HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON THE CURRENT READINESS OF THE U.S. FORCES

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 14, 2010

U.S. SENATE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS AND
MANAGEMENT SUPPORT,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:37 p.m. in room SD–562, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Evan Bayh (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Bayh, Udall, Burris, Inhofe, Chambliss, Thune, and Burr.

Committee staff member present: Leah C. Brewer, nominations and hearings clerk.

Majority staff members present: Peter K. Levine, general counsel; Jason W. Maroney, counsel; John H. Quirk V, professional staff member; and William K. Sutey, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: Adam J. Barker, professional staff member; David M. Morriss, minority counsel; and Lucian L. Niemeyer, professional staff member.

Staff assistants present: Christine G. Lang and Breon N. Wells.

Committee members' assistants present: Patrick Hayes, assistant to Senator Bayh; Jennifer Barrett, assistant to Senator Udall; Roosevelt Barfield, assistant to Senator Burris; and Jason Van Beek, assistant to Senator Thune.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR EVAN BAYH, CHAIRMAN

Senator BAYH. Good afternoon, everyone. The hearing will please come to order.

The purpose of today's hearing is to receive testimony on the current readiness of our forces with respect to deployed, deploying, and nondeployed units, and the Services' ability to meet combatant commanders' requirements and respond to unforeseen contingencies. We're all particularly interested in your assessment—I want to make sure it's still on, there—in your assessment of strategic risk resulting from the commitment of forces in Iraq and Afghanistan, as well as other areas around the globe. We are also interested in the status of unit reset activities, how you are all managing those vital readiness accounts, your areas of concern, and the impact and expected duration of reset actions on near- and mid-term readiness.

One of my concerns is that we have relied too much on supplemental funding to resource our reset activities. In order to restore

the readiness of our Armed Forces, it will be absolutely critical to fully fund reset several years beyond our withdrawal dates from Iraq and Afghanistan. I remain concerned that the requirements for combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan continue to consume readiness as fast as we can create it. I understand that high operational demand and tempo keeps the services off balance. But, we must strive to find new ways to restore readiness. While I understand the enemy we face gets a vote, we must improve the way we do business, as our current strategy is not sustainable and reduces our full spectrum of capabilities today and in the long run.

My biggest fear is that prolonged stress on our Armed Forces will break our strategic Reserve. We must increase the dwell time between deployments, not only for the men and women in uniform, of all—of our All-Volunteer Force, but for their families, who are critically important, as well.

In order to reduce risk to our National military strategy, we must continue to fully invest in our maintenance accounts to restore readiness. We cannot afford to merely man, train, and equip units "just in time" for deployment. We continue to have a significant difference in readiness between deployed and nondeployed forces. Nondeploying forces, along with our National Guard and Reserve units, continue to bear the burden of being billpayers for deploying units. We are very interested in hearing the services' goals, priorities, and investment plans for rebuilding the force, and when they expect readiness will begin to improve.

When we talk about supporting the troops, operation and maintenance accounts are where we must back up our talk with funding. These are the funds that train, house, and protect our Armed Forces with the food, water, ammunition, flying hours, streaming—steaming days and tank miles that need to accomplish their mission. At a time when readiness is under stress, we must do all that we can to protect these accounts from unreasonable cuts.

Gentlemen, I know you have prepared statements, which will be included in the record. In the interest of time, if you would please summarize, and then we'll have plenty of time for questions and discussions. If you could roughly keep it to about 7 minutes, give or take, with some flexibility there for things you think are particularly important, I think that'd be a good place to begin, and then we'll get into the questions and answers, and flesh out the statements, as need be.

I want to sincerely thank all of you for your dedicated service and your sacrifice to our Nation. I also want to thank you all, for making the time for attend our hearing this afternoon, and I look forward to your testimony.

I will now turn to my friend and colleague Senator Burr for his opening remarks, and want to thank him for his devotion to this committee and to the good citizens of the State of North Carolina.

Senator BURR. Thank you——

Senator BAYH. Senator Burr.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR RICHARD BURR

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral and Generals, welcome. We're delighted to have you here today.

And I commend the Chairman for calling this hearing as we continue to focus this committee's attention on the critical issue of the readiness of our combat units.

I also want to thank our witnesses for their dedication, for their service. I note that, despite 8 years of sustained combat operations, morale remains high, recruiting remains strong, retention is excellent, and our units, more importantly, continue to accomplish their mission. These are testaments to the leadership of our panelists, and their service.

Mr. Chairman, this is the third year of hearings on current unit readiness. During this time, we've achieved success in Iraq, meeting our goal of an orderly drawdown and transfer of security responsibilities to a democratically elected government of Iraq. The drawdown in Iraq has allowed us to surge forces and resources in Afghanistan in order to establish stability in a country that, for years, served as a training ground for terrorists. By this August, we plan to reduce U.S. force levels in Iraq to 50,000. In Afghanistan, we're surging 30,000 troops over the same period of time. The Marine Corps has completed its withdrawal from Iraq and is now deploying roughly 8,000 of the 30,000 additional troops to support increased combat operations in Afghanistan, bringing the Corps' troop level in there to about 19,400. This combined logistical movement is the largest effort since World War II.

I'd like to hear from each of our witnesses today how this rapid redeployment of forces impacts personnel and equipment readiness, particularly our readiness of nondeployed units at home.

What concerns me is our ability to respond to the next challenge; in other words, our strategic depth. Our Nation expects that our fighting force in all services has been the best equipped and trained to provide to our most precious resources, the young men and women who choose freely to serve in our military. And we need to—for them to be consistently ready—we need to look further than those fateful days of September 11, when attacks here, on our Nation, called for an immediate and decisive response to the horrible attacks of New York and Washington.

No better demonstration of what this country expects, in terms of strategic Reserve, can be found than the understanding of what we've been asked to do in the 82nd Airborne, out of Fort Bragg. Major elements of the division has recently returned from a year in Afghanistan, yet on January 14th, 2010, the 82nd Airborne was called upon by the President, with no prior notice, to deploy to Haiti to provide humanitarian assistance, security, and disaster relief. Within days, over 3,000 personnel of the 2nd Brigade Combat Team, a decorated unit with two rotations in Afghanistan, began providing manpower and security to about 15 food distribution sites around Port- au-Prince, Haiti, as well as running the international airport. And today major elements of the 2nd Brigade Combat Team still remain in Haiti.

This is not only an Army response. The Marine Corps deployed the 22nd Marine Expeditionary Unit, on January 13 from Camp Lejeune, to support relief operations with a network of sea-based logistics and land-based support, with as many as 1100 marines and sailors ashore, to conduct immediate aid efforts.

The Navy also contributed invaluable medical assistance offshore by an unnoticed deployment of the hospital ship, the Comfort, as well as using the medical treatment facilities on board the aircraft carrier U.S.S. Carl Vinson.

The Air Force supplied critical strategic airlift and air traffic controllers to maintain an essential flow of resources temporarily operating Haiti's main airport at Port-au-Prince.

While our Armed Forces responded magnificently to the disaster in Haiti, I'm concerned that we have our premier combat units still engaged there and not back in the States with their families. This means less time to prepare for their next duty.

In order for our combat forces to be ready to respond to future challenges, our support of these efforts to restore their readiness should be constant and vigilant. This will be tougher to accomplish in a budget climate of soaring deficits and economic hardships. It may be easier to claim victory in Afghanistan and then start drawing down budgets for the Department of Defense. This would be the same mistake we've made in the past. The best equipment and proper training needs—need to be in place before our Nation ask for further sacrifice. As such, we should not continue to accept risk across the full spectrum of operations.

I look forward to hearing our witnesses lay out their plans to reset forces, both in the active and Reserve.

Mr. Chairman, I thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Burr follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator BAYH. Thank you, Senator Burr, for your statement and for your service on the committee. I only

wish that every member of the United States Senate could have the kind of cooperative relationship that the two of us have been fortunate enough to enjoy. So, it's been good working with you.

And, gentlemen, just one personal note, since is the last time I'll be chairing this subcommittee hearing. It is my hope that our working together has been rigorous but not painful, because we're all on the same team, and I'm very grateful to each and every one of you for your service to our country. I believe that very strongly, as do the 6 and a half million people of my State.

General Chiarelli, why don't we begin with you.

STATEMENT OF GEN PETER W. CHIARELLI, USA, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF

General CHIARELLI. Chairman Bayh, Ranking Member Burr, I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today to discuss the readiness the U.S. Army. I've submitted a statement for the record, and I look forward to answering your questions at the conclusion of my opening remarks.

As you are all aware, these are challenging times for our Nation's military. Still, our deployed forces represent the best-manned, -equipped, -trained, and -led in the history of our Army. I'm incredibly proud of all they've accomplished in Iraq and Afghanistan and around the world.

America's Army remains a resilient, professional force dedicated to defending the homeland and defeating our enemies. However, 8-plus years of war continues to strain our soldiers, our civilians, and

their families, as well as our ability to build trained and ready forces and respond to unforeseen contingencies. Ultimately, this impacts the overall readiness of our force. Readiness is a reflection of the total number of deployed or deployable soldiers, time to train, and availability to materiel resources. We made progress over the last year in mitigating some of the negative effects of the consistently high demand for forces. If demand continues to come down, as forecasted, and budgetary expectations remains consistent, we should be able to restore our operational depth by fiscal year 2012.

That said, this prediction is based upon a number of factors, not the least of which is the projected drawdown of forces in Iraq. We all recognize we live in an uncertain world and there is always the possibility that circumstances may change unexpectedly and dramatically. In any event, we will work very close with Congress and with the Department of Defense to make necessary adjustments. In the meantime, we must continue to work together to ensure all soldiers, from both our Active and Reserve components, and their families, are properly cared for and have the training, equipment, and resources they need to accomplish their mission, now and into the future.

Mr. Chairman, Mr. Ranking Member, I thank you again for your continued generous support and demonstrated commitment to the outstanding men and women of the United States Army, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Chiarelli follows:]

Senator BAYH. General Amos, why don't we proceed with you.

Thank you General Chiarelli.

STATEMENT OF GEN. JAMES F. AMOS, USMC, ASSISTANT COMMANDANT, U.S. MARINE CORPS

General AMOS. Thank you, sir.

Chairman Bayh, Representative Burr, distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to report on the readiness of your United States Marine Corps. On behalf of the more than 242,000 Active and Reserve marines and their families, I'd like extend my appreciation for the sustained support Congress has faithfully provided its Corps.

As we begin this hearing, I would like to highlight a few points from my written statement.

Within the CENTCOM theater of operations, we have successfully completed a responsible drawdown of marines in Iraq. After 7 straight years of sustained combat operations and nation-building, our work in Iraq's Anbar Province is done. With the exception of our eight training teams and the support to higher headquarters staff, 100 percent of our marines and 100 percent of their equipment have left Iraq.

As we sit in this hearing room today, more than 31,000 marines remain deployed across the globe, supporting oversees contingency operations, security cooperation activities and exercises. Specifically, your Corps has reoriented its principal efforts towards Afghanistan. To date, we have 20,525 marines and sailors on the ground in Afghanistan. We will close the remainder of this surge force by the end of this month.

All of our forward-deployed units were manned, trained, and equipped to accomplish their assigned missions. These units continue to report the highest levels of readiness for those missions. For the past 8 years, we have been fully engaged in winning in combat operations as part of this generational struggle against global extremism. As I testified last year before this subcommittee, this sustained effort in performance does not come without cost to the institution, to our equipment, and to our strategic programs, and more importantly, or most importantly, to our marines and their families.

Equipment readiness of our nondeployed units is of great concern to our senior leadership. We have taxed our home-station units, as the billpayer, to ensure that marines in Afghanistan in our Marine Expeditionary Units have everything that they need. As a result, the majority of our nondeployed forces are reporting degraded materiel readiness levels. This degraded state of readiness within our nondeployed forces presents risk to our ability to respond rapidly to other unexpected contingencies around the globe.

The tempo of operations in the harsh environments that we have been operating in since 2003 have accelerated the wear and tear on our equipment. Necessarily, the diversion of equipment in theater from Iraq to Afghanistan has delayed reset actions at our logistics depots within the United States. Our current estimate of the cost of reset for the Marine Corps is $8 billion. Additionally, validating the lessons learned from 8 years of combat has necessitated that we update and approve the way we equip our units. The cost for these changes to our equipment sets is estimated to be an additional $5 billion. Money to reset and rebuild the Marine Corps will be required for several years after the end of the war. I ask for your continued support for that continued funding as we rebuild our Nation's Corps. With your steadfast support, we will succeed in current operations, take care of our marines and their families, and reset and modernize our equipment, and train the marine air/ground task forces for the challenges of the future. We continue to stand ready as the Nation's expeditionary force in readiness.

I thank you, each of you for your faithfulness to our Nation, and I request that my written testimony be accepted for the record, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Amos follows:]

Senator BAYH. Without objection, all the written testimony will be accepted into the record.

General Amos, thank you very much.

Admiral Greenert?

Oh, and by the way, let me note the presence of Senator Burris.

Thank you for your devotion to the committee, and your attention here today.

Admiral Greenert.

STATEMENT OF ADM JONATHAN W. GREENERT, USN, VICE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, U.S. NAVY

Admiral GREENERT. Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman Bayh, Senator Burr, distinguished members of the Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee, it's my honor to appear before you to testify on the readiness of our Navy.

Mr. Chairman, I have a brief opening statement, and, as you said, please accept my statement—full statement for the record.

I'd like to make three points, if I may. My first point addresses our increase in our fiscal year 2011 base budget O&M request. During the past 9 years, sustaining the readiness of our force in a high-demand operational environment has been aided by overseas contingency operation funds or similar supplemental funding. Despite this, both the high operational tempo and the reduced turnaround ratio continue to increase risk to fleet readiness, force structure, and personnel.

As we look to the future, we have to balance global demand with the global management of our forces, and we should transition a supplemental resource dependency toward a baseline budget that provides the level of resources and resource support needed to meet an operational level that we refer to now as "the new normal." To do this, we have increased our base budget O&M request by about 6 percent; that's $3 and a half billion, when compared to last year. This request is designed to meet our global obligations, properly sustain ships, aircraft, and expeditionary equipment to reach the end of their expected service lives, fund enduring flying readiness requirements, and fund price increases—notably, fuel. We request the support of Congress to fully fund the O&M request in the base budget and to fund contingency operations and maintenance in the oversees contingency operations funding. This level of funding request, appropriately, represents our new normal.

My second point addresses reset. Navy ships and aircraft are capital-intensive forces procured to last for decades. Scheduled maintenance of our force structure, training and certification of our crews between deployments, is a key element in Navy's reset of the force. This interdeployment, maintenance, and training, we refer to as "reset in stride." It helps assure timely rotational deployment of our forces, ensures capability and capacity for future missions, and enables forces to surge for operations such as Operation Unified Response in Haiti. Reset translates into decades of readiness for each ship and aircraft, and it's a good return on investment. We rely on OCO, if you will, to fund the requisite overseas contingencies operations and, in part, to reset in stride.

My third and final point addresses family readiness programs. We remain committed to the professional and personal development of our sailors, our Navy civilians, and the support to their families. Our budget request will enhance support to our sailors and their families, including those who are wounded, ill, and injured. Our Navy Child and Youth Programs provide high quality educational and recreational programs for our children. We are leveraging military construction, Recovery Act funding, commercial contracts, and military-certified in-home care expansion to increase our childcare spaces and to meet our goal for placing children under care.

I request your strong support for our fiscal year 2011 readiness budget request and our identified priorities.

Thank you very much for your unwavering support to our sailors, civilians, and families, and for all that you do to make our Navy effective and an enduring global force for good.

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

[The prepared statement of Admiral Greenert follows:]

Senator BAYH. Thank you, Admiral, for your leadership.

General Chandler.

STATEMENT OF GEN. CARROL H. CHANDLER, USAF, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

General CHANDLER. Mr. Chairman, Senator Burr—ah, here we go—Mr. Chairman, Senator Burr, distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to represent your United States Air Force to the committee today. I, like the rest of my joint teammates, are proud to be here to represent our services.

Let me begin by saying that your 680,000-strong U.S. Air Force—Active Duty, Guard, Reserve, and civilians—is ready to execute its mission. Our readiness is demonstrated every day as we serve alongside our joint and coalition partners in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world. On any given day, there are approximately 40,000 deployed airmen providing close air support, tactile and strategic airlift, intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, critical medical care, and combat search and rescue, along with combat and combat support functions. Of these 40,000, there are approximately 5,300 airmen performing joint expeditionary taskings, providing combat and combat support functions within the Army and the United States Marine Corps in Afghanistan and Iraq.

In addition to our deployed presence, more than 131,000 airmen are performing deployed-in-place missions, supporting combatant commanders. These airmen are operating remotely-piloted vehicles, maintaining satellite constellations, conducting inter-theater airlift, and maintaining our nuclear deterrence posture. Additionally, the Air Force continues to provide defense for the homeland as the total-force effort, with the active Duty, Guard, and Reserve personnel, from locations across the United States.

Stabilizing our end strength is a critical part of maintaining personnel readiness. We're moving toward a force with approximately 332,000 Active Duty airmen, approximately 71,000 Reserve airmen, and approximately 107,000 Air National Guard personnel.

The Air Force met its goals for new accessions in retaining our current experience in nearly every area. Our retention rates are the highest that they've been in 15 years and generally exceeding our goals by about 20 percent. Only health professionals fail to meet their retention in recruiting goals, and efforts are underway to mitigate these shortfalls through bonuses.

Selective retention bonuses remain our most effective retention tool. These bonuses, along with critical-skills retentions bonuses for officers, are successfully targeting 91 enlisted and 3 officer specialties.

Last June, the Air Force initiated the Year of the Air Force Family. More than half way through this effort, we're on course to eliminate known childcare deficit in our child development centers by 2012. We're increasing spouse employment referral assistance and adding 54 school liaison officers to assist school transitions for almost 175,000 school-aged Air Force dependents. We're improving our exceptional family member program, which supports more than 15,000 airmen with special-needs family members. And we're also

increasing the quality of programs provided for deployment and reintegration support for our airmen and their families.

Our aircraft are well maintained and ready. And although our aircraft inventory is seeing extensive use in contingency operations, the fleet's average age is continuing to increase, the dedicated work and professionalism of our airmen ensure that we're ready.

Our combat Air Force aircraft continue to provide global power when and where required. And our airlift fleet continues to provide strategic airlift, as well as theater and direct-support airlift missions, moving a wide variety of equipment and personnel and supplies.

The recent release of the KC–X request for proposal begins the process of recapitalizing our aerial refueling aircraft. The planned acquisition of 179 KC–X aircraft will help provide refueling capability for decades to come.

The Nation's nuclear aircraft and ICBMs remain the highest priority for our service. Of all the missions the Air Force accomplishes every day, none is more critical than providing strategic deterrence. Intercontinental ballistic missile crews sit nuclear alert every day, and nuclear-capable fighter and bomber crews and their weapons systems contribute to our deterrence posture.

Again, Mr. Chairman, the Air Force will continue to provide our best military advice and stewardship, delivering global vigilance, reach, and power for America. We thank you for your continued support for the United States Air Force, and particularly for our airmen and their families. I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Chandler follows:]

Senator BAYH. Thank you, General Chandler.

I note the presence of Senator Chambliss.

Saxby, thank you. Appreciate your service on this subcommittee, and your leadership.

We're going to have to—how long do we have per round? About 7 minutes per round. So, I'll try and be brief, and then turn to Senator Burr, and we'll then proceed in order of arrival at the subcommittee hearing.

Admiral Greenert, let me begin with you. First, a little background, then I'll get to my question.

Last year, the Chief of Naval Operations submitted only two unfunded priorities—ship and aircraft depot maintenance—to the amount of about $395 million. This committee, on both sides of the aisle, supported that request. Unfortunately, as you know, those amounts were not supported by the Appropriations Committees. As a result, a 1-year backlog of critical maintenance was not executed and deferred, which places unnecessary risk on fleet readiness, reduces the service life of the fleet, drives up long-term sustainment costs, and increases strategic risk for the Nation. While I am encouraged that the fiscal year 2011 budget request, including OCO, resources the ship maintenance to 99 percent of the requirement, we still have the 1-year backlog to confront. And, to the Navy's credit, once again you have submitted only three unfunded priorities for ship and aircraft depot maintenance and spare parts.

So, my questions, Admiral, are, first, What was the impact of not getting the $395 million in fiscal year 2010? What happens if we

do not support your unfunded maintenance priorities again in this fiscal year? And what is the risk and impact to readiness?

Admiral GREENERT. Senator, thank you for the question. The most difficult portion of dealing with the shortfall in the year of execution is, frankly, determining where you have to mitigate that lack of funding, if you will. What we've determined—in the past, we used to say—we used to take the ploy that surface ship maintenance, being a predominantly privately contracted entity, if you will, was where we would mitigate that shortfall. But, you also hit the nail on the head when you said "mean expected service life for our ships." That is a primary concern of ours.

Without the additional funds, and to mitigate $395 million in unfunded requirements, on top of a growing requirement that we have in fiscal year '10 of about $450 million in Central Command operations due to the shift from OIF to OEF, on top of $250 million in fuel price increases, and on top of another $150 million in requests for forces, which are emergent requests from our combatant commanders, we find that, among our operating accounts, we have to take actions, such as to defer some port visits, defer some exercises, reduce flying for those that are nondeployed or for airwings that return. But, what I'd like to assure you of is that our——one of our focuses is to make sure that our ships meet their expected service life.

So, we are honing the line as much as feasible on ship maintenance. However, when we don't receive the unfunded priority list, that puts more pressure on that. It can be debilitating as it rolls over into the next year.

The risk is the long-term health of the ships. It tends to manifest itself, sometimes, in that year, but, too often, later down the road, when we need to reset our forces.

So, in summary, it really becomes a matter of mitigating among the operating accounts. That's the problem that we have to deal with, sir.

Senator BAYH. Admiral, what does 2011's unfunded maintenance request buy back?

Admiral GREENERT. 2011's maintenance request will—for ships—excuse me—for aircraft spares, there's $423 million for that. We've found that we have introduced some type model series aircraft, the MV–22. It has been in service for some time, but as we get to understand the needs, that cost has gone up and we're using more spares. We're using the aircraft more. The increased operations in Central Command, in our Hornets, in our helicopters, and in some of our P–3s, has added to an increased use of spares, so that kind of describes that piece.

$75 million is for aircraft depot maintenance, and that would buy down our backlog of airframes and engines to no more than 1 year's backlog, which we find to be a risk that we can deal with without too much——

Senator BAYH. And do you have the capacity to execute, here, if your requests are authorized and appropriated?

Admiral GREENERT. We do have the capacity to execute. Yes, sir.

Lastly, $35 million is——

Senator BAYH. Make sure the Appropriations Committee has the benefit of your testimony here today. Hopefully, they'll——

Admiral GREENERT. I will do that, sir, you can be sure of it.

Senator BAYH.—make sure.

Let's see. We don't have the light system in effect here today, Pat. Someone going to let me know when my 7 minutes is up? I don't want to have a mini-filibuster here.

This question is for all the witnesses. Are we budgeting to restore readiness in fiscal year and the years beyond? And specifically, when can we expect to reach our dwell-time goals and to increase or restore the restoration of our strategic depth? Anybody want to take a stab at that one? Any volunteers from the committee?

General Chiarelli? You're a brave man, General.

General CHIARELLI. Senator, we expect to reach our dwell goals in most military occupational specialties. And I talk in individual dwell goals, where an individual will see he is—he or she is going to be home for 2 years in 2012. But, I think it's important to note that, although you'll—in 2012, you will be in a position where you will have 2 years of dwell, you really don't have the dwell until you have the dwell. And it is like Ranking Member Burr talked about when he talked about the 82nd. The 82nd was supposed to be home for 2 years, but took a detour down to Haiti. So, that creates issues, when we see these unforecasted contingencies.

And the second part of the question, Senator?

Senator BAYH. I think that pretty adequately covers it.

General CHIARELLI. Okay.

Senator BAYH. Let me follow up, though, with you on something else, if I can shift gears a little bit, General. As you know, last week DOD sent Congress a reprogramming request for fiscal year 2010. Included in that request was a $573-million reduction in the $1.3-billion Humvee procurement funding Congress approved for the Army. Can you confirm that the Army plans to buy new Humvees with the remaining $770 million?

General CHIARELLI. We have—we plan to buy 2,662 additional Humvees. We have reached our acquisition objective for Humvees—in fact, gone over it—and will begin a recap program for other Humvee requirements.

Senator BAYH. That's about $560 million for recapitalization, I think.

General CHIARELLI. Believe so.

Senator BAYH. Can you explain the difference—Humvee recap programs and the number of each type of vehicle you intend to recap, and the cost per vehicle for each?

General CHIARELLI. Currently, we are recapping 5,000—just over 5,000—5,046 unarmored Humvees at about $55,000 per vehicle, and 4,270 uparmored Humvees in fiscal year 2011, at a cost of $105- to $130,000 apiece, depending on the Humvee.

Senator BAYH. Thank you very much, General.

My time is expired in this round, and I will now turn to my colleague Senator Burr.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Chiarelli and General Amos, both, given the surge of 30,000 forces that are currently being deployed to Afghanistan, do you have the right type of equipment in sufficient quantities to fully equip the surged forces for the mission in Afghanistan?

Let me go to you first, General Chiarelli.

General CHIARELLI. We do. As the MRAP ATVs arrive in Afghanistan, it will not be too long before, I believe, we'll be able to get everybody who can be out of them, out of the uparmored Humvee and into MRAP ATV. But, we have had great success in getting equipment into Afghanistan, thanks to the great work of 3rd Army as they took equipment coming out of Iraq, ran it through maintenance, and we were able to get that equipment into Afghanistan. And, in fact, we have equipment in Afghanistan ahead of forces right now.

Senator BURR. General Amos?

General AMOS. Senator, we do. We have everything we need in Afghanistan. There's a little bit flowing in, but not much. The last time I checked, we had about 2 percent left to flow in for that 19,400 marine and sailor force that you talked about in your opening statement. We are good, in Afghanistan. Of note, though, about 42 percent of the equipment that ended up fleshing out—it's a total of about 75,000, what we call, principal end items—now, that doesn't mean 75,000 vehicles, but a vehicle is a principal end item; it could be a radio that's a principal end item—but 75,000 principal end items to flesh out and get that command the equipment that it needs in Afghanistan. About 40 percent of that came from Iraq.

So, I think the key piece is—the answer is yes, we do. And they are fully equipped. They are reporting the highest levels of readiness in Afghanistan. So, our young men and women that are forward deployed have got everything that they need. And it works, and it's up. But, to get that, we ended up taking equipment that we had planned on—this responsible drawdown that I referred to in my opening statement. We've been going through there, for the last year in Iraq, to get ourselves out, get positioned in Kuwait, get it on ships, and get it back to Albany, and get it back to Barstow, to depots. Forty-two percent of that gear, or 40 percent of it, is not going to make it back this year. And it's probably not going to make it back next year. And so, that's the kind of strain on the force, but we have everything that we need over there, Senator. I—you can rest assured of that.

Senator BURR. Thank you. Thank you, General.

Admiral, your written testimony, you said, and I quote, "The cost to operate and maintain our fleet has outpaced inflation by almost 2 percent each year. The need to balance between future fleet readiness and current readiness for the operational requirements has resulted in risk." In what areas of readiness are we at risk?

Admiral GREENERT. My concern, readiness at risk, is in surface ship maintenance, predominantly, to be most specific. We have to do a few things. One, we have to make sure we understand the requirement to make sure that when a ship goes in for long-term maintenance, we know what needs to get done in order to assure that it will reach its expected service life. Two, then we have to fund it to that level and ensure that that gets executed. And then, three, in the operations—when the ship is operating, we need to understand the impact of what the additional—or the—we're riding them pretty hard—and understand that impact, roll that into that next maintenance package. And that's what I called "reset in stride." We have to keep up with that, Senator.

Senator BURR. In—is the risk reflected, in the underfunding of certain readiness activities, in the fiscal year 2011 base budget, or is it overseas contingencies operations requests?

Admiral GREENERT. The risk is—we have—we are at 99 percent of our known maintenance requirement in our fiscal year 2011. So, we have—that's not much risk. That 1 percent is manageable.

My concern is carryover from the fiscal year 2010 execution, and I described some of that risk, at a previous question. We have unexecuted shortfall—I'm sorry—shortfalls in the year of execution. And, to your point, if we do not receive the OCO request, then we are operating these ships in, you know, contingency manner, and that's taking away from their service life. That's risk we'll carry forward.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Admiral.

General Chiarelli, as I stated in my opening statement, I'm concerned about the long-term cost of resetting the resources of the Army units, that they may supported amidst other Federal budget decisions we still need to make in the next 2 years. You stated, in our readiness hearings last year, and I quote, "The Army expects our reset requirements will be in the range of 13- to 14 billion per year, as long as we have forces deployed in for 2 to 3 years thereafter to ensure readiness for the future." Is that number still an accurate number? And—or would you like the opportunity to update it in any way?

General CHIARELLI. If I look forward to the next 3 years, we're looking at anywhere between 30 billion and 36 billion, total, for reset. For '10 and '11, our numbers are almost identical—close to $11 billion in each year, and that includes procurement money. But, at that——

Senator BURR. That's in your budget request?

General CHIARELLI. That is in the OCO request. It is, sir. And we expect—and that is in 2011, too, just—almost identical.

Senator BURR. And does that amount include the cost required to restore pre-positioned equipment?

General CHIARELLI. It does not, I believe, include that cost.

Senator BURR. Okay. Again, in your written testimony you state that, "In order to restore the Army's full operational depth by fiscal year 2012, the Reserve component—that is, our national—that's our National Guard and Reserve Forces—must continue a transition from a Strategic Reserve to an operational force, thus allowing the Army recurrent, assured, and predictable access to the Reserve components to meet operational requirements." How would you characterize the availability of equipment and resources for nondeployed Guard units, as compared to nondeployed Active Duty units?

General CHIARELLI. Active-component units are reaching an equipment level of about 80 percent, and National Guard units, in all equipment, 75 percent. However, the critical dual-use equipment is at 83 percent, and expected to make it to 87 percent, here, in the next 6 months.

Senator BURR. General Chandler, if I could turn to with the same question, relative to the nondeployed Active Duty force, versus the Guard and Reserve nondeployed.

General CHANDLER. Sir, I would say exactly what General Amos said earlier. We have, in some ways, taken from some of our non-deploying units to make sure some of our deploying units have exactly what they need to do the job. That's reflected in a lot of SORTS ratings that you see, both in flying units as well as support units.

Senator BURR. I've heard information that the Air Force intends to draw down disproportionate number of C- 130s from service in the Air National Guard. One, is it true? And two, can you elaborate on the pros and cons of maintaining aircraft in the active component, as opposed to the Air National Guard?

General CHANDLER. Well, sir, I understand your question. I will tell you, I've spent a lot of time over the last week with the director of the Guard as well as the Reserve. Just as a point of background, I will tell you that what you saw in that budget was an effort to react to what we saw coming in the military capabilities assessment; in other words, the C–130 fleet getting smaller. We took that opportunity to retire some of the older aircraft. Exactly how we get at the distribution, and how we'll do that, realizing that we have a Federal mission, and the States have a mission as well, and how we balance that, is what we're discussing with the Chief and the Secretary. And we should have an answer shortly.

Senator BURR. I appreciate your consideration under that, especially given the fact that we drew down that Guard contingent some time ago, and the further drawdown would deplete their resources to carry out their mission.

My time's expired. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator BAYH. Thank you very much, Senator Burr.

It's good to note Senator Udall's attendance today.

Thank you for your good work on the committee.

Senator Burris, I think you're next.

Senator BURRIS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I'd like to add my thanks to these four distinguished Americans for your committed service to this country and to the world. So, my hat's off to you, Generals and Admiral. Job well done.

In recent completed joint staff studies show that, in Iraq, DOD was highly dependent on contractors in four of the nine joint capacity areas. Furthermore, GAO has recently reported that planning operations planned for future operations include little or no information on contractors. Given the Department's high dependency on contractors to meet its mission, how do the services assure themselves that the needed contractors will be available when needed? General Chiarelli, you want to try that one?

General CHIARELLI. Well, as far as I know, Senator, we have not had issues in getting the contractors that we need. That has not been reported to me as an issue. I think you know that, currently, we have about 1.1 contractor for every soldier who is deployed, so the numbers are high. However, I do not know of any issues in getting contractors.

Senator BURRIS. General Amos, any word on Marines' contracting?

General AMOS. Senator, ours is a little bit easier. We don't—because we nest under the Army, as executive agent for things like logistics and a lot of the logistics hauling and that kind of stuff,

we don't really hire contractors. We have brought some contractors forward, for instance, from our depot in Albany, Georgia, and brought them forward. We had them in Iraq, working, doing some less-than-depot-level work to keep our equipment up to speed. And we're in the process of transitioning that same kind of capability into Afghanistan right now. But, we don't have—we don't really do much contracting in the way that I think your question leads us to.

Senator BURRIS. Admiral, how about—the Navy do any contracting?

Admiral GREENERT. Not much, Senator. We come either self-contained. Our Seabees, self-contained, don't use contractors. Same story with our explosive ordinance detachments. We—otherwise, we are embedded in a ground unit in their support, so we would depend on their support, to the degree they use contractors, sir.

Senator BURRIS. Just to change the subject a little bit, Admiral, I just left Djibouti, down at Camp "Lemonyar" or however you want to—"Lemonyon"——

Admiral GREENERT. Lemonier? Yes, sir.

Senator BURRIS. Lemonier?

Admiral GREENERT. Lemonier. Yes, sir.

Senator BURRIS. My French is not very good, my German is better. And I see our—people are living down there—I talked to the Seabees, and the captain there was very excited, but they're living in containers and tents. Can we get—at least get them in some containers or some decent facilities? Has that been budgeted, Admiral?

Admiral GREENERT. Well, Senator, I can assure you, what they are living in has been budgeted. We are——

Senator BURRIS. In some new facilities.

Admiral GREENERT. Some new facilities. These containers are, frankly—did you have the opportunity, by chance, to get inside one?

Senator BURRIS. Oh, yeah, I was——

Admiral GREENERT. You did? Okay.

Senator BURRIS. I was there, and——

Admiral GREENERT. The reports that—at least that I get—and I was there about 6 weeks ago—was that those were satisfactory. The tents were not. The tents are very hot and they use massive amounts of energy.

Senator BURRIS. Yes.

Admiral GREENERT. We're getting out of the tents. That will be before the year——

Senator BURRIS. But, that is the plan, to get out of the tents.

Admiral GREENERT. Get out of the tents. Yes, sir. Two reasons. One, they're not good quality of life for support, but also, they are extremely energy depleting.

Senator BURRIS. I'm sure Captain Frame* ***FLYNN? 45:45:7*** will be glad to be hear that, because he made a special remark on that.

Admiral GREENERT. I'm——

Senator BURRIS. General, how about the Air Force, you all doing any contracting there?

General CHANDLER. Sir, we have a certain amount of expeditionary integral support in the Air Force, in terms of Red Horse Civil Engineering, for example, and services to take care of the folks. Based on what I've seen, and if my numbers are right, the Air Force does about 70 percent of the contracting work, in terms of officers and NCOs for contracting in that part of the world.

Senator BURRIS. So, General, if were to do some work at Scott Air Force Base—say, that you were to expand housing or did something for those four commands down there in my territory—who would do the work? Would we contract it out to private contractors, or how would that be done at Scott?

General CHANDLER. There would typically be a contracting officer that work—would work the contract, in whatever arrangement—and particularly in terms of housing in the privatized scheme——

Senator BURRIS. Yes.

General CHANDLER.—that we're doing now. That would be work by a contracting officer in the Air Force civil engineering organization that handles those contracts.

Senator BURRIS. By the way, I want you to know I was born and raised down in that area, and I remember when we used to call it, you know, Scott Air Force Base, and there were maybe two or three planes flying out of there. You all have really expanded that area, General. It is——

General CHANDLER. Well, it's a great installation——

Senator BURRIS. It's really good for——

General CHANDLER.—Senator, as you know.

Senator BURRIS. It's really good for our southern Illinois community, and we appreciate what those commands are doing down there.

Now, do the services need a readiness reporting system for contractors—and maybe the Army can answer—do you need a readiness reporting system for contractors?

General CHIARELLI. I don't believe we do. We have CORs, contracting representatives, who are watching our contractors to make sure that they're fulfilling their portion of the contract. That's become a priority in the Army as we both increase the number of folks that we have in Contracting Command and commanders realize the absolute necessity of ensuring that they have good, qualified CORs to ensure that the terms of contracts are being met.

Senator BURRIS. Okay. And, General Chiarelli, the Army Chief of Staff recently directed that units preparing to deployed to Iraq or Afghanistan identify and train Contracting Officers Representatives prior to deploying. How does this Army track—how does the Army track this information?

General CHIARELLI. We have requirements for Contracting Officer Representatives. I do not know how we track the total numbers, but commanders have been told to train the necessary number that they need for the area that they're going into. And I have not received any reports that they are not doing that. In fact, I've heard that the quality of the CORs has gone up considerably since the beginning of the war.

Senator BURRIS. Thank you, General.

My time is expired, Mr. Chairman. Thank you very much.

Senator BAYH. Thank you, Senator Burris.

Senator Chambliss.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, as always it's a pleasure to have you here. Thanks for your service. Be sure and convey to all those men and women that serve under you how much we appreciate their great service.

Just this past week, I was informed that one of my Academy nominees to West Point, 1st Lieutenant Robert Collins, class of 2008, was killed by an IED in Mosul. And it certainly hits home when those tragic events occur, and it emphasizes more the importance of your testimony here today. I'd like to thank each of you again and to recognize Lieutenant Collins and his family for their sacrifice and for their son's service to our Nation. And when I talked to his mother yesterday—both his mother and his father are retired Army lieutenant colonels—and his mother said, "You know, we knew and he knew that when he joined the family business, there were risks involved," but it doesn't make it any easier when you lose a top young man like that, General Chiarelli.

I want to start with you, General Chandler. You note, in your written statement, that Air Force has been operating under continuous stress in deployments for 19 years, including 9 years of operations, obviously, in Iraq and Afghanistan. I know this has taken a toll on your airmen, but also on your aircraft. I understand that your air logistics centers have a backlog of work and have been challenged to deliver aircraft on schedule, back to warfighters, due, in part, to aircraft coming into the depots requiring more work than they have previously had, based on the near continuous use that you referred to. I assume that you agree this is extremely important, that the Air Force receive every dollar that you requested in the fiscal year 2011 budget to support aircraft maintenance and depot activities. Is that correct?

General CHANDLER. Yes, sir, it is.

Senator CHAMBLISS. And I note that the number-one priority of the Air Force's unfunded requirements is 337 million for weapon system sustainment, which will go towards a variety of depot maintenance and service life extension programs that you had deemed to be high priorities. Could you elaborate on how you would use those funds and how important they are to the Air Force?

General CHANDLER. Well, sir, they are extremely important, because it takes us from about an 82-percent dial to an 85-percent dial on weapon system sustainment of at least known requirements. Like the other services, our requirements continued to grow, and we continue to chase that, hence the unfunded priority. That represents about 16 aircraft through depot maintenance and about six to seven engines that would go through depot maintenance, as the vast majority of the money.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Thank you.

General Chiarelli, General Amos, from your testimony we've heard that our soldiers and marines are stressed, particularly our ground forces, and that you've had challenges in fulfilling your manning requirements for deploying units. I'm also told that in some of our deploying units, mainly Army BCTs and Marine regiments, that we've got almost battalion-sized elements remaining back in the rear as nondeployables. More importantly, I've also

been told that these nondeployable numbers have been rising over the past few years.

Now, it seems to me if we take efforts to reduce these nondeployables, that it should invariably increase the amount of available personnel for deployed units. Are the Army and Marine Corps taking steps to reduce these nondeployable soldiers and marines and replace them or turn them into individuals that we are able to deploy?

General Chiarelli?

General CHIARELLI. Well, we're doing our best to do that, but our numbers continue to go up. One reason they've continued to go up, we are averaging between 12 and 14 percent nondeployable in our Brigade Combat Teams at this time. One of the reasons why we've seen it go up is because the Army has taken units off stop-loss since the 1st of the year. That alone, given the fact we can only give them a 90-day drop on their contract, means that we have to hold onto them until we reach that point, which drives up the nondeployable rate. Other nondeployables we've seen increase are medical non-deployables. But, we have young men and women, who, after three rotations—the knee operation that they needed after the first rotation won't wait for the fourth rotation. And we owe it to them to make sure they have the opportunity to be taken care of, and that's what we're doing. Our largest increase has been in medical nondeployables, and it is because of many of those muscular-skeletal kinds of issues that arise.

Senator CHAMBLISS. General Amos.

General AMOS. Senator, right now, of a force of 202,000 reported as of just a couple days ago, we had 31,602 that we would classify as nondeployables. And of note of that—I mean, that sounds like an awful lot, but, of note in there, almost—excuse me—yeah, just about 29,000 of those are what we call trainees—marines that are in boot camp, marines that are in advance infantry skill training, marines that are in pilot training and going through their MOS training—22,000 of that 31,600 are in training right now, so they are nondeployable. Another almost 4,000 are in transit; at any given time, they're moving from the East Coast to the West Coast or coming out of schools or moving into their new units, and they're in what we call transit. And then we have about 3400 of them that are medical, that are not expected to recover. And we track those very carefully. So, while the number 31,000 sounds high, it's actually—it makes sense. And then, there's some other small or very small numbers in there.

But, we have not had any trouble fleshing out our combat units, Senator. I mean, they have—in fact, we have marines reenlisting and extending contracts, their 4- year enlistment, to extend for 6 months so that they could go back with the unit that they deployed with, in some cases, already twice. So, we have not had a problem with fleshing out our units. And we track the nondeployables very, very closely.

Senator CHAMBLISS. General Chiarelli, is this a funding issue, that these folks are having these medical problems, or what's the reason?

General CHIARELLI. It's the time between deployment, Senator. I mean, we've got aviation units that are going 1-to-1 right now. I

mean, they are 1 year deployed, 1 year back home. And it is that. We have instances where, as I indicated earlier, the—really, the only thing that counts is individual dwell. Keeping track of the dwell of an inanimate object, like a flag, means nothing; it's the individual that's key and critical. And we do not allow anybody to redeploy that doesn't have 12 months of dwell time. One of the increases I've seen in our nondeployables are individuals we have to leave behind for a month or two in order to get them 12 months of dwell time back home, because they've transferred from another unit. With the military occupational specialties we have, some are just more stressed than others are. And those things are driving it up. It's not a money issue, Senator.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Well, let me go back to that dwell time. As far as training is concerned, I know there are efforts underway to increase that dwell time for all of our service men and women once they return from deployment, and I think that, once we get to where we can have a, like, a 1-to-3 ratio, it'll make things much better for you. But, as it now stands, are units, particularly our tactical units, able to train in their traditional core competencies while still preparing for full-spectrum operations and counterinsurgency?

General CHIARELLI. They're doing more today than they were doing yesterday. And the mere fact that we're focusing on Afghanistan, which I believe is a different fight, has caused us to move into more full-spectrum type of training. But, as we approach at least 1-to-2, we're going to see the amount of that training be able to increase over time.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Okay. Thank you very much.

And, General Amos, just be sure, when you go to Albany, that you don't say "ALL' benny," it's "All BEN' ny."

General AMOS. Sir, I'll take that under advisement, and when I do go to "All BEN' ny," I'll be happy to pronounce it correctly. Thank you, sir.

Senator CHAMBLISS. It's a great base, too, but—you can bring that depot to North Carolina. We'll let you call it whatever you want to.

[Laughter.]

Senator BAYH. All politics is local.

[Laughter.]

Senator BAYH. Thank you, Senator Chambliss.

Senator Udall.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, gentlemen. As an old expedition mountain climber, I'm reminded of the adage that I think I heard first applied to the military, which is in—with all due respect to those in the military of other responsibilities, that—if I can get this right—tactics are for amateurs; strategies, for rank amateurs; logistics are the responsibility of the true professionals. So, thank you for the work you do in this important area that often is taken for granted.

General Chiarelli, great to see you again. I have fond memories—and again, I don't want to cast dispersions on anybody else who was in Iraq at the time I first met you, but you were serving as, quote/unquote, "the Mayor of Baghdad" and, I think, were on the cutting edge of helping us understand this concept of counterinsur-

gency and how we best help these countries in which we're forced to operate, rebuild themselves, and take responsibility for their own future. So, again, it's good to see you.

And, gentlemen, if I might, I want to be slightly parochial before I move to some broader questions, although I think the parochial nature of my concerns apply across the service branches, and certainly in theater. We're about to begin the latest round of a fighting season in Afghanistan. Rotary-wing capabilities are really important. In Colorado, we have the High Altitude Army Aviation Training Site in Eagle, which is near Vail. And what it does is, it captures the expertise and institutional knowledge of cadre of the experienced Colorado National Guard pilots, and leverages that to save lives in battlespace. It appears that the high altitude mountain environment training that the active component is offering at Ft. Carson, based on the train-the-trainer course that HAATS offers, is also trying to address the need for high altitude training. I'm concerned that the nature of the active component means that those trainers, after doing their good work, will then move on in their careers. And, in addition, Fort Carson, I believe, doesn't have the varied terrain and consistent environmental conditions that are found in the mountains around Eagle.

So, my question to General Chiarelli is, Can we institute multiple—or, I should say, multicomponent training at HAATS, following the successful multicomponent warrior leader course that the Colorado National Guard runs at Ft. Carson?

General CHIARELLI. Well, HAATS is a national treasure. And my XO happens to be an aviator. And he—aviators are always telling stories, and he told me, in preparing his brigade to go to Afghanistan, he sent about 200 of his pilots in command and IPs, instructor pilots, to HAATS for training, but he, too, deployed his brigades and—by battalion—to Denver, and they did individual training as part of HAATS, brought those instructors down, because of the throughput issues at HAATS, and had them do train-the-trainer on their battalions, doing collective training in the Denver, Colorado, area. It was much less expensive. And, at the same time, he was able to give everybody the benefit of that fantastic training by using a train-the-trainer model for pilots in command and instructor pilots.

I believe that is what a majority of our brigades are doing. There's no doubt, it—HAATS is saving lives today in Afghanistan, because of our ability to get that key and critical training. It is a fantastic course.

Senator UDALL. General, I think you're aware, too, of the recent tragedy that occurred on Mount Massive, which is the second highest peak in Colorado, at 14,400 feet. A rotary-wing exercise took place on Mount Massive. The bird was piloted by those that hadn't had that kind of training, and there was a tragic fatal accident that occurred. And I know we're learning a lot of lessons from that, but I hope we'll continue to use HAATS and think about how we keep that training capability as broadly available as possible.

And I know you've had this invitation before, we'd love to get you out to Colorado. And I know your XO can—has spoken, but would—we'd be happy to accompany you and do some flying with you, if you're able to come out at some point. But——

General CHIARELLI. Appreciate it, Senator.

Senator UDALL.—I'll leave that as an open-ended invitation to you.

General CHIARELLI. Thank you, Senator.

Senator UDALL. If I might, I'd like to follow up on a question I think the Senator from Georgia—who's also trying to teach me how to speak Georgian, by the way. He was talking about dwell time, and you've talked about musculoskeletal situations and the need for knee surgery and rehabilitation. I'm curious about also the—we're learning more and more about this marvelous organ we have, called the brain, and we have hidden wounds that occur in combat, we increasingly understand. Could you talk a little about what you've learned—and perhaps the other general officers that are here might want to chime in—and, when it comes to dwell time, the need for our men in uniform to recuperate, mentally and emotionally and spiritually, as well.

General CHIARELLI. I have, currently, 6200 soldiers that are most seriously wounded. We categorize anyone who has a single disqualifying injury of 30 percent or greater, and put them in a—what we call the "AW2 Program"—Army Wounded Warrior Program. Of that population, 56 percent have either PTS or TBI; 18 percent, traumatic brain injury, and the remainder is post-traumatic stress. We are instituting new protocols in theater that require soldiers, that are either in a vehicle that is damaged within 50 meters of a blast or in a building with an explosion, to go through an evaluation for a concussion as soon after the event as possible and 24 hours later. If they pass both those evaluations, they'll return to duty; if they don't, they are treated by a doctor until their brain has had an opportunity—the concussion has had an opportunity to repair itself.

PTS is a concern for soldiers, back here, and we are working—and down range—we're working to both inform our medics, so they can better identify PTS when it occurs down range, and we're using telemedicine to give a 30- to 40-minute evaluation of every soldier that comes back to the States. We've done two units now, one battalion in Hawaii and a brigade in Alaska, so we can get a good evaluation. And the results, using this telemedicine, are very, very encouraging.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for that update. I know my time's expired, but would anybody else want to comment briefly?

General Amos?

General AMOS. Senator, we share the same battlefield with our Army brothers, and have experienced the same amount—levels of TBI, PTSD. General Chiarelli and I worked on that pretty hard last fall to develop this protocol that he just described. That is in use right now in the Marine zone, as well, in the Helmand Province. And it—the idea is recognition that you get your—you get that wonderful thing between your ears rung really hard and there is a propensity—if it's not treated, if the brain is not put at rest immediately, the propensity, they've found, for PTSD, down the road, is there. It doesn't mean you're going to have it, but it does mean that there's a propensity towards that. So, there's a recognition, both in the Army and the Marine Corps, that this is serious problem. And this effort, this concussive protocol that General

Chairelli described, is in effort to say, "Okay, 100 percent of those marines and soldiers that have been either knocked out, had a—what we call a grade-three concussion—which is, you are knocked unconscious or something less—you are done. You're going to go back into the wire, you're going to get evaluated, we're going to put your brain at rest. And then, depending on how you look and what the doctors are saying, we'll determine whether you ever even leave the wire again. In fact, the way we do it is, you—it's called "three strikes, you're in." If you just get three grade-one concussions, you're done. You're going to stay inside the wire, you'll perform a function; you're not going to go back out again. And so, it's a—we're—it's a recognition for that, sir.

We've had—I'm just looking at—since January of 2003 to September of 2009, there have been 7,746 mild TBI cases reported within the Marine Corps. And so, a mild TBI case would be something that, "Okay, I was—I took a pretty hard blow—I may not have been knocked out, but I took a pretty hard blow to the head." So, there is great recognition towards—you know, of that problem, Senator, and I just want you to know we're working as fast as we can to try ameliorate that.

Senator UDALL. Thank for that. I test the patience of the Chairman, but I certainly would welcome the Navy and the Air Force, as well, to weigh in, maybe for the record, Mr. Chairman, and—or if I have another round, I'd——

Admiral GREENERT. Senator, given we deploy embedded in the ground units, our folks are susceptible to the same thing. I think overarching the program, the factor is, our work is not done when folks return from deployment. That's a cultural change. A lot of our sailors, that's something new to them, "What do you mean, you need to do a post- deployment health assessment?" And we need to look at folks, not just when they come back—30 days, 90 days—sometimes it takes 120 days for this to manifest itself and their personalities to change.

The other factor I would just mention to you is, their supporting group is the family. They're back here worrying all this time. There's a lot of stress. It's almost the boiling frog concept—just a little bit more, a little bit more, a little bit more—and we're finding it manifests itself in what we call the tone of the force—things from divorces, to drinking, to behavioral changes around the force, within our families. We need to watch them, as well.

Thanks.

Senator BAYH. Thank you.

General, if—my patience is infinite, but Senator Thune is being very patient, as well. This is a very important subject. If you have some thoughts, could you make them brief?

General CHANDLER. Sir, I would just say, we have approximately 650 airmen in what we call the Wounded Warrior Program; that's out of about 1100 airmen that have been wounded in combat, some of which suffer the same consequences, in terms of TBI. We've put a lot of effort and, frankly, learned a lot from the Marine Corps and from the Army, in terms of resiliency, what it takes, not just for the member, but their family, as well.

One other aspect of this, of course, is the remotely- piloted business, where you can find yourself in combat part of the day, and

then home the rest of the day, which is something that we also watch very carefully.

The only thing that I would add is, we've actually had some—"success" is not what I would call it, but—in the early stages of experimentation with hyperbaric chamber treatment for traumatic brain injury, which I know is something that our surgeon generals share amongst themselves.

Senator BAYH. Thank you very much, General.

Thank you, Senator, for asking about that, a very important signature of challenges from the conflicts we find ourselves in.

Senator Thune?

Senator THUNE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, gentlemen, for your great service to our country.

General Chandler, in your prepared statement, you said that, "The B–1, B–52, and 15E did not meet aircraft availability standards, due to maintenance- and depot- related issues, and the F–22 fell short of the projected availability, due to low observable maintenance requirements," end quote. Yet, this year the Air Force's number-one unfunded priority was for depot-level maintenance on several aircraft, including the B–1. Can you explain what maintenance standards the B–1 and the B–52 failed to meet, and what depot-related maintenance issues the Air Force is having with these aircraft?

General CHANDLER. Yes, sir. What you're seeing is a manifestation of trying to balance the requirements for today with being prepared for tomorrow on the throughput, obviously, in depot maintenance and the things that we need to do there.

Let me address, if I may, the F–22 first. I would tell you, we're still learning a lot about that aircraft. Eighty percent of the low observable maintenance that we're required to do on the aircraft is caused by having to do maintenance on something that really had nothing to do with low observable. Said another way, we had to remove a panel to repair a part or replace something underneath that panel that subsequently led to low observable maintenance requirements.

Over the last 2 years, we've been able to lower maintenance man hours per flying hour by 30 percent each year—frankly, by getting smarter and by replacing things under those panels, to give them a longer service life. We're sitting somewhere between 65 and 70 percent—66, 67, typically, on a daily basis—of mission-capable rates in the F–22 today; that's against an Air Force standard of about 75, and we project that that will continue to improve.

I would tell you, as far as the F–15E and the B–1, and even the B–52, for that matter, some of this reduction in mission-capable status is goodness, from the standpoint of taking those aircraft down and working on them, primarily in the areas of avionics. The B–1, for example, replacing the front cockpit, if you will, the pilot and co-pilot avionics displays. Also, as you know, we've podded that aircraft to give it situational awareness and to be able to do precision targeting and—part of the maintenance that's being performed is moving that display into the cockpit so we can not only control the pod, but display the pod the way we want to do it.

So, there are some things that are going on, in terms of driving the rates down. We have the aircraft we need to do the job. Now's

the time, we feel, as long as we can get the money, to continue those kinds of improvements on the legacy fleet that will then allow us to transition to the fleets of the future, whether it be the F–35, in the fighter world, or looking down the road at the next-generation long-range platform.

Senator THUNE. If these particular aircraft didn't meet the projected availabilities, why was there depot- level maintenance initiatives unfunded in this year's requests?

General CHANDLER. Well, again, sir, I would tell, that's simply a matter of trying to balance what we do with what we're being required to do today, and then maintaining the depot maintenance. There's no doubt in our mind—and we understand that it's taking OCO funding to get us to 82 percent, and then the 337 million unfunded requirement to get to 85 percent, of weapon systems sustainment. That is one of those big issues that we're going to have to watch closely, not only with the amount of money that we're finding and asking in OCO funding, but how we transition that to the base budget, so we can get at the issue that you're pointing out.

Senator THUNE. Okay. In your prepared statement, you also said that the standup of a fourth operational squadron of B–52s in October of '09 enhances our readiness to perform nuclear deterrence missions as well as support conventional mission requirements. It's my understanding that one of the reasons that the standup was ordered was to help the Air Force focus specifically on nuclear training issues in the midst of constant deployments, and yet the recently published NPR states that it will convert some B- 52Hs to a conventional-only role. The question is, What is the thinking behind standing up a new squadron of B–52s in order to help focus that community on the nuclear mission and, less than 5 months later, having the administration announce it will convert the number of nuclear-capable B- 52s to conventional-only aircraft?

General CHANDLER. Well, sir, as you know, the fourth squadron, as you describe, allows the units to not only concentrate on the nuclear mission, but have a constant and sustainable rotation of units through the nuclear mission and the conventional mission, which we asked them, obviously, to do both of. We know that the triad will be supported by the new Nuclear Posture Review. The analysis of that force structure, I would say, is still ongoing. And exactly how we adjust, in terms of nuclear and conventional bombers, remains to be seen.

Senator THUNE. I want to come back, General, to—you mentioned the sniper advanced targeting pod, and the integration of that into the B–1 bomber and other Air Force aircraft, and how that—I think that's had a great impact on effective close-air support in Afghanistan. However, there seems to be a lack of these advanced targeting pods for training use, because they're in such high demand in theater. And so, crews are using these advanced targeting pods overseas in combat; however, they have very limited ability to train with these advanced pods at home. Does the Air Force have a need for additional advanced targeting pods for training use? And, if so, how would additional pods affect combat readiness?

General CHANDLER. Sir, the overall requirement is approximately 835 pods. We find ourselves programmed through '12 to get up to about 625 or -35. Through '12, we anticipate we'll be able to get away from the just-in-time training scenario that you describe. And then, we'll have to follow on with 200 additional pods to do that.

Senator THUNE. Okay.

Thank you. I think that's all I have, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all very much.

Senator BAYH. Thank you very much, Senator Thune.

Out of respect for the time of our witnesses today, and in the interest of moving things along, I think we'll now move to 5-minute rounds of questioning. And I've just got two.

General Chandler, I'd like to follow up on some of your remarks to Senator Thune. And, as you say, it is an important issue. Just a little preamble before the question.

In your prepared statement, you say, "Modernization and recapitalization remain priorities." However, the fiscal year 2011 budget requests only fund—funds weapon system requirements at 65 percent, as you mentioned, of your requirement, and that increases to only 83 percent with OCO funding. While I admire the Air Force for making weapon system sustainment your top unfunded priority, even if we authorized the maximum amount, which I support—and I hope my colleagues in the Appropriations Committees support, as well—you will still only be at 85 percent of your requirement.

So, the question, General, is—I understand we operate in tough economic times, but if we do not fully fund weapon system sustainment, we will always have a maintenance backlog. So, my question is, What does the Air Force risk by not fully funding weapons system sustainment?

General CHANDLER. Sir, the majority of the risk that you see, that 15 percent that's not funded, will be reflected in aircraft and engines that go through depots. That's about a $2-billion deficit. And we understand that that is no small thing to try to get our arms around. As you know, that will continue to build in bow wave that someday we will pay the price for. So, we're looking, next year, at how we continue to move things out of OCO into the baseline budget and produce a more sustainable, if you will, weapon system support plan.

Senator BAYH. Thank you, General.

General Amos, this is for you. It came to the attention of some on the committee—I'd like to kind of cut to the chase—I'd like to ask you—there's apparently a small brouhaha about uniforms, which, in the great scheme of things, isn't the most important issue out there, but it was requested that I ask you about this. So, I—I understand the Marine Corps objected to the Navy fielding a ground combat uniform, and that if it was fielded, it be restricted to, basically, the SEALs, because it was too similar to the Marine Corps camouflage pattern. I wanted to ask you if that was correct; and if so, what was the rationale for objecting to the uniform being used more broadly? I understand the unique character of the Corps, and maybe some rivalry with the Navy, that kind of thing, but what's the rationale for that?

General AMOS. Sir, that—what you described is true. Two Commandants ago, when General Jones—Jim Jones—became the Com-

mandant, he set on a course to put the Marine Corps in a unique uniform and get something that was more practical, something that didn't require having to go through the laundry and get starched and all the things we've been living with for years and years and years and years and years. We even went away from the old spit-shine boots, and went to the rough-out boot, and it just all made sense. And so, 10 years ago, he was successful in doing that. It was an enormous effort. And that single uniform effort generated an enormous amount of pride inside an organization that, as you know, is steeped in tradition.

And so, we have had that now for 10 years, and it's served us well. It's—in fact, you talk to any marine out there, they love them. And they're comfortable, and they wear well.

Other services have come online over the last several years and developed their own service-particular uniform, but—I think all our services have done that—but there was an effort.

Senator BAYH. I think the Corps actually patented this uniform, didn't——

General AMOS. They did, sir.

Senator BAYH.—is that correct? That's interesting.

General AMOS. There's little eagle, globes, and anchor in the pattern, and it was put in there for a purpose. And the purpose was—is that this would be a Marine Corps-unique uniform. We're not saying that other services can't have additional uniforms. In fact, all the services have them now. But, it came to our attention, last fall, that there had been an effort underway, down in Special Operations Command, to use a pattern that was so close that, from 5 or 10 feet away, it looked absolutely identical, and we objected to that. We just said, "Look, we—there are plenty of patterns that are out there that are effective. There are patterns out there that can provide your service whatever unique uniform you want. But, in this case, we'd appreciate it if your service would pick—or your effort would pick a uniform that was significantly or enough different from ours that you could determine a marine on the ground versus somebody else on the ground," and it became a—it was—it became a point of internal pride within the Marine Corps.

Senator BAYH. Boy, my time is expired, but how did they respond to your response? I take it they—they brought it to somebody's attention around here, so they must not have been completely thrilled.

General AMOS. Well, sir, I think, I—actually, I think it's settled down now, and there is an agreement with the SEALs, forward deployed, to wear that pattern. It is a very good camouflage pattern. And so, it does—tactically, it does what they hoped would happen. So, the agreement between the Chief of Naval Operations and the Commandant of Marine Corps are those forward-deployed SEALs and those types of folks can use that uniform over there. And even though it is not using the patented pattern—like I said, it's so very, very close—and it's a point of pride, sir. It's internal pride, and it's—it actually transcends all the general officers. It's down to the young lance corporals and PFCs, the young 18-year-olds, who go, "No, wait a minute, this is my uniform, and, you know, I'm a U.S. Marine." So, it's probably hard to understand outside the Corps, but that's the inertia generated inside the institution.

Senator BAYH. Well, pride and unit elan is certainly an important factor, so I appreciate your response.

Senator, I think it's down to you and me. Senator Burr.

Senator BURR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Amos, in view of the limitations on the legacy Marine Corps helicopter assets, such as the CH–46 and -53, which have been deployed in Afghanistan, what other aviation assets do you believe will be in high demand?

General AMOS. Sir, we are in a transition, as you know, Senator, from your time down at New River and Camp Lejeune, and what we transitioned from—almost 10 years ago—from about 13 type model series down to what we're going to end up with, something around, I think, five or six. 53 Echo, there's no question that that airplane is—has been a workhorse. I'm just looking at—for the last 10 months, until—from February of '09 to January '10, readiness, the average mission-capable rate across the 53 Echo community is 65 percent. That is a heavy, heavy maintenance-intensive airplane, probably the most maintenance man hours per flight hour. And I don't know what that is, but it is significant. So, that airplane is—we'll continue to maintain until we get its replacement, the 53 Kilo.

But, most of the rest of our stuff, our legacy platforms—the CH–46, the 40-plus-year-old helicopter that we dearly love and have been flying—is transitioning to the MV–22. We've done it back in your State, in North Carolina; it's completely done. We have one squadron standing up on the West Coast right now, and we're in—we've got one foot in the 46 and one foot in the V–22 and we will have completed that in the next several years.

So, our Hueys and Cobras have been under—the older versions have been under an enormous amount of strain. But, we have fielded the new replacement for the Huey, the Yankee version of that airplane—four blades, new engines, new rotor head, glass cockpit—and the readiness on that airplane is high, and it is significantly more capable than the older ones.

So, we have lived with these legacy airplanes now for a long time, tried to be good stewards. But, we are in that—we're in that transition right now, Senator, and—of leaving the old and going to the new—and so, we're just—we're going to sustain the old, while we have to. We've got 53 Deltas in Afghanistan right now, the old two- engine version that was a predecessor to the Echo. So, we are flying and trying to maintain them as best we can.

Senator BURR. If——

General AMOS. I don't know whether that answers your question.

Senator BURR. Well, General, if I asked you if had adequate airlift capabilities——

General AMOS. Do we have what, now?

Senator BURR. Do you have adequate airlift capabilities?

General AMOS. We do, sir. We do.

Senator BURR. Okay.

General AMOS. In fact, it's interesting you ask that, because the Secretary of Defense, one of his highest priorities in the last—really, the year—has been ISR—increase the amount of intelligence, surveillance, reconnaissance, and then rotary-wing lift. And that is a combination of—the ISR is a combination of everybody sitting at this table and their assets; and rotary-wing lift is predominantly

the Army and the Marine Corps. But, I will also tell you, the Air Force—for instance, down in the Helmand Province, the—I'll tell you, the boys flying those medevac airplanes that are down there have done—have saved an enormous amount of lives for us. But, lift capacity, as far a moving around the theater, we absolutely do. We have what we need for that, sir. We're not wanting in that.

Senator BURR. Good.

Just as a general note—and I shared this with the Chairman—I looked at new technology, over the Easter break, that's designed for rotary aircraft, to balance that engine and the propeller when it's revved up, which eliminates the shaking in a helicopter. It was an amazing simulator to sit in and see one with, and without. And it made me really question how that would change the depot hours and intervals for some of the rotary aircraft. And I know, across the Department, that technology is being looked at. I'm sure I didn't see a single technology. There are probably others out there. But, clearly we're going to bring some things that provide us longer life, based upon how we change what, historically, we've used, because we've used technology to extend its life and to have a lesser impact on the platform itself over time.

Last question. Again, General Amos, as you know, the establishment of a Marine—of a Corps component of Special Operations forces was a relatively recent force- structure development. From my time down at Lejeune, I can report that the Marines assigned to MARSOC are training well, they're ready to be deployed worldwide with their brethren of the other services. How do you assess their readiness?

General AMOS. Sir, I don't have the precise readiness figure in front of me that—where I could tell that this Special Operations Battalion is—on average, is this; because they don't report their readiness through us, they report it through the U.S. Special Operations Command. But, absolutely no question, we put our arms around them. They're marines. Those marines came out of our Force Reconnaissance Units and our standard Marine Reconnaissance Units and then across the Marine Corps, when we stood them up. It sits about 2500 marines right now, and sailors. And what we're doing now is, we are rebalancing within that number of 2500, with lessons learned. We found out that we needed one less Special Operations Battalion, but we needed more combat service support integrated within those battalions, that would deploy with them. So, inside that number, that box, we are shifting around the deck chairs, so to speak, to make sure we have the right balance. But, I'll tell you, the—my sense is, having seen it—I was there when we stood it up at Camp Lejeune, and I just visited, with some of our marines—Special Operations lads—out in the western part of the Helmand Province and out there towards the Iranian border. They are highly trained. They are—they're incredible young men. And they are—and when you see them—I think the testimony, for me, is, when you see them, and they're wounded—in Bethesda or Walter Reed or Brooke—they're the ones that are getting out of the beds. I mean, they're severely wounded. They're the ones that leave the hospital first. They're the ones that are determined to get back on their feet and get back with their brothers again. So, it's a special breed, and they're well trained,

and their morale is enormously high. And I think it's a huge success story, sir.

Senator BURR. Well, thank you. I'm impressed with what I've seen when I've been there.

Let me conclude—my time's up—by once again stating, to all of you, thank you for your service. More importantly, please share those with the men and women that serve under you. We can't thank you enough for the insight that you're able to provide this committee. And more importantly—I think I can speak for the Chairman—our door is open. When there is a need, let us know what the need is. We want to make sure that every warrior has the equipment that they need, that they don't fall short, that our mission is one we intend to win, and not one just to be there.

Thanks.

Senator BAYH. Those are my sentiments exactly, Senator. Thank you for your comments.

This is a collaborative process. Let us know what you need. We're here to make sure that our military men and women have the equipment that they need to perform the services that they so gallantly do on our behalf.

So, gentlemen, thanks to each of you for your service. Please convey our respect and appreciation to the men and women who work with you. And I look forward to working with you the rest of this fiscal year to make sure you get what you need.

Thanks very much.

This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:07 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]