

**HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON THE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY IN REVIEW OF  
THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2012 AND THE FUTURE  
YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM**

THURSDAY, MARCH 31, 2011

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC.*

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:32 a.m. in room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin, Lieberman, Reed, Akaka, Nelson, Udall, Hagan, Begich, Shaheen, Blumenthal, McCain, Inhofe, Sessions, Chambliss, Brown, Portman, and Ayotte.

Committee staff members present: Richard D. DeBobes, staff director; and Leah C. Brewer, nominations and hearings clerk.

Majority staff members present: Jonathan D. Clark, counsel; Jessica L. Kingston, research assistant; Michael J. Kuiken, professional staff member; Gerald J. Leeling, counsel; Jason W. Maroney, counsel; Michael J. Noblet, professional staff member; and William K. Sutey, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: David M. Morriss, minority staff director; Adam J. Barker, professional staff member; John W. Heath, Jr., minority investigative counsel; Daniel A. Lerner, professional staff member; Michael J. Sistik, research assistant; and Richard F. Walsh, minority counsel.

Staff assistants present: Christine G. Lang, Brian F. Sebold, and Breon N. Wells.

Committee members' assistants present: Christopher Griffin, assistant to Senator Lieberman; Carolyn Chuhta, assistant to Senator Reed; Nick Ikeda, assistant to Senator Akaka; Ann Premer, assistant to Senator Ben Nelson; Gordon Peterson, assistant to Senator Webb; Casey Howard, assistant to Senator Udall; Lindsay Kavanaugh, assistant to Senator Begich; Chad Kreikemeier, assistant to Senator Shaheen; Jeremy Bratt, assistant to Senator Blumenthal; Anthony Lazarski, assistant to Senator Inhofe; Lenwood Landrum, assistant to Senator Sessions; Clyde Taylor IV, assistant to Senator Chambliss; Charles Prosch, assistant to Senator Brown; and Brad Bowman, assistant to Senator Ayotte.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN, CHAIRMAN**

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody.

The committee today welcomes Secretary of the Army John McHugh and Chief of Staff of the Army, General George Casey, Jr., for our hearing on the Army's fiscal year 2012 budget request and current posture.

This hearing marks the fourth and final appearance before this committee for General Casey as the Army's 36th Chief of Staff. In a few short days, he'll relinquish leadership of the Army and bring to a close his 41 years of dedicated and honorable uniformed service to our Nation.

General Casey's career has touched nearly every major military event of the last four decades, and his leadership has helped shape our military posture in the struggles that we face today. He and his wife, Sheila's, devotion to soldiers and their families, including the family programs that he has initiated, have resulted in improvements in Army quality of life that contribute to the force's resilience and readiness. For this, and for much more, we are grateful.

The Army that General Casey and Secretary McHugh will describe for us is as great today as it has ever been—combat-tested and proven, having met the challenges of the last decade with courage, determination, and professionalism. The Army remains, however, stretched by nearly 10 years of continuous combat, and must deal with many enduring and new challenges that will be no less daunting and will likely require similar sacrifice.

Let me open with a challenge that I don't believe the Army, or any of our services, should have to endure. The Department of Defense, as with all Federal agencies, continues to operate under a Continuing Resolution, a CR, that expires on April 8. If the current CR is extended for the whole year, then funding shortfalls will hurt all of the Army's operation, maintenance, construction, and investment accounts. Programs to improve facilities and take better care of wounded warriors and soldiers' families could be delayed. Tough decisions made by the Army over the last year to cancel poor performing or unnecessary weapons systems and instead increase investment in recapitalization, upgrade, and reset programs will stall. We should take up and pass a fiscal year 2011 Defense appropriations bill. It's the right thing to do for our troops and our country.

Despite the difficulty of managing resources under a CR, the Army continues to meet the demand for trained and ready forces in support of operations in Afghanistan and Iraq. The drawdown of U.S. forces in Iraq has begun, but nearly 40,000 American troops will remain there until the conclusion of our complete withdrawal by this December.

The Army provides over 60,000 troops to operations in Afghanistan. Hard fighting will continue, even as we and our allies continue to build the Afghan security forces so that they may take more and more responsibility for their own security. We know that our troops deploying to Afghanistan or Iraq have the highest priority for resources to ensure that they are trained and ready before they go, to make sure they have what they need when they get there. But, this drives the Army to make near-term tradeoffs among its many other resource needs. We're interested to hear from our witnesses how they're managing the challenges of CRs

and what risks confront the Army if a regular appropriations bill is not enacted.

As resilient, adaptable, trained, and ready as our soldiers are today for their missions in Afghanistan and Iraq, the future beyond these operations holds real questions about the purpose, size, and structure of the Army. In a speech to cadets at the U.S. Military Academy last month, Secretary of Defense Gates argued that it is unlikely that the Nation will commit large land forces to future conflicts, and that the Army must, quote, "confront the reality that the most plausible high-end scenarios for the U.S. military will be primarily naval and air engagements." Secretary Gates cautioned that, in a strategic environment where we are unlikely to fight an enemy employing large armored formations, the Army will find it difficult to justify the number, size, and cost of its heavy armored brigades.

At about the same time, General Casey seemed to go in a different direction when he said he expects that, at the end of the next 10 years, the Army will still have 50,000 to 100,000 soldiers deployed in combat. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Admiral Mullen, said that, for planning purposes, the Department assumes 6 to 10 combat brigades will likely be deployed.

We look forward to hearing our witnesses' views on these perspectives and how they may shape the Army's plans and priorities for the coming years.

Pressure to cut spending in general is being felt throughout the government and the Defense Department. The DOD's Efficiency Initiative is intended to take funds away from less important or inefficient programs or activities and to put them to higher current and future modernization priorities. The Army's share of this Efficiency Initiative is \$28 billion over fiscal years 2012 through 2016, which the Army plans to achieve through weapons systems cancellations, construction delays, and organization realignments and consolidations. We're interested to hear Secretary McHugh and General Casey's assessments of the Efficiency Initiative, its potential impact on the Army, and what actions they intend to take, if any, to ensure that the projected savings are realized.

It seems like only yesterday that we were concerned with growing our ground forces as quickly as possible, both to meet the demands of operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and to relieve some of the rotational pressures on soldiers and their families. People are the most important and precious asset throughout the Armed Forces. Dialing up or down the size of the Army is never easy, nor inexpensive. However, the Army needs to begin planning for the end-strength reductions announced by Secretary Gates in January.

Under General Casey's leadership, the Army has made restoring balance a guiding theme and objective of significant effort and investment. Balance, as we understand it, seeks to increase the amount of time at home, resetting our training for other contingencies, relative to the amount of time deployed for operations in Afghanistan or Iraq or elsewhere. More time at home station for training is critical to the Army's efforts to rebuild its strategic depth, the desired readiness in the nondeployed force, such that it is capable of responding to any unforeseen contingency.

Although the Army continues to meet the demand for counterinsurgency and support operations in Afghanistan, Iraq, and around the world, and despite the amazing resilience of our troops and their families, the Army remains stressed in many ways. Given the planned Army drawdown, budget pressures, and force demands for operations in Afghanistan, we continue to face substantial risk, should we need the Army to respond to another contingency. And we'd be interested to hear General Casey's report on the Army's progress towards restoring balance this year, and his assessment of Army readiness for unforeseen contingencies.

The Army needs to continue to rationalize and stabilize its near- and long-range modernization strategies and programs. In general, major Army modernization efforts have not been successful over the past decade or more. A recent study of Army modernization notes that, since 2004, the Army has spent from \$3.3 billion to \$3.8 billion per year to develop weapons systems that ultimately were canceled.

Over the last 2 years, at the direction of Secretary McHugh and under the leadership of Vice Chief of Staff of the Army, General Peter Chiarelli, and under Secretary of the Army, Dr. Joseph Westphal, the Army has worked diligently through an objective and detailed series of capability portfolio reviews that has started it on a path towards achieving rational, stable, and affordable Army modernization strategies and programs. As a result of this analytical process, the Army has canceled less relevant, overambitious, redundant, or unaffordable weapon systems.

But, the Army is not out of the woods yet with its major acquisition programs. There are still significant challenges ahead with the management and funding of its modernization priorities, including development of a new ground combat vehicle. We're interested to hear our witnesses' assessments of the Army's review process, and how they plan to sustain the momentum achieved over the last 2 years.

Finally, no two leaders in the Army have cared more or worked more tirelessly than Secretary McHugh and General Casey in dealing with the human cost to soldiers and their families of the pressures and consequences of an Army in continuous combat for 10 years. A noteworthy priority of General Casey over his 4 years as Chief of Staff has been finding ways to mitigate the stress of multiple combat rotations and long separations on soldiers and their families. The Department of Defense and the Army set a goal that soldiers and units should have twice as much time at home as they would deployed, and that Army families would enjoy greater stability and less stress.

Wounded soldiers deserve, and are getting, the highest priority from the Army for support services, healing and recuperation, rehabilitation, evaluation for return to duty, successful transition from Active Duty, if required, and continuing support beyond retirement or discharge. The Army has established many new programs for the improved care of our wounded soldiers and their families. And, despite the efforts of everyone, heartbreaking incidents of suicide continue. And the committee is interested to hear Secretary McHugh and General Casey's update and assessments of the Army's efforts in that area, and in those areas, as well.

The Nation could not be more proud of our Army, its soldiers, and their families. The most important thing we can do to thank them for their service and sacrifice is ensure that they have what they need, when they need it, to do what we ask them to do. And so, Congress needs to pass a fiscal year 2011 Defense appropriation.

General Casey, thank you again for your leadership and for the service and sacrifices of your family in supporting you over all these years.

Senator McCain.

#### **STATEMENT OF SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN**

Senator MCCAIN. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary McHugh and General Casey, welcome back to the committee.

Secretary McHugh, I believe this is your second appearance at our annual Army posture hearing. And thank you for your continued leadership.

General Casey, this will be your last appearance at our annual posture hearing, and you've spent the last 41 years in uniform, including nearly 4 years as Chief of Staff. Thank you for your years of service to our country. We all appreciate the many sacrifices that you and your family have made over the past decades.

Today, our Army is still at war. For almost 10 years, our soldiers have engaged ruthless and determined enemies on a worldwide battlefield. Our soldiers have fought exceptionally well and at great personal cost to themselves and to their families. Our soldiers turned the tide in Iraq 4 years ago. They're doing so again in Afghanistan. Their singular focus has been to bring the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan to a successful conclusion. Our focus, first and foremost, should be on winning those wars. I would like to hear from you how the Army directly provides those warfighters with the tools they need to win the current fight, and what resources the Army will need in the future.

But, as our soldiers are engaged in conflict abroad, our Nation faces a formidable financial crisis at home, a crisis that can't be ignored. The fact is, we are mortgaging our children's futures. And as such, we must be vigilant to both provide the resources for our warfighters to succeed at the missions we've tasked them with and be good stewards of the taxpayers' dollars.

Secretary Gates' Efficiencies Initiative is a step, I believe, in the right direction. I'd like to hear how the Army has supported the Secretary's efficiencies drive.

I'd also like to hear about what other programs, service contracts, or other organizations you believe could be reduced or eliminated, going forward, without hurting the war effort.

Success on the battlefield does not come without a cost. Equipment returning from Iraq will need to be repaired and recapitalized. Depleted stocks of Reserve and Guard equipment will need to be reconstituted and modernized. And most importantly, returning soldiers will need increased time to rest and recover before their next phase of training. I'd like to hear what steps you've taken to relieve the stress on both men and materiel, especially as Army

end strength declines. I'd like to also know how you intend to pay for it.

I would note, however, that despite the strain on the force, recruitment and retention remain historically high. This fact stands as a testament to the patriotism and resiliency of our servicemembers in the Army.

As we have witnessed in recent weeks, the global security environment means anything—remains anything but predictable. The Army needs a clear vision for the roles and missions it'll have to undertake in the future.

In his speech to the cadets about what their future in the Army would look like, Secretary Gates expressed his predictions. He discounted the likelihood of another large land campaign like Iraq and Afghanistan, and forecast an Army, in coming years, that would most likely engage in short-duration, low-intensity operations. He also warned that the Army would have difficulty justifying the cost of its large, heavy formations. I'm interested in your views for the future of the Army and whether or not you share Secretary Gates' views.

The Army must also tailor a force today to meet its vision for the future. Through the capabilities portfolio review process, the Army has made recent strides to eliminate acquisition programs that failed to deliver increased capabilities at a reasonable cost and in a reasonable amount of time.

That said, I continue to be concerned by the Army's seeming inability to successfully manage its major defense acquisition programs. A recent study noted that, between 1990 and 2010, the Army terminated 22 major acquisition programs. The same study suggested that the Army has wasted between \$3.3 and \$3.8 billion in research and development funds per year, every year since 2004, on programs that produced few tangible results. With this study's background, I was shocked to learn that the Army had asked for another \$407 million in the fiscal year 2012 budget to continue developing the Medium Extended Air Defense System, known as MEADS, when you have decided to cancel the program and never field the system.

Let me be very clear. This kind of business-as-usual approach should be stopped. I expect that the Army will substantially approve its program management of other larger acquisitions, such as the ground combat vehicle. I'd like to hear how you intend to improve the management and oversight of the major Army acquisition programs so that something like MEADS doesn't happen again.

I also, Mr. Secretary, have been very troubled by recent reports concerning these heinous acts that were committed in Afghanistan by Army units. It's not the United States Army. We all know that. But, we also know how damaging something like that of a—actions of a few can affect the reputation of the many. So, I hope that maybe you could discuss that issue a little bit with us this morning. It makes all of us grieve beyond words, because—not because there's occasional rogue element within our military, but the damage it does to the finest institutions in America. So, I would appreciate your comments this morning about that, and what actions can possibly be taken.

It's our job to remind the American people of the outstanding service and courage and sacrifice that's being made by our men and women in the Army every single day.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.  
Secretary McHugh.

**STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN M. MCHUGH, SECRETARY OF THE  
ARMY**

Mr. MCHUGH. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, Senator McCain, distinguished members of the panel, it's really wonderful to be back here in the halls of Congress again, and have the opportunity to be reminded of how lucky we are, as a Nation, to have such a body in the Congress—in the House and the Senate—and particularly, although I'm somewhat prejudiced, a committee such as this, where, through all of the political turmoil and challenges of the moment, a body of men and women can come together and have one common cause, and that is the welfare—doing the right thing by our men and women in uniform. And I want to particularly thank each of you for your steadfast support in that endeavor. Our 1.1 million soldiers and 279,000 civilians and their families are in your debt and very grateful for your leadership and the leadership of a Congress, and this committee particularly, that allows us to continue to field the greatest force for good the world has ever seen, in my judgment, the United States Army.

And today, we are an Army that continues, as has been noted in the opening comments of the Chairman and the Ranking Member, at the forefront of combat, counterinsurgency, counterterrorism, and security assistance operations in nearly 80 nations on the face of this planet.

In Iraq, as you know, our soldiers and civilians began one of the largest and most complex logistical operations in our Nation's history. And as we continue to draw down our forces to meet the December 31, 2011, deadline, we've already closed or transferred over 80 percent of the bases we once operated to Iraqi authorities. We've reduced the number of U.S. personnel by over 75,000, and redeployed more than 2—26,000 vehicles. And having visited Iraq very recently, I can tell you, firsthand, the enormity of the retrograde operations, and yet, the exceptionally high moral of our remaining forces as they continue to advise, assist, and train Iraqis to support that burgeoning democracy.

Simultaneously with drawdown operations in Iraq, the Army has surged an additional 30,000 soldiers to Afghanistan to defeat the al Qaeda terrorist network and the Taliban insurgency. This surge enabled our soldiers and our Afghan partners to seize multiple sanctuaries in the traditional insurgent heartland of southern Afghanistan. Additionally, during this past year, our forces have trained 109,000 Afghan National Army soldiers, as well as 41,000 Afghan National Police. And overseas contingency operations are just one part of what your Army does.

Our soldiers and civilians from all Army components remain committed to protecting our homeland, not only from the threat of enemies who would harm us, but also from the ravages of natural

and manmade disasters. From National Guard soldiers assisting with drug enforcement and border security, to the Army Corps of Engineers responding to the catastrophic oilspill in the Gulf of Mexico, America's Army has been there to support local, State, and Federal partners in saving, protecting, and caring for our citizens.

Yet, our challenges have not been Reserved simply for combat, border protection, or disaster relief. For, just as our soldiers and civilians conducted multiple operations here and around the world, the Army simultaneously continued its far-reaching efforts to modernize their equipment, transform units, and complete the unprecedented consolidations required under the recent base closure and realignment program.

As the Army continue to fight global terrorists and regional insurgents, we must be ever mindful of the future and the enemies it may bring—hybrid threats, hostile state actors, to name just two. It's vital, therefore, that we have a modernization program, one that provides our soldiers with the full array of equipment necessary to maintain a decisive advantage over the enemies we're fighting today, as well as deter and defeat tomorrow's threats, at a price we can afford.

Our fiscal year 2012 budget request is critical to achieving this goal by supporting the extraordinary strides being made in the Army's state-of-the-art network, tactical wheeled vehicle and combat vehicle modernization programs.

Regarding the network, we're requesting \$974 million in procurement and 298 million in research and development for the Warfighter Information Network-Tactical, WIN-T, which will become the cornerstone of our battlefield communications system. This budget also contains \$2.1 billion in procurement for joint and combat communications systems, including the Joint Tactical Radio System, also known and JTRS.

As we look to modernize our vehicle fleets, we're asking for \$1.5 billion for tactical wheeled vehicle modernization, and over 1 billion to support vital research and development for combat vehicle modernization, including 884 million for the ground combat vehicle and 156 million for the modernization of the Stryker, Bradley, and Abrams platforms.

Along with advances in equipment, the Army is seeking new methods to use and secure our scarce energy resources. Clearly, future operations will depend on our ability to reduce dependency, increase efficiency, and use more renewable or alternative sources of energy. We have made strides in this area, and we need, we will do, more.

The Army has established a senior energy council, appointed a senior energy executive, and adopted a comprehensive strategy for energy security. Based on this strategy, we are developing more efficient generators and power distribution platforms, factoring in fuel costs as part of equipment modernizations, and developing a net-zero approach to holistically address our installations' energy, water, and waste needs.

Moreover, we're changing how we do business by undertaking comprehensive efforts to reform our procurement methods. In May 2010, the Chief and I commissioned an unprecedented blue ribbon review of the Army's acquisitions systems from cradle to grave.

And as you noted, Senator McCain, we have a great deal of room for improvement. That panel provided us some 72 recommendations. We are currently analyzing the insightful report, and we'll use it as a guide over the next 2 years to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of the Army acquisition process.

But, we haven't stopped there. To ensure that we purchase the right equipment to meet the needs of our soldiers, we instituted, as has been noted by both the Chairman and the Ranking Member, a series of capability portfolio reviews to examine all existing Army requirements and transfer those programs that we found to be redundant, didn't work, or which were just too expensive. These broadbased reviews have already helped us to identify key gaps and unnecessary redundancies, while promoting good stewardship of our Nation's resources. And we will continue those reviews as a permanent part of our fiscal responsibility program.

We remain committed to using every effort to obtain the right systems, supplies, and services at the right time and in the most cost-effective, streamlined manner possible. Our soldiers and our taxpayers deserve no less. And we look forward to working closely with this committee as we continue to implement these sweeping changes.

Throughout it all, as this panel knows so very well, at its heart, the Army is people. Although our soldiers and civilians are better trained, led, and equipped, and more capable than ever before, as has been noted, our forces are clearly stretched and our personnel are strained from a decade of war. This is evidenced by yet another year of discouraging rates of suicide and high-risk behavior, not only among members of the regular Army, but the Reserve components, as well.

In response, under the direct supervision of Vice Chief of Staff, General Pete Chiarelli, the Army completed an unprecedented 15-month study to better understand suicide and related actions amongst our soldiers. In July, we published the first-ever health promotion, risk reduction and suicide prevention report. And it was a very candid, a very open, honest, and, at times, stark study and assessment designed to assist our leaders in recognizing and reducing high-risk behavior, as well as the stigma associated with behavioral healthcare. The lessons from this holistic review have been infused into every level of command and incorporated throughout our efforts to strengthen the resiliency of our soldiers, families, and civilians.

Moreover, our fiscal year 2012 budget request provides 1.7 billion to fund vital soldier and family programs to provide a full range of essential services, to include the Army campaign for health promotion, risk reduction, and suicide prevention, as well as sexual harassment, assault response and prevention, and comprehensive soldier fitness programs.

Caring for our families, our personnel, has to go beyond, however, mental, physical, and emotional health. We're also committed to protecting their safety, both at home and abroad, from internal and external threats. As part of our continuing efforts to learn and adapt from the Fort Hood shooting, the Army has instituted a number of key programs to enhance awareness, reporting, prevention, and response to such threats. For example, we've imple-

mented iWatch and iSalute programs to improve our ability to detect and migrate—mitigate high-risk behavior indicative of insider threat. To enhance interoperability with local, regional, and Federal agencies, Army installations, we have also fully implemented the National Incident Management System by 2014. We fielded the FBI's eGuardian system, and require all installations to have emergency management equipment, such as E911 and mass warning notification systems.

Finally, Mr. Chairman, I'd be remiss if didn't echo, for a moment, the comments that you made, very aptly, correctly, as to the continuing challenges provided by the CR. I could provide an entire list of those things that we have been unable to do, and the planning that we have been unable to conclude through that. And if you'd care to—choose to speak about it in specifics, I'd look forward to it. But, suffice it to say, every day that passes without that issue being resolved mounts the challenges that we face.

And I should say, given where we are at the moment, and the upcoming expiration of the Continuing CR, the only thing I can imagine worse than a year-long CR would be a government shutdown, in terms of what it would mean in providing for our soldiers. I was here for the shutdown in '95. Most everyone on this panel understands what happened then. I can tell you, from the Army perspective, there was—and the military perspective—some luck, in that the implementation of the shutdown didn't affect pay to soldiers. I doubt we'd be that lucky this time.

The fact of the matter is, and it's not well understood, that if we lapse over a payroll, in a government shutdown, soldiers won't be paid—won't be paid if they're at Fort Bragg, Fort Lewis, Fort Carson, Fort Drum—won't be paid if they're at Bagram, Afghanistan, Iraq, or wherever. We will not have the authority.

So, I say that only as a matter of encouragement to those of you on this panel who have been our champions in this effort. And certainly, to the extent we can provide you any kind of information that can carry forward, we are more than willing and, in fact, appreciative of the opportunity.

And with that, I'd yield back, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McHugh and General Casey follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Secretary McHugh.  
General Casey.

**STATEMENT OF GEN GEORGE W. CASEY, JR., USA, CHIEF OF  
STAFF OF THE ARMY**

General CASEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator McCain, members of the committee.

First, I appreciate your comments about this being my final hearing. But, this being Washington, I've learned that nothing's final. Just so you—I was told by the House Armed Services Committee chairman, that would be my last hearing, and they managed to squeeze one in next week. And I say that just to state a fact, not to encourage this committee to top them. [Laughter.]

Chairman LEVIN. We welcome the reminder, General. [Laughter.]  
General CASEY. Yes. Thank you.

Also, before I start, I'd like to introduce three guests that represent important segments of our Army family here. On the left, Ruth Stonesifer. Her son, Christopher, was killed in a helicopter crash along the Afghan-Pakistan border in 2001. And she has committed herself to helping other survivors, most recently as the president of the Gold Star Mothers.

Thank you, Ruth.

Sitting next to her is Sergeant Joel Dulashanti. Sergeant Dulashanti was wounded in 2007 in Afghanistan by a sniper, and lost his leg. He spent the last 4 years here in the Washington area rehabilitating himself. Two of those years, he's worked in the Army legislative liaison. Now, the good news for Joel is, he's getting a pardon this summer, and he will go to Fort Benning, Georgia, to become an instructor in our airborne school.

And then, lastly, to his right, Sergeant—First Sergeant Damien Anderson. First Sergeant Anderson is a two- tour veteran of Iraq. And he is a master resilience trainer. He recently completed a 10-day course at University of Pennsylvania to give him the skills to help our soldier be more resilient.

So, I'd ask—just ask that you welcome them.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, we do, in fact, welcome them. We thank them very much for their service.

And, Ms. Stonesifer, thank you for what your doing, and for your son's service and sacrifice.

We very much—I know I'm speaking for all of us on the committee—are grateful to all of you and your families.

General CASEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you.

For the last 4 years, you've heard me say that the Army was out of balance, that we were so weighed down by our current demands in Iraq and Afghanistan that we knew we couldn't do the things that we needed to do to sustain this All-Volunteer Force and to prepare ourselves to do other things. Today, thanks in large measure to the support of this committee, I can tell you that we've made great progress toward the goals we set for ourselves in 2007. And, as an Army, we're starting to breathe again. We're emerging from a decade of war and transformation with a well-equipped combat-seasoned total force that, while still stretched by the demands and lingering effects of a decade at war, is able to begin preparing for the challenges of the second decade of the 21st century.

Let me just give you a quick update on some of the progress. First, we've completed both the permanent end- strength increase that was directed by President Bush in 2007, and the temporary end-strength increase of 22,000, authorized by Secretary Gates in 2009. This allowed us to meet the plus-up in Afghanistan before we were out of Iraq without having to increase the deployed time for our soldiers.

Second, our growth plus the drawdown in Iraq have enabled us to significantly improve dwell, the time that the soldiers spend at home between deployment. And this a critical component of sustaining an All-Volunteer Force in a protracted conflict. For the better part of 5 years, we were returning soldiers to combat with just 1 year at home. We knew that wasn't sustainable, and we've been

working to bring the dwell to 2 years at home as quickly as possible.

I can tell you that, beginning the 1st of October this year, given what we know about projected demands, our Active units will deploy with an expectation of 2 years at home, and our Reserve-component soldiers will deploy with an expectation of 4 years at home. And that's a huge milestone for us. We'll continue to work to our long-term goal of 3 years at home before—between combat deployments.

Third. This year, we will also largely complete the largest organizational transformation of the Army since World War II. We'll finish the modular conversion of all but a handful our 300 brigades, and finish rebalancing soldiers away from cold-war skills to skills more relevant and necessary today, to the tune of about 160,000 soldiers.

Taken together, today we have a fundamentally different Army than we had on September 11th, 2001. And we had a great Army then. Today, we are a more versatile and experienced force.

Fourth, to enhance this versatility, we have developed a fundamentally different way of building readiness to provide trained and ready forces to combatant commanders, the Army Force Generation model. It's an output-based readiness model that, one, fully integrates the Guard and Reserve, that brings the kind of predictability we need to sustain our All-Volunteer Force, and that allows us to build the readiness we need to both meet current demands and hedge against unexpected contingencies. ARFORGEN is also a more effective and more efficient way of building the readiness we need when we need it.

So, after a decade of very hard work, we have a force that's the right size, that's organized into versatile, modular organizations, that's operating on a predictable rotational cycle, and that is beginning to have sufficient time at home to train for the full range of missions, and to recover from a decade at war. That would not have been possible without your support and the support of the American people. So, thank you.

Now, this fiscal year '12 budget marks a transition place—point for us in which we can begin shifting our focus away from restoring balance to sustaining the balance that we, together, have so painstakingly restored to this force. And sustaining that balance is particularly critical now, because this war is not over.

The fiscal year '12 budget that we're presenting today enables us to do three things: to maintain our combat edge, to reset and reconstitute our force, and to build resilience into this force for the second decade. And I'd like to say a few words about each of these. But, in short, the budget, as submitted, enables us to sustain the balance that we have, together, restored to this great Army. I do remain concerned about the outcome of the '11 budget and its corresponding impact on this year's budget.

So, just a few words about each of the three elements:

First of all, maintaining our combat edge. It's critically important that we maintain the edge that we've honed over a decade at war, because I believe we are in a period of persistent conflict and also one of continuous and fundamental change. That change is driven by rapid technological advances and adaptive enemies. Critical to

our ability to maintain this combat edge will be an affordable modernization strategy that provides the equipment to our soldiers to give them a decisive advantage over any enemy that they face.

The budget—this budget lays out such a program. And I'd just like highlight two key areas:

No matter where our soldiers are, no matter what type of environment they're operating in, they need to know where they are, they need to know where their buddies are, they need to know where the enemy is; and when they shoot at them, they need to strike the enemy with precision. They also need protective mobility. This budget contains funding that will begin fielding some of the key elements of the network that will enable our soldiers in any environment. These include the Joint Tactical Radio System and the Warfighter Information Network. The budget also includes funding for a new ground combat vehicle that provides protection against improvised explosive devices, that has the capacity to carry a nine-man squad, that is capable of operating across the spectrum of operations, and that can be developed in 7 years.

Maintaining our combat edge also requires training for the full spectrum of operations. This training is conducted both a home station and at our combat training centers. It will be critical to ensuring we sustain our combat experience and restore the ability to deploy rapidly for the full range of missions. It will require moving operations- and-maintenance dollars from the OCO to the base over the next several years.

It's also important that we consolidate the gains that we've made in our Reserve components. If you think about it, half of our guardsmen and reservists are combat veterans. And I've never seen the relationship between the active component and the Reserve component better than it is now. And we are working together to establish an effective paradigm that allows us to leverage the substantial investments and experience of our Reserve components.

Second major point: reconstituting the force. I see two elements to this. One is the continuous resetting of forces returning from Iraq and Afghanistan. We have over 110,000 soldiers deployed today, and they and their replacements and their equipment will need to be reset over time. Reset isn't a one-time shot. It's a process that's necessary for every returning unit and will require sustained funding for 2 to 3 years after we're out of Iraq and Afghanistan to ensure that we reconstitute the force fully and restore readiness to next-to-deploy forces. And we haven't had that ability for 5 or 6 years, so it's important that we restore that ability.

Third, and finally, is building resiliency into this force for the long haul. We've been at war for almost a decade. The cumulative effects of that war are still with us and will be with us for a while. This budget contains fundings for programs like the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness health promotion, risk-reduction, suicide prevention, the Army Family Covenant, survivor outreach services, and sexual assault prevention, that will allow us to continue to build resilience into this force. We remain, as I know you do, fully committed to the well-being of our soldiers, families, and civilians.

So, Mr. Chairman, in conclusion, I'd like to leave the committee with two thoughts as I complete 40 years of service to this great country:

First, we're at a key transition point, as we move from a decade of war and transformation to a decade of sustaining a force at war in a period of declining resources. Together, we have built a great Army. But, it's an Army still stretched and recovering from the last decade of war as it continues to prosecute a war in two theaters.

It took us a decade to get where we are today. We recognize that the country is in a difficult financial position, and we have, and we will continue to work hard to use the resources that you provide us as effectively and as efficiently as possible. But, we are at war, and this war is not over. So, we need to proceed with caution, because the last thing any of us wants to do is to create a hollow Army while we're fighting a war.

And second, Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the members of this committee for your enduring support of our Army. You visited our troops and their families in their homes and in war, you've helped us bury our dead, and you've seen, firsthand, through all the change, hardship, and demands of war, what has remained constant is the courage, the selfless service, and the sacrifice of our soldiers, families, and civilians. And I couldn't be prouder to have worn this uniform for the past 40 years and to have served alongside the great men and women of this Army. And I am humbled and particularly proud to have led them in this last decade. It's been the greatest honor of my career.

So, thank you very much for everything you've done for your Army. And I look forward to taking your questions.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you so much, Senator—I mean, General Casey. And we, again, want to express our gratitude. Each member of this committee has seen your dedication and your commitment during all these years, and we really appreciate that, and are grateful for that.

Let's try 7 minutes this morning. It'll be a lot tighter this afternoon, by the way, I would indicate to everybody. We were able to get Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen this afternoon for a limited period of time because of—particularly because of Secretary Gates's schedule. So, I just—we want to alert everybody to hone down those questions, because we're going to have to have a much more limited period for each of us this afternoon.

Senator McCain and I both referred to a speech that Secretary Gates made at West Point last month, when he said that the—it's unlikely that the Nation will commit large land forces to future conflicts, that the Army needs to confront the reality that the most plausible high-end scenarios for the U.S. military will be primarily naval and air engagements, and that, quote, "The Army will be increasingly challenged to justify the number, size, and cost of its heavy formations."

And let me start, I guess, with you, General, because you've already spoken out, it seems, with quite a different approach. So, let me ask you to react, if you would, to Secretary Gates's comments.

General CASEY. I don't necessarily disagree with Secretary Gates's comment, Senator. I mean, I took the West Point speech as Secretary Gates causing us to look forward, to look beyond where we are today. I can tell you that we have already reduced the size of our armored formations by 40 percent. We've reduced the supporting artillery formations by almost 60 percent, and the sup-

porting sustainment formations by 60 percent. So, we have already taken a big chunk out of our armored formations.

About 6 months ago, we began a complete review of all of our force structure, looking at: Do we have the right types of forces, the right mix of forces, and the right mix between the active component and the Guard and Reserve? And we are just wrapping that up. And we did it purposefully to—because the work that we did, that has driven the modular reorganization of the Army, was great work, but it was done in 2003. And we all know we've learned a heck of a lot in the last 8 years. So, we wanted to make sure that we were appropriately applying those lessons. And so, we are looking at whether or not we have the right mix.

But, I would tell you, Senator, the thing that I believe we have to move away from, as a Department, is, for 60 years, the central organizing principle of the Department of Defense and the Department of the Army has been conventional war. We were designed to build the systems to prosecute conventional war. We're not doing that now. And I believe the central organizing principle needs to shift to versatility, and that we need to structure our forces so that we have a versatile mix of heavy, light, Stryker, and enabling forces so that we can put together force packages for a wide range of contingencies that are going to face us. I mean, I think we all accept the fact that the uncertainty and the complexity of the environment we're operating in today is certainly greater than I've experienced in my 40-year career.

So, we're looking hard at versatility, and we're making sure that we have the right mix of forces to give us that versatility.

Chairman LEVIN. Part of that versatility would be the importance of the Army's doctrine on the new advise-and-assist brigades, which have played, really, a critical role in the last few years, in terms of the transition to full Iraqi security responsibility and, I'm sure, playing an important role in Afghanistan, as well.

Now, building the security forces of foreign forces has traditionally been a Special Operations Forces mission. But, both in Iraq and Afghanistan, general purpose forces have been performing this mission for some time in the form of these advise-and-assist brigades. And let just ask both of you, very quickly, if you would, Do you support the role of general purpose forces as advise-and-assist brigades in Iraq and Afghanistan? General, let me just ask you, just quickly, do you—

General CASEY. Yeah.

Chairman LEVIN.—do you support that?

General CASEY. I do support that, Senator.

Chairman LEVIN. Okay. And—

General CASEY. It's the reality that we're doing it.

Chairman LEVIN. And Secretary McHugh?

Mr. MCHUGH. Yes, sir, I do, fully. I just visited one of the six we have in Afghanistan, General Dave Perkins, and they're doing magnificent work. And I think we're fully structured and have the resources to do it, and do it very well.

General CASEY. If I could just follow up, Senator, I support it, but I don't necessarily think we need specialized formations to do it. As you see what we've done with the advise-and-assist brigades, we have adapted a modular brigade and given them some addi-

tional folks and have been able to do that. And that's the versatility that I think we need to sustain.

Mr. MCHUGH. I agree with that.

Chairman LEVIN. The—I think you made reference to the need for energy efficiencies, Mr. Secretary, and you made quite a point of it, and I couldn't agree with you more. But, the situation is that, when it comes to actually implementing those changes, those efficiencies, that you've got a long way to go, too, as you mentioned about some other aspect.

The Marines made a point about this issue when they deployed an infantry company to Afghanistan that was equipped with renewable power systems to recharge batteries and electronics and provide energy-efficient lighting. And the fuel used for that company of the Marines in Afghanistan has decreased 90 percent. And two patrol bases now operate entirely upon renewable energy. Lightweight solar panels are rolled up and carried in the troops' rucksacks. This allows combat patrols to maneuver in the mountains of Afghanistan for weeks without a battery resupply.

Now, the Marines are actually using technologies that were developed by the Army. And so, I'm just wondering why—or, it seems as though the actual deployment of those technologies is not happening as quickly in the Army. Or, is it? Have they just made a better point of publicly talking about how the actual deployment and implementation is advancing?

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, I should say, we're delighted to help our Marine brethren do better. And they actually gave us, the Army, credit for that, and we appreciate their openness.

I do think that this is a multifaceted problem. I don't want to underestimate the need for the Army to do better. We need to. I said that in my opening statement, and I promise you we will. However, I have a letter, that I signed out this week, coming back to you. You asked those very important and, I think, very apt questions. We, in fact, have deployed a good number of the systems cited in your letter, that the Marines have deployed, as well. Our PR effort, apparently, was not what it should be. And, in fact, I had a meeting, just last week, with the assistant Secretary of the Army for Installations, Environment, and Energy, Ms. Hammock, to try to ensure that we keep this panel, the Congress, and the public, better informed as to what we're doing.

We call that program the REPS Program. We have 100 fielded right now. We're working hard to field more. It's a great success. We actually think we can refine it and do even better. We have micro-grids out there, as well. Our—the micro-grid program is basically focused amongst our Special Operations Forces. They seem to be positioned best to use them.

You noted, Mr. Chairman, in your letter, that part of the challenge for the Army is the size of force. The Marines are configured in a way that, in some instances, allows them to use our equipment more effectively or more broad-basedly.

I think it's important to note, we just a few—I believe, a few weeks ago—opened a technology village in Bagram, and we're using that as a basing platform to bring in these new technologies, many of which were mentioned in your letter, by the Marine Corps, and to deploy them theaterwide to make sure that we're doing that.

And we feel very confident about our ability to do better. And the fact that we have challenged our FOBs and our combat outposts to reduce their energy consumption by 30 to 60 percent, which is a pretty big number when you're at war.

So, I promise you, we're going to do better in informing this committee, and the Congress as a whole and the American people, as to what we're doing. But, having said that—and I can talk about a whole bunch of programs.

We've got 126 renewable projects across our post camps and stations. Some of the things we're doing in solar and voltaic processing systems, micro-grids, et cetera, et cetera. But, we have a ways to go. And, of the services, I would candidly admit, we're the most challenged. But, we're working it very hard.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, that's an important news story, and a good-news story. And we are glad to hear it.

Senator McCain.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And again, thank you, General Casey. And thank the individuals you brought with us for their continued—with you—for their continued service.

General Casey, what is your estimate of the effectiveness of the 30,000-soldier surge into Afghanistan?

General CASEY. Senator, I believe it has been effective. It has been particularly effective in the areas where we have put them in. And, as General Petraeus has said, it has halted the Taliban momentum and begun to restore our momentum in the areas where we've put them in. So, I believe it has had its intended effect at the tactical level.

Senator MCCAIN. Are you, overall, optimistic about the future of our involvement in Afghanistan, General?

General CASEY. I am, Senator. I believe it's going to take a while; but, after my experience in Iraq—these things take a while. And if we stick this out, I believe that we will ultimately be successful in delivering an Afghan government that is seen as represented by its people and has security forces that can keep al Qaeda out and maintain domestic order. But, it's going to take a while.

Senator MCCAIN. As you know, there were—there is a commitment to begin some withdrawals the middle of this year—I believe, July. Do you have an estimate or idea of how large that withdrawal should be?

General CASEY. I do not, Senator. And that's going to—something that's going to be done in theater.

Senator MCCAIN. So, your estimate of the situation on the ground doesn't give you the, you know, idea or thoughts as to how large our withdrawal should be.

General CASEY. No, Senator. I wouldn't want to second-guess General Petraeus on that. He's much closer to it. But, my broad sense is that it will likely start relatively small.

Senator MCCAIN. Would you talk to us a little bit about the situation with these pictures that have come to light and the—well, I—

General CASEY. I mean, I don't—

Senator McCain—I don't have to describe it to you.

Go ahead.

General CASEY. I mean, where's—we share your distress. And the pictures are reprehensible. And they are not indicative of the conduct of the million soldiers that have deployed in combat in the last decade.

Senator MCCAIN. And the actions that are being taken——

General CASEY. There are 12 of those soldiers——

Senator MCCAIN. I mean, investigations——

General CASEY. Right. Twelve of those soldiers are pending court-martial charges now. As you know, there have been some convictions already. Five of the soldiers have been charged with murder, one convicted. Again, we believe we are pursuing this to the full extent of the law.

Senator MCCAIN. And——

General CASEY. I think you——

Senator MCCAIN. Excuse me. I'm sorry.

General CASEY. I think you should also know that the Secretary directed a look at the chain of command above those soldiers, and that investigation is coming to a conclusion.

Senator MCCAIN. So, there will be some command responsibility here.

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, we—that would be an assumption, Senator. I really don't have the granularity on what the investigation will show. But, I think the important part is, we are looking very hard at it. I think there are some serious questions as to the culpability, responsibilities of overseeing a unit that was engaged in this kind of activity. And we'll take that wherever the facts and the truth lead us.

I do get, frankly, distressed when I read reports that I think are, at best, premature, perhaps somewhat irresponsible, that the Army is just going to hold a few lower-ranking soldiers, in this case, responsible, that we're not even looking at higher command. And that's simply untrue.

I can't tell you who may be charged with what. But, we are absolutely looking at the higher chain of command. It's just the reality, as you know, Senator, when you have a absolutely heinous case, such as this, it starts at the ground level and works its way up. And that is what we're doing.

The Chief and I are going to take a brief, I believe next week, on just the very fact that you brought up. And a lot of people have compared this situation to Abu Ghraib. I would tell you, in some ways, it's worse. Abu Ghraib didn't go to the extent that some of these acts did. But, I think it's unfair comparison. This was not something the Army was lying back at and ignoring. By the time Der Spiegel published the first round of articles, we were well into the convictions.

No one finds this more distasteful, more harmful, than a soldier in theater, because it makes their job harder, makes their job more dangerous, and they detest it as much as we do. And we're going to go wherever the truth and the path takes us.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, thank you, Mr. Secretary. That's a very strong and helpful statement. And once you reach some conclusions on this issue—because, you know, we continue to be puzzled and, frankly, stunned that something like this should happen—so, once you reach some conclusions, we'd appreciate it, the members of the

committee, if you'd come over and tell us—because, we really—I continue, with years of experience with the military, to be—you know, I never thought a My-Lai-type thing would ever happen again. And so, I think members of the committee, as well as all Americans, would be interested in how something like this could happen. And obviously, you'll be taking steps to make sure that nothing like this ever is repeated.

General Casey, since I've got you for the last time—in your opinion, how useful would it be for Congress to pass an authorization for the use of military force for Operation Odyssey Dawn in Libya?

General CASEY. That's an interesting question, Senator. And I would defer that—I'd ask you to hold that question til this afternoon. I think you've got the right people to—that will answer that.

Senator MCCAIN. You don't want to—

General CASEY. I don't want to set up the Chairman and the Secretary. [Laughter.]

Senator MCCAIN. Well, thank you.

I hope, again, this MEADS issue, Mr. Secretary, will be resolved. Maybe you could say a few words about that—conclude my questioning.

Mr. MCHUGH. Yeah, I will, Senator. And I will tell you, the optics of it, from far enough away, are puzzling. And I think you're looking at this, as most logical people would, Why would the Army, over 2 years, spend some \$800-plus million so we could withdraw the program in 2014, instead of withdrawing right now? And I asked that very question.

As you know, Senator, this is—the Army is the executive agent here. It is really—the program was negotiated above the Army and continues as an international cooperative agreement amongst the United States, Italy, and Germany.

The reason for the extension and the request this year, which would be followed by a second request in 2013, is that to withdraw now brings penalties. And you can't do the assessment as to the exact number—amount of penalties until it's actually executed and certain negotiations are finalized. But, it's likely the termination cost in 2012 would be in excess of \$800 million, as well. So, it was the thought that we will spend an equal amount of money until 2014, when the contract—and, really, the international agreement—allows partners to withdraw at that time. And the good news about the 800 million that would be spent getting us to 2014 is, it does allow us to take away whatever capability package—technology capability package is available.

This has been an underperforming program. It's been around since the mid-'90s. It's about 15 years old. The agreement phase we're in right now was created and agreed to in 1996. It's rarely met the thresholds of development that it—that was desired to be. So, I think the right decision is to get out. But, given the fact we spend 800 now to get out, and we'll have nothing, let's spend 800 million to get out—it also helps us to work more cooperatively with our two important allies and walk away with some kind of technical package—makes more sense.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, the only thing that I don't think taxpayers understand, and I don't either, is why we would have a situation where termination costs would cost the taxpayers as much as

to continue. Why would we—and, as you said, it's been a troubled program since the '90s—why would we enter into such a situation, where it would cost us just as much to terminate it—and it's being terminated because of nonperformance—as it does for us to continue? That is something that only in the Defense Department, frankly, could we have—when we go out and we buy a target—a product, and the product doesn't meet the specifications or the schedule or the contract provisions, then we terminate it, we don't pay them any money.

So, I guess, Mr. Chairman, we need to look at this kind of arrangement, that it costs us more to terminate a bad program than it does to continue it.

I don't know if you've got any answer to that, General.

Mr. MCHUGH. I wasn't around in 2006. It wasn't an Army-negotiated agreement. I suspect, at the time, there was high hopes. Whatever the cause, it never materialized.

Chairman LEVIN. Well, why don't we ask whoever did negotiate the agreement. Who was it? What department? Or is that the State Department or—where is it?

Mr. MCHUGH. I'm sure there were multi-agency involvement. I—

Chairman LEVIN. Well, we'll try to—we'll ask our staff to give us a report on the history of this program, and how is it that that kind of language gets into a contract, as Senator McCain has requested. So, we'll ask—we'll find out what agencies were involved, and get a staff report on the history of that.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator McCain.

Senator Lieberman.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary, thank you for your continuing service.

General Casey, thanks so much for your 40 years of service—extraordinary service, really. And it's been a real pleasure for me to get to know you personally over the last several years. I think you have every reason to feel real pride, as you leave the service of the Army and the country, in not only the quality of your leadership, but what you've presided over. In your time, both in Iraq and then, of course, as Chief of the Army, the Army has faced, I think, some of its greatest challenges ever, and also had some of its greatest successes ever. I think this will be seen as one of the great periods in the great history of the U.S. Army. And part of it is exactly what you said a while ago, which is that this was a conventional Army trained for conventional warfare that suddenly faced the most unconventional kind of warfare and made a transition—admittedly took a little time—that was remarkable and has been successful and has now brought us to a period of historic accomplishment, I think, in Iraq, which I believe is part of the reason why the uprisings are occurring in the Arab world today. Because somebody in Lebanon said to Senator McCain and me—we were there about a month ago—once that statue of Saddam was pulled down in Baghdad, not only people in Iraq, but throughout the Arab world, began to lose their fear of their dictatorial leaders and began to believe that they had the capacity to change their lives. Of course, you presided, in your time as Chief, in—over the surge in Iraq, and

now the surge in Afghanistan, and over a remarkable generation of Army troops. So, I just—I can't thank you enough for that.

I wanted to ask you, in the nature of an exit interview, when you come to the moment of transition with General Dempsey, what are you going to say to him that you most hope he protects in the next period of time in the Army? And then, what are you going to say is kind of unfinished business that you want him to make sure he finishes?

General CASEY. Oh, that's great. I'm making those notes as we speak here, Senator.

I'm going to tell Marty I think his greatest challenge is to—will be to preserve the gains that we, together, have built over the last decade. And you know what's happening with the budget. You know about the end strength reduction that is on the table, albeit conditions based, on the withdrawal in Iraq and Afghanistan.

End strength is a key factor for the Army. We have to have the right size Army that can meet our commitments at a 1-year-out/2-years-back cycle. That's a new dimension that we haven't had to deal with before. But, it's also got to be the right size that we can afford to equip it, to train it, and to sustain the soldiers and families. And finding the right size so that we can have a balanced force, still meet the demands, and do it at a sustainable deployment tempo, that's the art that he's going to have to take on here to move the Army forward.

I believe the biggest thing that he needs to protect is the dwell. Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General CASEY. I mean, we—I can't understate the fact that we are still dealing with the impact of 10 years at war. I mean, we've had over 100,000 soldiers diagnosed—I'm—or, with mild traumatic brain injury. Fortunately, 95-plus percent is mild or moderate. Over 45,000 soldiers diagnosed with posttraumatic stress, 29,000 soldiers wounded. I mean, there is something that has to be done and sustained.

The other thing I'd mention—and Ruth Stonesifer's over here—we've lost over—just in the Army, over 4300 soldiers—

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General CASEY.—leaving over 20,000 family members.

So, all of that needs to be dealt with and taken care of. So, he can't take his eye off that ball, and he needs to stay focused on the dwell.

Senator LIEBERMAN. I appreciate the answer.

Let me ask you a followup question about the dwell time, because you've helped to educate a lot of us on this—on the importance of this question. And obviously, dwell time is a result of a lot of different variables. One is, What's the demand on the Army? How many troops do we have in Afghanistan, for instance? And how many troops do we have in the Army? And you're right that we're—Secretary Gates has proposed a reduction in the end strength, as of 2015, but conditions-based.

I've been wondering whether there would be value in Congress, by legislation, requiring a certification for the attainment or a sustainment of a satisfactory dwell ratio before any end-strength cuts are enacted. In other words, that—obviously, we will look and see, What are the demands in Iraq, Afghanistan, or anywhere else

in the world? But, the dwell-time ratio has been so—dwell-to-deployment—has been so significant; I think you've made that case—I wonder if we should establish a formal certification process.

General CASEY. I'd have to think about that, Senator. My initial reaction would be that anytime Congress puts another constraint, it limits flexibility. But, I think—I mean, as I mentioned, I believe that we have drawn a new baseline now—

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General CASEY.—and we can't knowingly accept a—an end strength that will allow—that would cause us to do less than that.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General CASEY. I mean, we could do it for short periods of time in an emergency, but I don't think we should accept an end strength that would allow us to do less than 2 years at home. It just doesn't—

Senator LIEBERMAN. Two years at home for one year in battle; and, for the Guard and Reserve, I know your aim was 5, but 4 is a good standard.

General CASEY. I think it is. And interesting what the Guard and Reserve leadership is telling us now. They think 5 years at home is too long, because they lose that—it's easier to lose that combat edge over a 6-year cycle, and that 4 is feeling about right to them. It's the right balance between maintaining their skills and maintaining their jobs and their families.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thank you.

I want to ask you if you would just speak a little bit about the kinds of acquisition program difficulties the Army has had over time. I was particularly surprised when the ground combat vehicle competition was canceled and then restarted. And I just want to ask you generally, What have you—what do you take away from the experience you've had, particularly in your time as Chief of the Army? And again, what would you say to those who follow you about how to get this acquisition process to run better this time?

General CASEY. Thank you, Senator. I will tell you that I personally learned an awful lot from the Future Combat Systems Program. One of the first things I learned was that anything that goes—that takes longer than two chiefs' tenures to do won't work. And what I found I had to do is, I had to reeducate myself and the Army about the program when I returned from Iraq. It had kind of gotten off and adrift.

The second big thing that I've learned is that we tend—we, the Army—tend to overreach. We want the best for our soldiers, so we go out there and think we can deliver on technology that's just not ready to be—to deliver. And I think the Future Combat System is a good example of that. We tried to press too hard and rely on technology that just wasn't ready. And then the integration problems just were insurmountable.

The other thing that the Secretary and I both realized was that, over the last two decades, we've allowed our acquisition skills and our professional acquisition corps to atrophy. And so, that's why the Secretary charged this study to look at ourselves. And we asked Mr. Decker and General Wagner to look—give us a soup-to-nuts look. And that's the report that Senator McCain quoted—

Senator LIEBERMAN. Right.

General CASEY.—about our lack of success in the acquisition process.

And so, we're using this report, much like we use the Gansler Report on contracting, as a springboard to improve our process. But, it's going to take some time.

So, we've learned a awful lot, and we're trying to adapt it, because, as Senator McCain said, we recognize that we—resources are going down, and we have to use the ones that you give us efficiently.

Mr. MCHUGH. May I—

Senator LIEBERMAN. Thank you.

Mr. MCHUGH. I'm sorry, Senator. May I add—

Senator LIEBERMAN. Sure.

Mr. MCHUGH.—a word there?

Senator LIEBERMAN. Please.

Mr. MCHUGH. The ground combat vehicle RFP cancellation surprised a lot of people. I would respectfully suggest that it was actually a good-news story, because what we found, as we went forward with the first—the initial RFP, was that we were recreating the very pitfalls that the Chief just outlined, with respect to the Future Combat System. The original RFP contained over 990 core requirements, many of which had heavily dependent requirements upon immature technologies, just as the FCS did. We said, “Well, here we go again.” So, we pulled back the RFP. The acquisition experts, including Dr. Ash Carter in DOD, sat down and brought that down to 162 core requirements, put it back out, injected competition, let the industry know that we encourage commercial off-the-shelf technology, allowed for biodegradable fuels and hybrid engine development to be part of that, allowed the tier-two requirements to be traded for cost. So, I think it showed we've, at least for the moment, learned a lot of very important lessons, particularly out of FCS, but in a lot of other programs that have failed over the last decade.

Senator LIEBERMAN. Good enough. Thank you. Thank you both.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Lieberman.

Senator Inhofe.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I had more than 7 minutes, I would elaborate a little bit on the great job that both of you have done, but, you, General Casey, the personal attention you've always given me in responses to—you're really hands-on. In fact, I say this about your whole team. Under Secretary Westphal has been very helpful. You've just got a very responsive group there. But, General Casey, I just want to thank you, personally, for all that you have done, personally, for me and our relationship.

Let's—it's been kind of an interesting discussion on the FCS, because, frankly, I don't agree with any of that stuff, but I'm kind of a little closer to where you guys are now. I've—we worked through this thing. One of the areas that we really needed work on, of course, was our NLOS cannon capability. Right now, the PIM, as I understand, is taking that role—that portion of the FCS role and is on schedule, and it will continue to be on schedule. And would both of you agree with that position?

Mr. MCHUGH. I certainly would. I would tell you, however, that is a program that is jeopardized by a CR—

Senator INHOFE. Yes.

Mr. MCHUGH.—as you know. But, we feel that we're going to be able to maintain the milestone C coming up for June 2013. And we're going to work hard to make sure that happens—

Senator INHOFE. Yes.

Mr. MCHUGH.—because, as you noted, that is our cannon capability for the near future.

Senator INHOFE. No—and very familiar with that. And also, the fact that it's—you know, up until this program started getting into development, I would that NLOS capability that we have there—I think five countries, including South Africa, that have a better piece of equipment than we do. Do you think—do you agree with his comment on that, General Casey, in terms of the significance of the PIM program, as well as where it is on track?

General CASEY. I do, exactly.

Senator INHOFE. Yeah. And then getting on to some of the other areas of the FCS. In looking at the budget briefing that we had, "The Army's combat vehicle modernization strategy represents a holistic approach to the development of the ground combat vehicle replacement of the M-113 family of vehicles and the incremental modernizations of the Bradley, Abrams, Paladin, and Stryker." So, we're still looking down the road to getting to where we thought we were getting with the FCS. Is that an accurate way of characterizing it?

General CASEY. In terms of the ground combat vehicle, that's correct.

Senator INHOFE. Yeah. Let me—

General CASEY. If I could—

Senator INHOFE. Yes.

General CASEY. If you think about where we started with the Bradley and the Abrams, we started back in the late 1960s, early 1970s, and we basically—the frames for both of those vehicles are pretty much how they were back in the late 1960s or early 1970s, but they're different vehicles.

Senator INHOFE. Yes.

General CASEY. What we're looking for with a ground combat vehicle is a new baseline. After 50 years, we need a new baseline to go forward and modify and adapt. And that's the only way I can see credibly going forward: use existing technologies that are 40 to 50 years better than we started, build a new base, and then continue to update it as technology matures. That is the strategy.

Senator INHOFE. And I think I agree that that's where we are today. But, I—you know, I can remember going back in—I was sitting next to you on the House Armed Services Committee when they canceled the Crusader. And all these things that were going on—I—Senator McCain talked about termination costs. We know, when we shift in the middle of the stream, there are going to be costs. But, I just hope that we are around to be able to make sure that we continue.

Let me just mention one success story, from my observation, and have you comment on it, because it didn't just happen, somebody had to make it happen—is, I look at our deployment of our Na-

tional Guard, our 45th—it's going to be—3,200 will be redeploying over there. The last time they deployed, I think, was 2008, maybe 2009, the first part of 2009, and I was—had the opportunity to really be there. In looking at this deployment this time, it's going much smoother than it did before. And I know you've heard this from other people. And I don't—and I'm not sure who's accountable for it. Just comment on that and also the Yellow Ribbon Program, in terms of these deployments, on our Guard.

General CASEY. As I mentioned in my opening statement, Senator, the improvements in the Guard and Reserve have been huge. And probably back in 2008, we studied the deployment of five National Guard combat brigades, and we learned an awful lot. And the Guard and Reserve took those lessons and applied them to how they'd man the units, to how they make sure that the—when the people show up, they're medically ready.

Senator INHOFE. Yes.

General CASEY. And we've made great improvements to the training. So, all that—I give credit to the Guard and Reserve leadership for taking on these challenges and learning from them. Because, what we're doing with the Guard and Reserve today is fundamentally different than we set them up to do in—earlier in this decade. It's not a Strategic Reserve. It's an operational augmentation to this active Force. And that's how we've been using them. And they've made great improvements in their process.

Senator INHOFE. Well, it's not going unnoticed, because, just at the troop level and all the way up to Bud Wyatt—I know he's been very active in this thing, too. And so, I applaud you guys for getting that done.

I would say this to you, Secretary McHugh, that you're faced with, you know, what's on fire today. You can't really look into the future. And I—Senator McCain made a statement—I think he was quoting Gates' statement at West Point when he talked about the probability of fighting against the large mechanized formations of the future, and all that. What he didn't say was what Gates said later in that speech. He said, "However, our predictions about future conflict had a perfect record. We've never been right." And—now, you and I remember when we were—my last year over there in the House Armed Services Committee—I was—I think I was seated next to you—but, it was—we had someone testify, in 1994, that in 10 years we'd no longer need ground troops. So, I don't think, as smart as all of you guys are—and—when—do you spend much time looking into the future? And I say this to you, Secretary McHugh. Because it's hard to do; we have so many problems today. But, how do you view that? Are you looking to try to determine what our needs are going to be 10 years from now?

Mr. MCHUGH. I'd like to be imperfect and maybe get one right. We do. And I think it has value. Whether it's on the Army side, in trying to envision the next battlefield to help, through TRADOC, prepare our soldiers for the unknown, or whether it's through the so-called large group and the Office of the Secretary of Defense and the QDR and other planning documents, I think it's responsible to sit down and do that.

But, having said that, it's a challenge that we've rarely been able to hit a home run upon. And I think that's why the Chief's earlier

comments as to the direction of the Army is so very important. And what we're trying to do is array ourselves into combat formations and brigade combat teams that provide us the greatest amount of flexibility so that wherever that Army that we're going to have to face arises, we're able to put the right forces with the right equipment on the ground to do the job effectively and efficiently, as they've always done.

The other thing the Chief and I have started to work on—and I'm looking forward to working with General Dempsey, because he's coming out of command at TRADOC—is that what we also need to do is ensure we have a training and education system that prepares the soldiers of tomorrow to have the kind of flexibility, the leadership, the great judgment, the comfort level in an environment of uncertainty that the soldiers of today have gotten in combat. When they're in garrison—and Secretary Gates mentioned this, and I think it's the most important part of his speech, and it got lost in some of the other discussions and comments he made—we've got to ensure when we bring these young, amazing soldiers back, we're providing them a training environment that challenges them and lets them feel fulfilled and, hopefully, trains them to be as good as the trained and experienced force of today is.

Senator INHOFE. Yeah, I think you're—it makes a lot of sense. We're making every effort you are. But, what I said about looking into the future is not just the Army. We have the same problems in the other services.

And my time has expired. But, I would hope that, as we try to do a better job here and get this budget thing under control, that you continue with your progress at the KBO Training Center—Military Training Center. We were over there during the—in New Year's. And I'm just most impressed with the progress that's been made there. It's a great program. It's—and I hope it can continue.

Thank you very much.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe.

Senator REED.

Senator REED. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Secretary and General Casey.

And I, too, want to thank you, General, for your extraordinary service to the Nation and to the Army, and to your unwavering support for the soldiers that you lead and the example you've set for them. Thank you very much.

One of your contributions, among many, will be the effort underway for the Profession of Arms to look seriously at what it means to be a professional soldier, both an officer and noncommissioned officer. And I know General Dempsey has instituted a survey. It's one—it's part of it. But, in your final, sort of—here before the committee, can you give us some ideas of what you'd like to see accomplished, not only in the survey, but what you'd like to see—sort of, what's your concept of the Profession of Arms at the moment?

General CASEY. Well, Senator, we came up with this notion last year. And we asked ourselves the question, What has been the impact of a decade at war on the Army as an institution and on our leaders and soldiers as individuals? Because, intuitively, we felt, you're not at war for 10 years without having some significant impacts and changes. And so, we wanted to get out ahead of what

was going on within the Army, because we all know our culture's changed, but we're not exactly sure how it's changed. And so, we launched on this tack.

We kicked it off—the Secretary and I kicked it off at—in October, at our annual conference. And General Dempsey has had the mission to basically bring it into effect. And he has started with a white paper, which is pretty good. It's a little academic. But, it causes you to go back and think about the things that underpin a strong institution. And so, we're having that dialogue at all of our advanced courses, staff colleges, and war colleges, and across the Army, at our divisions. The survey is intended to get something a little more than anecdotal evidence about how our culture has changed.

So, what I hope to get out of this is, one, an assessment of where we are and how we've changed, but, two, I think we're going to see—get inputs that will allow us to update, for example, our efficiency reports. Are the values that we have historically valued, are they still the right ones? And so, things like that will also come out of this. I think it'll make us a better Army as we go forward.

Senator REED. Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, you have any comments? Because you're a big part of this, also.

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, I totally concur with what the Chief said. We know one thing for certain; we've changed over the last 10 years. And we need to understand how that change has occurred, and most importantly, what we need to do to manage it and to form it in a way that gives us validity as an institution to—as what we are, an institution in combat arms and professionals.

Senator REED. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

One of the issues that came up in our hearing with the Supreme Allied Commander in Europe and the TRACOM Commander is the issue of the cyber dimension of warfare. And I think, you know, it's been amazing, the kind of deployment of technologies, both in the military realm and civilian realm, that pose potential threats. And it also sort of had me stop and think about the dependency—and this might go in terms of the culture—the dependency that soldiers have on systems that, when we started our military careers, didn't exist. And to the extent that we have to have, as redundancy, some of the old skills, like reading a compass and figuring out, on a map, where the heck we are, which was always a challenge to me, is that—are you beginning to sort of cope with, one, the—integrating these new technologies, but, two, having—continuing to have—as a fallback? Because there's a scenario in which nothing's working. And now, the enemy has the advantage, because they never had this stuff in the first place. And are we prepared for that, you know, concept?

General CASEY. I think, Senator, what you're going to see is that, as we have more time at home to spend training against hybrid threats, rather than just preparing for Iraq and Afghanistan, we're going to exercise that capability more than we have in Iraq and Afghanistan. We all share the same concern, particularly those of us who wandered around, lost, like you did as a lieutenant. So, I think that—we're going to see that play out.

The real—one of the real challenges we've had is because of—the growth of information technology has been so rapid—is trying to keep it—enough structure in the program so that we don't waste resources, but, at the same time, allow individual initiatives to leverage the technologies. And we've—the Vice Chief has recently completed an effort that has clearly spelled out the division of labor, within the Army, for who's responsible for doing which part of the information technology effort. And I think it's going to help us out as we go forward.

Senator REED. Mr. Secretary, your comments there?

Mr. MCHUGH. There are some things that we've looked at that I—we would have to talk about in a closed session. I would just say, your question is very well placed. The last thing we need to forget is, the enemy has a vote. And if he can endure in a certain environment where we can't, we've caused a real potential for catastrophe.

So, while I think we're absolutely headed in the right direction with our network systems and with our reliance upon making each soldier an independent, wired-in communication device, we have to make sure that, for whatever reason, either by some failure of technology or by covert or overt action of an enemy, those are taken away, that we can still prevail.

And as the Chief said, I think the opportunity to better ensure that is as we come back to home station and we can get back to a more full-spectrum training scenario.

Senator REED. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Circling back a bit to just one final point about the Professions of Arms, and—I'm just—for the record, I'm just probably establishing what you're already doing, is that—we're also talking to the families, the spouses and children, about the Profession of Arms, because today it's—they're a—they're—always been a great part of the Army. But, even more so, in my recollection, and going back two decades or three decades. Is that part of this conscious effort, too, as to what they expect out of the profession, what they contribute?

General CASEY. I'm going to give you credit for that, Senator. Right now, it's not. But, I think it's a great insight. And I think it's something that we ought—we'll add to it.

Thank you.

Senator REED. Well, I know when to quit, when I'm ahead.

So, congratulations, General Casey. Thank you for your service.

And, Mr. Secretary, thank you for your great service.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you Senator Reed.

Senator Brown.

Senator BROWN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for holding this.

And certainly, Mr. Secretary and General Casey, thank you for appearing once again.

And obviously, General Casey, first of all, I know you're retiring soon and coming to a really good State, Massachusetts. Appreciate that. Have fun in your retirement. And certainly want to say that you positioned our Army and its families in a good place during incredibly challenging circumstances. So, I want to thank you for that. And I've enjoyed personally getting to know you. I appreciate the many times that you've come to the office or answered ques-

tions. You and your staff have been exceedingly professional. You've got a couple of good men, right behind you, working and watching your back. So, I appreciate that.

That being said, sir, I want to follow up a little bit on the MEADS program. We had a hearing the other day on that program. And I've got to be honest with you, you know, the fact that we're paying that amount of money—and this would be, obviously, to the Secretary, as well—either/or—basically, to stop a program—I find amazing. You know, when we're talking about billions of dollars of overruns—and I got so frustrated in the hearing, I actually had to leave, because I was afraid of what would appear on YouTube. But, the fact that we are working with Italy and Germany—and when I asked, “Well, what are we getting for our 14 years and the billions of dollars?” he said, “Well, we're getting some really good technology. We're getting some—you know, some interesting things.” I said, “Well, like what? You know, is it new?” He says, “Yeah, it's new.” “Well, but what?” I mean, what, tangibly, could we benefit, after spending that amount of money, that we couldn't make up with the amazing businesses we have in the United States?

So, I guess my first question is, Are there serious negotiations with Italy and Germany to try to mitigate the damages and not pay the full nut of—I think it's \$800 million? Or, what?

Mr. MCHUGH. There are constant communications. And as I said earlier, the Army is not the birth parent of this program. We are the——

Senator BROWN. No, I get it.

Mr. MCHUGH. —executive agency——

Senator BROWN. Yes, we were—I was zeroing right in, believe me, on——

Mr. MCHUGH. Yes.

Senator BROWN.—the other appropriate folks.

Mr. MCHUGH. We signed the checks. And the Army very strongly endorsed the termination, largely for the reasons that you state. But, for whatever reason, when this program was reconfigured—I believe it was in 2006—amongst the United States, Italy, and Germany, that was the agreement, that they would go through what has been called “proof of concept.” And as best I can tell, that's really a calendar date, not any substantive moment in development. And any withdrawal before that was apportioned according to each country's contributions over the life of the program.

I mentioned earlier, we really don't know, to the dollar and cent, what a withdrawal cost would be—or at least, if someone does, I'm not aware of it. But, reasonable calculations are that it would be somewhere north of \$800 million. In part, that would have to be negotiated.

My understanding is, our two partners are not, at this moment, to my knowledge, interested in early termination. So, that left our people with the choice of, Do we pay the \$800 million-plus withdrawal, whatever it may be, or do we spend what will probably be a similar amount through 2014, which is the magical proof-of-concept calendar date? And that would provide some goodwill with our two partners, which I think we could all agree has some value. I'm

not sure what the pricetag of that would be. But, it would also give us a technology package.

And I can't sit here, Senator, and tell you what that technology package will be comprised of. Now, you cut—

Senator BROWN. Neither could the previous, you know, person that—

Mr. MCHUGH. Yes, but I'm not telling you how whiz-bang great it will be. [Laughter.]

Senator BROWN. No, no, listen. I'm not throwing any blame. I guess my message is, you know, first of all, let's not do contracts like this before—I mean, again. I mean, it just makes no sense, especially when we're relying on other countries to do things for us or with us. In this instance, we should have a—along the way, we should have had—the alarm bells should have gone off, like every year, as it got further and further behind. And talking 14 years—by the time we get it done, the technology is virtually obsolete. We're doing the same thing already. We don't know it. So, that's my only comment on that.

I'd like to shift gears for a minute. And I'm wondering, Do you have a plan—and this is for both of you—a plan to compete for the new version of the M-9 semiautomatic pistol, or do you plan to buy more Berettas? And the reason I ask, the industry has invested a lot of money in preparing for competition. But, you know, there's still a lot of confusion. And I'm wondering if either one of you can comment on that.

General CASEY. We—I would tell you, Senator, that replacing the M-9 is not one of our top procurement priorities. And as we're going back now, and looking through how to allocate our procurement assets, that's not one of our top priorities. And so, it's not something that we're actively seeking right now.

Senator BROWN. And how about the M-4 carbine competition? How is that going?

Mr. MCHUGH. Yeah. Well, we haven't put it to competition, as yet. As I'm sure you're aware, Senator, we have a two-phased M-4 program. One is the improvement program of the existing. We're working with industry to try to incrementally build in new improvements while we are going through RFP development. We hope to put the RFP on the street for the next bid—M-4, the next generation—very, very soon. And we consider that a requirement. And we fully intend to go forward.

Senator BROWN. And then, General Casey, your first—your last question from me in your entire career, so here it is—I know that your number-one modernization priority is to build the network that reflects the requirements of today's force and future threats. Can you comment how important the Warrior Integrated Network-Tactical, or WIN-T, communications program is for the Army? And when will that program be in the hands of soldiers?

General CASEY. WIN-T is the backbone of the whole network. It provides us the broadband wide-area coverage. And WIN-T Increment 1 will finish fielding this year. And WIN-T Increment 2 will begin fielding next year. And the whole network—all the different pieces—the JTRS and elements of WIN-T Increment 2—are going to start to come together over the course of fiscal year '12. And that's a huge, huge milestone for us.

Senator BROWN. I think it was Senator Lieberman that actually said, or the Chairman said something about, you know, as you get—and I've been to Natick Labs, you know, a bunch of times; I see the technology of everything that's going on. I'm concerned, a little bit, also, about getting so techno'd out that we actually get away from the basics, you know, how to read a compass, how to orient yourself, you know, where we're going, what we're doing, and we can, you know, fight on the battlefield with the basic—I mean, you know, basic soldier skills. I'm hoping that's still going to be a priority.

General CASEY. I think we'll still be able to soldier when this is all over, Senator.

Senator BROWN. Thank you, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Brown.

Senator Akaka.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for your leadership of this committee.

I want to add my welcome to Secretary McHugh, and thank you for your distinguished leadership; and also, General Casey, for your four decades of service to our country, and your incredible commitment to the Army and to our Nation. And we are really grateful for all of that. I want to say that it has been an honor working with you on issues related to Army and our National security.

I also want to thank the men and women of the Army, civilian and military, Active, Guard, and Reserve, and their families, for all that they do.

Secretary McHugh, the Military Leadership Diversity Commission noted that the services have not yet found a way to continuously develop leaders who are as diverse as our country. Secretary McHugh, what are your thoughts on the study? And can you talk about what the Army currently does, as well as any future plans to increase diversity?

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, my thoughts are, I think the study made some excellent points. In baseline recruiting, we're actually doing pretty well, in terms of the various segments of our population we're bringing in. And across the board, while we're slightly challenged in a few of the categories, we're pretty much where we need to be, and we want to make sure we sustain that.

Where I think we have to work very hard is, as the study pointed out, in promoting officers up through the ranks who represent that same level of diversity. And we have some absolutely incredible minority officers—and if I started naming them, I'd make someone angry that I forgot them—but, great leaders who have performed magnificently in the highest echelons of our Army and the highest echelons of our joint assignments, as well. And we need to work with them to provide a pathway by which we can promote more effectively, and bring officers through.

I think the Congress—and I'm speaking now from my days on the West Point Board—I think the Congress can be enormously helpful in going out and actively utilizing their full allocation of nominations to the United States Military Academy in promoting young minority students, young minority soldiers. I don't think anybody on this committee would be so challenged, but, without naming names, there are a broad array of members in both houses

who don't take advantage of that. And while ROTC and other officer accessions programs are important, as well—and we try to reach out and inform minority student populations of what—the great opportunities they provide—obviously, West Point is our number-one generator of officers and leaders of tomorrow. And to see those billets go unfilled is crushing. And you could help us to spread that message.

But, we've got a long way in making sure that our officer development program produces more minority representation. And that's pretty much in line with the study's findings.

Senator AKAKA. Well, thank you very much for your statement.

General Casey, upon completing deployments and returning to the civilian world, many in the Guard and Reserve are experiencing problems which were not previously diagnosed. You did mention how the Guard has helped itself in readiness. And my question, really, is, What happens after they have the impact of action? We know that sometimes PTSD and other effects do not immediately surface. In your opinion, what can be done to better assess and treat these returning soldiers as they transition back from their deployments?

General CASEY. That's a great question, Senator, because what we see is, when the Guardsman and reservist goes home and goes off Active Duty, his security blanket, his support network that has sustained him or her through combat, evaporates. And so, it's a much more difficult challenge than it is for the active forces, who stay with their organizations.

I would tell you that we have tried to come at this a couple of ways. One is by the post-deployment assessments and reassessments, to keep coming back to that. Two, is by increasing the counselors, behavioral health counselors that are available to our guardsmen and reservists, especially in dispersed locations. But, three is the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program that Sergeant Anderson represents. And one of the things we did with this program was to put the assessment online. So, any guardsman and reservist, in the privacy of their own home, can go online, take the assessment, and get an assessment of where they stand in the five key areas of fitness: physical, emotional, social, spiritual, and family. If they have a—perceive a problem in one of those areas, then it allows them to connect—again, online—to self-help modules. And there's about five self-help modules in each of those areas. So, again, in the privacy of their own home, they can go in and get pointers on how to do this, and then contact the master resilience trainer back at their unit.

The Comprehensive Soldier Fitness is designed to help our soldiers not get in the dark place to begin with, and to build the resilience to take them forward.

So, those are the things, the primary elements that we're working on here. As I said, it is a much tougher nut to crack than with the active Forces. But, the Guard and Reserve are working it very hard.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you.

General Casey, you've witnessed many changes in the Army, over the course of your career. General, beyond dwell time and resets,

what are the biggest challenges facing the Army over the next—what do you think?—5 or 10 years?

General CASEY. Senator, I really believe it's maintaining the right size and capable force in a period of declining resources. I mean, that is going to be my successor's greatest challenge, is to find the right balance between the resources that are available and the size of the force to meet the demands at an appropriate deployment tempo. I mean, that—and that's why I worry, because our track record on this isn't good. And if you look back through our history, as the wars end, the budgets come down, and we incrementally slice the resources available.

You know, I called "Shy" Meyer, who was my predecessor in the 1980s, who came to Congress and said the Army was hollow. He did that 8 years after the last combat battalion left Vietnam, because of 8 years of slicing. And what I worry about is—the resources are coming down, we know that—but, we have to proceed carefully; otherwise, 8 years from now, we'll turn around and look over our shoulders and say, "What the heck happened to the Army?" And that, I think, is the greatest challenge for all of us.

Senator AKAKA. Thank you very, very much, for your responses.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you Senator Akaka.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to share everyone's comments, General Casey, for your distinguished service to our country. I don't think we can commend you enough for what you've done and the leadership that you've provided to our brave men and women.

And, Secretary McHugh, it's—thank you very much, for your service.

And I also wanted to say thank you, to Ms. Stonesifer, for your sacrifice and for what you are doing for our country, as well as our wounded warrior, Joel, who's with us here today. You know, we're all grateful for what you're doing on our behalf.

I wanted to follow up, General Casey, and Secretary McHugh as well, on the question that Senator Akaka had asked you about our Guard and Reserves. We—one of the concerns that I have is, we have—and I know that you share this—that we've seen disturbingly high rates of unemployment and suicide rates; in particular, with the Guard and Reserve, because we've used them as an operational force, and there are unique challenges, when they come home, because those types of support systems that may be in the active Duty, on a base setting, aren't there for when they come home from a deployment.

And I know, General Casey, you described some of the program that you've put in place, called the Comprehensive Soldier Fitness Program. I have to say, I commend you for doing that, but I don't think it's enough. Because, if you think about the problems that our guardsmen and -women and Reserves face, to ask them to come home and to—in a situation where they need that direct support, to conduct an online system, we're going to be missing people.

And one thing that I wanted to point out is, in New Hampshire, we have a Deployment Cycle Support Program that is a public-private partnership that has been quite successful. In fact, we've kept

metrics of it. It has served, since 2007, 800 families and over 4,000 individuals. And one of the things that was very inspiring for me about this program is, this week I received word that the life of a New Hampshire National Guard soldier who was on the verge of suicide was saved, due to the proactive predeployment intervention of this Deployment Cycle Support Program and a care coordinator who reached out affirmatively to prevent a suicide. And I'd—

So, I would say to you, this is a very strong track record and, I think, a pilot—a model for what we should be doing. I know that there are several other States that are—also have these types of pilot programs.

Senator Shaheen and I have written, Secretary McHugh, you, about this program, as well as Chairman Mullen, about the program.

And so, one of the concerns that I have is, we—you know, what we got back, basically, is a commendation for the program, but that the—that in June it will likely end unless we get some commitment for resources for it.

So, my question, I guess to both of you, is, Have you had a chance to look at this program? What do you think of it? And what more, not only for New Hampshire, because I think this is a pilot we should be looking at across the country—I'm obviously committed to seeing this through for our guardsmen and -women who are serving overseas right now and coming home from deployments, but also, across the country, as we use the Guard and Reserve as an operational force, making sure those systems are in place so that reintegration back—we're preventing suicides, we're reducing homelessness, unemployment, the things that we deserve—that they deserve, given the service that they've given for us. So, if the both of you would comment on that, I'd deeply appreciate it.

Mr. MCHUGH. Yeah, I'd be happy to start off, Senator. First of all, I'm thinking back now on exactly how I worded my response. I hope I didn't give the impression that there's somehow no value in New Hampshire's program. And, in fact, it's unquestionably a national leader. And as someone who—

Senator AYOTTE. No, you did not give that impression.

Mr. MCHUGH. Okay. Good.

Senator AYOTTE. I want to be clear.

Mr. MCHUGH. It still wasn't very helpful. And the fact of the matter is, both from a CR perspective, but more real is the PB-12—it wasn't an issue when it was drawn up, and there is just not resourced.

Overall, we do have to work harder, as the Chief said earlier, as to how we can reach out to Guard and Reserve people who go back and don't have, traditionally, the kind of support and proximity to a big base, where you have all the kind of behavioral healthcare specialists, where you have access to a wide range of things that, you know, Guard and Reserves in rural communities that are predominantly found in New Hampshire or back in my northern New York old congressional district have—don't have, as well.

So, I promise you, we're going to continue to work those. Part of the thing we want to look at is the effort that you gave. But, our

funding opportunities is set by the budget cycles, and that won't present itself for some time.

And you've mentioned some of the stresses that they feel. And we tend to forget about that. At least when the full-time Army comes back, they generally continue to have a job; they're still in the Army. But, our Guard and reservists often go back to the current pressures of the economy that are certainly felt by the active component and their families. But, the fact of having a job is a great relief to them.

And I believed you're involved in the Hire the Hero—a Hero Program, to some degree. And anything that can be done privately to provide jobs for these great redeploying soldiers is a terrific effort.

So, I promise you, we're going to continue to work it. But, we do have some funding-cycle challenges.

Senator AYOTTE. Well, I very much appreciate that, Mr. Secretary. And I would like to work with you on it, because I want—I think one of the things that we need to do is—it has to be a public-private partnership, because there are those in the private sector that will join with us so that we can maximize resources to make sure that those services are there in a cost-effective manner. And so, I would very much look forward to working with both of you on that. Well, obviously, we wish General Casey would continue. But, Secretary McHugh, I very much look forward to working with you, and certainly your successor, General Casey, on this issue which I think is so important if we're going to continue to have the Guard operate as an operational force, as you've described it, which I anticipate will continue.

And as a followup to that, there has been a recent announcement, a Department of Defense proposal, to look at how the Guard and Reserve are used, and to come up with a hybrid-type proposal. I don't know a lot about the proposal. I understand it's a new proposal, and wondered if you could describe, for us, what that would entail and what we would envision. As I understand it, it's a proposal to look at having some reservists stay in longer than the traditional time they would serve, or to have longer-type requirements for their Reserve—to maintain in the Reserves.

General CASEY. I'm not familiar with the specifics of the approach that you describe, Senator, but I can tell you what we're doing, because, it's clear to us that none of us wants to go back to having the Guard and Reserve going back to a Strategic Reserve. We've got too much money invested in them over the last decade, and they have too much experience.

And so, the question is, Can we design a system that builds the readiness we need when we need it and, at the same time, sustains the experience of the Guard and Reserve over time? What we're faced with, and starting the 1st of October this year, is, we will actually have as many brigades available and not deploying to Iraq and Afghanistan as we do. So, we'll start having guardsmen and reservists who could be available, but they may not deploy. So, the question we've asked ourselves is, Okay, well then what's the appropriate level of readiness to bring those guardsmen and reservists to? Because, readiness—it's about cost, as well. And we have—we're working to figure out which portions of the Guard and Reserve can get ready quickly, because of the nature of their skills.

And we might want to have more of those and less of the Guard and Reserves that have complicated skills that require integration across a number of functions.

So, it—this is the process I described in my opening testimony. But, it's something I think has great promise. But, again, none of us wants to see the Guard and Reserve to go back to being just a Strategic Reserve. It took us a decade to get them where they are today.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you very much, General Casey, and also Secretary McHugh.

As we go forward in looking at how the Guard and Reserve are being used, I do hope that we will seek strong input from the leaders of the Guard and Reserve, as well, as we make those decisions.

General CASEY. They are fully integrated into this.

Mr. MCHUGH. They're an integral part of our planning process. And we wouldn't even begin to think about doing it without them.

Senator AYOTTE. We deeply appreciate that.

Thank you so much for answering my questions today.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Ayotte.

Senator Udall.

Senator UDALL. Good morning, gentlemen. Terrific to have you here.

I have, of course, some questions, but let me first start with some acknowledgments. It's been an exciting and important week for all of us in Colorado, and I wanted to highlight the reasons why.

Secretary McHugh, I received your letter this week regarding the Army's plans for the Pinon Canyon maneuver site in Colorado. And I want to thank you for your response and tell you that I sincerely believe that your assurances are exactly what Fort Carson soldiers and the southern Colorado's ranching community need to move forward. Our soldiers need to conduct tough, realistic training—will keep them safe in combat. And our ranchers need to be able to develop their property and work their land. And I think—and I want to say, I know that your explanation of the Army's intent will make it easier for all those needs to be met. And I'm grateful for your leadership on the—

Mr. MCHUGH. It might be described as lack of plans, not plans.

Senator UDALL. That's—yes, we'll make sure the record shows that.

And then I want to both—thank you both publicly for the great news about the addition of a combat aviation brigade at Fort Carson. This, no doubt, will be a great benefit to the 4th ID, and to Colorado.

And I want to trumpet the 4th ID. It's an incredible organization, has some of the finest leaders in the Army. And the CAB will make them even stronger. And I'm looking forward, as I know thousands of Coloradans are, to welcoming all these new soldiers to the best hometown in the Army.

And then, General Casey, I want to join with everybody here in the Senate SASC and all on the HASC, for also the great privilege of serving, and thanking you. It's been an honor to work with you. The Nation owes you and your family a tremendous debt. And your sacrifice and devotion to duty are truly inspirational.

I'll never forget first meeting you in Baghdad and the way in which you carried yourself, briefed us, and gave us a chance to see what was happening, at a particularly tough time. And you stayed the course and set the stage for the successes that we now have in Iraq. So, I want to extend my personal gratitude to you.

Then I want to follow up and start with a question. General Casey, I know how focused you've been—yeah, now a question. Sorry. I set you up. But, I want to speak to something that you have great passion for, which is dwell time for soldiers. And I want to make sure I help you reach your goal of providing 2 years at home for every year that a soldier's deployed. And while we move towards that goal, I know we are doing everything we can to improve suicide prevention programs for our troops. And Fort Carson's recently seen some very promising numbers that have included some significant reductions in their suicide rate. And I know you're stalwart in saying one suicide is one too many. But, I know there are some lessons to be learned from what we're seeing at Fort Carson, and would welcome you sharing those with us.

And then a follow-on would be, I know we have this Mobile Behavioral Health Team on post. And is the Army considering adding programs like that at other posts?

General CASEY. The answer to the last one is yes, Senator. In fact, we've been rotating behavioral health providers around the Army to the different posts as part of the deployment life cycle, as the other Senator talked about here earlier. And so, I think you're going to continue to see that. I mean, we're really forced to that, because we just—there's still not enough behavioral health providers available across the country. But, it—so, that is a way that we're maintaining those skills.

We've devoted a lot of effort to suicide prevention, going back several years. You know, one of the first things we did, back in 2007, was to launch a campaign to reduce the stigma of getting help—

Senator UDALL. Yes.

General CASEY.—for behavioral health issues and for depression. And we've started to make a dent. We just recently completed a survey—it's an annual Army survey—where two-thirds of the sergeants and above said that they believed their chain of command would support them if they got behavioral healthcare. That's a huge, huge change for us. Now, there's—the lower levels in that, there's still reservations, and we have more work to do.

The other thing, I think, that has helped us in suicide prevention is the great work that the—that was—already been talked about—that our Vice Chief did, sponsoring that 15-month study that was a hard, candid look at us. And there were some warts that we needed to fix. But, I believe that openness and willingness to address the issue has really helped us and is starting to turn the tide. Last year, in 2010, we had a slight downturn. And we're not declaring victory yet. But, that's a significant look.

Now, we've had a significant upturn in National Guard suicides. And I will say, the Guard has really jumped on that. And they've produced their own campaign plan. They've hired suicide prevention coordinators in every State. The States have—they're putting in hotlines and reaction teams. There's a—a reaction team in Indi-

ana, I'm told, has already reacted to over 300—to 300 cases. So, everybody is moving on that.

And one of the things—the other thing that's helped is, the Vice Chief holds periodic video teleconferences with all the senior leaders in the Army—subordinate leaders. And they share different techniques that they're doing among the different installations. So, we're getting good cross-leveling of good ideas.

Mr. MCHUGH. If I—just a couple of additions. You know, we support 90 behavioral healthcare studies and analysis within the United States Army. In fact, since '07, we've increased our money and our dedication to those efforts by 83 percent.

Probably the most important study we do is—it's a 5-year longitudinal study, a \$50 million study, conducted by the Institute of Mental Health, that is groundbreaking in its scope, groundbreaking in the latitude it has in access to medical files of virtually every man and woman in uniform, that we're very hopeful can bring the kind of medical breakthroughs that we've seen in other areas, like taking aspirin a day for heart attacks, et cetera, et cetera. I can't tell you what the great victory is now, but we're cooperating fully, and very excited about that.

The frustrating thing for me is that, 8 months ago, we had a behavioral healthcare specialist requirement of about 4,200. And we were at about 3,800 at that time. I checked back about 5 months later. I said, "How many behavioral healthcare specialists do we have on board?" And they told me, 4,400. I said, "So, we're 200 above our requirement." Well, no. The requirement's gone up to 5,800. Now check back and that requirement has grown again to 6,100. It's frustrating chasing the ever-increasing goal. But, it's an important development, because it shows us we're deadly serious about providing the numbers that we need. We're preparing to send two behavioral healthcare specialists and two technicians with every brigade that deploys into theater. We're providing healthcare—behavioral healthcare specialists and access to the most remote FOBs in Afghanistan. But, to always be in competition for that next specialist is a very frustrating chase. But, we're going to stay in that chase and continue until we can declare that victory that is eluding us to this point.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for all those updates. My time has expired, but I did want to make two additional short comments.

General Casey, again, I want to acknowledge, your leadership has let other leaders emerge, as well. Or—and they're leaders in their own right, they didn't need to emerge in the way I suggested. But, General Chiarelli, General Graham, who served with such distinction at Fort Carson, and General Hamm, have all, in their own ways, led in this important fight, as well.

Second, the—of course, the civilian world is—been touched increasingly by suicides; my own family, for example. And so, there are parallel undertakings in our society, writ large, to understand this and prevent this wherever we can.

And then, finally, General Casey, I'll continue to sing your praises, and I'll probably also continue to ask you questions whenever I can, even after April 11th, because you will, no doubt, be called upon to continue to comment and provide insight and pro-

vide leadership. So, again, thank you. It's been a privilege for me to get to know you.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Udall.

Senator SESSIONS.

Senator SESSIONS. Thank you.

I would follow up with Senator Udall's comments, General Casey, how much I appreciate your leadership, how much I have absorbed you commit yourself to service to the men and women in uniform. I visited you several times when you were in Iraq during a very difficult time. And you've made it one of your priorities to focus on the quality of life of the men and women in the Army. I think you've made great progress in that. I know you appreciate the partnership your wife has given to that effort.

Maybe I'll ask you. Tell me about how you feel about your efforts, in terms of quality of life, deployment times, how that's impacted the Army during your leadership. Also, perhaps you would share with us contributions that your wife and your family have made to the U.S. military. I think it's—would be healthy for us to appreciate the kind of leadership you and your family have given to the country.

General CASEY. Thanks, Senator. I would tell you, I believe that the efforts that we have made with the families are a critical component of us arriving where we are today, after a decade at war. When I first got here, 4 years ago, my wife and I hit the road and went around, all across the Army, all around the world, visiting soldiers and families. And what I took away from that was that the families were the most brittle part of the force. We'd just announced 15-month deployments. They were really strapped.

And I still remember, to this day, going—talking to a group of family members at Fort Bragg. And this woman stood up and said, "General, we need some help. I'm a family readiness group leader. The first one's hard. The second one's harder. And the third deployment is harder than the first two. We need some help." And it was at that point that I came back and said, "We need to put paid family readiness groups assistants in every family readiness group. And we put \$170 million against it, and did it quickly. And they saw it. And by that October, the Secretary and I put together the Army Family Covenant, where we committed ourselves to supporting the families in five key areas. And then we doubled the amount of money that we put toward soldier and family programs. And we've sustained that over time. And it took us about a year to get legs under that Army Family Covenant, but the families started to see the impact of it. And frankly, they saw that the country cared in what—about their sacrifices.

So, I personally believe that the efforts that were made by the families and supported by this committee have been a huge element in our ability to come out of this decade here in a fairly balanced fashion. And I'm very proud of that.

My wife, Sheila, has been a driving force and a voice for families. And she speaks very, very practically with all the family readiness group leaders as we travel around. And she's been able to energize support across the country. And I give her great credit for that.

Senator SESSIONS. Secretary McHugh, thank you for your leadership. I believe you're doing a great job. I enjoyed serving with you on the West Point Board. And I know how committed you are to the Army and to the men and women who serve our country. And I think President Obama should be commended for making you—giving you the opportunity to serve in this important position. I think he chose wisely, and I'm proud of that.

Both of you probably know, and have indicated, that we have a debt problem in America. The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs has said that debt represents the greatest threat to our National security. And frankly, that's accurate. Forty cents of every dollar we spend today is borrowed. The plans that we see, even with the President's budget, do not change the unsustainable course that we are on.

Just for example, interest on our debt last year was around \$200 billion. The Congressional Budget Office just completed its analysis of the President's 10-year budget; and in the 10th year, CBO projects that interest on the debt will amount to \$900 billion—more than Medicare, more than the Defense budget. This is why people are saying we're on an unsustainable course.

Being on the Budget Committee, ranking Republican, and having to deal with these numbers, I'll tell you what question I get most often from the news reporters—probably Senator Levin gets it, too—which is, “Well, is Defense Department immune? Are they—you're a big Defense hawk. Are you going to—willing to acknowledge that the Defense Department is going to take cuts, too?” And I have to say, “Yes, the Defense Department is not immune. It's going to have to tighten its belt, also.” I think Secretary Gates has led on that in a number of ways.

But, I just want to share with you that—your concern, General Casey, that we could make some mistakes—hopefully, as we are able to extract ourselves from Iraq and Afghanistan, as we draw down our forces and seek to get our financial house in order. And I appreciate your leadership and your planning and your thinking so that what we do to contain cost is smart and the best way to go about it. We have no dollar to waste. And we should not make cuts that are counterproductive, that end up costing us more than if we hadn't made them. That would make no sense at all.

One of the issues that I'm a bit concerned about is our strength of our deployments in Europe, and whether or not we can afford that, and whether or not we should continue that. A March 2011 Government Accountability Office report entitled “Opportunities to Reduce Potential Duplication in Government Programs, Save Tax Dollars, and Enhance Revenue Plans”—that's a pretty good title for a report—Congress could do—Secretary McHugh, that sounds like some of our titles.

Mr. MCHUGH. They could have saved a few words in the title.

Senator SESSIONS. But, anyway, it's got a good motive, and it stated that the Department of Defense plans to reduce forces in Europe are being reconsidered. And DOD recently held up the planned return of two Army brigades from Germany, pending an announcement of the NATO Strategic Concept, as well as the results of ongoing U.S. assessments of the Global Defense Posture. Two, GAO showed that leaving these two brigades in Europe could

cost DOD between \$1 billion and \$2 billion over 10 years, compared to bringing them back to the United States.

I would also say, those of us who are concerned about jobs and the health of the American economy, we have to all be aware that when that money is spent in the United States, it creates economic activity in the United States. When it's spent in a foreign county, it's a wealth transfer. It's a drain on the economic growth potential of the country.

And so, I guess I would ask you, What about this?

I do note that a number of years ago, I led a CODEL to Europe to participate in briefings over how these drawdowns would occur. I was very supportive of it. It came not—about the same time we were doing BRAC in the United States. It made a lot of sense to us. We told foreign leaders, and they seemed to acknowledge that we were going to be drawing down.

But—so, I guess I'll ask you, in terms of this one particular item, Are we changing our plans to draw down in Europe and in other places around the world? Can we do that? And should we change the plans that are out there?

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, I can't tell you we are changing, because I can't tell you what the plans are. I can tell you that what you cited as the analysis process and our interaction with NATO is absolutely correct. From the Army's side, we—as you know, Senator, we have four brigade combat teams there. I think the GAO tended to simplify the analysis a little bit, and tended to overlook some of the things—and it's probably a matter of timing—but, overlook some of the things that the Army has done. It costs us about \$465 million just to base the MILCON to bring a BCT back.

I don't know as they calculated what it meant for training rotations, where you want to partner up with your NATO allies to train as you will go to war. And that has to occur in one way or another. Either we pay to get our troops to Europe or we assist our allies to bring their troops over here for that kind of training. And I don't know as they could have possibly—in fact, I know they couldn't have possibly made a value judgment on the efficacy of having troops available, geographically, as we're seeing them begun to be utilized in Libya. And of course, that's more than an Army issue. It involves naval posture and the laydown of our air assets.

So, it's a big issue. But, it is currently being—

Senator SESSIONS. Wasn't there a plan to draw down two—

Mr. MCHUGH. There was an original—

Senator SESSIONS.—of the four brigades?

Mr. MCHUGH. Absolutely. There—

Senator SESSIONS. So, is that being reevaluated?

Mr. MCHUGH. It is being evaluated.

Senator SESSIONS. Reevaluated. A decision was made to bring—

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, I can't speak as to how the first decision was made. I assume they did evaluate it. So, in that context, yes, annually is being reevaluated. It's being discussed with our partners. And I can't—that's not an Army decision to make, and it's not an Army announcement. But, I think you will hear—

Senator SESSIONS. Doesn't the budget call for military construction in Germany?

Mr. MCHUGH. Our MILCON budget does nothing but sustain what will be, under any circumstance, legacy forces. And we do not put any MILCON against those two brigades.

I should note, as well, in Germany alone, we've already closed 90 Army facilities. We have plans to close another 30. And that, just in sustainment, saves us about \$265 million a year. That's already done. But—

Senator SESSIONS. Well, that was inevitable as result of the Soviet Union's collapse. But, regardless, I just want to tell you, I think that Congress is going to be looking hard at that. You're going to have to make some tough decisions. If you can save any money by bringing those brigades home, they ought to be brought home, in my opinion, mainly for an economic benefit to the United States. We just have a tough time.

And, General Casey, I won't—my time is up—but, I think we've had cooperation from our European allies. We're happy to have that. Military men and women in uniform always go out of their way to thank them. But, they haven't been that reliable. The Germans didn't even support the no-fly zone in Libya. They don't allow their soldiers to fire their weapons. I know they've got troops in the—or, Afghanistan, and we're supposed to say we're thankful, and we are thankful, but, really, give me a break.

So, I think we've got a—ask more of our Europeans. The Japanese are paying 40 percent of our Navy and base supports in Japan when we deploy our military there. And we're not having the same kind of support out of Europe.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Sessions.

Senator Hagan.

Senator HAGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, to both of our gentlemen here today, for your testimony.

And, Secretary McHugh, thanks for your service in the House, but thank you so much for your service in this new position.

And, General Casey, 40 years, we're so honored with your service. And I really appreciate the time to have gotten to know you. Thank you so much.

As you know, I'm interested in the status of the ongoing investigation of the sudden infant deaths that have taken place at Fort Bragg in North Carolina. And I'm very concerned about this situation. And I want to ensure that the Army produces a comprehensive and timely report that gets to the bottom of this issue and provides answers for our families at Fort Bragg.

This is an issue of family readiness. We don't want soldiers from Fort Bragg to worry about the safety of their families when they're deployed. And the well-being, safety, and health of our military, and especially our families and their members, is my top priority. And I know this is something that the Army is looking at closely. And I also understand that the Army is working on its own investigation to follow a report issued by the Consumer Product Safety Commission in February.

Can you share with me the status of the Army's investigation and the projected timeline to complete this report? And what will

the report discuss? And to what extent will the Army utilize the Consumer Product Safety Commission's report in your analysis?

Mr. MCHUGH. First of all, Senator, we deeply appreciate both your interest and your support. And I assure you, our concern is equal to yours and many others of the Fort Bragg community. And it is incredibly frustrating to see the loss of 12 infants, 2 of whom perished while living in the same house, and not be able to find the answer.

The Army scientific analysis actually started off this process. And we brought what we thought was every reasonable—every available resource to bear and came up negative, with no answers beyond what the medical diagnoses were, with respect to the infants who had been lost.

The Consumer Product Safety Commission that you mentioned is the Federal agency—most trusted Federal agency to look at these kinds of analysis. We're very hopeful that their comprehensive look would help us better understand what might be at play here, whether it was environmental; a lot of talk about Chinese wallboard. We recently had a death of an infant who did not live in a home that had been refurbished with this Chinese wallboard, so that would rule that out, by specifics. But, there was no scientific analysis that they did that showed any environmental issues, no ground, no pesticide, nothing they could identify that might in any way demonstrably add to the circumstance and result in infant deaths.

As a third measure, I directed what we call an EPICON study, which is, in essence, a specialized team to go on—to go down—and they're a very comprehensive, multidisciplinary team, with chemists, with environmental specialists, with architects—and look at it anew—look at the baseline data, do their own analysis. They have begun that work. And I expect we'll have a report—a final report from them in the relatively near future.

Now, I don't have any information on their feedback, but I've not heard anything that would suggest they have found a definitive answer. If we knew that, I assure you, we'd be working on it right now.

When you look at this statistically—and I don't like to do that, because we're not talking about statistics, we're talking about three—

Senator HAGAN. Right.

Mr. MCHUGH. —children. And I can only imagine the grief of their families. But, when you look at it statistically—and it's a tough thing, because it's slightly apples-to-oranges—but, the infant mortality rate amongst the Fort Bragg community is actually below that of the surrounding community—Cumberland County, I believe.

Senator HAGAN. Right.

Mr. MCHUGH. I'm not sure what that tells us. It doesn't solve the mystery. It doesn't solve the cluster issue.

And the—I can tell you this. When we run out of things to do, if someone thinks of something else we can do, please let us know. We don't want to leave any stone unturned. But, quite honestly, from a scientific analysis perspective, we're getting to the end of what we know to be the available investigatory tools.

There was an article recently in a newspaper, where the implication was that we didn't do a particular test, a so-called chamber analysis. First of all, the industry experts with whom we have spoken said that's not the gold standard test. The one the CPSC did is the gold standard test. But, in fact, the Army, in its original testing, did do a chamber test. So, we've done that, as well. And we've asked the publisher of the magazine to correct that. I'm not sure if they have or they haven't. But, I want to assure you, we did that chamber test.

Senator HAGAN. I was not aware of that aspect—

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, it's a recent development. I wasn't aware, either. And I said, if we hadn't done it, we're gonna. And they came back and have shown that we have.

But, if there's something we haven't done, we need to know about it. And I promise you, we'll continue to work with you at every possible opportunity. If there's an answer out there, we sure as heck want to find it.

Senator HAGAN. Secretary McHugh, thank you so much. I can tell that you're very concerned about this, too. And obviously, it is a family readiness issue. And all of these families, when this happens again, as it has done recently, it's just—it raises the concern and the question and the issue of the what-ifs. So, I appreciate the earnestness with which you have replied, and the seriousness that you're taking on this issue.

And we certainly are awaiting the results of this new report. And I really appreciate the fact that you have them—looked into this and looked at that other, that chamber analysis, and—that that's been done, too. I think that's positive. Thank you.

General Casey, as you reflected in your prepared statement, successful implementation of the repeal of Don't Ask, Don't Tell is a matter of professionalism, leadership, and respect. And I understand that last week you spoke with Army units about their opinions on how the training program implemented last month was going. Can you—how are these units adapting to the training? And is the training well received and successful?

General CASEY. Thank you, Senator. I did, I went up to Fort Riley, Kansas, and I met with different levels of the leadership. I talked to a group of soldiers. I talked to a group of company-grade officers, noncommissioned officers, and then to a group of battalion and brigade officers and noncommissioned officers.

The things I took away were the following: One, the training is simple, and it's effective, and it's starting to break down the misconceptions that they—the soldiers had in their minds. And that was played back, frankly, by every level. And so, I think that's a very positive thing.

The second big take-away for me, though, was, until a leader has to deal with it, or a soldier has—is confronted with it, it's an intellectual discussion. And so, what I took away was, we're—this is the start of the process. And if you think about—you know, we're still doing equal opportunity and race relations, and still doing gender-bias training, so we're going to be doing this for a while. And we have directed that, for our fiscal year '12 sexual assault and harassment training, that it be prepared in a gender-neutral way. And that's how we intend to go forward.

Those are the two main things that I took away. I would—the third thing I would tell you is, the main concerns are not surprising. Billeting. And I—basically, if they find they have to live a gay/lesbian soldier. And I emphasized to the commanders that we're not going to have segregated billets, but the commanders do have discretion to adjust the billets to suit people's needs. And benefits. They—people understand that benefits aren't going to change substantially unless DOMA is repealed. But, they're very apprehensive about the fact that that might—they perceive that might happen.

And then, the last thing I'd say is, there still is a lot of concern among the religious—very religious element of our population. And they're wrestling harder with this, I would think, than the others.

So, those were the—kind of the four big takeaways from my visit.

Senator HAGAN. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Hagan. Thank you for raising that issue with the General.

Senator Shaheen.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary McHugh and General Casey, thank you both very much for being here, and for all that you do to ensure that we have—our men and women in the military are prepared to serve every day.

I know that my colleague Senator Ayotte has already had a chance to ask you about something that we're very concerned about in New Hampshire. You know, one of the benefits of having two of us from the same State on the committee is that we can double-team you. So, I do want to reemphasize what she had to say about New Hampshire's National Guard's Full Cycle Deployment Program, and appreciated your remarks, Secretary McHugh, about it being a national leader.

You may already know this, but I think it's—the data that they have collected on the program is very impressive, because what they found is that the military members involved in New Hampshire's Full Cycle Deployment Program are eight times more likely to be treated for previously untreated mental health issues. They're four times more likely to stay married. They're four times more likely to stay in the military. And they're five times less likely to be homeless. So, clearly, it has had a huge success rate. And I think, most importantly, the program has a suicide prevention component that means that every single returning Guard member who is considered at risk of suicide is in an active prevention program.

So, I know you pointed out that you're requesting 1.7 billion to fund soldier and family programs. And I just wondered if you had considered whether there was any component of that that might be used as a grant program to really help some of these State initiatives that have been very successful.

General CASEY. The short answer is, I had not considered any of that 1.7 billion going to grant programs. But, a portion of that 1.7 billion does go to the Guardsmen and reservists for their family support and family readiness programs and for suicide prevention programs. So, I mean, it—that is not strictly for the active force. It is—

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

General CASEY. It is for the total force.

I must say, I—that I really appreciate the initiative that the State has taken on this, and especially the public-private-partnership nature of it. And it's important for two ways, one that the private partnership allows you to do things that we can't—

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

General CASEY.—necessarily do. But, two—and this is one of the main reasons why I think we have to continue to find the best way to use the Guard and Reserve—because it ties the population to what we're doing.

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

General CASEY. And when they're actually contributing, I think it's a huge statement. And our soldiers see that. And it sends a signal to them that the American public appreciates what they're doing. And that's priceless.

So, I had not considered a grant program. It's something we certainly can take on board and think about.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, I would urge you to think about that, given that there are State initiatives, not just in New Hampshire, but in other States around the country, that may use the unique circumstances in those States to develop programs that are directed at those unique circumstances that may address some of those needs in a way that's different and, in some cases, I hesitate to say, better, but than some of the National initiatives.

I know that you're aware that this program had been funded through congressionally directed spending, and, given the changed circumstances in Congress, that that's not going to be available any more. And I have to say, I—it's one of those things that I think we should still be funding through congressionally directed spending. But, since I'm not in the majority on that, I understand that that's changed. And hopefully we can find a way to deal with these kinds of successes, even though we're not able to do that sort of earmarking.

I also wanted to just express what I know others here have said about the MEADS program, and just urge, again, that the administration and you all look at how we can get our international partners to help us cooperate to address the issues that have been raised with that program.

And finally, one of the other areas that I've been very concerned about is what's happening with R&D and with the new development of the engineers and the scientists and the mathematicians that the military's going to need for the future. Again, in New Hampshire, we have a very strong defense industry. We have the Army Corps' Cold Region Lab. And, as you all know, so much of the innovation and the technological advances in the country have come from the research and development that the military has done. And DOD employs about 67 percent of all Federal scientists and engineers, and 90 percent of all Federal mechanical engineers, which is an extraordinary number. And, unfortunately, the average age of our DOD engineers is 53.

So, I would ask you, What have—what are we doing, given the current personnel and hiring freezes, to ensure that we're attracting the new engineers and mathematicians and scientists that

we're going to need for the future? And are you confident that we're able to bring in the people that we need?

Mr. MCHUGH. I wished I could say I was. But, this is an area of incredible challenge, not just for the United States military—

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

Mr. MCHUGH. —for the Nation, as I know you're aware. Our access to that pool becomes more and more difficult with each passing year. Our basic approach—it's much more than that now, but the Military Academy at West Point was, at one point—at one time, totally an engineer school. And we have a little license on those young people when they graduate, and we try to make good use of them, as we can. Similarly, through the ROTC program, we're looking very carefully to make sure that we're sustaining programs on campuses where those kinds of students tend to come from.

But, I think the challenge for us, particularly, is in the civilian area. We are bound by certain pay bands that, many times, are not competitive with the outside sector. That becomes more and more true as supply-and-demand realities come to bear, as well.

So, we want to use every available resource and opportunity, but, unlike the—or, like the Nation as a whole, this is an area of great challenge right now that's only going to become more difficult.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, thank you. My time is up. But, notwithstanding the concern that everyone here has expressed, and I know we all understand, about the debt and deficit situation of the country, this is an area where I think we would be very interested—I certainly would be very interested in working on what else we can—need to do to make sure that we're training the future scientists and mathematicians that we need for the country. So, thank you for your response.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Shaheen.

Senator Begich.

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

First, to General Casey, as everyone has said here, thank you very much for your service and what you have done for our country, but also the work in the last 2 years with our office. I just want to say, personally, thank you for that.

Also, I'd take this moment, only because, you know, sitting behind you is one of our former fellows, Lieutenant Colonel Jim DeLapp, and I know he's going off to command. Now, I hope the year he spent with us did not cause any problems for his advancement, but I'm hoping it enhanced his opportunities. But, we were very pleased. And the fellow program is a fantastic program that I hope every Senator takes advantage of, because it really does bring some incredible talent to our offices. And hopefully, we don't spin them the wrong way, and that they can continue to have forward advancement after they finish with us.

General CASEY. Actually, we're very satisfied with the program, too. And it's what we call a broadening experience for our young leaders.

Senator BEGICH. Yes.

General CASEY. And it's very productive for us, as well. Thank you.

Senator BEGICH. Well, very good.

Mr. Secretary, as we've had a conversation over the last couple days, another thank you in regards to this 16th Aviation Combat Brigade. Thank you for all the work you've done there, and the Army recognizing—even though we had a split, a little bit, with Washington, I think, at the end, is, again, a statement by the Army, the military overall, that—how Alaska fits into the global picture of national defense. And I can tell you, the folks in Fairbanks were very happy to hear the news in regards to the continued stationing of a significant portion of those assets there in Alaska, for both of you. And especially, Secretary, thank you for the conversations we've had over the last year, and tolerating those conversations from our office.

Mr. MCHUGH. Well—

Senator BEGICH. I greatly appreciate that.

Mr. MCHUGH. No, I appreciated the input. And one of the very first Hill visits I had, when I became Secretary, was to your office. You were very gracious in seeing me. And you pressed that issue early and, I should say, often. And I thank you for that kind of engagement. And it does help us to focus on what we need to focus upon; that is, the strategic location, the value of what happens up around Fort Wainwright in the great State of Alaska. So, I think it was a good decision. I appreciate your support in that. And we're looking forward to a good, long, happy future in the great State of Alaska.

Senator BEGICH. Great. Thank you very much.

I would—I want to add a little bit to what Senator Shaheen said. We introduced a piece of legislation on STEM, which was Science, Technology, Engineering, and Math, in that kind of global—but, it made me think of an idea—and I just want to put this to you—not necessarily maybe a response, but just some feedback later. You know, as you know, we have military—or, on the bases, we have schools, obviously, from different levels—especially in Alaska, their elementary schools. But, the point that I'm making is, I'm wondering if there's a value in this legislation, or maybe, as we look at DOD authorization, if we need to look at this onsite, on-school bases, and maybe, some specialized program regarding STEM. Because, we know—obviously they're all military dependents going to those schools, and the high likelihood is, there's a higher percentage that are dependents that will go on to further—as their parents that are in the military—if there's maybe a value to kind of look at those and see if there's a way to incentivize, within those schools that are on base, this STEM—or, the STEM education, also.

So, I don't know if it's—it's more of a—maybe it's a rhetorical question, but I think it's worth exploring, because I 100-percent agree with Senator Shaheen that this a huge gap. And, like you said, it's not just in the military, it is nationally. We are so far behind. But, in our military infrastructure, maybe there's a way to enhance the educational opportunities that we do have for our young people who are dependents of military personnel, and STEM is a great opportunity.

I don't know if you have any quick comments on that, or—

Mr. MCHUGH. I'd—we firmly commit ourselves to looking at every option and every potential avenue to help expand this pool

and to help put more young people into—in the programs that'll produce the engineers that we, as a military and the National as a whole, are going to need. So, we'll take a look at that. I don't want to sit here now and tell you that's an idea that can absolutely work. But, it's certainly an idea that we absolutely will take a look at.

Senator BEGICH. That's all I'm asking, because it's—it kind of just jogged me, as I'm sitting here and listening, you know, there's maybe a—something to merge there.

General CASEY. Let me, If I could—

Senator BEGICH. Sure, sure.

General CASEY.—just chime in here. It's also something that lends itself to public-private partnership.

Senator BEGICH. Absolutely.

General CASEY. And getting the businesses involved—the industries involved in the school, I think, is a high payoff.

We recently started five pilot programs with the National Association of State Boards of Education and Junior ROTC. And we've just kicked it off with Secretary Duncan in Kentucky a couple of weeks ago. And what we tried to do is get the National Association of State Boards, so there's a local commitment—

Senator BEGICH. Yes.

General CASEY.—to the program, a cadet corps, like Junior ROTC, that puts the values and the civics and the physical aspects to it, and then to match that with business, putting in things that drive math and science skills. I think that has a lot of promise.

Senator BEGICH. That's great to hear that. So, I'd be anxious, as you explore it and see if there's some additional work we can do. But, I think that's a great initiative.

Mr. Secretary, I—you know one of the subjects I'm going to bring up is Fairbanks housing. And I'm sure you're prepared for this, but it's the 801 housing. And, as you know, the GOA—GAO report talked about how to deal with the inventory, and maybe not depleting, but consider additional leases or long-term leases. And I know, in Alaska specifically, as you know, we have the Birchwood property, which expires in 2018—private-sector development—and you know a lot about it.

But, I guess, with not knowing the footprint, the total footprint—and I know there's been some discussion of some new developments that might be on that property—but, you know, I'm going to continue to push that. In order for that good public-sector/private-sector partnership that's there and an important tax base for our Fairbanks community and, I think, a quality housing project that can and should provide housing for the military, what is the status? And what—for the long-term outlook, in regards to that lease? I know—I actually meant to talk to you about this on the phone, but I was so happy about the other news, I didn't want to go down another path. So.

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, I appreciate the question. As I—you may be aware, I'd—we've notified your office, but you're busy. I visited there, personally—

Senator BEGICH. Right.

Mr. MCHUGH. —in an effort to try to have a full and most complete understanding of that. Very frankly, what we've—what we try

to do is provide the local commander a lot of leeway, because he is the one who's in charge of helping to plot the future of that base and obviously is a person who's most concerned about its future viability. And after several housing analysis, looking at available equal-value, equal-quality residences throughout the outside-the-gate community, looking at pricing and looking at the condition of homes and, most importantly, looking at the property upon which those lease—those 801 housing lease units sit, as one of the few pieces of land where permafrost on the base does not exist, where they can actually go in and use it to create the kinds of facilities that we feel very strongly are necessary to ensure the future liability of the base itself. So, the—we have notified the leaseholder that our intent is not to renew the lease past the upcoming termination date, and that his requirements under the lease are known to him, and expected that he'll follow through.

Senator BEGICH. Let me—my time is up, but I guess I'm—as yesterday was good-news day, today is not a good-news day when I hear that, and here's why. You know, as you know, the base has thousands and—I mean, our bases are not measured in hundreds of acres, as everyone knows, in Alaska; they're measured in thousands of acres. And Fairbanks is—has a high percentage of permafrost and various elements; and Alaska is known to build on anything, everywhere. And so, I understand that they have a plan, which we learned about recently, but no long-term funding for it, or no—and the type of plan they have, the type of facility they're thinking about on there, is difficult, not only in these times, but in past times, to get resource for. So, I'm—I'll be very frank with you, I'm concerned about the plan that kind of showed up, after a year of discussion, and has a pricetag of over \$220-plus million, and yet it's a small percentage of land that the proprietors of the property indicated that they would utilize and upgrade to the level that—whatever the military wanted, as well as provide the pricing that they want, at any point, at any time. So, I just—I'm a little disturbed, just to be frank with you, because of how it's kind of evolved.

And I agree with you, the command on the local, who shifts out, as you know, every 2 years—so, today's commander is not the same as—when I was Mayor, I went through four different commanders in Anchorage. So, I'm concerned. And I just want to stress that with you greatly here.

Mr. MCHUGH. Well, I appreciate that, Senator. And I'd—and I can't sit here right now and tell you what the Future Years Defense Program is for that particular plan, but I promise you, we'll take a look at it, and we'll try to get you a better laydown as to what we see is the way forward.

I would—I'm not an engineer, I don't play one on TV, but our engineers have said that, while it's true, you can construct on permafrost—and obviously, Alaska's a pretty good example of that—it adds pretty dramatically to the cost, et cetera, et cetera. And this was always the way forward. I mean, this is—the terms of this lease are not a surprise to anyone.

Senator BEGICH. No, I understand that.

Mr. MCHUGH. And we are concerned, as well, is—while we having units is one thing, many of the units no longer meet the mini-

mal standards of size that we have in the Army. But, I don't want to treat you unfairly and give you pieces—

Senator BEGICH. Sure. Well—

Mr. MCHUGH. —here and there. Let—I promise you, we'll get back to you with a more complete answer.

[The information referred to follows:]

[INFORMATION]

Senator BEGICH. Thank you very much.

Mr. MCHUGH. Yes, sir.

Senator BEGICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Begich.

Any other questions? [No response.]

If not, we thank you both. Thank you again, especially General Casey, for four decades-plus. Thank you for bringing your guests this morning. We honor them as well as we honor you.

And Secretary McHugh, thank you for your great service, as well.

And we'll stand adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 12:21 p.m., the committee adjourned.]