technologies. And we are seeing that across all of our bases.

But there is the operational aspect, as well. Admiral Moran talked about from a Navy perspective. From a Marine perspective, you talk about fuel. That is weight. So we are looking for opportu-

nities to have to carry less stuff. And so to the extent that we can operationalize that, that is what we are trying to do.

And we have actually been doing that over the past—with our joint teammates, we have an expeditionary energy office that looks at things of that nature, and we have—we have had some success over the past 15 years in Iraq and Afghanistan employing those technologies.

Ms. HAALAND. Thank you.

General WILSON. Congresswoman, I would say it is much the same for all the infrastructure. We are also working on those things that they have talked about, whether it be adaptive engines to give us better fuel efficiency, whether it be wingtips, winglets on the engines or the wings of the airplane to give us, some around the fuselage.

We are looking at software that helps us predict and plan our routes to be more fuel-efficient. So we are looking across the gamut. We know how important energy is to all of us, and we are trying to find all those savings that we can.

Ms. HAALAND. Thank you. Thank you so much. And, Chairman, I will yield back. Thank you.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you. I now turn to Ms. Horn.

Ms. HORN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you all for being here today.

General Wilson, I want to start with you. I represent Oklahoma's Fifth Congressional District, which as I am sure you know is adjacent to Tinker Air Force Base. And when we are talking readiness, we can't do so really without talking about the critical piece that our depots play.

And as Tinker works with aging airframes, from the KC-135 the B-1, the B-52, and many other critical components, it is also an economic engine as well as a support to our forces across the Air Force and their readiness.

So I want to ask you about issues surrounding the overall facilities. There was a GAO report about military depots and actions needed, entitled Military Depots, Actions Needed to Improve Poor Conditions of Facilities and Equipment That Affect Maintenance, Timeliness, and Efficiency.

And in that report, it specifically mentioned the repair of equipment at Tinker being poor and exceeding its useful life. So with that in mind, what is the Air Force doing specifically to address this problem in both the short and the long term? And what is the strategy for addressing the—what it estimates is \$104 million backlog restoration at Tinker?

General WILSON. Yes, Congresswoman, you are correct in that our depots are critical to our warfighting capability moving forward, specifically Tinker.

I would say we work closely with the GAO and we agree with lots of things.

Let me maybe nuance the part. Certainly the facilities are important, and we have work to do to improve those, but besides the facilities, it is also the people that work there, the equipment there, and in our case we are dealing with airplanes that are often way past their design life.

So when I bring in a KC-135 that is, you know, over 50 years old, we are finding things that we have never found before.

So it is important that we have all those pieces not only from the facilities, but the people and the equipment, and then that we are looking at all the processes we can to speed up the depot throughput.

We think we have seen some improvements to that, that we have done some blue suit maintenance and some work with our processes. And we have done it now 30 percent faster than we have done it under the contractors before.

But it is an ecosystem that supports the depots. Again, it is the facilities, but beyond the facilities, it is the people, the equipment, the parts, and the process that is supported.

Ms. HORN. Absolutely. And the chairman and ranking member visited me at Tinker. We toured the facilities. And they are absolutely to their credit doing amazing work at Tinker, both the civilians as well as our uniformed service members.

And the efficiencies that they have been able to put into place in the maintenance of these KC-135s and other aircraft are really phenomenal. And I think it is important to note that they have increased the speed of the turnover by 40 percent at half the cost of recent industry contract proposals. So that is really important.

But I also want to visit a question that some of my colleagues have touched on about the industrial base, because one of the challenges that Tinker and I am sure other depots are facing right now with the maintenance of aircraft that are 60-plus years old, they are finding things that are breaking, as you said, in new ways. And the inability of—or sometimes the absence of OEMs [original equipment manufacturers] and the parts, the work that is being done there at the Rapid Sustainment Office to fill those gaps is really critical.

So next step is my question is, what additionally is the Air Force doing to encourage the industrial base and the small or smaller contractors to fill these holes?

General WILSON. It is a great—we just met as an example in New York City with small businesses and in one day awarded 51 contracts to small businesses, where they came in, they gave a pitch, they had a one-page contract, and they were on business with United States Air Force.

We are trying to knock down all the barriers to doing business with small business, which is all across of our country. As a tagline that I thought was fantastic, one of the small businesses says it is easier and faster to do business with the United States Air Force than it is to get a beer in New York City, right? That is a good testament to what we are trying to do as we build and modernize the force faster and smarter.

And we realize that all of our—it is vitally important to our nation to have this industrial capability, and we are going to need all hands on deck to be able to do that.

Ms. HORN. Thank you. Yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. We are going to do a second round. So if you have got to go, you have got to go, but you can have another shot.

I want to thank our members for raising a whole series of really critical issues. And each time they spoke, I started adding to my

list, so we are good for about another 3 hours. Can you gentlemen stay with us?

With regard to the question of the industrial supply base, last year, in our wisdom, we created a program called—section 846 of the, I think, 2019 NDAA [National Defense Authorization Act]. It is called the Defense Manufacturing Community Support Program. I am sure you four gentlemen are very much aware of this. I became aware of it about an hour and a half ago, not that I had read every line of last year's NDAA.

It has not been funded. It is in appropriation. It is specifically designed to address the problem that we saw at Tinker, that is the major contractors have given up providing the parts necessary for the 135 and other legacy platforms. This may be a solution in bringing into the industrial supply base new manufacturers, small manufacturers, and the like.

I was looking to trying to put \$50 million into the appropriation bill to fund this program so these gentlemen and their services can make use of this outreach that occurs. It also was tied into a tax bill that provides certain tax credits for certain parts of America that are in economic distress.

So I will leave that one to you. Here is a note for you. And for you gentlemen, we will get the same thing.

The other thing has to do with the issues that were raised by my colleagues here, the energy issue. It is in the law. It has been there for, I think, about 5 years now. This committee will press you hard on that, looking for resiliency on the base, base energy resiliency, and energy reduction.

We don't need to talk about climate change. We need to talk about energy reduction, cost savings, and the like. All of you talked about some of the things that you are doing, good. You might consider some of those gas guzzlers that run around on your bases. They could be electric cars. Many, many things, energy conservation, all of that.

That ties back to what I have shared with everybody that cared to listen, and that is that the building codes going forward are going to be—we are going to try to make them the strictest in the nation with regard to sustainability, wind, earthquake, fire, and energy conservation. So be aware of that.

In this year's NDAA and appropriations, previous years' military construction programs are going to be funded. We believe that many of those are not built to the highest standard or to modern today standards. They are designed for yesterday's standards. I would ask each of the services to look at those specific programs and military construction programs. And in the normal process of design change and construction changes that occur, it may be appropriate and possible to improve the energy resilience, conservation, wind, and so forth, with very little additional cost, if any. It might just be a simple additional screw that is put into the rafter.

So if you will take a look at that, keep that in mind. We don't want to change the design plan, but I have been through enough construction over the years to know that there has never been a construction project that didn't have changes along the way. And so keep that in mind, and we will help you by providing some language in the NDAA so that you are reminded.

With regard to Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point, as well as Tyndall and Offutt, I shared this with the services, your plans must be presented to us on how you are going to address the risk at that base. It may be flooding. We have talked about this at Camp Lejeune and Cherry. We didn't pick up and you didn't mention Parris Island. We have to add that discussion.

With regard to Tyndall, you have given us a preliminary report on what might be there. I looked at it, and it looked to me like you are building right back where you were. I hope that is not the case.

It appears that a good many of the buildings at Tyndall are on the beachfront, or at least the front of the waterway there. Storm surge is going to happen. Another Category 5—there may have been five in the last century; there are certainly going to be five in the next. There are going to be Category 5 hurricanes in that area, and I want to, as you said, but did not put in your plan, General Wilson, at least what you have given to us, the relocation of facilities away from the most harmful and most likely area to be harmed.

We are going to look at that very carefully. We are going to scrub it. You are going to scrub it first. We will look at it. If you go back and build where it was destroyed, you better be able to tell us there is absolutely no other place, and then you better build it for the worst possible case, similarly.

And for the rest of you, one of our colleagues talks about base access roads. I suggested maybe waders would suffice at Norfolk and we can save some money. Admiral Moran, you got a problem, you know it. Not only there, but other places. Sea level rise is real. And the Army, we can probably find someplace where you have got a similar problem.

So, please, keep in mind that this committee is going to want to build for the next 70 years. And we are going to assume the worst possible thing to happen. Don't want to pick on the Marines, but there is going to be a fire at Pendleton and it right now could probably take out your housing program, too, and probably some other things. And I am sure the rest of you have similar circumstances.

So that is heads up. We are going to watch it closely. We will put language in to encourage you to do it, and we will follow along on that.

One final point, and that is my current thing that just wakes me up—it doesn't wake me up, doesn't put me to sleep, either, but during the day I ponder—there was a billion dollars of unused money in the Department of Defense 2 months ago. It was in the Army personnel account. For whatever reasons, you didn't meet your recruiting, didn't spend the money, it was sitting there, a billion dollars.

By most accounts, it was somewhere, \$1,150,000,000 of immediate expense to just clean up Cherry Point, Lejeune, and Tyndall. That billion dollars was used to build a fence on the border, not for the needs of the military, even though the money was already in the military. I know how it was done, transferred the money over to a counternarcotics program which has the authority to build facilities to stop narcotics. That is a game that made this chairman very, very angry.

Now, your job is to take an order and salute and get it done. It is not you. This is a message for the service secretaries that didn't say one word of opposition when you, General Wilson and the Air Force, were in desperate need of money to clean up a terrible disaster that happened at your bases. The same for you, General Thomas.

So we are short of a billion dollars. Presumably we will have a fence someplace.

The question for this nation is, is that fence more important than Tyndall Air Force Base getting back under operation and Camp Lejeune and Cherry Point?

I don't expect you gentlemen to answer, but I want that message to be on everybody's mind, because the next brick is going to fall. And it is going to fall this Friday, by all accounts. And that is the existing military construction budget that may be whacked for \$4 billion of programs that are thought by every one of your services to be the highest priority. They have been scrubbed and reviewed by not only your services, but by the Appropriations Committee in both Houses and the authorizing committees in both Houses, and found to be necessary.

About \$4 billion of projects may be taken out of your services. We will be expected to backfill it. Where the money is going to come from isn't known yet, but there is a limit for the amount of money that is available, and it is going to come from something in the Department of Defense.

So maybe it will come from, I don't know, fuel for your airplanes. I don't know.

So we have got to be aware of what is going on here. And this is a very serious problem for the nation's defense. And I don't know when you are going to get the—General Wilson, when you are going to get an emergency appropriation bill. It is locked up in the Senate. As I said earlier, we are going to try to push something again through this House, maybe get things moving, maybe not.

But you just said it is a critical problem for the readiness of the U.S. Air Force, and I am sure it is for the Marines, also. There are consequences to stupid decisions that have been made. And the consequence here is the nation's security. So just be aware that as chairman of this committee, I am watching this closely. I am very, very concerned about what the long-term and short-term readiness implications will be.

I don't know if I asked you guys a question. I guess I made some comments. But be aware that on all of these matters we will be paying very, very close attention to it.

Mr. Lamborn, if you have another question, it is your turn.

Mr. LAMBORN. Yes, thank you.

I do have a couple of specific questions, although let me in response to what you just elaborated on, I want to say that there is another side of the story. Many of us do feel that the situation at the southern border is also a national security issue. It is Homeland Security, not DOD. However it is a very important issue.

I would not use the word stupid myself. I would say that there are well-considered arguments actually in favor of beefing up the southern border. But we are not going to get into that here.

What I would like to get into here, though, I have a couple of specific questions, but before I ask those easy specific questions, could you all talk about prepositioned stocks?

How is the stockpile that you are concerned about? And what does Congress need to do to make sure that that is at 100 percent?

General McCONVILLE. Congressman, I will go ahead and start.

And first of all, prepositioned stocks are absolutely critical for the United States Army. You know, we have a concept of dynamic force employment, which allows us to quickly move forces around the globe, and by having those prepositioned stocks, we can quickly follow-on equipment, but if the equipment is not ready to go, if the ammunition is not there, if all the logistics are not there, it really doesn't accomplish the mission that we want to do.

The funding we have had over the last 2 years has really significantly improved that. We have put significant amounts into all our prepositioned stocks, and we are at a much higher rate of readiness because of that.

Admiral MORAN. Congressman, same for the Navy. We are taking a hard look at our logistics network to include PREPO [prepositioning]. It is old. It needs replacement. And we are working on some—we are working on some opportunities to change that, working with this body, Congress, to help us have the authorities to do what we need to get a more modern force that can resupply the force.

Mr. LAMBORN. Okay.

General THOMAS. Congressman, we are very grateful for the support that we have gotten from Congress to help us get our prepositioned stocks where they need to be. From a Marine Corps perspective, places like Norway, and then munitions as a part of the Department of the Navy.

As we look forward, and, you know, posture going forward for the joint force, you know, I think that prepositioned stocks is going to only become more important.

Mr. LAMBORN. Okay. But do you feel that the Marine prepositioned stocks are up to snuff?

General THOMAS. They are right now, yes.

General WILSON. Congressman, it is the same thing for the Air Force. We appreciate Congress' support to give us the funding to be able to do that, to be able to support prepositioned both in Europe and the Pacific. And we have increased our stocks across the board, and including munitions.

Mr. LAMBORN. All right. Okay, thank you.

General McConville, can you tell me about synthetic training environment? That is something I don't really know a lot about, I will admit, and I would like to know more about it.

General McCONVILLE. Yes, Congressman.

We are really excited about the synthetic training environment. I would equate it to virtual reality training.

And in fact, we are putting a system in place—we are calling it the integrated visual augmentation system. What it is going to allow our soldiers to do is to go into virtual reality and train on a mission that they are about ready to accomplish, and what that allows them to do is do 30, 40 repetitions of that actual mission.



And it is virtual. It is real. And they can practice, they can rehearse, they can hit the sled a whole bunch of times, and then they could actually take the same equipment we are developing and go and execute the mission.

Mr. LAMBORN. Well, you and I are going to have to go through that, experience that firsthand.

General MCCONVILLE. No. We do—this is cutting-edge technology. It is going to transform the way we train soldiers and the way soldiers operate in combat. We are excited about it.

Mr. LAMBORN. I am excited, too.

General WILSON. Congressman, I will jump onto that, because we are using the same thing, for example, in pilot training next, where we are using today's state-of-the-art technology and we are finding that we can produce pilots quicker and actually better. We have our first couple classes underway, and the results are astounding.

Mr. LAMBORN. How is it different than the old simulator approach to training?

General WILSON. Well, it actually takes it to the next level. So if you were to go to—we have got one in Austin to be able to do this. You put on virtual reality goggles. It is basically looking at your eye movement. You are able to do multiple repetitions.

It is not expensive to do this. And again, students can go through hundreds of reps, where before they couldn't do that. So it is really reducing the amount of time it takes to train folks.

Mr. LAMBORN. Critical—yes, Admiral, did you want to—

Admiral MORAN. I will just piggyback on what General Wilson just commented on. The Navy is—and the Air Force and Marine Corps—shifted heavily towards what we call live, virtual, constructive. So we can take—and this is an energy savings step that is really important to understand—so in the old days, not too long ago, we used to actually have to fly “red air” to present enemy forces to a live event with your own “blue air” force.

Nowadays you can inject that virtually through the system. It will show up on the radar. It will show up on the heads-up display in cockpits, on ships, and in other areas as if it were real.

So you are saving all that money by not having to generate other red air or red surface/submarine forces, red missiles that are coming at you. That can all be done through a live, virtual, constructive environment. It is really beneficial to training, because you can do more reps and sets than you could if you had to put airplanes up or shoot live weapons.

Mr. LAMBORN. Well, it sounds, Mr. Chairman, like that is going to take readiness to the next level, so that is really exciting.

Mr. GARAMENDI. It will if these simulators are paid for and available on time. And I understand—I am trying to remember which of the four forces has a problem with the more advanced simulator, and it has been delayed a bit. I think it might be a ship simulator.

Admiral MORAN. No, sir. If the budget goes through, we are appropriately funded to deliver those on time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Not fair to toss the ball back here.

[Laughter.]

Mr. Wilson, you had a question, let me—

Mr. WILSON. And thank you very much, Chairman Garamendi.

And as a Member of Congress, as a veteran, but mostly as a military dad, four sons who have served in the branches, it is just so reassuring to have such leadership on behalf of our country.

Thank you for what you mean to the people of the United States and promoting freedom around the world.

And General McConville, I am grateful that the Army's efforts over the last 2 years to address the decline of readiness. The Army's goal is for 66 percent of the Active Duty forces as rated to meet full-spectrum readiness requirements by fiscal year 2022.

As the current Vice Chief of Staff and future Chief of Staff, do you think the Army can achieve the goal of 66 percent by 2022? What are the challenges and obstacles that might prevent you from attaining the goal? Is 66 percent enough to meet the goals of the National Defense Strategy? And does the budget align with that goal?

General McCONVILLE. Congressman, first of all, we believe we will make it. And again, I don't want to push it back to you, but the timely, adequate, predictable, and sustainable funding is going to allow us to do that.

We have a positive path right now. We have seen what has happened over the last 2 years. And we are convinced if we get the resources that we can get to that level, and we believe that level is going to be sufficient for the threats we are going to face.

Mr. WILSON. Well, again, we just appreciate your determination and best wishes on your future position, too. And additionally, General, the Army's operation and maintenance account request includes an additional \$132.5 million for maneuvering unit accounts. These accounts support training and operations for the Army's brigade combat teams to maintain readiness.

How does the budget request impact the number of combat training center rotations for the Army's brigade combat teams? How are the combat training centers developing the environment to support the multi-domain operations?

General McCONVILLE. Yes, Congressman.

First of all, the funding gives us 32 rotations. Twenty-five of those combat training centers are what we call decisive action type rotations. And what we will do is, we will immerse our soldiers into situations where they are basically contested in most of the domains they are going to see in the battlefield.

So it is just not the ground. They are going to have electronic warfare challenges. They are going to have cyber warfare challenges. They are going to have space challenges as they execute their operations.

And so, as we train our forces for the future, we are not trying to fight the last fight better. We are trying to win the next fight.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, General.

And Admiral, with the multiple collisions, sadly, that we have had in the past several years, what is—in your testimony, you indicate that there has been a budget assignment of the highest priority of recommendations to the comprehensive review and strategic readiness review [SRR]. What is this budget that directly addresses the readiness shortfalls in training, maintenance, and operations to prevent future collisions?

Admiral MORAN. Sir, in the fiscal—we have already invested close to \$100 million in the last year and a half since the collisions. We have got \$348 million in fiscal year 2020 and over a billion dollars across the FYDP [Future Years Defense Program] to do all of the things that support every single recommendation in the comprehensive review and the SRR.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you again for your determination to address this on behalf of the health and safety of our naval personnel.

And General Wilson, the former Secretary of Defense James Mattis directed the Air Force to achieve 80 percent mission capability by the end of fiscal year 2019 for combat-coded strike aircraft.

Will the Air Force meet this goal for F-15, F-22, and F-35A? How does the budget enable the Air Force to meet these readiness goals?

General WILSON. Congressman, I am confident we are going to make it on the F-16. We have put a lot of money into the parts to be able to improve our MC [mission capable] rates, and we have seen an improvement across the F-16 fleet.

For the F-22 fleet, I am not as confident, and that is because of the impact of Hurricane Michael. We had to dislocate all the families that are now just showing up at the new bases, as well as the critical driver for the F-22 is our LO [low-observable] maintenance. And we had to shut down our LO maintenance facility at Tyndall for about 6 months. It is now back up and running, but I am not confident we are going to make it for the F-22.

For the F-35, all of us—the Navy, Marine Corps, and the Air Force are working hard to make sure we have got the right parts in the system to be able to try to achieve that 80 percent MC rating.

Mr. WILSON. And as I conclude, General Thomas, we are really grateful for the F-35s located at Beaufort Marine Corps Air Station. It is such a positive enhancement to that very significant military facility.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Wilson, thank you for raising the F-35. This committee is going to spend a lot of time on the F-35. The issues were just—we decided to put them aside today because it demands at least one full hearing, if not multiple hearings, to deal with all of the issues in the F-35. We will get to that.

One of the things that was raised here early on—I think it came out, Ms. Horn, with regard to Tinker.

The reality is that the services are dependent upon civilian personnel. The training, the ability to hire civilian personnel, I know, Admiral Moran, you have hired several, twenty-some-thousand at the various shipyards. I recall the number somewhere in that range.

That is an important piece of it. There are hiring issues. There are training issues. We want to go into those. We will go into those in depth with—at a later—not a hearing, but probably briefing. Would welcome the participation of certainly the staff and the members as we get into the civilian personnel issues and the training issues.

Just going through my notes, and don't want you gentlemen to escape without the final word here. Finished?

With that, gentlemen, thank you very much. Congratulations once again, General McConville, Admiral Moran. Thank you.

And we will look forward to our next iteration in the readiness of the services.

Thank you very much.

The hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:48 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

---

---

**A P P E N D I X**

MAY 9, 2019

---

---



---

---

**PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD**

MAY 9, 2019

---

---





**Statement of the Honorable John Garamendi**  
**Chairman, Readiness Subcommittee**  
**“Fiscal Year 2020 Budget Request for Military Readiness”**  
**May 9, 2019**

Ladies and gentlemen, I call to order this hearing of the Readiness Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee.

Today the subcommittee will hear from the service vice chiefs regarding the state of military readiness and how the FY2020 operation and maintenance budget request supports military training, weapon systems maintenance, and efforts to meet full spectrum readiness requirements in alignment with the National Defense Strategy.

This year the subcommittee has held events covering a range of topics including the quarterly readiness report, the mobility and logistics enterprise, the impacts of climate change on national security, military family housing, surface navy readiness, and the budget request for military installations. Those briefings and hearings have touched on important issues that affect military readiness, but I think it’s appropriate that we have these witnesses here today to help inform us on the readiness challenges their services face, the initiatives they have in place to mitigate these challenges, and how the FY2020 budget request supports those efforts.

For the past several years we have heard the services raise their concerns with the state of the military’s full-spectrum readiness after more than a decade of focusing on a counter-terrorism and counter-insurgency mission. With a two-year budget agreement in place, and additional resources available to the Department, FY2018 was touted as the year to “arrest the decline” of readiness and FY2019 would begin the readiness recovery. I hope today our witnesses can discuss how those additional resources have been executed by the Department, where we have seen progress in readiness, and areas that may still require additional attention.

As we look at the FY2020 budget request, which represents a significant increase in defense spending, I am concerned that the Department is overly focused on long-term readiness through modernization programs and is not placing enough emphasis investing in near-term readiness accounts that support training and sustainment of existing weapon systems. For example, the budget request only addresses 94% of the Navy’s ship depot maintenance requirement, 90% of the Air Force’s weapons system sustainment, and 82% of the Marine Corps’ ground depot maintenance. I hope today our witnesses can explain how their respective services view the balance between sustainment and modernization and how this budget request will affect near-term readiness building efforts.

Related to the budget request, there are a number of programs and areas that have caught our subcommittee’s attention that impact the readiness of the force. For example, GAO has found that since 2015 nearly 64% of public and private

shipyard availabilities either have been or are expected to be behind schedule, affecting Navy and Marine Corps training and readiness. The aviation community has shortfalls in pilot and maintenance personnel, mission capability rates below the standards, and a number of challenges with the operation and sustainment of the F-35 fleet. The continued demand on Army forces, combined with the lack of sufficient time for home station training and proper equipment maintenance, challenge its readiness recovery efforts. And, climate change presents a myriad of readiness challenges both at home and abroad. It is not only a future threat, but is impacting the resiliency of our installations and operations today as we've seen at Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, Tyndall Air Force Base, and Offutt Air Force Base. I hope that you will address how you view these issues and the actions you are taking, or plan to take, in an effort to address them.

Finally, I hope that you will talk about areas where you are pursuing innovation as a means to improve the delivery of readiness. For example, things like "conditions-based maintenance plus," the adoption of commercial and industry best-practices in supply chain management, additive manufacturing, and the use of live-virtual-constructive training environments. We are interested in how these innovations can improve efficiency and reduce costs while supporting a more-ready and capable force.

With that, I now turn to our Ranking Member, Congressman Doug Lamborn of Colorado, for any opening remarks he may have.

39

**RECORD VERSION**

**STATEMENT BY  
GENERAL JAMES C. MCCONVILLE  
VICE CHIEF OF STAFF UNITED STATES ARMY**

**BEFORE THE**

**SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**FIRST SESSION, 116TH CONGRESS**

**ON READINESS**

**MAY 9, 2019**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED BY THE  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES**

**Introduction**

America's Army is ready today to deploy, fight, and win our Nation's wars. The publication of the National Defense Strategy last year marked an inflection point for the US Army, and a shift in focus from irregular warfare to great power competition. The resources Congress provided in the FY18 and FY19 budgets enabled this shift, allowing the Army to continue to restore readiness for high-intensity conflict. From September 2016 to December 2018, we increased the number of ready Brigade Combat Teams from 18 to 28, and more broadly, increased readiness across all Army units by nearly 11%. Despite this progress, we have not yet fully recovered from the previous eight years of untimely and inadequate funding. In order to achieve our stated readiness goals, and to build the force outlined in the Army Vision, we must have timely, adequate, predictable and sustained funding.

Aligned with the National Defense Strategy, the Army is pursuing a new operational approach, Multi-Domain Operations, to ensure we stay ahead of our competitors and remain ready and lethal into the future. Great power competitors, such as China and Russia, have developed sophisticated anti-access and area denial systems, offensive and defensive fires, cyber, electronic warfare, and space-based capabilities that generate layers of stand-off intended to disrupt the deployment of military forces, deny the build-up of combat power throughout competition and conflict, and fix maneuver forces in place. The recent surge in enemy ballistic missile, hypersonic, cruise missile, and unmanned aircraft capabilities is driving the Army to adopt a Joint, comprehensive approach to improve all aspects of missile defense as outlined in the President's Missile Defense Review (MDR). This includes next generation active defense capabilities, integrated long-range precision fires, passive defense measures and increased cooperation with coalition partners. Across all domains, the Army must continue to build readiness and increase lethality for joint, combined, multi-domain, high intensity conflict.

**Readiness: Training, Manning, Equipping/Sustaining, and Leader Development**

Army readiness is comprised of four distinct but interrelated concepts: training, manning, equipping, and leader development. With the resources provided in the FY18 and FY19 budgets, the Army has made positive progress in each of these areas.

**Training**

In the past year, the Army instituted a number of changes aimed at improving training and Soldier readiness. To increase Soldier survivability and lethality, we increased the length of Infantry basic training from 14 to 22 weeks, and we plan to similarly adjust other branches in the coming years. Furthermore, we introduced a Holistic Health and Fitness Initiative, along with a new Army Combat Fitness Test, which will reduce injuries and make our Soldiers more likely to survive the dangerous battlefields of the future. The addition of physical and occupational therapists, strength and conditioning trainers, and dietitians to our units will improve our fitness culture and increase physical toughness across the Army, which will render a more lethal, ready force.

Army collective training has also undergone major changes in the past year. To enable commanders to focus on their warfighting mission and improve unit readiness, the Army combined, reduced, or eliminated more than 85 headquarters directed requirements, allowing commanders to assess their units and focus on the needs of their formations. We increased training days for select Army National Guard and Army Reserve units. Combat training centers are maximized for capacity to ensure Army force readiness requirements. There are 25 rotations to build brigade combat team readiness and 7 other mission-specific combat training center rotations, for a total of 32 combat training center rotations. Additionally, we increased the complexity of combat training center scenarios, incorporating electronic warfare, cyber, air defense, and long-range fires capabilities to train for Multi-Domain Operations. Finally, advances in the Synthetic Training Environment will allow our Soldiers to integrate live, virtual, constructive, and gaming training environments in a single platform to increase home station training repetitions and enhance the variety and realism of training scenarios.

**Manning**

Major manning changes have also improved Army readiness over the past year. We are filling operational units to 100% of their authorized strength today, and will fill them to 105% strength by the end of 2020. To further increase the quality of our force, we reduced the number of non-deployable Soldiers from a high of 15% in 2015 to just

6% today. These changes equate to thousands more Soldiers ready to deploy in support of contingency operations around the world. We are in the process of rebalancing the force by converting two Infantry Brigade Combat Teams to two Armored Brigade Combat Teams, thus enhancing overall lethality. Finally, we continue to expand critical capabilities, such as cyber, electronic warfare, air defense, and long range precision fires in order to further improve Army readiness.

### **Equipping/ Sustaining**

Army readiness includes the imperative to provide our Soldiers with the best equipment we can to enable them to fight and win. Army Material Command has positively influenced Army readiness by increasing spare parts inventory and ammunition stockpiles. We redistributed equipment to our Focused Readiness Units, and made progress towards achieving ground and aviation equipment readiness goals. Finally, we are enhancing readiness through changes in the configuration of our Army Prepositioned Stocks. This equipment, positioned in strategic locations around the world, enables commanders to quickly execute operational plans or conduct contingency operations. Recent changes to these prepositioned stocks reduce both the time and the strategic airlift required to deploy early entry Army forces and will significantly enhance the Army's ability to respond to future contingencies.

Because our future readiness is as important as our readiness today, we are also investing in modernization. We developed six modernization priorities focused on delivering the capabilities we need to execute Multi-Domain Operations and ensure future overmatch against any adversary. Those modernization priorities are: Long Range Precision Fires, Next Generation Combat Vehicles, Future Vertical Lift, The Army Network, Air and Missile Defense, and Soldier Lethality. The establishment of Army Futures Command and the redistribution of resources to ensure funding of our six modernization priorities will enable us to continue to grow Army readiness for the future.

### **Leader Development**

Soldiers remain our most important strength, with leader development as the foundation of the Army's ability to respond to the rapidly changing global environment. To execute Multi-Domain Operations, the Army needs smart, thoughtful, and innovative

leaders of character who are comfortable operating in complex battlefield environments from the tactical to strategic level. We are grateful to Congress for the Defense Officer Personnel Management Act reforms in the FY19 NDAA, which provide much-needed flexibility in reforming our personnel system. We recognize that the Army must continue to compete with other services and with industry for the best of our American youth. To that end, we are implementing a talent-management based personnel system designed to attract, develop, and retain the best people. These changes will preserve our ability to produce leaders who are ready to respond to any challenge, now and into the future.

While we are changing many facets of our personnel management system, one thing that will never change is our commitment to the Army values. Unit cohesion is critical to readiness. We demand that every member of our Army team treat all of their teammates with dignity and respect. As part of that mandate, we are fully committed to eradicating sexual harassment, sexual assault, and associated retaliatory behavior.

#### **Conclusion**

Our Army remains unquestionably ready today to fight and win around the world, and with continued Congressional support, we will remain ready in the future. However, sustaining readiness while investing in modernization requires timely, adequate, predictable and sustained funding. We need your continued assistance to ensure your Army remains the best-trained, best-equipped and best-led fighting force in the world.

**General James C. McConville**  
**36th Vice Chief of Staff of the Army**  
**United States Army**

Gen. James C. McConville assumed duties as the 36th vice chief of staff of the Army, June 16, 2017.

He is a native of Quincy, Massachusetts, and a graduate of the U.S. Military Academy at West Point, New York. He holds a Master of Science in Aerospace Engineering from Georgia Institute of Technology and was a National Security Fellow at Harvard University in 2002.

McConville's command assignments include commanding general of the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault), where he also served as the commanding general of Combined Joint Task Force-101, Operation Enduring Freedom; deputy commanding general (support) of Combined Joint Task Force-101, Operation Enduring Freedom; commander of 4th Brigade, 1st Cavalry Division, Operation Iraqi Freedom; commander of 2nd Squadron, 17th Cavalry Regiment, 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault); and commander of C Troop, 2nd Squadron, 9th Cavalry Regiment, 7th Infantry Division (Light).

His key staff assignments include the U.S. Army deputy chief of staff, G-1; chief of legislative liaison; executive officer to the vice chief of staff of the Army; G-3 for 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault); J5 strategic planner for U.S. Special Operations Command; S-3 for 25th Combat Aviation Brigade; S-3 for 5th Squadron, 9th Cavalry; and S-3 for Flight Concepts Division.

McConville is senior Army aviator qualified in the AH-64D Longbow Apache, OH-58 Kiowa Warrior, AH-6, AH-1 Cobra and other aircrafts. His awards and decorations include two Distinguished Service Medals, three Legions of Merit, three Bronze Star Medals, two Defense Meritorious Service Medals, three Meritorious Service Medals, two Air Medals, the Joint Service Commendation Medal, two Army Commendation Medals, four Army Achievement Medals, the Combat Action Badge, the Expert Infantryman's Badge, the Master Army Aviator Badge, the Air Assault Badge, the Parachutist Badge, and the Army Staff Identification Badge.

McConville and his wife, Maria, have three children serving in the military.



NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE  
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
ARMED SERVICES

ADMIRAL WILLIAM F. MORAN  
U.S. NAVY  
VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS  
BEFORE THE  
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS  
ON  
CURRENT READINESS OF U.S. NAVAL FORCES

MAY 09, 2019

NOT FOR PUBLICATION  
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE  
HOUSE COMMITTEE ON  
ARMED SERVICES

Chairman Garamendi, Ranking Member Lamborn, distinguished members of the Readiness Sub-Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify about the readiness of your Navy.

On behalf of the Chief of Naval Operations, ADM John Richardson, and the Sailors, civilians, and families who serve in the world's finest Navy, thank you for the substantial readiness investments this committee has made in national defense during the past two years, especially the on-time delivery of the Fiscal Year (FY) 2019 budget. In fact, you have accelerated our ability to meet the emergent needs of your naval forces. For those serving the world over, both uniformed and civilian alike, your trust in us with such a steady and reliable flow of resources has made a substantial impact in our strategic capacity to maintain international order, to keep the seas free for trade and commerce, and to deter those who would challenge us. In short, we are a larger, more capable, and more ready force today.

The Department of Defense 2018 National Defense Strategy (NDS) is the first strategy in recent memory that directly addresses America's geopolitical, economic, and security challenges by name. It is also the first strategy that accurately identifies a historical inflection point occurring now, in real time: an age of rapid change in accelerating technologies and complex threats that leaves our former competitive advantages reduced in size and scope.

The National Defense Strategy is very clear on the threats that have emerged during a rapid return to great power competition. In this emerging maritime century, naval forces play unique roles across a spectrum of rivalry; as powerful, visual symbols of confidence for our allies and potential partners; as a deterrent to those who seek to manipulate the maritime environment for their own benefit; and as a guarantee of equal access to opportunity foundational to global prosperity. Innovative American Sailors and a ready, more capable fleet are essential in our nation's ability to meet these challenges, to protect our nation, and to preserve our continued prosperity.

Naval readiness is foundational to our current and future national security strategy. As this committee well knows, over the past 17 years, the Navy has maintained a high operational tempo with a fleet roughly half the size of the one we sent to sea during the Cold War. As a result, a backlog of maintenance, procurement, and modernization has accrued that we are aggressively addressing now, with deliberate investments provided by Congress. The President's FY 2020 budget request sustains the commitments to improved readiness made in FY17, FY18, and FY19. With additional FY17-19 funding and FY19 budget stability, we've halted the decline in readiness and are working toward recovery. In the FY20 budget, using a holistic approach, we balance these investments in personnel, equipment, spare parts, training, munitions, networks and infrastructure. Based on the assessed requirements, this budget request funds our major afloat and enabling readiness accounts to executable capacity, allowing for more at-sea time, more flying hours, more ammunition and spare parts, and much needed maintenance. For example, compared to 53 ship maintenance availabilities funded this FY, the FY20 budget request funds 62 ship public and private maintenance availabilities, allowing us to sustain the capital investments we've made in our fleet. Additionally, the FY20 budget request assigns the highest funding priority to those recommendations listed in the Comprehensive Review (CR) and Strategic Readiness Review (SRR).

But we also understand that the answer to sustainable readiness is simply not more money. Over the past year, we've employed major reforms in our ways of doing business designed to improve our performance and effective use of resources. Our leaders are thinking differently, planning for the future, and owning readiness in new ways. For example, our newly created Navy Sustainment System is transforming the processes by which we generate aviation readiness. Using best practices from commercial aviation, in the past seven months, we have corrected process flows in shops and hangars, reduced variability to drive standardization across our maintenance procedures, and adopted data-driven analytical methods to prioritize resources and evaluate our performance. Our aviation depot-level Periodic Maintenance Interval (PMI) inspection cycles are 50% faster, our supply chain is more robust, and our maintenance

teams are more efficient. In short, we're delivering more Mission Capable (MC) Super Hornets – the backbone of our carrier airwings – to the fleet, thereby giving our pilots more flight hours to maintain currency while also allowing our Combatant Commanders to meet their warfighting requirements. This demonstrates that a balanced approach to maintenance and operations is possible. Stable, sufficient, and predictable funding remains pivotal in sustaining this momentum.

Advancements in technology are allowing us to look at generating more readiness with the resources provided by Congress while reducing the burdens on our ship CO's and Sailors. For example, this year we plan to invest \$34M in Surface Training Advanced Virtual Environment (STAVE). Similar to the proven benefits provided by simulation in naval aviation, STAVE leverages state-of-the-art gaming technology to enhance the training and education of our operators and our maintainers using a combined virtual and hands-on experience. Our latest effort incorporates virtualized training for our surface combat watchteams, from the technician maintaining the equipment to the operator responding to the environment. This newest trainer achieved initial operational capability last December in San Diego, and a similar trainer is scheduled for delivery in Norfolk this June. Additionally, we have budgeted \$222M this year to achieve our Fleet Training Wholeness 2025 Vision, allowing for full integration across warfare domains. Using these Live, Virtual, Constructive (LVC) training tools will allow us to conduct more realistic training at the pier than we can currently do underway at sea. These systems, when realized, will revolutionize the way we do business in the fleet by providing more rigorous scenarios with fully simulated threat platforms, at a lower risk and cost, while maintaining more flexibility.

While we have made important strides in readiness, we realize there are areas where we need to improve. For example, the maintenance challenges that our submarine forces face continue to be one of our most pressing priorities. In FY19, we project 655 days of idle submarine operational time, an unacceptable level by any measure. We've aggressively gone after this challenge, and identified three key drivers: public shipyard capacity not keeping pace with growing maintenance requirements,

shipyard productivity, and parts availability. We are taking demonstrable steps to address the issue although it will take time. In our public yards, we're investing in modernization and optimization, work force hiring and training, and improvements in equipment and infrastructure necessary to increase capacity and performance. Working with our industry partners, we've been able to allocate multiple submarines to private shipyards, where it made sense and where capacity exists, in order to alleviate the disparity between demand and capacity within our public shipyards. With these efforts, and at sustained levels of maintenance funding, we assess that we will eliminate submarine idle time and maintenance backlog in FY23.

Clearly, there remains room for improvement with respect to maintenance across our fleet. Our 30-year Maintenance and Modernization Plan is an effort to capture all the requirements necessary to maintain mission-ready platforms. This plan will form the basis for predictable future industrial base capacity requirements, making us a better customer for our partners in the private and public yards. A forward-looking approach to sustainment is imperative to our ability to grow the operational capacity of our Navy over time. In addition to stabilizing industrial base capacity, the 30-year Maintenance and Modernization Plan puts us on a path to optimized business processes thereby increasing the industrial base capacity needed to grow the fleet; all the while providing a stabilized demand signal for our vendor base. Scaling these efforts to the enterprise level will drive more predictable maintenance schedules resulting in improved material condition of our platforms.

Employing new processes, like Performance to Plan (P2P), we're using predictive analytics, informed by data, to determine the highest-leverage, actionable levers we can pull in order to generate readiness faster, more efficiently, and more effectively. Ultimately, the objective is to "move the needle" on improving performance and producing higher levels of readiness and better strategic outcomes. There are a number of areas being addressed through P2P pilots, and we're beginning to see indications of progress, especially in naval aviation. We've expanded P2P to include surge-ready submarines and surface ship maintenance delays. This requires the

accurate identification of any maintenance actions earlier in the planning phase, a supply chain optimized for on-time delivery, and better commitment to balancing operational demands with maintenance requirements. Efforts like P2P will increase our operational reliability, while also delivering a better product to the fleet.

None of these improvements in readiness would be possible without the dedicated efforts of our men and women, both civilian and uniformed. They ensure that we are able to fight tonight if called upon. Last year, we met all accession goals in a very competitive employment market and are on track to do so again this year. Looking at the near term trends, we are not relying on what worked in the past. Instead, we've aggressively applied greater flexibility using recent DOPMA relief language provided by Congress, as well as targeted bonuses for hard-to-fill ratings. We have also focused on reducing entry level training attrition at Navy Boot Camp in Great Lakes. Our Ready Relevant Learning system is a reality. It's delivering just-in-time and modernized training at the point of demand, starting with our first Sailors in the Operations Specialist rating last month. We're also working hard to retain the talent we have by pursuing more flexible career paths for those specialties where we need to compete the hardest with the private sector; for example, the ability to access cyber professionals directly into our uniformed ranks in the near future.

Our Sailors join the rest of our combined naval force, supported by their dedicated families, who are working hard to achieve increased readiness, as you well know from your inspiring visits at sea and ashore. They are aware of their essential place in this strategic inflection point. And they understand that increased naval strength matters now, both to sustain our own way of life and also for the confidence of our allies and partners, who look to America to protect the rights of our current order by defending the seas for all. In the past, our readiness, modernization, and recapitalization strategic requirements were often presented as zero-sum choices. However, the NDS is a strategy painted in terms of global ends and ways and these elements of naval means aren't really choices at all. We unapologetically need to continue to strengthen, grow, and deliver a ready Navy to guarantee the continued prosperity and security of the

nation. Now in an era of renewed great power competition, we appreciate both Congressional support and the committee's oversight to make it so.

**Admiral Bill Moran**  
**Vice Chief of Naval Operations**  
**5/31/2016 – Present**

Adm. Bill Moran is a native of New York and graduated with a Bachelor of Science from the United States Naval Academy in 1981 and a master's degree from the National War College in 2006.

As a flag officer, he has served as commander, Patrol and Reconnaissance Group; director, Air Warfare (N98) on the staff of the Chief of Naval Operations; and most recently as the 57th chief of naval personnel.

His operational tours spanned both coasts, commanding Patrol Squadron (VP) 46 and Patrol and Reconnaissance Wing 2. He served as an instructor pilot in two tours with VP-30 and as a staff member for Commander, Carrier Group 6 aboard USS *Forrestal* (CVA 59).

Ashore, he served as executive assistant to the chief of naval operations; executive assistant to Commander, U.S. Pacific Command; deputy director, Navy staff; and assistant Washington placement officer and assistant flag officer detailee in the Bureau of Naval Personnel.

Moran assumed duties as the Navy's 39th vice chief of naval operations, May 31, 2016. He is a senior naval advisor to the secretary of the Navy and the chief of naval operations.

He is entitled to wear the Distinguished Service Medal, Defense Superior Service Medal, Legion of Merit (five awards) and other various personal, unit and service awards.



STATEMENT  
OF  
GENERAL GARY L THOMAS  
ASSISTANT COMMANDANT OF THE MARINE CORPS  
BEFORE THE  
HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS  
ON  
FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST FOR MARINE CORPS READINESS  
9 MAY 2019  
WASHINGTON, D.C.

**Introduction**

Chairman Garamendi, Ranking Member Lamborn, and distinguished members of the House Armed Services Committee Subcommittee on Readiness, I appreciate the opportunity to testify on the current state of Marine Corps readiness and the Fiscal Year 2020 budget submission. As set forth by the 82nd Congress and reaffirmed by the 114<sup>th</sup> Congress, the United States Marine Corps is our Nation's maritime combined arms air-ground force in readiness. As outlined in the National Defense Strategy (NDS), forward deployed Marines, as part of the Navy-Marine Corps team, operate within the contact and blunt layer to deter our adversaries and prevent conflict from escalating into wars that require large Joint Force intervention. As part of the inside force, forward postured Marine forces are ready to contest the malign behavior of our foes, improve interoperability with our allies and partners, and are prepared to meet adversary aggression should deterrence fail. At the same time, Marines stationed at home must be properly trained and equipped in preparation for rotational deployments, or as part of the Joint Force Surge Layer during wartime. Today we are prepared to meet this challenge. But as current readiness continues to improve, we must also invest in modernization to ensure overmatch over potential adversaries who now have capabilities that meet and in some cases exceed our own. Over the last two years, we have improved our readiness both for the fight tonight and the fight in the future. However, adequate, sustained, and predictable funding is still required to maintain current readiness and the necessary investment in future capability. These requirements can only be achieved through Congress' help and the Marine Corps' balanced approach to funding current readiness and modernization.

In spite of the generous support of Congress of the last few years, unforeseen \$3.7 billion in damage caused by Hurricanes Florence and Michael directly impacts the Marine Corps' lethality and readiness. While we greatly appreciate Congress' approval to reprogram \$400 million, we continue to work to address the remaining \$449 million shortfall within Fiscal Year 19. We plan to fully fund these repairs to allow the Marine Corps to maintain the bases, stations, and installations that house our families, train our Force, and allow us to properly store and maintain equipment to ensure our future operational readiness.

**Readiness and Modernization**

A balanced approach to funding current readiness and modernization is necessary to posture and ready the Marine Corps for the future operational environment. Consequently, our modernization and current readiness investments in PB20 each represent roughly 30 percent of the total budget submission. This budget submission ensures we will meet current operational requirements while investing in appropriate modernization priorities. These priorities include: Command and Control in a degraded environment, Long Range Precision Fires, Operations in the Information Environment, Air Defense, Protected Mobility/Enhanced Maneuver, and Logistics. Investments in these capabilities will modernize the force in line with Marine Corps Force 2025 and the NDS, and provide the force that Congress and our Nation expects from their Marine Corps.

**Ground Readiness**

Ground equipment readiness rates represent the cumulative effect of years of effort to reset our equipment and ensure a ready force. Through our initiatives over the last year, we have reset 99 percent of our ground equipment with 72 percent returned to the operating forces. These efforts are ongoing and our ground equipment reset is on schedule to be complete in Fiscal Year 2019. The Fiscal Year 20 budget supports 82% of the ground equipment depot maintenance requirement, an increase from the 80% funded in Fiscal Year 2019. Currently, our depot funding shortfalls are partially mitigated by maintenance actions at the field level, but reduction in sustainment resourcing at the depot or field levels would increase the risk in sustaining the readiness of critical legacy equipment. Due to steady funding and maintenance initiatives, the Marine Corps achieved 82 percent availability and 93 percent serviceability of our reportable ground equipment with major increases in key Principal End Items.

**Aviation Readiness**

While we have seen marked improvements over the last year, aviation readiness continues to be the primary focus of our readiness recovery. The recent increase in funding has enabled us to accelerate readiness recovery efforts, and all of our aviation readiness metrics are trending up. For example, the number of flight hours per crew per month has increased by over 16 percent. In addition, mission capable rates continue to improve resulting in more combat

capable aircraft. Most significantly, the active component F/A-18A-D increased readiness by 12 percent from Fiscal Year 17 to Fiscal Year 18, and the available mission capable aircraft for the aging CH-53E platform increased by a staggering 52 percent since 2015, and we continue to see significant gains.

Despite these gains, we continue to look for ways to increase our readiness. To accomplish this, we have set four goals: 1) reduce Non-Mission Capable Supply (NMCS) to 10 percent; 2) reduce Non-Mission Capable Maintenance (NMCM) to 10 percent; 3) reduce in-service repair time by 50 percent; and 4) fix depot throughput. We anticipate reaching these goals in Fiscal Year 21.

To achieve the Secretary of Defense goal of 80 percent mission capable TACAIR aircraft, we must synchronize efforts both inside the Marine Corps and with our partners in industry and other agencies. Internal efforts focus on increasing maintenance touch time on the aircraft, improving maintenance practices, reducing commitments and training outside of primary maintenance activities, managing the talent of our maintenance Marines, and modernizing our flight lines. Outside of the institution, the Marine Corps is working with Naval Supply Systems Command to harvest parts from Stricken Aircraft Reclamation Disposal Program aircraft in Fiscal Year 19 to rebuild our supply shelf, sustain readiness, and enable account funding. We are also working with the Defense Logistics Agency to meet material availability ahead of need. We are leveraging existing contracts with our industry partners to improve readiness by rebuilding long-term down aircraft, and adopting industry's best practices that can be applied to the Marine Corps fleet.

We have made remarkable progress in aviation readiness. The F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, for example, is our newest aircraft and just completed its first extended, six-month combat deployment, sustaining a 70% mission capable rate and executing its first combat operations. This is directly linked to the efforts of our Marines and the funding provided in the Fiscal Year 17 and Fiscal Year 18 defense appropriations bills. With consistent, predictable funding, our aviation readiness will continue to improve, and the Marine Corps will reach its goals. Once achieved, we will institutionalize our best practices and policies to maintain them in the future.

**Amphibious Readiness**

Amphibious shipping force structure and availability remain a major readiness concern. The Marine Corps' strategic and operational mobility are tied to its ability to maneuver at and from the sea. The amphibious force in the maritime and littoral domains conduct steady state operations around the world, ensure a global cost imposition strategy in an escalating contingency, and project and sustain forces in a contested environment during conflict. Without a robust and protected amphibious fleet, the Marine Corps would be unable to meet these objectives. The Navy's 2016 Force Structure Assessment and the 30-year ship building plan solidified the Marine Corps' long standing requirement for 38 amphibious warships. Due to existing shortfalls within amphibious ship capacity and availability, the naval force struggles to satisfy this requirement.

But availability is only one part of amphibious employment. The Marine Corps requires amphibious warships with organic air defense, vertical launching systems, enhanced command and control suites, and reduced signatures with sufficient capacity to not only deter, but fully operate in a contested environment, disaggregated from the surface fleet and in support of distributed maritime operations. Additionally, the amphibious force must possess critical logistics enablers to sustain Marine forces in a contested environment. Without adequate planning and funding to sustain legacy logistics systems while concurrently developing future capability, risk to mission will increase. We remain dedicated to working closely with the Navy to meet amphibious requirements and to mitigate the associated risks.

**Infrastructure Readiness**

Our bases and stations are strategic power projection platforms from which our forces deploy. They are where we house and care for our Marines and their families. To ensure our infrastructure meets the needs of our evolving force, we have prioritized our efforts through the Marine Corps Infrastructure Reset Strategy. This strategy hardens our structures from emerging threats, ensures our Marines train in state of the art facilities, and provides for the needs and requirements of our military families. In addition to supporting our infrastructure, the strategy maximizes our ability to sustain combat operations and support readiness through the management of depot-level maintenance, storage, and prepositioning of war reserve equipment. The Marine Corps Infrastructure Reset Strategy prioritizes investments to align with the NDS

guidance to include: supporting new capabilities and platforms, modernizing inadequate and obsolete facilities, relocating and consolidating forces, and improving quality of life. To be successful, full Base Operating Support (BOS) and Facility, Sustainment, Repair, and Modernization (FSRM) funding is required. Decrements to the funding of this strategy will lead to higher costs, reduced readiness, and reduced lethality.

This year the Infrastructure Reset Strategy was challenged through the unforeseen catastrophic events of Hurricanes Florence and Michael. These storms damaged or destroyed \$3.7 billion of infrastructure. Personnel at bases and stations in the Camp Lejeune area work in damaged and severely degraded facilities that inhibit mission accomplishment and over time, could prove harmful if not repaired or replaced. Furthermore, the Marine Corps has internally funded initial hurricane recovery efforts at the expense of other base operating funds. The additional use of installation funds for hurricane recovery will significantly strain the Marine Corps installations' budget and lead to unacceptable risk within the installations' portfolio, and will impact the entire Marine Corps. As we move through the third quarter of Fiscal Year 2019, we face a difficult choice between undesirable options; use installations funds to pay for hurricane recovery or use the same funds to pay for day-to-day installations operations. The Marine Corps cannot do both without unacceptable, simultaneous risk to the force and to the mission.

### **Manpower**

Our Marines remain the center of gravity of our Corps and are the key component to our overall readiness. While we are not looking to increase force structure, we must evolve to meet increasingly capable threats. Moving forward we intend to adjust the composition of our Marine Corps to provide a more mature, capable, and experienced force, that leverages emerging technology, and is able to fight and win in an increasingly challenging combat environment. Our PB20 end strength plans for an 186,200 Active and 38,500 Reserve component force. This accounts for marginal growth of the force of approximately 100 Marines, specifically targeted in specialized fields like MARSOC, intelligence and cyber operations.

As the Talent Management Officer of the Marine Corps, I am personally focused on the recruiting, training, and retention process. Our recruiting efforts are designed to ensure our force consists of the best, brightest, and most highly qualified civilians willing to raise their right hand

and become Marines. We have added a Fourth Phase to recruit training focused on mentorship to help new recruits transition from civilians to Marines capable of meeting the rigors of the operating forces. We also closely track our ability to retain our most talented Marines, guiding them to be the future leaders of our Corps. This process consists of mentorship, education, and leadership opportunities that challenge and engage our young Marines to grow into mature and confident leaders. In aviation, we offer retention bonuses to our most qualified aviators and maintainers to ensure the Service remains competitive with industry and our flight lines contain an experienced and capable maintenance base.

To ensure that we retain our best talent, the Corps is dedicated to treating all Marines, civilians, and their families with dignity and respect that is centered on our core values. To assist in this task, the Marine Corps established the Personnel Studies and Oversight Office (PSO) recently re-designated the Talent Management Oversight Directorate (TMOD). The TMOD's mission is to recommend changes to policy to optimize our ability to attract, retain, and develop the talent necessary to achieve our strategic objectives. This ensures that we constantly look to improve our culture through introspective and critical evaluation, ensuring our policies match our core values and meet our operational commitments.

Another component of our manpower readiness is the operational demand on our forces. We characterize this dynamic through the unit deployment to dwell ratio, which can differ drastically depending on the type of unit considered and its operational commitments. The Marine Corps desires to return to a 1:3 deployment-to-dwell ratio to train for full spectrum operations, and provide reset time with families at home. Although not sustainable in the long-term, the Marine Corps is currently maintaining a 1:2 deployment-to-dwell ratio, which in the short-term allows us to modernize the force without jeopardizing operational commitments. A return to a 1:3 deployment-to-dwell ratio will require a decrease in operational requirements. We are exploring all options to achieve that goal. Our Marines are the bedrock of our operational readiness, and for them to retain their effectiveness and focus, they remain our highest priority.

### **Conclusion**

On behalf of all of our Marines and Sailors - many of whom are deployed in harm's way, we thank you for the opportunity to discuss the readiness of the Corps. The Marine Corps is

dedicated to maintaining readiness while increasing our capabilities and lethality. The only way to achieve these requirements is through adequate, sustained, and predictable funding. In the face of dangerous adversaries and revisionist powers, our ability to resource the Marine Corps in this manner will ensure our success today and in the future. Our ability to be the Nation's expeditionary force in readiness depends on it. With the support of the 116th Congress, we will meet our responsibility to ensure your Marine Corps is organized, manned, trained, equipped and postured to protect our fellow Americans, assure our allies, deter our adversaries, and, when necessary, defeat our enemies.



**General Gary L. Thomas**  
**Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps**

General Gary L. Thomas is currently serving as the Assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps.

A native of Austin, Texas, he graduated from the University of Texas and was commissioned in 1984. He previously served as the Deputy Commandant for Programs and Resources.

General Thomas is a Naval Aviator and has served in several F/A-18 squadrons. He commanded VMFA-323 during Operation IRAQI FREEDOM while embarked aboard the USS CONSTELLATION (CV-64). He also commanded Marine Aviation Weapons and Tactics Squadron One (MAWTS- 1), and he served as the Commanding General, 2d Marine Aircraft Wing (Forward) in Afghanistan as well as the Commanding General, 2d Marine Aircraft Wing in Cherry Point, North Carolina.

He has also served as Assistant Wing Commander of 2d Marine Aircraft Wing, the Assistant Deputy Commandant for Aviation, and as the Marine Corps Deputy Director of Operations. His joint assignments include service in the Joint Staff Strategic Plans Directorate (J-5) and in the Force Structure, Resources, Assessment Directorate (J-8).

General Thomas is a graduate of the Weapons and Tactics Instructor Course, the Navy Fighter Weapons School, Air Command and Staff College, and the National War College. He holds a M.S. in National Security Strategy from National Defense University.

62

**PRESENTATION TO  
THE ARMED SERVICES SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS  
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**SUBJECT: U.S. AIR FORCE FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET REQUEST  
FOR MILITARY READINESS**

**STATEMENT OF: GENERAL STEPHEN W. WILSON  
VICE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE AIR FORCE**

**May 9, 2019**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED  
BY THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES  
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS**

## INTRODUCTION

Chairman Garamendi, Ranking Member Lamborn, distinguished members of this committee; thank you for the opportunity to testify on Air Force readiness.

This is my third year as Vice Chief. Your leadership and bipartisan collaboration has returned fiscal order and stopped a decade of readiness decline during my tenure. This is **the** pivotal enabler for a more lethal and ready Air Force. On behalf of the over 685,000 Total Force Airmen, I want to thank you and your colleagues in authorizations and appropriations. Buoyed by your support, we have arrested the decline and turned the corner to begin restoring readiness.

While our shared momentum for the nation's security has been substantial, so too is the work that remains ahead of us. Readiness is dynamic. Competitors are increasing, not decreasing their capabilities. Meanwhile, natural disasters and fiscal uncertainty risk generating enduring impacts that will quickly reverse our own course. The Air Force fiscal year budget submission, critical supplemental requests for Tyndall and Offutt, and reprogramming to meet directed in-year requirements combine to prevent erosion and continue forward progress.

## THREAT ENVIRONMENT

Great power competition is the central challenge to our nation's prosperity. Increased threats in air and space have generated the most competitive security environment seen by Airmen in generations. The independent and bi-partisan 2018 National Defense Strategy Commission stated it clearly: **"Regardless of where the next conflict occurs or which adversary it features, the Air Force will be at the forefront."**

As the joint force readies to compete, deter, and – if called upon – win peer conflict, the Air Force will only see increased demand. We are committed to the standup of U.S. Space Command and to the proposed establishment of a U.S. Space Force under the Department of the Air Force as key movements to maintain American advantage. National security now requires us to simultaneously defend the homeland, provide a credible nuclear deterrent, win against a major power while countering a rogue nation, all while combating violent extremists with a lower level of effort. Combined, this threat environment demands new solutions to readiness.

## READINESS RECOVERY

Last spring we gathered fifty Airmen from around the service to plot a readiness course that rises to the call of the National Defense Strategy. They spent over six weeks together analyzing gaps. They looked at how we measure and report readiness, and developed a recovery plan equal to the security challenges. That plan guides our current budget request.

**Operational Squadrons.** To begin with, we continue to focus resources on our 204 pacing squadrons. Every Airman and unit is vital to the combined strength of air and space power. These 204 are our lead combat units; i.e. the squadrons asked to respond in the first stages of a high-end conflict. This focus has generated positive outcomes at an accelerated rate.

We are more ready for major combat operations today than we were two years ago. Over 90% of our pacing squadrons are ready to “fight tonight” with their lead force packages – the first Airmen to deploy at the beginning of a conflict. When we include their follow-on forces, our pacing squadrons are on track to reach 80% readiness before the end of Fiscal Year 2020. That is six years faster than we projected before we developed our recovery plan and received your resourcing support. In parallel, we are elevating the remainder of our 312 operational squadrons to the 80% mark by 2022, and our entire force by 2024.

**People.** Readiness progress for our squadrons is foremost about people. Recently authorized increases in end strength helped eliminate a shortage of 4,000 Active Duty maintainers. We are now working to build expertise in these new Airmen. While Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve maintainers still face manning challenges, our FY20 budget continues this end strength growth by adding 4,400 Airmen and 5,100 civilians to the Total Force.

We look forward to collaborating with Congress to continue accelerating hiring authorities for civilian Airmen. Current methods leave vacancies for several months, often reaching well beyond a year. This is especially problematic in lengthy cooling off periods required for recent uniformed Airmen – including maintainers, and in skills facing exponential commercial demand such as space engineering, cyber operations, software coding, and artificial intelligence. We cannot compete with the commercial sector on monetary incentives, but we can compete on matters of purpose – if we can get them in the door at the speed of relevance.

**Aircrew.** There is a national shortage of pilots and aircrew. A good economy and strong hiring by airlines makes aircrew retention a priority and directly affects our readiness. We have energized all facets of recruiting, production, seasoning, and retention.

We’re strengthening partnerships and creating incentives to get America’s youth flying again with the Civil Air Patrol, Junior ROTC, and university programs. Moreover, thanks to your resourcing support and innovations in processes and technology by Airmen, we produced 1,201 pilots last year. We aim to scale those improvements to 1,341 in the current year and, with timely and sufficient funding, 1,480 pilots in 2020 – a 23% annual increase over a two-year span. Once they’re flying, our new Talent Marketplace gives Airmen greater transparency on their assignment process, and we are reducing the number of year-long deployments to improve stability and reduce the burden on families.

**Training.** Our advances in aircrew production are in part due to adopting innovative solutions. Pilot Training Next is a program using augmented and virtual reality with increased simulations to train our crews. The initial classes have shown a capacity to not just train faster and more affordably, but with even better results.

However, as potential adversaries become more complex, so do range requirements. The current budget request funds 1.1 million peacetime flying hours, the maximum amount of sustainable training. Those hours work in tandem with investments in simulation and operational training — our ranges and airspace. The priority effort to rebuild Tyndall Air Force Base is an example of the importance of excellent airspace so critical to readiness.

Curriculum, technology and range advancements are equally critical to the future of our space crews. To ensure Airmen remain the best in the world at space, we've expanded the focus on contested operations by adding 36 days – a 50% increase in course length – to our initial space officer course. For experienced operators, we're pairing this increase with capstone events, including three major Space Flag exercises per year. These advanced training scenarios integrate and elevate warfighting capabilities across the force and, in the very near future, allied space operations.

**Safety.** A significant increase in training complexity and operational difficulty is inherent with great power competition. Despite this, we will not compromise the safety of our force.

Last year, the Air Force experienced an uncharacteristic increase in in-flight mishaps and fatalities for manned aircraft. We initiated several actions to bolster our mishap prevention programs, including additional safety training and operational pauses to discuss risk. Notably, our mishap rates are decreasing to historic averages.

We will continue to improve these programs over the next fiscal year while working closely with our joint teammates and the newly created National Commission on Military Aviation Safety.

**Personal Readiness.** A well-organized, available, trained, and safe fighting force is only as ready as the quality of life and infrastructure it relies upon every day.

This begins with matters of trust. Should an adherence to principles and values breaks down, especially in the case of sexual assault, the consequences ripple beyond the crime. It is an affront to the dignity and respect rightfully expected by every Airmen and the nation they serve. We are relentlessly pursuing the moral standard and look forward to teaming on solutions from the congressionally requested Pentagon Task Force on Sexual Assault.

Beyond the intangibles of trust, the most important readiness infrastructure that we can guarantee our Airmen and families is not a spacecraft or an aircraft – it is a home. Reversing the unacceptable decline in base housing standards is job #1 in this regard. We intend to return the priority to Airmen and authority to Commanders, while being unapologetic in our expectations of contracted services. We welcome your continued partnership in this endeavor.

Finally, we have applied lessons from U.S. Special Operations Command's Preservation of the Force and Family (POTFF) program to initiate a test initiative at four installations one year ago. The construct of mental, physical, and spiritual fitness experts integrating into units has the potential to strengthen personal resiliency – via increased trust from regular access – so critical to force readiness. More broadly, careful implementation of the Defense Health Agency model is a central variable in this area. We are working in partnership with our Joint teammates and DHA to ensure Airmen and family healthcare remains responsive to a force in demand.

## **COST-EFFECTIVE MAINTENANCE AND LOGISTICS**

The next element of restoring the readiness of the force is weapons system sustainment – the parts, supply, and equipment – to make sure our aircraft are ready to fight tonight. This budget includes \$16.4 billion in weapon system sustainment to support our home and deployed fleets.

We are striving to achieve 80% Mission Capable Rates in our F-16, F-22, and F-35 fleets by the end of this fiscal year. Our concern remains with the F-22 fleet. It is currently at risk of falling short of that goal due to the natural disaster and associated resourcing shortfalls on Tyndall Air Force Base. More broadly, maintaining old fleets with a high operating tempo and new maintainers is among the most challenging aspects of restoring a ready force.

**Sustainment Review.** Teams of Airmen have conducted detailed sustainment reviews over the past year intended to overcome these challenges. They identified multiple process reforms to ensure our fleets are ready to meet Combatant Commander requirements. Focus areas to achieve those results include supply chain, engineering management, fleet management, and technology that capitalizes on data analysis for vast improvements to performance and readiness.

**Conditions Based Maintenance.** The sustainment review further highlighted the increased lethality derived from conditions based maintenance – the use of analytical tools and monitoring sensors – to predict parts failures. Initial tests on E-3 and C-5 aircraft demonstrated the potential to reduce up to 30% of unscheduled maintenance. We are scaling this to the B-1 next, followed by all aircraft as rapidly as possible.

**Depots.** We have also found efficiencies in our depots. Our Oklahoma Depot is now completing major repairs on our KC-135 fleet 40% faster and at half the cost of recent industry contract proposals. Last year, we established the Rapid Sustainment Office to further improve readiness and drive down the cost of repairs by using advanced manufacturing technologies. Through partnerships with universities and industry, this office is identifying emerging technologies that can reduce the cost of maintaining our weapon systems.

## MODERNIZATION

Today's modernization is tomorrow's readiness. The Air Force we need to meet the requirements of the National Defense Strategy is 386 operational squadrons, much larger and much more technologically advanced than the Air Force we have today. We remain focused on joint concept-driven, threat-informed and expedient approaches to capability development. Congressionally granted authorities to build and field technology faster and smarter are enabling us to increase readiness ahead of urgent calls from Combatant Commanders.

**Nuclear Forces.** Our nuclear force is foremost among our modernization priorities to ensure readiness. The Air Force provides two-thirds of our nation's nuclear triad and 75% of our nuclear command, control, and communications capability. This remains the ultimate guarantor of American, allied, and partner security. It underpins America's military power and diplomacy worldwide.

Notably, our adversaries continue to modernize and expand their nuclear weapons and delivery systems. In response, the National Defense Strategy, Nuclear Posture Review, and National Defense Strategy Commission all reaffirm America's need for a modernized triad. Our investments in the Ground-Based Strategic Deterrent, Long Range Standoff Weapon, B-21, and nuclear command and control systems pair with B-52 and B-2 modernization efforts to ensure a safe, secure, and credible deterrent.

**Multi-domain Operations.** The future fight requires mastery of multi-domain operations to integrate joint and coalition forces for unmatched lethality. Expanded investments for defensible space are central and reach \$14 billion in this budget – a 17% increase over the previous year – focused on access and persistence in that pivotal domain. Additionally, sensors and shooters regardless of platform must reliably and rapidly connect, share, and learn, simultaneously, across all domains. The Advanced Battle Management System is one key component of that future. Beyond our procurement programs, we aim to invest \$1.5 billion to test and prototype game-changing technologies that will grant us warfighting advantages.

**Faster and Smarter.** Modernization efforts extend beyond specific programs and into broader digital age reforms. An intense focus on fast but fair competition has saved over \$15 billion dollars with the National Security Space Launch, Global Positioning Satellite III, the UH-1N helicopter replacement, and the T-X jet trainer. Critically, we are no longer sacrificing the intellectual property, data, and software rights needed to set the pace.

Our innovation incubator – AFWERX – has built commercial-facing centers in three major cities (Austin, Washington D.C., and Las Vegas) while cultivating a series of fusion challenges and idea factories we call “Spark Cells” across the force. These are connecting Airmen with solutions to pressing problems. Acquisition and Contracting teams are removing barriers to small businesses via new methods that culminated in a “Pitch Day” in New York City – we awarded contracts to 51 companies in one day. That model will expand across the force.

Large programs must also find faster and smarter ways to field systems if we are to maintain advantage against innovating great powers. Last Spring we set an aggressive goal of stripping 100 years of unnecessary schedule from our largest program plans within one year. Three contributing factors are making us faster in this regard; prototyping, tailored acquisition strategies, and agile software development. The results are powerful. Airmen have saved over 92 years – meaning force capability vital to readiness is being delivered a total of 92 years faster – and are closing in on that 100 year milestone.

## MAINTAINING THE PROGRESS

With the help of Congressional funding and acquisition authorities, we are more ready for major combat operations today than we were two years ago. While our shared progress for national security has been substantial, so too is the work that remains ahead of us

Military readiness is never static in such a demanding era. Each year -- truly each month -- of fragile progress builds on the previous. Conversely, delays compound exponentially in their lasting impacts. It is for this reason that **regular fiscal order remains the most impactful variable to prevent – or enable – the erosion of readiness.** We request your support to avoid the return of self-inflicted erosion while competitors continue to accelerate their pace. The Air Force Fiscal Year 2020 submission, request for reprogramming, and supplemental for disaster relief combine for momentum to restore a ready force.

On behalf of the over 685,000 active guard, reserve, and civilian Airmen and their selfless families, thank you for your continued leadership and partnership in defense of this great nation.

**GENERAL STEPHEN W. "SEVE" WILSON**

Gen. Stephen W. "Seve" Wilson is Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C. As Vice Chief, he presides over the Air Staff and serves as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Requirements Oversight Council and Deputy Advisory Working Group. He assists the Chief of Staff with organizing, training, and equipping of 660,000 active-duty, Guard, Reserve and civilian forces serving in the United States and overseas.

Gen. Wilson received his commission from Texas A&M University in 1981. He's had multiple flying tours, and led bomber; intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance; mobility; aeromedical evacuation; and airborne command and control operations supporting Iraqi Freedom, Enduring Freedom and Combined Joint Task Force-Horn of Africa. Gen. Wilson has also held numerous command positions, including the Joint Functional Component Commander for Global Strike and Air Force Global Strike Command. Gen. Wilson is a command pilot with more than 4,500 flying hours and 680 combat hours. Prior to his current assignment, the general was Deputy Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, Offutt AFB, Nebraska.

**EDUCATION**

1981 Bachelor of Science, Aerospace Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station

1985 Squadron Officer School, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

1989 Master of Science degree, Engineering Management, South Dakota School of Mines & Technology

1993 Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

1997 U.S. Air Force Weapons School, Nellis AFB, Nev.

2000 Master's degree in strategic studies, Air War College, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

2005 Leadership for a Democratic Society, Federal Executive Institute, Charlottesville, Va.

2007 Joint Force Air Component Commander Course, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

2009 Joint Flag Officer Warfighting Course, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

2010 Leadership Decision Making Program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

2013 Pinnacle Course, National Defense University, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C.

**ASSIGNMENTS**

1. June 1981 - May 1982, student, undergraduate pilot training, Laughlin AFB, Texas

2. May 1982 - September 1986, T-38 Instructor Pilot, evaluator pilot and flight commander, 86th Flying Training Squadron, Laughlin AFB, Texas

3. September 1986 - May 1987, B-1 Student, 338th Combat Training Squadron, Dyess AFB, Texas

4. May 1987 - July 1991, B-1 Instructor Pilot and Flight Commander, 77th Bomb Squadron, Ellsworth AFB, S.D.

5. July 1991 - July 1992, Chief of Weapons and Tactics, 28th Operations Support Squadron, Ellsworth AFB, S.D.

6. July 1992 - July 1993, Student, Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

7. July 1993 - September 1995, Joint Staff Officer, Doctrine, Concepts and Initiatives Division, Plans and Policy (J5), Headquarters U.S. European Command, Stuttgart, Germany

8. September 1995 - June 1997, Chief of Safety, 28th Bomb Wing, later, operations officer, 37th Bomb Squadron, Ellsworth AFB, S.D.

9. June 1997 - June 1999, Commander, B-1 Division, and Instructor Pilot, Weapons Instructor Course, USAF Weapons School, Ellsworth AFB, S.D.

10. August 1999 - June 2000, Student, Air War College, Maxwell AFB, Ala.

11. June 2000 - June 2002, Deputy Commander, 366th Operations Group, Mountain Home AFB, Idaho



12. July 2002 - March 2004, Commander, 608th Air Operations Group, Barksdale AFB, La.
13. March 2004 - June 2006, Commander, 14th Flying Training Wing, Columbus AFB, Miss.
14. June 2006 - July 2007, Deputy Director of Air, Space and Information Operations (A2/3), Headquarters Air Education and Training Command, Randolph AFB, Texas
15. July 2007 - July 2009, Deputy Commander, Canadian North American Aerospace Defense Region, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada
16. July 2009 - July 2010, Commander, 379th Air Expeditionary Wing, Southwest Asia
17. July 2010 - June 2011, Director for Joint Integration, Directorate of Operational Capability Requirements, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Plans and Requirements, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.
18. June 2011 - October 2013, Commander, Eighth Air Force (Air Forces Strategic), Barksdale AFB, La., and Joint Functional Component Commander for Global Strike, U.S. Strategic Command, Offutt AFB, Neb.
19. October 2013 - July 2015, Commander, Air Force Global Strike Command, Barksdale AFB, La.
20. July 2015 - July 2016, Deputy Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, Offutt AFB, Neb.
21. July 2016 - present, Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

#### **SUMMARY OF JOINT ASSIGNMENTS**

1. July 1993 - September 1995, Joint Staff officer, Doctrine, Concepts and Initiatives Division, Plans and Policy (J5), Headquarters U.S. European Command, Stuttgart, Germany, as a major
2. July 2007 - July 2009, Deputy Commander, Canadian North American Aerospace Defense Region, Winnipeg, Manitoba, Canada, as a colonel and brigadier general
3. June 2011 - October 2013, Joint Functional Component Commander for Global Strike, U.S. Strategic Command, Offutt AFB, Neb., as a brigadier general and major general
4. July 2015 - July 2016, Deputy Commander, U.S. Strategic Command, Offutt, AFB, Neb., as a lieutenant general

#### **FLIGHT INFORMATION**

Rating: Command pilot  
 Flight hours: More than 4,600, and 680 combat hours  
 Aircraft flown: T-37, T-38, B-1 and B-52

#### **MAJOR AWARDS AND DECORATIONS**

Distinguished Service Medal with oak leaf cluster  
 Defense Superior Service Medal  
 Legion of Merit with oak leaf cluster  
 Bronze Star Medal with oak leaf cluster  
 Defense Meritorious Service Medal  
 Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters  
 Air Medal with oak leaf cluster  
 Aerial Achievement Medal  
 Air Force Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster

#### **EFFECTIVE DATES OF PROMOTION**

Second Lieutenant June 2, 1981  
 First Lieutenant June 2, 1983  
 Captain June 2, 1985  
 Major June 1, 1993  
 Lieutenant Colonel Jan. 1, 1997  
 Colonel June 1, 2002  
 Brigadier General Dec. 3, 2007  
 Major General Sept. 1, 2011  
 Lieutenant General Oct. 23, 2013  
 General July 22, 2016



---

---

**QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING**

MAY 9, 2019

---

---



## QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT. General McConville, I know Army readiness and modernization is at the top of your priority list. Your posture statement centers around improving the training of your soldiers and all 10 of the Army's top unfunded requests are tied to readiness. You and your team have initiatives to reduce "non-deployable" soldiers from 15 percent to 6 percent. In addition, your focus on collective training emphasizes high-intensity conflict, utilizing complex terrain, and under degraded environmental conditions.

1. As urbanization increases globally, could you discuss your efforts to focus the Army's ability to train in dense-urban terrain and subterranean operations?

2. From the platoon level through the battalion level at the Combat Training Centers (CTCs), are you currently able to meet all your training requirements? What gaps do you foresee for potential future conflicts?

General McCONVILLE. The Army places a high priority on training in dense urban terrain (DUT), including subterranean (SbT). Army Special Operations Forces (ARSOF) have standing training requirements for SbT. General Purpose Forces (GPF) units train in DUT as an environmental condition, with select GPF units conducting SbT training related to specific Operation Plans (OPLANs) and mission requirements (e.g., U.S. Indo-Pacific Command OPLAN). GPF units have access to training locations, to increase proficiency with DUT, including 35 Urban Assault Courses (UACs) located at 30 different Army installations, such as the Underground Training Facility (UTF) 50 at Ft. Hood, TX; the Asymmetric Warfare Group (AWG) urban training site at Ft. A.P. Hill, VA; the Muscatatuck Urban Training Center (MUTC) in Butlerville, IN; the tunnel system (repurposed trench complex) at Fort Bliss, TX; and the four tunnel/cave complexes and the large Ubungsdorf Military Operations on Urban Terrain (MOUT) site, both located at the Joint Multinational Readiness Center (JMRC) in Hohenfels, Germany. In addition to these fixed sites, the Army has three Mobile Training Teams (MTT) that conduct SbT operations. The Army is increasing DUT training infrastructure at our Combat Training Centers (CTCs) through specific military construction investment in multi-story buildings to expand existing large MOUT sites at both the National Training Center (NTC) and the Joint Readiness Training Center, as well as by funding a design effort for a large (approx. 1800 buildings) DUT facility at the NTC. Finally, the Army contributed to the Department of Defense classified report on subterranean training as requested in Senate Armed Services Committee Report 115-262, accompanying S. 2987, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2019.

Yes. Army Combat Training Centers (CTCs) are able to build on home station training to prepare units for current known operational requirements and for decisive action in major combat operations against contemporary threats. The CTCs constantly examine ways to prepare forces better. For example, CTCs have increased the use of enemy drones, jamming, chemical attacks, unmanned aerial system sorties, and indirect fire, and are planning to increase CTC capability to train forces in dense urban terrain (DUT). Army CTCs remain ready to adapt to specific requirements of any long-term contingency or named operation by providing mission rehearsal exercises for rotational forces. In the coming decade, the Army will fully develop operational concepts and training for multi-domain operations. The CTCs will need to replicate criminal organizations, civilians on the battlefield, DUT, and other complex terrain as parts of the operational environment (OE). These and other OE factors must be realistically replicated in CTC training, such as peer/near-peer opposing force, cyber, space, deception, electronic warfare, and artificial intelligence threats.

Mr. SCOTT. General Wilson, I have had several conversations with Air Force leaders about the Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) and the Advanced Battle Management System (ABMS). Now that the decision has been made to maintain the current fleet of JSTARS aircraft through 2034 while the Air Force transitions to ABMS, I am focused on the Air Force's Battle Management and Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR) enterprise. With consistent resourcing shortfalls, the Air Force and the Department of Defense must field capabilities that exceed the current Battle Management-ISR enterprise, while ensuring

the men and women at Robins Air Force Base receive all the assistance they need to make a seamless transition.

1. I have been assured that the ABMS mission will remain at Robins Air Force Base as JSTARS phases out. What is the Air Force's plan to begin MILCON for ABMS at Robins Air Force Base?

2. Regarding personnel numbers associated with ABMS, when can I expect a final determination on the number of employees, Airmen, and civilians, that will be assigned to conduct the ABMS mission?

General WILSON. The Advanced Battle Management System (ABMS) Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) Team is working diligently to complete their analysis and prepare their final report. Recently, the United States Air Force (USAF) determined a need to extend the AOA by several months to complete the analysis of a broader range of capabilities. Once the AOA is completed and assessed, the USAF will begin planning and programing for any future ABMS organizational construct required, including any required manpower and MILCON for units and locations within the ABMS Family of Systems (FOS). The AOA results, combined with data from the strategic basing process, inform USAF decisions on appropriate basing and support locations. The USAF envisions Advanced Battle Management (ABM) FOS elements at multiple locations, leveraging the infrastructure and talents resident in the Command and Control (C2), Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR), and Battle Management (BM) enterprise. Robins Air Force Base is and will continue to be a key part of this enterprise. The number of personnel assigned to the enterprise is likely to evolve over the next several years.

