

**HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON THE  
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY IN REVIEW OF  
THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST  
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2014 AND THE FUTURE  
YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM**

---

**THURSDAY, APRIL 25, 2013**

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 8:32 a.m. in room SD-106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin, Reed, Nelson, McCaskill, Hagan, Manchin, Shaheen, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, Sessions, and Ayotte.

Committee staff members present: Peter K. Levine, staff director; and Leah C. Brewer, nominations and hearings clerk.

Majority staff members present: Jonathan D. Clark, counsel; Creighton Greene, professional staff member; Gerald J. Leeling, general counsel; John H. Quirk V, professional staff member; and William K. Sutey, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: John A. Bonsell, minority staff director; Adam J. Barker, professional staff member; Steven M. Barney, minority counsel; Allen M. Edwards, professional staff member; Ambrose R. Hock, professional staff member; and Lucian L. Niemeyer, professional staff member.

Staff assistants present: Jennifer R. Knowles and John L. Principato.

Committee members' assistants present: Carolyn Chuhta, assistant to Senator Reed; Jeff Fatora, assistant to Senator Nelson; Jason Rauch, assistant to Senator McCaskill; Christopher Cannon, assistant to Senator Hagan; Mara Boggs, assistant to Senator Manchin; Chad Kreikemeier, assistant to Senator Shaheen; Marta McLellan Ross, assistant to Senator Donnelly; Nick Ikeda, assistant to Senator Hirono; Karen Courington, assistant to Senator Kaine; Steve Smith, assistant to Senator King; Paul C. Hutton IV, assistant to Senator McCain; Lenwood Landrum, assistant to Senator Sessions; Todd Harmer, assistant to Senator Chambliss; Brad Bowman, assistant to Senator Ayotte; and Craig Abele, assistant to Senator Graham.

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

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody. I want to welcome Secretary Mabus, Admiral Greenert, General Amos to our committee to testify on the plans and programs of the Department of the Navy in our review of the fiscal year 2014 annual budget request. We very much appreciate your willingness to accommodate this early starting time for our hearing. It's my goal to conclude the hearing in time for members to attend an all-Senators briefing at 10:30 this morning, and in order to do that we're going to have to have a shorter first round when we come to that of either 6 or 7 minutes to give everybody a chance, depending on when that first round begins.

We're grateful to each of you for your service to the Nation and for the truly professional service of the men and women that you work with. We're very grateful to their families, all of your families, knowing as you do the vital role that families play in the success of the men and women of our Armed Forces.

This year the defense budget situation is particularly challenging. The sequestration required by the Budget Control Act for fiscal year 2013 is already having an adverse impact on the Navy and the Marine Corps in the form of deferred maintenance, reduced steaming and flying hours. The problem will get dramatically worse in fiscal years 2014 and beyond, and I look forward to the testimony of our witnesses on how this fiscal situation is likely to affect personnel, readiness, modernization, and our operations overseas.

The Defense Department's most recent strategic guidance, issued in January 2012, refocuses the U.S. military on the Asia-Pacific. Consistent with that strategy, the Defense Department has been working to realign U.S. military forces in South Korea and Japan and plans to position Navy and Marine Corps forces further to the south in Australia, Singapore, and possibly elsewhere.

The Department has also begun implementing a plan to deploy forward more ships, as shown by the beginning of the Navy's first rotational deployment of a Littoral Combat Ship, the USS *Freedom*, to Singapore in the past few weeks.

As we rebalance and realign our presence in the Asia-Pacific, it is important that we not only get the strategy right, but that we also ensure that it is sustainable. With respect to the planned realignment of U.S. Marines currently on Okinawa, Senator McCain, former Senator Webb, and I advocated changes to the 2006 U.S.-Japan realignment roadmap plan to better support U.S. strategic goals in the region while also accounting for the fiscal, political, and diplomatic realities associated with long-term sustainability.

The April 2012 joint U.S.-Japan announcement of changes to the 2006 plan reflected an appreciation by both governments of the need to make adjustments in order to support the goal of achieving a more viable and sustainable U.S. Marine presence in Japan, Guam, Australia, and Hawaii. The Department is currently working to develop the details of this new plan, so the final construction schedule and total cost are not yet known. After we receive that plan, we will be in a position to judge it. But until that plan is forthcoming, the committee has deferred action on associated requirements until the conditions that we set are met.

Even in the absence of sequestration, the Department of Defense authorization request raises significant issues. For example, should we increase the cost cap for the aircraft carrier CVN-78? Should we approve the multi-year procurement authority for the E-2D surveillance aircraft? Should we authorize advance appropriations for the SSN-774 *Virginia*-class submarine?

For many years the committee has expressed concern about Navy ship force levels which have consistently fallen short of the projected needs. At the same time, Navy and Marine Corps aviation force levels are also under pressure. The budget provides for a service life extension program on some 150 F-18 aircraft already in the inventory and for the purchase of additional E/A-18G electronic warfare aircraft to support land-based electronic warfare squadrons, but would end the acquisition and production of new F-18 aircraft. The budget also sustains planned purchases of the Marine Corps and Navy versions of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter aircraft and, while it is encouraging that the Navy is now predicting a strike fighter shortfall of only 18 aircraft compared to earlier projections as high as 250 aircraft, I suspect that estimate will be significantly impacted by sequestration.

The Weapons Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 requires that the Defense Department make significant changes to avoid the kind of costly delays and overruns that have plagued our acquisition system in the past. While this legislation should help correct past problems, I know that we will succeed only through concerted efforts within the executive branch to implement that legislation, and we look forward to hearing from our witnesses as to how the Department of the Navy is implementing the provisions of the Acquisition Reform Act of 2009.

Finally, I want to commend you, Secretary Mabus, for your efforts to lead on energy efficiency and energy self-reliance. You have placed a strong emphasis on an area where, as strong as our military forces may be, we remain subject to the tyranny of energy supplies. You have put deeds behind the commitment to a more sustainable Navy and the Nation is stronger for it.

Our witnesses this morning face huge challenges as they strive to balance modernization needs against the costs of supporting ongoing operations and sustaining readiness in the face of across-the-board cuts from sequestration. Those challenges are made all the more important by the fact that we continue to have roughly 7,000 marines in Helmand Province in Afghanistan and thousands more Navy and Marine Corps personnel deployed elsewhere around the world.

We appreciate everything that you do and the men and women of the Navy and the Marine Corps, to do every day what they do to meet the challenges that this Nation faces.

Senator Inhofe.

#### STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES M. INHOFE

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

First of all, let me thank all three witnesses for sharing your valuable time with me personally. It was actually helpful to me, Secretary Mabus, with some of the areas where I thought I would

have more disagreement with you, and that's kind of changed. You'll have a chance to cover those things.

I think, Mr. Chairman, you've covered the budget comments that I would have made adequately. Our ability to meet our 30-year shipbuilding goal and recapitalize our sea-based nuclear deterrent will greatly depend upon budget certainty. It's the certainty that's important, I believe.

The Navy needs a sustained level of investment topping \$20 billion by 2021 and maintaining that level for the following ten years. More importantly, this assumes that the Department can finally control the runaway cost overruns in ship construction. We are not on the right track to accomplish that at this time.

The Navy's largest research and development program in fiscal year 2014 is the *Ohio*-class ballistic missile submarine replacement program. A failure to recapitalize our at-sea deterrent on time would have devastating impacts. I encourage the Navy to aggressively continue to reduce risk and emphasize affordability of this program.

The Navy also needs a sustained level of funding for readiness, training, and shipyard maintenance to keep a majority of the fleet fully mission capable. Sequestration in 2013 has resulted in a \$4 billion operations and maintenance shortfall and a \$6 billion investment shortfall. In addition, the Navy has not budgeted for over the \$700 million in unscheduled ship repairs resulting from a series of sea accidents, sabotage, and major equipment failures. I think you have to budget for these things because these are going to happen.

The Navy just released a report stating that shipyards are in such poor shape that at the current funding rate it would take 17 years just to clear the backlog of critical facility repairs that have been identified to date. Further, the Navy announced in January 2013 yet another reduction in its requirement for Navy combatant vessels, from 313 to 306. Then the budget request for 2014 goes even further and accelerates the retirement of 16 ships, reducing the combatant force structure to an all-time low of 273, down from 289. I suspect that we'll hear some comments about that in opening remarks. If not, there'll be some questions.

In addition, while the Department has identified a requirement for 33 amphibious ships to support the Marine Corps, the Navy only had 22 of those ships actually available and fully mission capable and ready to go last year.

Marine Corps readiness continues to be a significant concern. Similar to other Services, the Marine Corps has rightfully prioritized deployment and next-to-deploy Marines in the operations and maintenance accounts. This is at the expense of non-deployed units and has already resulted in a degradation of the Marine Corps readiness.

By the beginning of calendar year 2014, approximately 50 percent of Marine ground and aviation units will be below acceptable mission readiness levels. Of course, readiness, risk, lives are all tied together.

This all comes down to risk. As the world is becoming more dangerous, our Navy and Marine Corps are becoming less capable and less prepared. We're going down a path where readiness and capa-

bility are being cut at such a rate, as General Dempsey has said, will soon be at a point where it would be immoral to use this force.

So we've got problems and I'm looking forward to your testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe. Secretary Mabus, welcome.

**STATEMENT OF HON. RAYMOND E. MABUS, JR., SECRETARY OF THE NAVY**

Mr. MABUS. Mr. Chairman, thank you, Ranking Member Inhofe, and distinguished members of this committee. I first want to thank you for your support for the Department of the Navy, for our sailors, our Marines, our civilians, and our families.

General Amos, the Commandant of the Marine Corps, and Admiral Greenert, the Chief of Naval Operations, and I could not be prouder to represent those steadfast and courageous sailors, Marines, and civilians. No matter what missions are given to them, no matter what hardships are asked of them, these men and women serve the Nation around the world with skill and dedication.

In the past year the Navy and Marine Corps team has continued to conduct a full range of military operations, from combat in Afghanistan to security cooperation missions in the Pacific to disaster recovery operations on the streets of Staten Island. In each one of these, sailors and Marines have gotten the job done.

As the United States transitions from two land wars in Central Asia to the maritime-centric defense strategy that was referenced by the chairman and which was announced 15 months ago, our naval forces will be absolutely critical in the years ahead. This strategy, which focuses on the Western Pacific, the Arabian Gulf, and continuing to build partnerships around the world, requires a forward-deployed, flexible, multi-mission force that is the Navy and Marine Corps, America's away team.

Within this strategy we have to balance our missions with our resources. We're working under Secretary Hagel's leadership on a strategic choices and management review to assess how we deal with budget uncertainty facing the Department as we go forward. He has directed us to review the basic assumptions that drive the Department's investment in force structure, to identify institutional reforms that may be required, including, as we always should, those reforms that should be pursued regardless of fiscal pressures. As he said during recent testimony, everything will be on the table during this review.

2013 has been hard because we began the fiscal year operating under a continuing resolution that gave us little room to be strategic and to prioritize, limiting our ability to manage the Navy and Marine Corps through this new fiscal reality.

Thanks to the efforts of this committee and to your Congressional colleagues, we have an appropriations bill for this fiscal year. However, sequestration is still forcing us, as also mentioned by the chairman and the ranking member, to make across-the-board cuts totaling more than \$4 billion from our operations and maintenance accounts and about \$6 billion from our investment accounts.

These cuts will have some real impacts. We've prioritized combat operations in Central Command and deployments to Pacific Command. However, we've had to cancel a number of deployments into Southern Command. In order to maintain our priority deployments in 2013 and 2014 and to meet our global force management allocation plan, funding shortfalls will cause our units back home to cut back on training and maintenance. Pilots will get less flight time, ships will have less time at sea, and Marines will have less time in the field. It will take longer for repair parts to arrive when needed. Our facilities ashore will be maintained at a far lower level.

The Department's 2014 budget request is a return to a measured budget approach, one based on strategy that protects the warfighters by advancing the priorities I've referred to as four P's: people, platforms, power, and partnerships.

We're working to make sure our people are resilient and strong after more than a decade of a very high operations tempo. We're doing this with programs like 21st century sailor and marine. With this program we aim to bring all the efforts on protection and readiness, on fitness and inclusion, and the continuum of service, together as one coherent whole. This encompasses a wide range of issues from preventing sexual assault and suicide to fostering a culture of fitness to strengthening the force through diversity to ensuring a successful transition following 4 years of service or 40.

In the Marine Corps, we continue decreasing manpower to meet our new end strength of just over 182,000 marines by fiscal year 2016. But we're doing this in a way to keep faith with the marines and to help retain the right level of noncommissioned officers and field grade officers and their experience.

We're working to make sure that our sailors and marines have the tools and the platforms they need to do the missions they are given. One of the most important of these is our fleet. On September 11, 2001, the U.S. Navy had 316 ships. By 2008, after one of the largest buildups in our Nation's military history, that number was down to 278 ships. In 2008 the Navy put only three ships under contract, far too few to maintain the size of the fleet or our industrial base, and many of our shipbuilding programs were over budget, behind schedule, or both.

One of my main priorities as Secretary has been to reverse those trends. Today the fleet is stabilized and the problems in most of our shipbuilding programs have been corrected or arrested. We have 47 ships under contract today, 43 of which were contracted since I took office, and our current shipbuilding plan puts us on track for 300 ships in the fleet by 2019.

The way we power our ships and our installations has always been a core and vital issue for the Department of the Navy. We continue to lead in energy as we have throughout our history. From sail to coal to oil to nuclear, the Navy has led in moving to new sources of power, and every time it has made us a better warfighting force. Today, from Marines making power in the field to alternatives on land, on and under the sea, and in the air, the Navy and Marine Corps are powering innovations that will maintain our operational edge.

Building partnerships, interoperability, capacity, and capability is a crucial component of this defense strategy. The strategy directs

that these partnerships be pursued in a low-cost, small-footprint, innovative way. This is exactly what the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps do. The process we use to craft the Department's budget was determined, deliberate, and dedicated to our responsibility to you and to the taxpayer. And, like the budget resolutions of both the Senate and the House, we do not assume in this budget that sequestration will continue in fiscal year 2014.

Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, the budget we are submitting supports the defense strategy. It preserves the readiness of our people and it builds on the success we've achieved in shipbuilding. For 237 years our maritime warriors have established a proven record as an agile and adaptable force. Forward deployed, we remain the most responsive option to defend the American people and our interests.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Mabus follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Secretary Mabus.  
Admiral Greenert.

**STATEMENT OF ADM JONATHAN W. GREENERT, USN, CHIEF  
OF NAVAL OPERATIONS**

Admiral GREENERT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Chairman Levin, Senator Inhofe, distinguished members of the committee: It's my pleasure to appear before you today to testify on the Navy's fiscal year 2014 budget and our posture. I am honored to represent 613,000 Active and Reserve sailors, Navy civilians, and the families who support them, all who are serving today. This morning I will address three points in my testimony, in my oral testimony: our enduring tenets for decisionmaking, our budget strategy for 2013 and the subsequent carryover that we will incur, and our intended course for 2014.

Two important characteristics of our naval forces describe our mandate, that we will operate forward where it matters and that we will be ready when it matters. Our fundamental approach to meeting this responsibility remains unchanged. We organize, man, train, and equip the Navy by viewing our decisions through three lens, or I call them tenets. They are that warfighting is first, we have to operate forward, and we need to be ready. Regardless of the size of our budget or our fleet, these three tenets are the lens through which we evaluate all our decisions.

If you refer to the chartlet I've provided in front of you, you will see that on any given day we have about 50,000 sailors in 100 ships deployed overseas. They are providing forward presence. The orange bow ties, if you will, on the chart represent what I call the maritime crossroads, where shipping lanes and our security concerns intersect. A unique strength of your fleet is that it operates forward from U.S. bases, represented by circles on the chartlet, and from places provided by partner nations, represented by squares on the chartlet.

These places are critical to your Navy being where it matters because they enable us to respond rapidly to crises and enable us to sustain forward presence with fewer ships by reducing the number of ships on rotational deployments.

The reverse side of the chartlet will describe the plan for our deployments shown in the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific while sustaining our Mideast posture.

In February we faced a shortfall of about \$8.6 billion in our 2013 operations and maintenance account. Since then we received a 2013 appropriation in March, and I thank this committee for their work in that regard. In accordance with our priorities and tenets, we plan to invest our remaining 2013 operations and maintenance funds to fund our must-pay items such as contracts, leases, and utilities, to reconcile our 2013 presence with our combatant commanders, and to conduct the training and maintenance for forces next to deploy, and to prepare to meet our 2014 global force management allocation plan responsibilities. Also, we'll restore critical base operations and renovation projects.

Although we intend to meet our most critical operational commitments to the combatant commanders, sequestration still leaves us with a \$4.1 billion O&M shortfall and a \$6 billion investment shortfall. This will result in our surge capacity of fully mission-capable carrier strike groups and amphibious ready groups being reduced by two-thirds through 2014. Further, we will have deferred about \$1.2 billion in facilities maintenance, as well as depot-level maintenance for 84 aircraft and 184 engines.

Combined, our operations and maintenance and investment shortfalls leave us \$9 billion worth of carryover challenge for 2014. A continuation of sequestration in 2014 will compound this carryover challenge from \$9 billion to \$23 billion. Further, accounts and activities we were able to protect in 2013, such as manpower and nuclear maintenance and critical fleet operations, will be liable to a reduction in 2014.

Our people have remained resilient in the face of this uncertainty and I have been amazed throughout this process with their patience and their dedication, that of our sailors and our civilians.

Now, our 2014 budget submission supports the defense strategic guidance and enables us to maintain our commitments in the Middle East and to rebalance to the Asia-Pacific. We prepared this budget with the following priorities: One, to deliver overseas presence in accordance with our global force management allocation plan; and two, to continue our near-term investments and address challenges in the Middle East and the Asia-Pacific region; three, we want to develop long-term capabilities with the appropriate capacity to address warfighting challenges in the Middle East and the Asia-Pacific.

Our budget submission continues to invest in future fleet. We've requested \$44 billion in ships, submarines, manned and unmanned aircraft, weapons, cyber, and other procurement programs such as the Joint Strike Fighter, Littoral Combat Ship, unmanned aerial vehicles, the DDG-1000, and the P-8A Poseidon, just to name a few.

These investments will deliver a fleet of 300 ships by 2019 with greater interoperability and greater flexibility when compared to today's fleet.

We also continue to fund important high-technology and asymmetric capabilities such as the Laser Weapon System for small boat and drone defense, which will deploy aboard the ship *Ponce* in the

spring of 2014. Also in 2014, we will deploy on the carrier *George Herbert Walker Bush* a successfully tested prototype system to detect and defeat advanced wake-homing torpedoes.

We continue to grow manpower by about 4,600 sailors in this submission compared to last year's budget, and these new sailors will reduce our manning gaps at sea, will enhance our cyber capabilities, and will improve our waterfront training. We will continue to address our critical readiness and safety degraders, such as sexual assault, suicide, increased operational tempo, and our at-sea manning.

Mr. Chairman, this budget places our Navy on a good course which enables us to meet the requirements of the defense strategic guidance today while building a relevant future force and sustaining our manpower for tomorrow. We appreciate everything you and the committee have done for the sailors and civilians of our Navy as well as the families, and we again ask for your support in removing the burden of sequestration so that we can better train, better equip, and deploy properly these brave men and women in defense of our Nation.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Greenert follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Admiral, thank you so much.

General Amos.

**STATEMENT OF GEN. JAMES F. AMOS, USMC, COMMANDANT  
OF THE MARINE CORPS**

General AMOS. Chairman Levin, Ranking Member Inhofe, and members of the committee: I'm pleased to appear before you today to outline the 2013 posture of your U.S. Marine Corps. I'm equally pleased to be sitting alongside my Service Secretary, the Honorable Ray Mabus, and my good friend and fellow shipmate, Admiral John Greenert, the Chief of Naval Operations.

For more than 237 years, the Marine Corps has been a people-intense force. We have always known our greatest asset is the single individual Marine. That has borne true yet again during 12 years of hard combat. Our unique role as America's principal crisis response force is grounded in the legendary character and warfighting ethos of the U.S. Marine.

Today's Marines are ethical warriors, forged by challenging training and made wise through decades of combat. You can take great pride in knowing that as we gather here this morning in this hearing some 30,000 Marines are forward deployed around the world, promoting peace, protecting our Nation's interests, and securing its defense.

Sergeant Major Michael Barrett, Sergeant Major of the Marine Corps, and I recently returned from Afghanistan and can attest to the progress there. Marines have given the Afghan people a vision of success and the possibility of a secure and prosperous society. I'm bullish about the positive assistance we are providing the people of the Helmand Province and I remain optimistic about their future. Afghan Security Forces have the lead now in almost every single operation. Our commanders and their marines assess the Afghan National Security Forces as overmatching the Taliban in every way and in every single engagement.

Speaking today as both a Service Chief and as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the foundation of our Nation's defense and the security of the global economic environment depends upon regional stability and international order. Failing to provide leadership in the collective security of the global order will have significant consequences for the American people. Worse, a lapse in American leadership and forward engagement will create a void in which lasting security threats will be left unaddressed and new security challenges will find room to grow.

The reality of today's security environment reveals the true value of forward-deployed naval presence. Sea-based naval forces support a proactive security strategy, all while treading lightly on our allies' and our partners' sovereign territory. Amphibious forces are a sensible and unmistakable solution in preserving our national security. Naval forces, and the Marine Corps in particular, are our Nation's insurance policy. We are a hedge against an uncertain and unpredictable world. A balanced air-ground logistics team, we respond in hours and days to America's needs, not in weeks and in months. This is our *raison d'être*. It has always been that way.

This year's baseline budget submission of \$24.2 billion was framed by our following service-level priorities:

Number one, we will continue to provide the best-trained and equipped Marine units to Afghanistan;

Second, we will protect the readiness of our forward-deployed and rotational forces;

Third, we will reset and reconstitute our operating forces as our Marines and our equipment return from nearly 12 years of combat;

Fourth, as much as is humanly possible we will modernize our force through investing in the individual Marine first by replacing aging combat systems second;

And lastly, we will keep faith with our marines, our sailors, and our families.

We have remained committed to these priorities in fiscal year 2013 despite the loss of \$775 million in operations and maintenance funding as a result of sequestration. To guarantee near-term readiness, we have traded long-term infrastructure and non-deployed unit training to bolster the readiness of our next-to-deploy forces. By doing so we are capable of meeting all current GFMAP requirement for the remainder of this fiscal year.

However, we cannot continue to sustain this level of reduction in fiscal year 2014 without impact to our deployed and next-to-deploy forces. Sequestration in 2014 will mean that more than half of our non-forward-deployed ground and aviation units will have readiness ratings of C3 or below.

Ladies and gentlemen, your Marine Corps is well aware of the fiscal realities confronting our Nation. During these times of constrained resources, the Marine Corps remains committed to being responsible stewards of scarce public funds.

In closing, the success of your marines and your Marine Corps is directly linked to the unwavering support of Congress and the American people. You have my promise that during our economic challenges the Marine Corps will only ask for what it needs, not for what it wants. We will continue to prioritize and make the hard decisions before we ever come before Congress. We will continue to

offer a strategically mobile force, optimized for forward presence and rapid response. Your Marine Corps stands ready to respond whenever the Nation calls and whenever the President may direct.

Once again, I thank this committee for your strong support over the last many, many years and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Amos follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you so much, General Amos.

Let's have a 6-minute round. We hope to get everybody in in time. If there's a few minutes left, then we can see if there's additional questions.

Secretary, General Amos just talked about what the effect of continuing sequestration would be if the assumption which is made in the budgets that we have adopted, both the President's budget and the House and Senate budget, prove not to be true, if, as you point out, the assumption that sequestration will not continue in 2014 proves to be a false assumption. Can you tell us what the effect would be if sequestration occurs in the next fiscal year, the one that we're considering right now?

Mr. MABUS. Mr. Chairman, the effect would be wide-reaching, deep, and incredibly damaging. For the Navy, we have met all our deployments for this year following the passage of the appropriations bill. We are training to meet all our deployments for next year. However, the risk that we are taking is that we are maintaining ships and aircraft in lesser amounts. We are maintaining our bases at very low levels. Except for emergency repairs, we're essentially not doing repairs on those bases.

In terms of investments for ships, there is a term "cost to complete" and it's things like documentation, all the government-furnished equipment being put on the ships, things like that. We have moved those further out so that they're not required to be paid for today. But that bill will come due and it will be very difficult for us to complete ships or to get to the level of shipbuilding that we need to.

For the Marine Corps, there, as the Commandant said, they have put their money into readiness today because they have to be our first-to-deploy, always ready force. They have to be ready every day. If sequestration continues, the degradation to training would not only occur in units at home, it would begin to occur in the units next to deploy.

The harm of sequestration is number one in its amount, but number two is—number two is in the fact that it allows us no planning time, no ramp time to get ready; and number three, that it does not allow money to be matched against strategy. It's a fairly mindless way of cutting funds.

So while the effects are very real in 2013, the effects will be far more damaging and far-reaching should it continue into 2014.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Do you know how much the OCO funding is going to be, the request for OCO for fiscal year 2014 yet? Has that number been established?

Mr. MABUS. No.

Chairman LEVIN. In the past witnesses have told our committee that the Navy and Marine Corps will require at least two to three years of additional overseas contingency operations, or OCO, fund-

ing after the end of combat operations just to bring equipment and personnel back to an acceptable state of readiness. Is that your position as well?

Mr. MABUS. That is, and I'd like for both Admiral Greenert and General Amos to answer this, but the Department of the Navy has been moving funds previously expended under OCO back into our base budget very aggressively. But we have OCO-related expenses for both Navy and Marine Corps, particularly in terms of reset for the Marine Corps, but also in terms of maintenance for our ships, which is the Navy's version of reset.

Chairman LEVIN. Admiral?

Admiral GREENERT. As the Secretary said, "reset" is the key term to cover those years following the completion of operations in the Middle East. For us it's the depot work that didn't get done while we spent the extra time supporting operations in the Middle East. We've captured that amount and quantified it. It's relatively modest compared to the Marine Corps's numbers, which I'll turn over to the Commandant.

But as the Secretary said, in my opinion, Mr. Chairman, we need a strategy in order to move ahead. Supplementals have been around for years and years. Decades we've had supplementals for various and sundry reasons, and I believe it would be a good idea if we could work through a strategy as we move from this OCO to determine what's an appropriate way to deal with emergent costs for emergent operations.

Chairman LEVIN. General?

General AMOS. Mr. Chairman, 2 to 3 years is a good marker on the table. It's a function of physically being able to get all the equipment, the remaining equipment, out of Afghanistan and actually getting it through the depots and back reset to the fleet. If sequestration continues—and we're planning on it—that's going to be in the long run a 75 percent reduction in our depot capacity because it's going to reduce civilian manpower, contractors, and everything else reduce. So it's going to have an impact. That two to three years could go to the right.

But for us it's 2 to 3 years, about \$3.2 billion, to reset the Marine Corps and get all our equipment out.

Chairman LEVIN. Senator Inhofe.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I have two areas that I want to, in this brief period of time, to address. One is during—a couple days ago, during one of our hearings, I cited, having to do with the Article 60 the incidents where a convening authority overturned a particular conviction and I covered all four services, and mistakenly there was an article saying I didn't think that sexual assaults were a reality. That was wrong. That was corrected after that.

However, as far as the Marines and the Navy are concerned, from the year 2010 to 2012 in the Marines, as you and I talked about, General Amos, there were 1768 court-martials resulting in findings of guilty. In seven out of those—that's 0.4 percent—they were overturned you the convening authority. In the Navy it's a little bit more—a little stronger case in terms of how things are working. 16,000—this is over a decade, 2002 to 2012—16,056 special and general court-martial cases resulting in findings of guilty.

There are only two in the Navy. I state that because I think we need to put it into perspective.

So I am sending each of you a letter and a letter actually to the Chiefs, and I want to, Mr. Chairman, have this a part of the record at this point.

Chairman LEVIN. It will be made part of the record.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator INHOFE. Then I would only—I think we can come down to a couple of ideas or conclusions that I feel strongly about. First of all, Secretary Hagel came out with a solution—it was a suggestion, I guess it was, and I thought it was very generous. He was wanting to change the convening authority's jurisdiction on post-conviction trials, and I thought that that was giving up more than I thought should be given up, when you consider these commanders have the responsibility of sending our kids in where their lives could be lost and certainly that's something that is very significant. That's an authority that they have and they should keep.

So I would like to ask each one of you in terms of the suggestion that Secretary Hagel had on just addressing the post-sentencing authority.

Then also, there's a review that's going on, that's going to be convening this summer. Wouldn't it be better to address this after we get the results of this hearing and the study that's taking place this summer? Those are the two questions I would ask each one, starting with you, Secretary Mabus.

Mr. MABUS. Thank you, Senator. The legislative proposal that's being done under the direction of Secretary Hagel is to take away the power of a convening authority to change the findings of a court-martial, which is a very narrow exception. And I think—and I support this, as do all the judge advocate generals of all the services. I think it's representation of how our military justice system has matured over the past 50 or 60 years. You now have professional prosecutors, defense attorneys, judges, and a very strong appeals process.

What it does not do—and I know that General Amos and Admiral Greenert are concerned about this and will talk more specifically about it—what it does not do is take away any authority in terms of convening, in terms of post-trial sentence relief or clemency. And it seems to be a very directed and very fair and prudent change to make.

Finally, in regard to the panel that was set up by the NDAA, while it's true that it will begin meeting this summer, I believe the results will not be out for about 18 months, and this seems to be an area, because of the attention that it's gotten, that needs to be acted on sooner than that. But it will be a Congressional decision and not a DOD decision.

Senator INHOFE. I would say, you generally agree with Secretary Mabus? I'm almost out of time here.

Admiral GREENERT. I do agree.

Senator INHOFE. Okay.

General AMOS. Sir, I'm probably just a little bit out of sync here, because I think we need to proceed cautiously. I support Secretary Hagel's panels that he's setting up. I think that's exactly the right

way to go. I just think we need to be cautious of what it is we're trying to fix, what the problem is we're trying to fix.

Senator INHOFE. I appreciate that and I do, I'm in more agreement with you on this.

Secretary Mabus, I've been critical for quite some time over the over 400,000 gallons of fuel and all this stuff in terms of how much money it costs. This comes out of the budget, the warfighting budget. The Department of Energy, which was started in 1977, was set up for this very reason, and I'm going to put into the record the mission statement of that today, which shows that, in my opinion as I look at it, they are the ones who need to be making these determinations.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator INHOFE. If our concern is to do away with our reliance upon foreign countries, we can do that quite easily just by developing the resources that we have right now. You've heard me say this. I'm sure you're tired of hearing it. But the one thing that I had learned during our conversation, Mr. Secretary, was that you have—that the Department of Defense will not make bulk purchases—I'm reading now—"of alternative drop-in replacement fuels unless they are cost-competitive with petroleum products."

Is that the commitment that you would make at this time?

Mr. MABUS. It's a commitment I have made. I made it to this committee last year at this very hearing. But, Senator, in terms of needing alternative sources, I applaud the fact that our resources are going up in terms of fossil fuels and we should certainly continue that. However, oil is the ultimate global commodity and the prices are not set here. They are set around the world.

In the last three years, the Department of the Navy has been hit with additional fuel bills over and above what we had budgeted for of \$1.5 billion to pay for unexpected oil price shocks. That amount of money comes directly from our operations accounts, maintenance accounts, and if the bill gets too big it will come from platforms. And I simply think that that is unacceptable and I think it's irresponsible for us not to address this sort of military vulnerability.

I am confident, I am absolutely positively confident, that by the time we begin buying bulk amounts of biofuels, which is one important but fairly small part of this whole effort, is that it will be competitive with petroleum products.

Senator INHOFE. Yes, but we have the language in there to be sure that that will be the case. I'm old-fashioned enough to still believe in supply and demand, and once we open up our resources here we're going to be—I think that's going to positively affect the costs that we have to bear. Thank you.

Mr. MABUS. Well, you and I, Senator, agree very enthusiastically on the free market, and I simply think that relying on one type of fuel which is a monopoly today is not a prudent thing to do.

Senator INHOFE. I think the safeguard you have is satisfactory. Thank you.

Mr. MABUS. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe.

By the way, on the 18-month provision that you referred to for the first report on the powers of the convening authority, it says

no more than 18 months. I hope it won't take anywhere near that amount.

Second, in terms of proposed changes in the legislation that follow that, there's another panel that we've created I hope will review that. It's much too long a process, I think unnecessary, because there's a kind of a growing, I think, if not a consensus, there's a growing understanding that we've got to do something at the end of the process relative to reversing the findings. They've been rare, as I think Senator Inhofe has pointed out, and that means this would not be disruptive, to just focus on that one narrow part of the process. And I hope we'll do that in this year's defense authorization bill.

Senator Manchin.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Mabus, Admiral Greenert, and of course General Amos, I thank you all for your service and also for the quality of men and women that serve in the Navy and in the Marines.

I know a lot of people wouldn't know it, but in West Virginia geography-wise we're not maybe at the largest body of water, but we do have a real close tie to the Navy and we cherish that. Sugar Grove Naval Base in Pendleton County, as you know, is a strategic position and it's been a strategic asset for a long time for the Navy, and we know that might be changing and we look forward to working with you as the changes come about to make sure that we're able to serve this country in a continued future.

We also have in the Rocket Center, the Navy Rocket Center at the Allegheny Ballistics Laboratory, which I think you just designated as the Navy Enterprise Data Center, which is extremely important. We appreciate that and we're proud of that designation and when it continues that partnering with you.

Let me ask this to Secretary Mabus, if I may. I know we talked about sequester and sequestering is now starting to hit and we're seeing the effects of it. I think it was very draconian how it's been implemented across the board. None of us run our lives that way. So we've talked about flexibility. I know there's an awful lot of politics in this whole flexibility.

But I think when you look at the security of our Nation—are you too far or are we too far down the road with sequestration, since there's a \$42.5 billion cut between now and September 30 or October 1, and in between that time we've got to come up with a budget or we continue, the way the legislation is written?

If we were able to vote as a body to give you the flexibility, the Department of Defense, to pick and choose where the \$42.5 billion in cuts would come from, are you too far down the road to make a difference, or could you change quickly enough to stop some of the draconian things that are happening?

Mr. MABUS. I think the short answer is no, we're not too far down the road. The flexibility in terms of whether it's under the traditional reprogramming or something else would certainly be welcome. What I don't want to imply is that that would solve anything for 2014.

Senator MANCHIN. Sure, we know that. I'm just trying to get you through this fiscal year—

Mr. MABUS. And I appreciate that.

Senator MANCHIN.—to October 1. To me it just makes sense, sir, as a former governor—and we have a few former governors on this committee. We understand that it's tough sometimes, but working—sometimes you can work through these things, and we're just hoping that you're still in that position if we can make something happen for you.

Mr. MABUS. Thank you.

Senator MANCHIN. The other thing I would ask is on the Sugar Grove, which we just talked about. I think we've been asking you for your assistance on that, to try to help us find—anyone can comment on that—to try to help us. Maybe, Admiral, you might have more input on that.

General AMOS. Well, I'll give you a better written answer, but my fleet cyber command commander, Admiral Rogers, and I are talking about that, how do we make that adjustment, directed by Cyber Command, that makes sense so we use the civilian cyber warriors we have properly and make the best of an activity which has been around for quite some time supporting us. I'll give you a better written answer.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator MANCHIN. If you could do that. Also, if I could ask—and I know with your schedules—but if there's a time that we could meet there, myself and Senator Rockefeller would love to meet with you there. If you haven't had a chance to visit there, the assets that the Navy has there is unbelievable and we'd like to be able to work with you.

Admiral GREENERT. Yes, sir.

Senator MANCHIN. Maybe we'll schedule that with your staff.

Secretary, I think this might come back to you and really to General Amos and to the Admiral also. I know, General Amos, the Marine Corps is reducing by 20,000 marines and there are I guess civilian furloughs that have been looming and hiring freezes in place for many of the DOD civilian positions. Sir, I think you know my position on contracting. It's not real favorable.

Do you know how many contractors we will still have and are they being—are we downsizing our contracting fleet in proportion to our military fleet?

Mr. MABUS. You ask a question that I asked exactly: How many do we have? The best answer that I've got is for the Department of the Navy we've got a little over 170,000 contractors or contracts out there. We are moving—

Senator MANCHIN. That's just the Navy, right?

Mr. MABUS. That's the Department of the Navy.

Senator MANCHIN. Department of the Navy, I've got you, yes, sir.

Mr. MABUS. We're moving pretty aggressively to go into these things, and we've set up something called contract courts. It's got a more formal name, but that's what we call it. It makes every contracting officer come in every year and say: Here are the contracts I've got, here's why I need them, here's the best price I can get, this sort of thing. We're going to get more—we're moving toward becoming more aggressive on that, which is, instead of saying here are the contracts I've got, tell the contracting authorities to come in at zero and say, here's what I need, because I think that there

are still some areas that we can make a difference here. It's too opaque right now. It's too hard to get into.

Senator MANCHIN. Let me just real quickly. My time is running out. But on auditing, you know that myself and Senator Coburn have put in legislation to have the Department of Defense audited. Does that cause a problem with the Secretary—I mean, with the Navy, to meet this auditing that we've been talking about?

Mr. MABUS. Senator, I started by elective career State auditor of Mississippi.

Senator MANCHIN. Yes, sir.

Mr. MABUS. I'm a big fan of auditing. I'm going to brag on the Navy and Marine Corps right now. The Marine Corps audit is under way right now and we're expecting—

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, General.

Mr. MABUS.—an opinion soon. The Navy's audit will be ready to go, we think by the end of this year—

Senator MANCHIN. So that doesn't create—the audit does not create a hardship for you? The Navy can meet that auditing requirement?

Mr. MABUS. We are meeting it. I don't know about adding layer on there, but we're meeting it on current things.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, sir. I appreciate it.

Sorry.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Manchin.

Senator McCain.

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank the witnesses. Admiral Greenert, due to sequester the Navy is faced with the prospect that two-thirds of the fleet will not be fully mission capable by the end of the year; is that correct?

Admiral GREENERT. Yes, sir, those that are not on deployment. So if you're not on deployment or just ready to go, two-thirds will be what we call C3, and that's a capability rating, or less.

Senator MCCAIN. So they will not be ready to replace those rotating back out?

Admiral GREENERT. Typically we have about a half the fleet at C3 or C4. They're in the progress of getting ready to deploy. That will increase to two-thirds from one-half.

Senator MCCAIN. General Amos, you said recently "By the end of this year more than 50 percent of my combat units will be below minimal acceptable level of readiness for deployment to combat." Is that still the case?

General AMOS. Yes, Senator, it is.

Senator MCCAIN. If the sequester is not fixed, Admiral Greenert, are you ready to identify where you would have to cut your budget?

Admiral GREENERT. I can't give you specific program and budget lines now, but we are working on that right now. We're working within the Department and we're working with the Department of Defense staff. It's called a strategic concepts management review.

Senator MCCAIN. But you are working on the eventuality of actions that need to be taken, budgetary actions that need to be taken in case sequester is not repealed?

Admiral GREENERT. We are working that within the Department, yes, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. General?

General AMOS. Senator, we absolutely are. We're under the assumption that sequester will stand. It's law. And the pain of that will be a Marine Corps that's going to be below 182,000. So the immediate impacts will be a drastic reduction, probably RIFs in the Marine Corps, to some number below that once the strategic forces has leveled out and gives us the amount of money we have. But it'll be civilians, it'll be military, it'll be programmatic, and the cuts will be severe.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, one of our problems is that the budget that has been submitted to Congress does not take into account the effects of sequestration, assuming that sequester will be repealed. So I'm glad to hear that, at least at your level, you are planning on actions that need to be taken if sequester is not repealed.

General Amos, earlier this week General Odierno testified that sequester will produce a hollow Army. Will it have the same effect on the Marine Corps?

General AMOS. Absolutely, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. And, General Amos, from talking to, and Admiral Greenert, to a lot of young officers, this is having a significant effect on the morale and willingness to retain high-quality non-commissioned as well as commissioned officers; is that correct? Is that a correct impression that I have from conversations with our senior NCOs and captains and majors and lieutenant commanders and lieutenants?

General AMOS. Senator, we're not seeing that right now. In fact, the retention both of our enlisted ranks and our officer corps is very, very high. But I will say that with an air of caution, because as we go through sequestration, the full impacts take place, and we come back from 12 years of combat, there's going to be a sea change in the Marine Corps and it wouldn't surprise me at all to find that the retention will become challenging.

Admiral GREENERT. It's the word, the simple word "predictability." They ask us, so what's the predictability? How can I plan my future? That's the case, Senator. My retention right now is good, but there are some signs here and there. I attribute it to increased operations right now based on the skill set, the Navy enlisted classification code, pilots, nukes, that nature, right now. But it's about predictability, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. Secretary Mabus, the repositioning or, unfortunate word, pivot that was used to Asia-Pacific, how much credibility do we have when we consider, when we continue to have our Navy shipbuilding plan continue to decline now to 270 ships in fiscal year 2015?

Mr. MABUS. Actually, Senator, I think that our credibility remains high. If you look at our shipbuilding plan, it takes the fleet up to 300 ships by the end of 2019, and the fact that we are forward deploying four Littoral Combat Ships in Singapore—the first one is there on its maiden deployment today—the fact that we are putting our new builds, our most capable ships, into the Pacific, and the fact that 60 percent of our fleet will be in the Pacific by the end of the decade.

Senator MCCAIN. So we are planning—you are planning on by what year?

Mr. MABUS. 2019, to have 300 ships in the fleet.

Senator MCCAIN. We will remember those, that testimony, Secretary Mabus, because it isn't going to happen.

Admiral Greenert, the 30-year shipbuilding plan reflects the reduction of the fleet to 270 ships in 2015. How many ships with the right capabilities do you think the Navy needs?

Admiral GREENERT. I need 306 ships with the right capabilities to do the jobs assigned to me in accordance with the strategic guidance we have today.

Senator MCCAIN. You need 306 and we're going to be down to 270 by 2015, and you believe that we're going to add 30 more ships plus those that need to be replaced by 2019?

Admiral GREENERT. Based on the ships we have under construction today, yes, sir. We have 47 ships under contract or in construction today.

Senator MCCAIN. I'd like to see those numbers for the record, please.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator MCCAIN. I thank the witnesses. It's interesting that we are now in a panic mode because the FAA is delaying flights. We don't seem to be concerned about the testimony that you and other uniformed leaders have given to Congress about the devastating effect on our National security of sequestration. It's one of the more embarrassing moments for me in the many years that I have had the honor of serving here in this body.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

Senator King.

Senator KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all, gentlemen, for being here this morning and for your service.

Admiral, I'd like to begin by a comment about the Navy. My home town is Brunswick, Maine, and for about 60 years, as you know, we were the home of the Brunswick Naval Air Station. Losing that station was a tremendous blow to our community, but it was a blow in a way—it was certainly economic with business and the economic effect.

But as a resident of that community with kids in the schools, the loss of the Navy personnel was a tremendous loss for us because of what they contributed to the community, teaching in Sunday school, coaching in the Little League, kids in the schools. The Navy added so much to our community, and this is just a way of complimenting you on the quality of people that you have because they were our friends and neighbors for so many years.

The economic loss we can calculate, but the community, the loss to the community of the Navy personnel, was incalculable. I just want to convey that to you. We regret that decision.

Secretary Mabus and Admiral, talk to me about how you envision the future of the Navy's destroyer force. We continue to retire frigates. The decision several years ago not to procure the next generation cruiser—it seems like destroyers will fill multiple roles in the Navy. Can you give me, Admiral, an idea of how you see the destroyer, the future of the destroyer fleet?

Admiral GREENERT. We need 88—we call them large surface combatants and that's cruisers and destroyers. So as we phase out the cruisers that we have, destroyers will, if you will, replace them.

The destroyer of today, the ones built, for example, in Bath, Maine, very high-end ship, in fact much higher end, if you will, capability-wise, has more capability than a cruiser. It's multi-mission. It's a fantastic vessel right now.

So the future is we need 88. We have 84. We're growing and will continue to grow through this decade, and we need to sustain that. To do that into the 20s, we need to build about two and a half a year on average of these destroyers or a ship like them.

Now, I'd add to this. In 2016 we will add a capability, the Advanced Missile Defense Radar, which will make the current *Arleigh Burke* a vastly more capable, even more capable, missile defense-capable, in addition to anti-air capable. We call it integrated air missile defense.

Senator KING. How do you intend to leverage the technology that's been developed for the DDG-1000? That's an amazing ship as well.

Admiral GREENERT. We get a lot of engineering technology from that ship, its fuel efficiency as well as the reduced manning. So we'll take that capability as well as the stealthiness that the ship provides. There's a good element of ASW, the sonar, the hull-mounted sonar and the towed array sonar, that we would want to backfit as much as feasible into destroyers.

Mr. MABUS. We are putting the radar that came out of the DDG-1000, the dual-band radar, on our aircraft carriers now.

Senator KING. So that technology is being used in other areas?

Mr. MABUS. Yes.

Senator KING. I think it was the Admiral who used a phrase that I never want to hear these three words in the same sentence, "Reducing nuclear maintenance." Talk to me about the impact on maintenance of the sequester, which we've talked about today? I find that—to me, not doing maintenance isn't a savings. It's simply deferring the cost to a later date and it will probably be more expensive at that point. Your thoughts?

Admiral GREENERT. Well, Senator, if you're talking those numbers, which the one I was referring to was \$23 billion, it's a balance of sustaining the force of today, and that would be the maintenance and the readiness of it, the force structure today, the number of ships and aircraft, and building the future fleet. So we need to do this in a balanced manner.

If we defer all—if we ensure we do all the nuclear maintenance that needs to get done, we bring all of the non-nuclear maintenance to kind of parade rest, to very little. I can't do that. We have to have a balance towards that. Those numbers at that level make it difficult for me to see how we would preclude needing to reduce the number of shipyard workers we have, that capacity, and therefore the amount of ships, ship maintenance that would go on.

Senator KING. Gentlemen, I've been going to these hearings now for a couple of months and every single uniformed and civilian official in Defense and also—I'm on the Intelligence Committee—in the intelligence community has told me that they have never seen a more dangerous, volatile, and complex period of threats to the

United States. And yet at the same time we are going through the sequester and hollowing out our services, which has been testified.

What are we doing to ourselves? I mean, I just don't understand it. I think Senator McCain made the point that, you know, everybody knows about the delays at the airports. What's happening to you? We're putting not only our soldiers and sailors at risk, but our people at risk. Am I overstating this problem?

General AMOS. Senator, I don't think you are at all. I had a little bit of an advantage a couple years ago. I spent almost a year with a very elite team working on trying to determine what the future security environment would look like. It was an international team, to include corporate America. I think your sense for the world we're in is accurate. I see no indication that the world is getting any nicer. I think all you have to do is look at the Washington Post on Sunday and you can start from the front and go all the way to the back and you can see that.

So from my perspective, it is every bit as dangerous and perhaps because it will be spread out, it could be considerably more dangerous in the future. From my perspective as a service chief, I think that dictates—it's a predicate for us to remain engaged in the world. We're the only global superpower on this planet. We have people that count on us for leadership. They expect us to be leaders.

So that's part of why I said what I said in my opening statement. We are global leaders. We have a responsibility globally, international, and quite honestly, very selfishly and myopically. That's really what the Navy and Marine Corps team is able to do, is be out there engaging and representing the interests of the United States of America.

Senator KING. Thank you, gentlemen.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator King.

Senator Donnelly.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral, thank you. Mr. Secretary, thank you. General, thank you.

As you know, our State of Indiana is proud to be a key center for naval operations at NSWC Crane. The dedicated people there work night and day to keep our service members safe, and we want you to know we are proud to be your inland Navy.

In regards to China, Admiral, when you look at the threats that are out there, can you give us an update on their development of anti-ship ballistic missiles and what the intention of that program is? And do you consider that a game changer in regards to our aircraft carrier reliance?

Admiral GREENERT. My assessment would be they want to be—China wants to be able to influence what we call within the first island chain, roughly 1,000 miles and in, the first island being—if you're familiar with that, the Philippine Islands.

Senator DONNELLY. Yes.

Admiral GREENERT. They want to be able to influence that area to a great degree. It's a defensive measure for the mainland. They look to that area as, they call it their "Near Sea." And they want to have the ability to defend it, if you will, as they need to.

Is it a game changer? It certainly could be. It depends. But in a perhaps more classified setting I could describe to you, we haven't been standing around wringing our hands. There is a series of events that has to take place for something like that. You have to find—you have to have the right detection, you have to classify it, you have to be able to target, you have to know when to launch it, you have to have confidence in that launch. It has to go through its launch sequence. Then do you shoot it down? Do you deceive it, do you jam it? Then lastly, do you shoot a bullet with a bullet?

All of these things go through what we call the kill chain, and we study that very closely.

Senator DONNELLY. That was going to be my next question, was the current capability in regards to countering that. But as you said, perhaps a more classified setting would be more appropriate for that.

In regards to the balance of power in submarines, you hear of the Chinese bringing a submarine on and the discussion of other nations seeing how important this is. In regards to where we are today in helping to control the seas and the strength of our submarine program, has our premier position changed at all in the last year? And if so, how? And what do you see five years from now?

Admiral GREENERT. Well, Senator, simplistically, I say we own the undersea domain, and we still do and I have empirical data that convinces me of that, and I watch it very closely. It is our job to keep that asymmetric advantage in the future. I believe it is our asymmetric advantage, one of our asymmetric advantages, and it's our job, my job, to come to you and show you how we can sustain that.

Senator DONNELLY. Okay.

General, your Marines have done an extraordinary job in Afghanistan. As we look toward the next year or two ahead, for instance Helmand Province, do we have the confidence of the people in Helmand Province as we move forward in this process that they have some confidence level that they'll be able to be protected, that they'll be able to have a life that they can protect their children and have a decent life?

General AMOS. Senator, they do. The chemistry has changed dramatically over the last four and a half years. It's leadership. It's leadership by the provincial governor, Governor Naim, the district governors, mayors, and the Afghan National Security Forces.

The Taliban have—I'm not saying they're not there. They're there, but they have been marginalized to the point where the Afghan National Security Forces have become strong enough where they can handle this themselves. So we are today turning over—I've already said major operations belong to the Afghan National Security Forces. We don't write op plans any more. We just write supporting plans. So we're there as a backup.

But the actual kind of control of the districts, the Afghans have got it. So in Helmand the answer is yes. The key will be the continued stable support of the central government, the ability for the central government to continue to put resources down in these various provinces, to include the Helmand Province. If that stays, the confidence of the people will remain. If that goes, then it will evaporate quickly.

Senator DONNELLY. Do you think that the continued presence of—we don't know the exact number, but 8,000 to 10,000 or whatever that number is at the end of 2014, the continued presence of those Marines or soldiers or sailors or airmen, do you think that the Afghan people—that the presence of those military makes them sleep better at night?

General AMOS. Senator, without a doubt. You talk to them personally face to face, whether it be in Kabul or whether it be in Helmand or anyplace else, and they are very, very worried. The normal Afghan civilian is extremely nervous that we will just completely come out, as we did in Iraq.

Senator DONNELLY. Are our service members kind of viewed by the Afghan people as we move forward in those much smaller numbers as kind of the glue that will help hold things together?

General AMOS. Sir, I think so. At the very senior levels of government and the military and whatever, we will help be that connecting tissue with thought and resources that perhaps they wouldn't otherwise have.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you very much. To all of you, thank you for your service.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Donnelly.

Senator KAINE.

Senator KAINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Thanks to all of you for your service and your testimony today.

Secretary Mabus, your testimony, written testimony, really talked about something I'm very focused on, which is that the challenges of the future require flexible force more than fixed force, and the combined operations that you represent here in this hearing give the Nation a great flexible force capacity to deal with challenges whenever and wherever they arise. That's why this is such an important hearing.

I stepped out for a few minutes to attend a Foreign Relations Committee meeting on embassy security. So I think I may just start, General Amos, with you on that topic. I visited the Marine security guard program at Quantico within the last month or so and was very impressed. But certainly there's a significant need in the aftermath of Baghdad. One of the recommendations from the review board was upgrading Marine security guard and the foreign affairs security training, and it looks like you've got a pretty significant both capital expansion at Quantico as well as an upgrading of about an additional thousand Marine security guards to help our missions around the world.

I'd love to just know how the current budgetary challenges or sequester if it continues will affect our ability to beef up the needed Marine security guard presence and training.

General AMOS. Senator, none of that is funded. It was all done in good faith, for all the right reasons, 6, 8 months ago. The original intent, my understanding is, is that once the NDAA authorized the 1,000-Marine plus-up to the already, I think our number is at 1,449 marines we currently have in that field, so it will be another thousand on top of that to perform the missions that you talked about, that the funding of that would follow basically on top of whatever funding I would normally get.

We're on our way down to 182.1, as Secretary Mabus said. So to add another 1,000-Marine requirement on top of that pulls those combat forces out of the 182 and kind of makes me a 181-size force. So I'm still hoping that we're able to sort through the funding of that. But right now it's not funded.

We are pressing ahead, just so that you know. We're not sitting back. In agreement with the State Department, we will stand up three new MSG DETs between now and June. We'll stand up another seven by the end of this year, and then over the next several years we'll stand up another 26.

So we're proceeding as if we're going to have the money, because the need is there. So our intent is honest. We just would appreciate the funding.

Senator KAINE. Well, and I think we have to be consistent in our message. I'm on the Budget Committee, too, and we end up hearing a lot about the need to cut, cut, cut, and then at the other side, on the foreign relations side, we're telling you that we need a dramatic expansion of security presence at our embassies, and the Marines own part of that space. So we have to be consistent in the message we deliver.

You have a sizable price tag for the retrograding of equipment back from Afghanistan. I think the testimony I heard earlier, not today but earlier, was about \$3 billion or so just to retrograde equipment back for the marines. And then that equipment has to be retrofitted and improved, etcetera, before it's ready for additional use. So the budgetary environment and sequester affects both the retrograding and the upfitting of that equipment to make it available for its next use in the field.

General AMOS. Senator, you're 100 percent correct. In fact, within our Corps as a result of the sequester we've gone back and said, okay, what's good enough? What is it we currently own? What is it we've been driving and using for the last 5, 10 years? And whereas otherwise we might have moved on to something new, we're actually taking that back through the depots right now.

So the equipment—we've got 60 percent of the equipment that we had on the ground in Afghanistan out as of today. I'm pretty please about that. 38,000 principal end items are working their way through the depots, all really important to reset the Marine Corps, and the bill is about \$3.2 billion to complete the mission and reset it.

Just to give you a sense for how we've done, though, it wasn't but about four or five years ago the bill was about \$15 billion. So Congress has been very good, helped us out. We've been faithful stewards to get our equipment through, and now we're in the final stages of that to get the equipment out once we finish the mission and to reset the Corps.

Senator KAINE. Excellent.

For Secretary Mabus and Admiral Greenert; One of the things I noticed in the 2014 submission was that you're funding 80 percent of ship depot maintenance, but I believe it looks like it's 100 percent funding on both carrier and subs. So this is surface ships, I gather. Is there an intent to put in an additional budgetary request through OCO for the remaining ship maintenance? Or how will you manage lesser maintenance on the surface ships?

Mr. MABUS. That's correct. We would get from 80 percent to close to 100 percent based on our OCO submission. That's based on the fact that, unlike the Marines, who pull equipment out, send it through a depot and reset, Navy tends to reset every day through maintenance, through maintaining our ships. So that OCO request—and as I said earlier, we are aggressively moving OCO into base. But this is—that 20 percent of maintenance is still very much related to the operations tempo in Central Command right now.

Senator Kaine. How about just generally the sequester environment and future shipbuilding costs and scheduling? If we don't find that solution that is assumed in the budget that the President has submitted, that you're testifying to today, what will be the long-term effect on the costs and scheduling on the shipbuilding side?

Mr. MABUS. One of the things that we have done based on the bill passed here in 2009 on acquisition reform is we've pushed things like multi-year contracts, which save a great deal of money. We've pushed things like competition. And sequester would have a bad effect on all those things. Again, as the CNO said, we're working through exactly what that effect would be.

But if we are unable—we have, for example, the *Virginia* class submarine program now under multi-year, the DDG-51 under a multi-year, the Marines' MV-22 aircraft under a multi-year, the Hawkeye electronic surveillance aircraft for the Navy under a multi-year, ending a multi-year.

If we cannot continue those multi-years or if we can't execute them as multi-years, the cost goes dramatically, dramatically higher for fewer ships and aircraft.

Senator Kaine. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Levin. Thank you very much, Senator Kaine.

Senator Shaheen.

Senator Shaheen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you all very much for being here this morning and for your service.

I want to begin by saying I share Senator McCain's frustration and outrage that this Congress hasn't yet addressed sequestration and very much appreciate the challenges that we have given to all of you as you try and deal with a budget that has so much uncertainty.

One of the things that I do every week is to host a coffee for my constituents from New Hampshire who are here. Several weeks ago I had a woman at the coffee who approached me close to tears because her husband works at the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard and she said: We don't know what we're going to do about our personal budget because of the furloughs that he is expecting.

I know the Navy has been working on this issue, trying to address the furlough question. Clearly it's one of the things that has an impact on morale, which all of you have mentioned this morning. So I wonder if you can give us any insights into whether you are going to be able to address the furlough and how you might do that?

Mr. MABUS. Thank you, Senator. That decision, as you know, has not been made yet. It's being made at a DOD-wide level and they're looking at the health of the whole force. But as you point out, we

have civilian workers—shipyard workers is a great example—that have a direct operational impact on the Navy. The CNO and I have both talked about this publicly, about how that will impact the ships that go through these depots, how it will impact the sailing schedules, the steaming schedules, and our operational schedules.

So that's part of the input that we've been given. As Secretary Hagel said, if we can do better we will do better. I think everybody recognizes just how crucial these civilians are. General Amos says that he considers them civilian marines. We consider them civilian sailors. They are absolutely crucial to the fleet and to the Marine Corps.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Secretary. I know that the shipyard workers at the Portsmouth and throughout the country appreciate the efforts that are being made to try and address their situation.

I want to switch to energy, because one of the best things I've done since I've been in the Senate was to join with you in the hearing on the USS *Kearsarge* about the efforts that are being made by the Navy to address energy use. I certainly agree that we've got to reduce our what has been almost a total dependence on oil in recent years.

I wonder—I know that biofuels is something that you've been working very hard on and very much appreciate that. But I wonder if you could also address some of the other efficiencies that you're trying to achieve in order to address energy usage throughout the Navy and the Marines?

Mr. MABUS. I appreciate the opportunity to talk about it. You're right, we're proceeding down two tracks. One is to change the type of energy we use, but the other is to do the same amount with less energy. In the Navy we're doing things like different hull coatings, stern flaps, different kinds of lighting on ships, voyage planning tools, this sort of thing, to use less energy.

All these things have a tremendous impact on the amount that we use. We have the USS *Macon Island*, the first hybrid ship, that has an electric drive for under 12 knots. They made a deployment to Central Command and to Pacific Command. We sent them out with a \$33 million fuel budget and they brought \$15 million back that they did not use, which is able to put back into operations.

The Marines, through their EXFOB, their Experimental Forward Operating Base, that they have twice a year, once at Quantico, once at Twentynine Palms, and get whatever industry is doing. So marines are lightening their loads by using fewer batteries and by charging their radios and GPS's with solar power. They're doing insulation. They're using wind power, they're using hybrid generators at their bases.

So we are bringing down the amount of energy that we use and not cutting our operations at all. In fact, we're increasing the amount we can do on the same amount of energy. I think we've got to keep proceeding down these two tracks because, as I said in answer to a previous question, in the last three years just from the spike in oil prices the Navy, the Department of the Navy, has had to pay an additional \$1.5 billion in fuel bills that we didn't have budgeted. That money could have gone to operations or to platforms.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, particularly in these challenging economic times, I think it's prudent for you to continue proceeding down this path, and hope that we can provide you as much support in the Senate as possible.

General Amos, I'm almost out of time, but I wanted to go back to your comments about sexual assault and about the convening authority, because I certainly appreciate your concern about proceeding with caution in this area, but the fact is that there are over 3,000 reported sexual assaults in the military. The estimate is that it's more than 19,000.

You've indicated that you're going to lead a cultural change within the Marine Corps regarding sexual assault. How do you do that? Do we not have to look at how the system addresses sexual assault in order to make that cultural change?

General AMOS. Senator, I don't want to confuse you here. I'm working my way through the convening authority Article 60 mentally as it relates to sexual assault, because I don't want anybody to think for a second that this isn't important to me. If that's what it takes, if that becomes part of the solution set, then I fully support it. So I just want you to know that.

The institution—to your question, though, about our institution, the U.S. Marine Corps, this has to be a culture change. We began last, probably around the May timeframe, began with a general officer symposium. I brought every general in the Marine Corps back to Quantico for two straight days and talked nothing about where we were. It was a cold dose of reality, where we are in the Marine Corps, because quite frankly—and it's like the Gregg Zoroya article that popped in USA Today two days ago. The numbers are shameful. It's more than being embarrassed. I'm ashamed of this thing.

But that's not where we're headed and that's not where we are right now. I mean, we have the entire senior leadership of the Marine Corps after this—I'm talking about officers and staff NCOs. We've just really been after it since probably about the mid-summer. We started in the spring, but all the campaign plan, three phases of it—and there's a host of things we've done.

I know we're out of time. I'd be honored to come by and talk to you about it. But I don't want anybody to think for a minute that this culture change is going to be easy. But we are dedicated, my generals are and my sergeant majors are, and we're going to succeed. It's going to be hard, but we are going to succeed at this, because it's the right thing to do.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, thank you, General. I appreciate that. I have other questions, but I'm sure my colleagues on the committee will follow up.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Shaheen.

Senator Reed.

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

Thank you, gentlemen.

Just a quick follow-up question because both Admiral Greenert and General Amos indicated that they are looking at units that will be C3 towards the end of the year. As I understand it, that is not—that has several different components in terms of the rating, personnel, the equipment, etcetera.

Can you sort of go just one step down? What's the problem? Is it personnel readiness, availability of sailors? Is it equipment? Just to give us some texture for the rating.

Admiral GREENERT. The fact that a unit is C3, Senator, unto itself shouldn't be that alarming. It is not unusual. In other words, we have units that just before they're ready to deploy they are fully manned, trained, equipped. They need to get their ammo on board. They pick it up and they go. So for the record, they remain C3 until that point.

The point is it's a trend and it's a quantification of how those that are ready to deploy, they are C1 and C2, those that are in the surge are drifting further from that C1-C2. It's like a Slinky dog, you know, that goes further behind. It takes that much more to get it ready to deploy.

So what is the issue? It tends to be training. They don't have as many skill sets as they need to have when they're ready to deploy. If they're called to surge, we have to have a longer conversation to say, okay, here's what your unit will have. It could be an air wing, it could be a destroyer, but we have to have a better, a more in-depth conversation, whereas if they're where we want them to be and where they are typical in our fleet response plan, then that is automatic, that is the covenant that we already have.

Senator REED. Thank you.

General Amos, your comments about the Marine Corps?

General AMOS. Senator, the reality is it's equipment available—we talk what C3 is. The exact definition of C3 is units trained to undertake many but not all wartime missions. We don't typically deploy units that are C3. We deploy them C1 and C2, as you know, and that's what the combatant commanders, that's what they expect.

Would we deploy a C3 unit? Absolutely, yes. If war broke out, I'd deploy a C4 or a C5 unit. So I want to be clear about that.

But what's causing—what's happening is the equipment readiness as a result of things going through depot—I've said, when sequestration fully hits in 2014 and 2015, 75 percent of our depot capacity is going to be affected in one way or the other. That's going to have an effect on the equipment availability. It's training ranges, it's O&M, it's fuel, it's ammunition. It's the ability to be able to take a unit and fly it out to or move it out to Twentynine Palms to do its final integrated training exercise. It's all of that.

Finally, the last I guess kind of litmus test is, because the depot maintenance and aviation has had an impact as a result of O&M, we're going to have—and I'll give you the exact numbers. Today I've got 102 of 257 F-18s that are out of reporting status, which means they're not flyable. Something's—they need depot maintenance of some kind. 23 F-18s are not going to be inducted in the third and fourth quarter of this year.

So the net result will be this. I'll have 125 out of 257 U.S. Marine Corps F-18s out of reporting status. If you take all the squadrons that I've got forward deployed, which will have the full complement of airplanes, the ones on carriers, the ones that I've got in the Persian Gulf, they're my first priority. The remaining squadrons back home by January 2014 will have 6 of 12 F-18s sitting on the flight line.

Senator REED. Thank you, sir.

Let me do one follow-up question, too, because this was brought up previously. As you retrograde equipment out of Afghanistan, some of that equipment I presume, because it was specifically, particularly some of the MRAAPs and some of the vehicles, were designed for the conflict in Afghanistan—do you have the flexibility to sort of bring them out, but then deferring maintenance, as a way to husband resources without affecting sort of the ability of a MEU to operate and conduct?

General AMOS. We do, Senator. For instance, we've got well over 2,500 MRAAPs right now. Our long-term plan is to keep roughly about 1,200 of them. Those—we're going to bring them all back.

Senator REED. Right.

General AMOS. And we'll start parsing out those that need it and those that don't, to be able to husband resources.

Senator REED. Understand.

Admiral Greenert, I was particularly impressed with the brilliance of Senator Donnelly's questioning about submarines, and also the threat to surface ships. I think it raises an interesting question. As you know and Admiral Locklear testified, there are a number of countries, particularly in Asia—China, Australia, Singapore, Indonesia, Malaysia, Vietnam, the Republic of Korea—who are developing new submarines, much more capable submarines. Indeed, I'm also indicated that Russia and China are expected to soon field new ballistic missile submarines, which adds another dimension.

Then you can join that with the surface-to-surface precision long-range weapons, particularly with the Chinese, which threaten the surface fleet, which raises I think sort of not only the necessity, but the criticality of the submarine fleet. Is that a view that you support or take?

Admiral GREENERT. I absolutely support that. As I testified last year, that 2014 submarine was our number one priority.

Senator REED. Thank you very much.

Thank you all, gentlemen, for your service and your thoughtful testimony today.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Reed.

Senator McCaskill.

Senator MCCASKILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all for being here very much.

General Amos, I know that you had expressed to my colleague that you want to get at this culture change and it's very important to you as to sexual assault. But let me just say the quickest way to change the culture is to put these cowards in prison. The people who commit these crimes are sully your ranks and they are diminishing what you are as a powerful force in this country.

I think the challenge around that is getting the victims to come forward. This has to be one of the problems that is foremost in your mind: How do we create an environment of professionalism and justice that gives victims the confidence that they can help you weed out these cowards and get them out of our wonderful military that I know you are so proud and it is your life, and you want

nothing more than the Marines to be seen for the wonderful men and women they are.

So when you have a convening authority that picks five colonels and lieutenant colonels to sit on a jury and they do the thing that you always do in these cases, and it is one thing you do as a jury, you decide who's telling the truth, because all this case was about was who was telling the truth—was it the fighter pilot and his wife or was it the victim? And these five colonels and lieutenant colonels decided the victim was telling the truth, and with one stroke of a pen that convening authority said to every victim out there that he's confident if they come forward they're either not going to be believed or they're not going to be supported or nothing is going to happen to the guy.

You know what he did when he did that? He told all of them they were exactly right to hide in the shadows. That is more damaging to our military in the area of sexual assault than anything that could happen. All the training in the world will not fix this problem if you don't give these victims confidence.

Frankly, when he wrote the letter explaining how he did it and the first point in his letter is that she hadn't taken a ride home from the party? Are you kidding me? You know what every victim said? Oh my gosh, no matter what happens at the trial, no matter if they believe me, some general is going to decide that I'm a slut because I didn't take a ride home.

That is the problem. And until you guys at the top levels of the military get that, we're not going to fix it. I firmly believe that. And I'm so proud that the Joint Chiefs made the recommendation, the Joint Chiefs made the recommendation to the SECDEF to change 60.

I'm going to work as hard as I can to change 60. I don't want to throw it all out. I get that the convening authority has a role in terms of the good of the order. I get that. But the idea that they can overturn a factual determination by a jury they hand-picked, that's ridiculous.

So I feel better.

Now, on to F/A-18s. I think it's really an issue here that we're taking a real risk with our strike fighter inventory when it comes to JSF. I know that we now have a problem with them landing on the carriers, with the tailhooks, that they're all going to have to be modified. This is a huge issue. We now know another \$8.5 billion just to fix the tailhook problem.

The F/A-18 line is going to end domestic production after the final procurement this year. Doesn't the F/A-18 line mitigate the risk of this shortfall going forward? We're now not to full production until 2019 on the JSF. I would like Admiral or Secretary Mabus or any of you to speak to this issue.

You know, we can talk about how expensive it is. We can talk about how it's not doing what it should have done. We can talk about the capability being diminished. But at the end of the day, what about the inventory?

Mr. MABUS. On the F/A-18 line, in our budget we're requesting 21 more Growlers, F/A-18Gs, be built in fiscal year 2014, which would keep the line going through 2016. We do think that it's important to have that capability there.

I'll let Admiral Greenert talk about the issues with the F-35 and the tailhook and the inventory.

Admiral GREENERT. Simply, Senator, I need a tailhook, a helmet, and I need a program that will deliver weapons equivalent to a Super Hornet, so that the F-35 comes into the air wing. The air wing can't turn around the F-35. I've been pretty clear on that. My air wing of the future has to be Hornets, Growlers, and a fifth generation. So I do need the capability, and in my view unmanned; there's an unmanned element to that.

Does it mitigate? Yes, it definitely would mitigate the need for the capability. So it all fits together into an air wing of the future that has to be able to deliver ordnance as well as jam and handle the electromagnetic spectrum, which is huge, in the future.

Senator MCCASKILL. In terms of extending the flight hours, I know that the report came back from GAO saying that maybe we need an independent assessment about what the cost is going to be on extending the flight hours on existing Super Hornets. Can you speak to that? Based on experience, we've not always gotten the right number when it's been an interior assessment as opposed to an independent assessment.

Do you have any—

Admiral GREENERT. Let me get you a written answer, but here's what my NAVAIR systems commander is telling me, that the extension on the Super Hornet looks very good, that the Super Hornet's performing very well and its fatigue factors and those areas look well. So that he was confident that we could get an extension.

I'd prefer—I'll just give you something in writing that is deliberate.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator MCCASKILL. That would be great. That would be great.

Thank you all very much. General Amos, I know your heart wants to get this fixed, and we'll work together and get it done. I know all of the military wants to do this. As you can tell, this one hits close to home for me because of the years I spent doing this.

Thank you very much.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCaskill

Senator Blunt.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral and Secretary Mabus, I was here yesterday at the defense appropriations hearing. I didn't get a chance to ask the questions I wanted to ask then. I think maybe my colleague Senator McCaskill has opened that door and asked some of them already.

Admiral, you're the last in line of the services to get the F-35's, is that right?

Admiral GREENERT. Yes, sir, that's right.

Senator BLUNT. And the same things you mentioned today I heard you mention yesterday, that you've got to have some things happen before those are really useable planes.

Secretary, you mentioned you've ordered the Growlers. You've asked for them in the budget, rather. You haven't ordered them; you've asked for them in the budget. I guess one of my questions is, I know your tactical aircraft, you're 29 or 30 short of what you think you need and there's no—what's the risk of not moving for-

ward and asking for more of the Super Hornets at the same time? Or is there just not a shortage in the Super Hornet part of the tactical aircraft mix?

Mr. MABUS. Senator, the TACAIR shortfall which the chairman mentioned in his opening statement has gotten significantly better. It's down to less than 20 aircraft in about 2023 now. This is a result of a lot of things. Part of it is what Admiral Greenert said. As we're doing the high flight hour inspections of the Hornets and Super Hornets, there is—these inspections are turning out better than we had anticipated. The wear is less, the repairs will be less. We are currently planning to do the service life extension on 150 aircraft to get us there.

The other thing is we're transitioning quicker to the Super Hornets from the legacy Hornets, which are giving us more capability and more flight hours.

So I think that, just in terms of numbers of TACAIR risk, the risk is relatively low as we're going forward. We're buying the extra F/A-18Gs or requesting that we buy 21 additional Gs because of the electronic attack mission. The Marines are retiring their EA-6Bs and this would be required to make sure that we maintain that important capability of electronic attack in an expeditionary way, so that we can have enough expeditionary squadrons to support electronic attack, not just for the Navy and Marine Corps, but across the joint force.

Senator BLUNT. I'm hearing right that you think that your shortfall is now less than you might have—than the Navy might have thought it was going to be a couple of years ago, because these planes are more serviceable and lasting better than anticipated?

Mr. MABUS. Yes.

Senator BLUNT. Admiral?

Admiral GREENERT. Well, there's also, when we did the numbers that you referred to, the higher numbers as to what the shortfall might be, a big factor was the use, how many cycles are the aircraft being used. That number has come down as we've operated in the Gulf. So two years ago the use of the Super Hornet and the legacy Hornets, if you will, was much higher than it is now.

So as we do the measurements we're finding, hey, they're not as fatigued as we originally thought. The assumptions have changed in the analysis.

Senator BLUNT. I think there was a fairly significant request for maintenance and parts, maybe beyond what I would have thought. But General Amos, do you have anything to say on this topic of your transition on planes?

General AMOS. No, sir. I'm in complete agreement with my Secretary and the CNO on this. The management of the shortfall has been mitigated by a large degree as a result of actually managing each bureau number aircraft. I mean, every single airplane, the number of carrier landings, the number of arrested landings, catapults, Gs on the airplane. So the naval aviation enterprise is actually managing each one of those aircraft by bureau number to mitigate the long-term effects of a lot of flying hours.

So we're actually managing the fleet and that's what's helping us out.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Blunt.  
Senator Hagan.

Senator HAGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you so much for your service. Thank you for being here. Thank you for what you do for our country.

Before I get into my questions, I did want to make one comment and it's echoing Senator Shaheen and Senator McCaskill. It's about sexual assault. General Amos, I really appreciate what you're doing, but you made a comment saying that it is not going to be easy to change this culture. I think if you look at the training, you look at the convictions, you look at the punishments, we shouldn't be saying it's not going to be easy.

This is something that has, as you said, has got the attention. You brought the generals together. You've discussed this.

I guess one question is, how many of those generals are women percent-wise?

General AMOS. I can't tell you percent-wise, but we have a slice of our general officers, 80-plus general officers, that are females.

Senator HAGAN. I just think it is imperative that we understand that sexual assault, sexual harassment, has absolutely no place in our military, and that it is something that is really affecting the culture, especially of our women who are in service. So I just echo the other comments, how important this is. So I appreciate what you're doing.

But, General Amos, I did also appreciate the time that you've taken to discuss with me a lot recently on the issue of notifying those affected by water contamination at Camp Lejeune. The Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry's recently released water model did find that the levels for some contaminants were as high a 150 times now what is considered safe. So it's very important to me that the marines, the civilians, and family members who were exposed to these contaminants are kept informed as key information is released. I appreciate our discussion and our commitment to do so.

Can you update the committee on what the Marine Corps has done since we talked to notify those affected by this tragedy of recent and future findings?

General AMOS. Senator, I can. I'll be happy to. Thank you for the opportunity.

As you said, the ATSDR released what they call a chapter 8 water model and it became public, and that was an official report. That's one of five phases of reports, and it talks about the contamination started as early possibly as 1953 instead of 1957. So as a result of that, we've advertised in USA Today, national publications, full-page ads talking about the report, and with a link on there that you can link to get the report.

We've notified 104,000 email addressees that we currently have in our registry. We've sent them emails. We also mailed out 188,000 letters here just this month. All this has been done this month, to notify everybody that we are in contact with that have come forward, that are part of the registry, about the results of the report.

I'll also say, Senator, we intend to do exactly that same type of mass notification and awareness for all the other reports as they

come out in the future over the next year or two. So we're dedicated to this. We want to do it the right—we are going to do it the right way.

Senator HAGAN. Thank you. I appreciate us working together on that, I really do.

The Department of the Navy's investment in amphibious warships represents a critical investment that also supports a key Marine Corps mission. Citing fiscal constraints, you've decided to reduce the number of amphibious ships to a fleet of 33, with only 30 available at any given time due to maintenance requirements. My understanding is that 30 ships is the bare minimum required for sea-based forcible entry.

Secretary Mabus, do you consider it an acceptable risk to rely on the exact minimum number of ships needed to execute such a mission should the need arise? Then what is plan B if there are not enough ships operationally available?

Mr. MABUS. Senator, in the shipbuilding plan that we've sent the tables to Congress we're building toward that 33 level. The Commandant has said repeatedly that if he could have 50 he would. So would I. But given the fiscal constraints, I think 33 is a reasonable number with a reasonable amount of risk.

The other thing that is in there is that in terms of operations concepts there perhaps are other ways we can transport things beside just amphibious ships. The afloat forward staging bases that we're building two of today and two more to be configured as—the last two will be afloat forward staging bases. The first two are mobile landing platforms that can transport huge amounts of equipment into an amphibious assault area. The Joint High Speed Vessel that can move people and equipment around very quickly.

So the Marines I know are looking at the concept of operations, but also we find that these amphibious ships, the three-ship amphibious ready groups with the big-deck amphib, the LPD, and the LSD, are some of our most flexible and important forces, and we think that these, the Gator Navy, the amphibs, are some of the most important things that we have.

Finally, we're exercising that as well, the exercise Bold Alligator that happened off the coast of North Carolina last year and will be repeated next year, to make sure that the Marines have gone back to the I amphibious roots and have the training and the doctrine to be able to perform the way that we know Marines do perform.

Senator HAGAN. We definitely know that.

Thank you all for being here today and your testimony.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Hagan.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, chairman.

I want to thank the witnesses for their service during challenging times and for all of those that serve underneath you, we're grateful.

I wanted to ask Admiral Greenert and certainly Secretary Mabus about the fleet size. I know that you've testified about the fleet size and I believe you began with that if you look back to 9–11 our fleet size was 316 and now we're at 283. We know from your recent re-

porting to us that what you believe you need is 306 to meet all of our needs.

As I look at the schedule, the schedule that you have put forward that would put us dropping down to a fleet of 270 in 2015, did I understand that correctly? Is that a schedule that is based upon the President's proposed budget? In other words, this 270 by 2015 does not account for sequestration, does it?

Mr. MABUS. That's correct. The reason that you have the dip is that there were a lot of smaller surface combatants, particularly frigates, built in the 1980s during the big Cold War buildup and they are reaching the end of their service life. Now, they're being replaced, as you can see from those charts, and we're going to go back to 300 ships by the end of this decade, by far more capable, far more flexible ships in the fleet.

One of the things—and I was the one that said, that gave the numbers—is that we today have 47 ships under contract and 43 of those ships have been put under contract since I got here.

Senator AYOTTE. But just to understand, we don't meet 306, which is what we've said we'd need, until 2037, is that right? And that is with what we believe to be more robust, appropriate levels of funding.

Mr. MABUS. I believe that is correct, Senator.

Senator AYOTTE. So that's according to the P-14 battle-force inventory. That's where I got that number.

So as I look where we are, we have pretty great challenges of getting to where we need to be for our naval fleet now, even if we keep funding where you've proposed it to be without sequestration. So what happens to us if we go forward with sequestration in terms of fleet number and capacity?

Mr. MABUS. I'd like Admiral Greenert to also comment on this. But sequestration looms over everything and it will have impacts on things like multi-year programs that we're building submarines and destroyers under. It will have obviously an impact on the number of ships we can build.

But the President's budget, the Senate budget, budget resolution, the House budget resolution, all went forward saying that sequestration was not a good idea—

Senator AYOTTE. Well, Mr. Secretary, I'm looking around here and I don't see, unfortunately, people doing what needs to be done to resolve sequestration. So I want to make sure that everyone here understands if we go forward with sequestration for our military, for our Navy, what size does our fleet end up being? Because we right now are at 283. We know we need 306. As far as I can see—and I'm sure you would agree with me—the world's not getting any safer with Iran marching toward a nuclear weapon, with what's happening in the Persian Gulf, with our shift to the Asia-Pacific region, all of which needs naval capacity. And numbers obviously matter in terms of what we can cover around the world.

So, Admiral Greenert, I don't know if you can share with me, what happens to our fleet?

Admiral GREENERT. If we just apply sequestration, the number is \$50 billion a year through there, and they are pro-rated, you prorate it to the shipbuilding plan, and then I have to reduce force structure, again it's a straight linear extrapolation: 30 less ships,

roughly, by 2020. So you're looking at, instead of 295, somewhere around 265. You keep taking that out to a ten-year posture, we could be down as low as 235 ships.

Senator AYOTTE. 235 ships. Would you agree with me that that would take on tremendous risk, given the challenges we face around the world? What would that do to our shift to the Asia-Pacific region?

Admiral GREENERT. Well, number one, yes, I agree with you it would be tremendous risk. The shift to the Asia-Pacific, it would slow it down, truncate it by a lot.

A point I'd like to make: Ships are definitely important. Ships forward are most important. So we have to sustain our forward-deployed naval force, the Singapore, initiative, making sure we take care of lift for the Marines to Darwin. That is something I think would be most important to work out, so that we do the best we can to be forward.

Senator AYOTTE. I appreciate it.

I wanted to ask—I know it was touched upon before, Secretary Mabus and Admiral Greenert, on the Navy's proposed—as I understand it, you submitted a proposal to OSD that would allow you to forego furloughs for 2013. Do you know when that decision will be made from OSD as to whether we can forego civilian furloughs? Because obviously one of the concerns that I have heard that seems to me to be a sensible concern is that we will get behind on the maintenance schedule, which will further exacerbate the difficulties and the strain put on our fleet.

Mr. MABUS. Secretary Hagel said, I believe last week, that the decision had not been made, would not be made for a few weeks. One of the things that both the Commandant, the CNO, and I have said during these discussions is that, exactly as you pointed out, some of these civilian workers that we have, like our shipyard workers, have a direct operational impact in terms of maintenance and in terms of getting ships back out to sea.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you.

I appreciate all of you being here. I know that it's a challenging time to serve. Sequestration is something that I think is particularly foolish with regard to our national security, and I think it's been clear from your testimony and the other Service Chiefs that if we continue with this we're going to really diminish the strongest military in the world.

So I thank you all for being here.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Ayotte.

Senator Nelson.

Senator NELSON. And if we get out of our ideological stances here on both sides of Capitol Hill, we can get rid of the sequestration going forward. But it's baked into the cake between now and October 1st.

Admiral and General, since you're not going to have as many flying hours, can you use simulators to try to keep your crews tuned up?

Admiral GREENERT. We can, and in fact during this phase we went through with the continuing resolution and the sequestration we turned to simulators to help keep our folks current, as current

as feasible. There are some skill sets that you can't replicate in a simulator.

Some are getting better. The P-8 you're well aware of down there in Jacksonville. That's an excellent simulator and does magnificent things. But you can do some, but it's very limited.

General AMOS. Senator, exactly. We revamped the training and readiness manual for our aviation squadrons some time ago to incorporate more simulation as pressurization on flight hours increased. So we are and we obviously are going to have to continue to do even more.

Senator NELSON. Mr. Secretary, I want to thank you for your service. It has been extraordinary.

As evidenced by the female Senators that have spoken so emotionally, I want to point out that six and seven years ago in another committee I chaired hearings about the rapes that were occurring in Iraq among contractors. I did that through the means of the Foreign Relations Committee. What we had was the dramatic testimony of a number of female contractors, and they came to the committee and told about how everything was swept under the rug, that in some cases—now, this is only six or seven years ago—that they could not get medical attention, and of course they had to rely, not just on the contractor medical attention, but they were in the war zone, the U.S. military—and in addition, that once they got home they couldn't get the U.S. attorneys to prosecute because all of the evidence had been swept under the rug. It was so bad that they could not get rape kits.

Can you bring me up to date on what is the standard procedure not only of this raw issue that has been brought out here with regard to active duty military, but with regard to the contractors as well under the supervision of the military?

Mr. MABUS. Senator, just as an overall thing I want to say that—and this is the way I put it—that, asked if I'm concerned about sexual assault in the military, I've said—and I know I speak for General Amos and Admiral Greenert here—we're angry. It's an attack. It's a crime. It's not—it's not anything else. If somebody was walking around and taking shots at random at our service, we would fix it, and this is the same thing. This is an attack. This is an attack from the inside.

We have made a lot of progress, I think. We're beginning to learn what works.

In answer to your specific question, we now have trained sexual assault responders, victim advocates. We've trained our medical personnel in sexual assault and rape. There is a requirement to keep evidence for very long periods of time and not discard it after a certain amount of time.

We have other things to encourage people to come forward, that if they feel in danger we will transfer someone immediately to get them out of even that feeling of danger.

We are finding that we're beginning to figure out what works in a lot of these cases. I think we're doing a good job in terms of just training like NCIS investigators in this specific thing, training prosecutors in this specific thing, training defense attorneys in this specific thing.

There's a lot more that can be done, but I do think that we have to make it clear from the seaman recruit to the four-star that we won't put up with this, this is unacceptable.

Senator NELSON. Is this being applied now to the contractor personnel as well as the military?

Mr. MABUS. Senator, as far as I know, in terms of the contractor personnel that the military supports in medical care and things like that, it is. On the broader question, I simply will have to get back to you.

Senator NELSON. Okay. Well, that was the situation that we examined in the committee years ago. In some cases some of the rapes were perpetrated by contractor personnel on contractor personnel, in some cases active duty military on contractor personnel.

Admiral GREENERT. Excuse me, Senator.

Senator NELSON. Yes, Admiral?

Admiral GREENERT. If I may—

Senator NELSON. Please.

Admiral GREENERT.—just a tidbit. Contractors, we can't compel them and order them to come to training. We're doing training. But the feedback is they are attending the training and they're quite interested in what we're doing. They're embedded in our people and those that are embedded are coming to the training and interfacing. Just thought you'd want to know that.

Senator NELSON. And I appreciate that, and I'm sure they are, because it all affects morale and so forth.

But in your execution of a contract with them, I wish you would look into the fact that your contract could compel contractor training.

Don't forget those women.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Admiral, will you get back to us about that last point of Senator Nelson, about whether contracts can be amended to require the training which you've referred to?

Admiral GREENERT. Yes, sir, I will.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Thanks, Senator Nelson.

Senator Blumenthal.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank each of you for your service and most especially the service of the extraordinary men and women under your command. I'm grateful to you for being here today and proud of your service to our Nation.

Let me begin. Admiral Greenert, you were very kind to come to visit the sub base in New London. Mr. Secretary, you've been there as well. I assume that you continue to be of the view that that submarine base is important, indeed essential, to our national security?

Admiral GREENERT. Yes, sir, I do, both the piers and the support to the submarines, as well as the submarine training—actually, the Submarine Learning Center, excuse me.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. And are you satisfied, Admiral, that the President's budget has sufficient funding to continue the submarine building program, *Virginia*-class program, at the present pace of two submarines a year for 2014 and beyond?

Admiral GREENERT. Yes, it does. We have a submittal and a funding mechanism in place that we proposed to Congress. With that, I'm comfortable.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I've noticed that mechanism, which I fully support because I think the submarine program, as you and the Secretary observed, is absolutely essential to our continued under-sea superiority, which in turn is vital to our national security.

Are you satisfied, Mr. Secretary, that there's enough funding for the *Ohio*-class program?

Mr. MABUS. I am, Senator. At the place we're in, which is early design, continuing to do some R&D, we have the funding in place and we are on track to not only begin construction on the timeline that we have laid out, but also working with our British partners on the common missile compartment, we're on schedule for their successor class as well.

The one caveat that I would put in there is sequestration has the potential to change that answer considerably.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. My hope is that sequestration has no effect on the submarine program, because I think it ought to be clearly excepted from any of those cuts that could be contemplated in light of all the considerations that you and others have stated so powerfully and eloquently. So I'm hopeful that we can avoid those effects.

Also, with all due respect, I know that you may not be able to comment on this point in detail, but the proposal for another BRAC I think is probably destined to be doomed or, as it's been put, dead on arrival here in Congress. But I would certainly believe there are better ways to save money. Indeed, the BRAC process has shown itself to be cost-ineffective rather than a means of saving money. So I'm hopeful that we can avoid that mistake as well.

I know that you may not be in a position to comment on it, but I just want to state for the record that I'm hoping that the President will reconsider that point of view.

Let me say to you that I take with complete trust and confidence the position that you have stated, all three of you, with great passion and commitment to eliminating sexual assault. I think that one of the aspects of this that deserves greater scrutiny is the reporting, which has to be encouraged. I noted that the report released on Monday—I believe it was on Monday—the 2011 health survey, stated that the percentage of reporting or responding to that survey in the Marine Corps was only about 22 percent, or in other words 78 percent of troops declined to participate.

Now, that was before the legal reorganization, I suppose. So perhaps the reporting rates would be higher now.

General Amos, I wonder if you could comment on what more can be done to encourage reporting?

General AMOS. Senator, I want to make sure I'm clear here. When I think of reporting, it's not so much a survey as it is the actual victims coming forward and saying something bad happened. It could be male or female.

With the advent of this surge effort, this more than surge, this sustained long-term effort that the Marine Corps has taken on since the mid-summer of last year, we've said all along that we expect the numbers of restricted and unrestricted reports to go up.

That would be an indication to me that my Marines actually have confidence in the battalion commanders, the squadron commanders, the senior enlisted leadership, that they will not be revictimized, that they will not be humiliated, that they will be treated with dignity and respect and they'll be protected.

That's what's happening. Our reports are going up. So there's a side of me that you go: Oh, I hate to see that. But that's the reality. As I travel around, as my sergeant major travels around, the feedback we get, the anecdotal feedback we get from predominantly our females is that: Okay, we're more comfortable; we have more confidence in the leadership now.

A large percentage of the reports in this—and I can't tell you how many, sir, because the information is convoluted—are reports from two years ago. In other words, my Marines have come forward and they've said: Okay, this happened to me two years ago. That's an indication that there is more confidence in the leadership's ability to be able to take this seriously.

So that's the reporting I'm looking at, Senator.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. And your point is very well taken that there are two kinds of reporting and the reporting of actual crimes is what really probably is most important. I would just suggest in closing, because my time has expired, that the way to get more reporting, the way to make this system more effective, the way to give confidence to the men and women under your command, is to increase the conviction rates. I say that with all due respect as a prosecutor and not as a career military person as you are. But the best deterrence is—and I would just second Senator McCaskill—putting people away, putting them in prison, giving harsh, significant, but fair punishment. And I know that you're committed to that policy.

General AMOS. Senator, if I could, I realize time is of the essence. That's a very good point. As a result of NCIS's help and the result of reorganization of what we pull together are complex trial teams, where we actually have the pros from Dover doing this now, from 2011 to 2012 we more than doubled the amount of prosecutions and we've more than doubled the amount of convictions.

So we're headed in the right direction.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Blumenthal.

I'm going to leave. I think that Senator Inhofe will be leaving. We have that meeting of all Senators.

Before I call on Senator Hirono, I would ask that she, when she's completed, if she's the last Senator here, which I think she will be, if she could then adjourn the hearing.

Thank you very much for your testimony, gentlemen, and I call on Senator Hirono.

Senator HIRONO [presiding]. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you for your service.

I echo the sentiments of a number of my colleagues on this committee to focus on the need to do everything you can to end sexual assault in your service and of course all the other Services.

Admiral Greenert, you gave a response to Senator Ayotte regarding the number of ships, and I believe that you said that the reduc-

tion in the number of ships will slow our rebalance to the Asia-Pacific. This is not a question. It's simply to say that I share those concerns with you and this is yet—your response is yet another reason that we need to end sequestration and focus on going forward come October 1.

Secretary Mabus, I want to thank you for your noting that you are doing everything you can to use some other method than furloughing the thousands and thousands of civilian employees at our various shipyards and other places in order to meet your budget cuts. So the thousands of our civilian employees at Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard and I commend you for those efforts and please continue them.

Yesterday the National Security Adviser, Tom Donilon, spoke of the critical link between energy security and national security. He stated, quote: "Energy matters profoundly to U.S. national security and foreign policy." I could not agree more. I know that this is something that you, Mr. Secretary, have long recognized. I want to commend your work as Secretary in aggressively pursuing a strategy of diversifying the Navy's fuel sources and using energy more efficiently so that we would be saving significant amounts of money that can go for other defense priorities.

So as you note in your testimony, the Navy has historically been a leader in energy innovation. Given the successes you are seeing within the Navy and Marine Corps, what in your estimate would be the impact on the Navy's long-term capabilities if we were to reduce our investments and initiatives in energy security?

Mr. MABUS. Senator, this is a military vulnerability, the amount of fuel we use, the types of fuel we use, the vulnerability we have not only to supply shocks, but also to price shocks. I think that if we were to lessen that commitment to diversifying our sources, to becoming more efficient, that we would simply be making a military vulnerability worse; and that one of the things that leaders of military services are required to do and certainly should do is identify, you have a series of adversaries' or potential adversaries' vulnerabilities, but also your own, and to work to lessen those. That's what we've been trying to do, and we very much appreciate the support of you and of your colleagues toward this, toward this goal.

It's a wide range of things. It's the efficiencies that we talked about, but it's also putting some competition in, putting—trying to develop sources of energy that are not influenced by world events, by somebody threatening to close a strait here or there and making the price of oil spike.

For every dollar that oil increases per barrel, it costs the Department of the Navy \$30 million in additional fuel costs. So for fiscal year 2011, fiscal year 2012, and then the proposed increase for fiscal year 2013, that's \$1.5 billion to the Navy. Those sorts of impacts have impacts on our operations, they have impacts on our people, they have impacts on our ability to do what our missions are.

So I would be very happy to—because I literally could go on about this all day, but to get you some of the figures that we have worked through in terms of the benefits of this, in terms of where this will take us, and, as you point out, the fact that the Navy in

particular, but also the military in general, has led in this and other technology changes.

Senator HIRONO. Mr. Secretary, I could not agree with you more that we need to continue to make the investments in energy security, and you correctly identify this as a security vulnerability if we don't do that.

General Amos, it's good to see you again. The Marines obviously play a major role in the Pacific and are a significant part of the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific area. Can you talk a little bit about the latest with regards to relocating Marine forces throughout the Pacific?

General AMOS. Senator, thank you. Yes, I can. We actually began this about a year and a half ago. If you take a look at the amount of moneys over the FYDP, there's about \$3.5 billion all totaled money being focused on the reorientation of the Marines in the Pacific. So the just gives you a sense for how committed we are.

But last year we deployed our first rotating battalion back onto the island of Okinawa last year. One of the companies of that battalion went down to Darwin, Australia, and began the Darwin detachment down there, which has just been reconstituted again this month.

So that's going to begin an effort between our Nation and Australia, gradually eventually growing to about 2,500 marines there.

We started again this year with another installment of another Marine battalion from Hawaii to Okinawa. So today we not only have the kind of typical battalion that's affiliated with Okinawa; we now have two rotating battalions on the ground on Okinawa in support of the rotational forces.

This fall we're going to do that again. We'll triple down on that, so we'll have three rotating battalions plus one on the ground. We'll move more aviation assets into the Western Pacific.

So we're committed on that. There's already this footprint increasing in the Western Pacific for the shift to the Pacific.

Senator HIRONO. Thank you very much for that explanation.

As I am the last remaining person on the committee here, I want to once again, on behalf of our committee, thank you all for your service and for being here with your testimony.

The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 10:57 a.m., the committee adjourned.]