

**TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATIONS OF ADMIRAL CECIL E.D. HANEY, USN, FOR RE-APPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL AND TO BE COMMANDER, U.S. STRATEGIC COMMAND; AND LIEUTENANT GENERAL CURTIS M. SCAPARROTTI, USA, TO BE GENERAL AND COMMANDER, UNITED NATIONS COMMAND/COMBINED FORCES COMMAND/ U.S. FORCES KOREA**

---

**TUESDAY, JULY 30, 2013**

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:37 a.m. in room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman), presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin, Reed, Udall, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Chambliss, Ayotte, and Fischer.

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

Majority staff members present: Jonathan S. Epstein, counsel; Ozge Guzelsu, counsel; Richard W. Fieldhouse, professional staff member; Gerald J. Leeling, general counsel; Mariah K. McNamara, special assistant to the staff director; Russell L. Shaffer, counsel; and William K. Sutey, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: John A. Bonsell, minority staff director; Steven M. Barney, minority counsel; William S. Castle, minority general counsel; Thomas W. Goffus, professional staff member; Anthony J. Lazarski, professional staff member; Daniel A. Lerner, professional staff member; and Robert M. Soofer, professional staff member.

Staff assistants present: Lauren M. Gillis and Daniel J. Harder.

Committee members' assistants present: Jeff Fatora, assistant to Senator Nelson; Casey Howard, assistant to Senator Udall; David LaPorte, assistant to Senator Manchin; Marta McLellan Ross, assistant to Senator Donnelly; 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 Peter Schirtzinger, assistant to Senator Fischer.

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

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody.

The subcommittee meets this morning to consider military nominations for two critically important command assignments. We welcome Admiral Cecil Haney who is nominated to be Commander, U.S. Strategic Command and Lieutenant General Curtis Scaparrotti who is nominated to be Commander, United Nations Command, Combined Forces Command, and U.S. Forces Korea. Thank you both for your decades of service to our Nation and for your willingness to continue to serve in these positions of great responsibility.

We would also like to welcome and to thank your family members, some of whom are here this morning. Our military families are essential to the overall success and the well-being of our Armed Forces, and we appreciate greatly their many sacrifices, particularly during the course of long military careers. And in this regard, as is the tradition of this committee, we invite each of you, during your opening remarks, to introduce the family members or others who are here with you this morning.

It is most appropriate that these nominees appear together because the responsibilities of the positions to which they have been nominated intersect, particularly as they relate to the security situation on the Korean Peninsula and the potential threats from North Korea.

Unfortunately, as has been evident from the words and actions from North Korea in the last several months, the leadership change in North Korea, occasioned by the death of longtime dictator Kim Jong-il, has not yet resulted in any meaningful, positive change in North Korea's policies. North Korea continues its reckless pursuit of ballistic missiles, nuclear weapons, and continues to threaten its neighbors and the overall peace and stability in the region. The regime remains determined to defy the international community to the detriment of its own prosperity and growth and with little concern for the well-being of its own people.

U.S. Strategic Command is responsible for our deployed nuclear deterrence, integrating global missile defense, and managing military space systems, and countering weapons of mass destruction. Strategic Command also oversees Cyber Command, a sub-unified command tasked with managing military operations in cyberspace, and is charged with coordinating the Defense Department's electromagnetic spectrum. If confirmed, Admiral Haney will be a key player in the overall strategic posture and policy of the United States.

Admiral, we will be interested in your views on the U.S. nuclear employment strategy, your priorities for missile defense, and the status of Cyber Command. With regard to North Korea in particular, we would be interested in your thoughts on the various steps announced earlier this year by Secretary Hagel to improve homeland missile defense capability, including the planned deployment of 14 additional ground-based interceptors in Alaska by 2017.

Lieutenant General Scaparrotti is currently the Director of the Joint Staff where he assists the Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff with many of the most challenging issues facing our military and our country today. If confirmed, he will bring his breadth of experience to bear on maintaining a military force on the Korean Peninsula that is ready, willing, and able to respond to any aggression from North Korea. General, we would be interested in your assessment of the security situation on the peninsula, the posture of U.S. forces there, and the plan for the transfer of wartime operational control from the United States to the South Koreans in December 2015.

So, Admiral and General, we again welcome you today. We look forward to your testimony.

I now call on Senator Inhofe.

#### **STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES M. INHOFE**

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I join you in welcoming General Scaparrotti and Admiral Haney. I thank both of you for the time that you have spent going over in personal visits.

General Scaparrotti, you have been nominated to replace General Thurman as Commander of the U.S. Forces in Korea, and General Thurman and the men and women under his command have done a tremendous job in standing with our South Korean partners to ensure stability in the Korean Peninsula.

However, this stability is at risk. Tensions over the last year have risen dramatically, and as a result, Kim Jong-un's belligerent behavior, including the testing of nuclear weapons and launching of ballistic missiles, his provocative actions threaten to overturn the peace, stability, and prosperity of the entire region.

Our military capabilities in the region must be designed to deter North Korean aggression, but should deterrence fail, it has got to be ready to punish aggression, to protect vital U.S. interests, partners, and allies. However, I am greatly concerned that further defense cuts under the sequestration will put these capabilities at risk, undermine our influence in the region, and will encourage Kim Jong-un's reckless behavior.

Admiral Haney, you have been nominated to serve as the next Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command. If confirmed, your principal responsibility will be to ensure the effectiveness of our Nation's nuclear deterrent force. This requires a credible nuclear strategy backed by capable nuclear forces. There is cause for concern in both respects. Not only are our nuclear modernization programs facing funding cuts and increasing schedule delays, but the President's insistence on reducing the role and number of nuclear weapons could also undermine deterrence and make our allies nervous.

The current Commander of the U.S. Strategic Command told Congress earlier this year that as the sequester impacts continue to grow, he said, quote, reduced readiness and curtailed modernization damage the perceived credibility of our capabilities, increasing the risks to achieve our primary deterrence and assurance objectives. End quote. These cuts are likely to have real negative consequences on our ability to deal with the crisis around the world

which, in turn, may increase rather than reduce the role of nuclear weapons in our National security strategy.

We also face a growing and increasingly complex threat with cyberspace, and despite the reality, this administration has failed to implement an effective cyber deterrence strategy that dissuades those seeking to hold our economic and national security interests at risk in cyberspace. While the White House has been quick to blame Congress on the need for cyber legislation, it has been slow in developing and implementing the far more important strategy for exposing, countering, and deterring our adversaries.

Finally, the Department is currently debating the elevation of the Cyber Command from its current position under Strategic Command to become its own unified command. We will want to be talking about that, and I look forward to your comments.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe. Admiral Haney?

**STATEMENT OF ADM CECIL E.D. HANEY, USN FOR REAPPOINTMENT TO THE GRADE OF ADMIRAL AND TO BE COMMANDER, U.S. STRATEGIC COMMAND**

Admiral HANEY. Mr. Chairman, Senator Inhofe, and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to come before you today. It is my sincere honor to appear as the nominee to lead U.S. Strategic Command.

I am honored to be here also with some of my family members. First, my wife Bonnie, who sits behind me here, has been with me throughout my military career, and has raised three wonderful children who could not be here today. She is also representative of all the spouses that support our military servicemembers.

Second, my sister, Dr. Yvonne Coates, is here who has worked tirelessly in my hometown, Washington, DC, here as a public school educator for many years.

As you know, our All-Volunteer Force is sustained by our families that support us and allow us to serve.

I am also honored to be here with Lieutenant General Scaparrotti.

I would like to thank the President and the Secretary of Defense for nominating me. I also thank the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff for expressing his confidence in my ability to serve as a combatant commander. If so confirmed, I look forward to working with this committee to address the strategic challenges that face our Nation. They are complex and compelling, and Strategic Command plays a key role in each. I know that this committee knows and respects the strategic challenges we face today and the ones over the horizon that must be addressed. Complex threats provide opportunities for tourism and raise significant security concerns. We must address nuclear issues today to include both state and non-state actors, proliferation, and weapons of mass destruction.

Space, though a vast operational area, is a complex environment that is competitive, congested, and contested. Addressing the cyber threat is critical to our national security. Intensive and extensive cooperation across the whole of government and the governments of our allies, partners, and friends is required to prepare for and

respond to these developments. Our ability as a Nation to shape events to our interests will continue to depend on the skill and dedication of the great men and women who serve our Nation.

Leading Strategic Command is a significant responsibility and a unique opportunity. If confirmed, I pledge to you that I will devote all of my energy, commitment, and focus to address these challenges.

I am very fortunate to have had assignments to include operational experiences and command opportunities that align with Strategic Command's mission set. I believe they have prepared me for this challenge. If confirmed, I will also be fortunate and deeply humbled to follow the paths blazed by some of our truly great national leaders that have mentored me such as Admiral Hank Chiles and Rich Mies and General Kevin Chilton, prior commanders of U.S. Strategic Command who have helped in shaping my intellect, experiences, and understanding. I also want to thank the current Commander, General Bob Kehler, whose leadership has been deeply important in these past critical years to shaping our national posture, and I am grateful to have served with him as his deputy.

Of course, as always, if confirmed, I look forward to working with and caring for the world's best soldiers, sailors, airmen, marines, and civilians and their families.

Mr. Chairman, Senator Inhofe, distinguished committee members, it is a privilege to be before you here today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Haney follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Admiral, thank you very much.

General?

**STATEMENT OF LTG CURTIS M. SCAPARROTTI, USA, TO BE  
GENERAL AND COMMANDER, UNITED NATIONS COMMAND/  
COMBINED FORCES COMMAND/U.S. FORCES KOREA**

General SCAPARROTTI. Chairman Levin, Senator Inhofe, and other distinguished members of the Senate Armed Services Committee, I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today, and I also want to thank you for the support that you have provided to our servicemembers, our Department of Defense civilians, and their families who selflessly serve in the defense of our great Nation and defense of our way of life.

I would also like to thank the Secretary of Defense and the President for their trust and confidence and for nominating me to be the Commander—or the next Commander for United Nations Command, the Combined Forces Command, and U.S. Forces Korea.

If confirmed, I look forward to working closely with this committee, with our civilian and military leadership, and with Republic of Korea military and civilian leadership to advance our national interests and to address the opportunities and challenges in the Korean theater.

If confirmed, I commit to the servicemembers serving in Korea that I will do all that I can to ensure their readiness for the mission and to provide the support that they and their families deserve. I look forward to working with this committee to realize this commitment.

Finally, I would like to introduce and thank my wife Cindy, who is here with me today. She has been by my side for nearly 34 years and has been an essential part of my service. Cindy has supported me during multiple deployments, cared actively for our servicemembers and their families, and raised our children.

Also with me today, Stephanie, our youngest child, is here with her husband, Captain Luke High, presently a company commander in the 82nd Airborne Division. They have given us two grandchildren, Ava and Jacob. My son Michael, who could not be here today, lives and works in Ann Arbor, Michigan.

I am blessed with this family who has given so much, like other military families, so that I may serve.

I thank the committee again for the opportunity to appear today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Scaparrotti follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, General.

We now ask our witnesses standard questions, and you can respond together to these questions.

Have you adhered to applicable laws and regulations governing conflicts of interest?

Admiral HANEY. I have.

General SCAPARROTTI. I have.

Chairman LEVIN. And do you agree, when asked, to give your personal views even if those views differ from the administration in power?

Admiral HANEY. I do.

General SCAPARROTTI. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. Have you assumed any duties or undertaken any actions which would appear to presume the outcome of the confirmation process?

Admiral HANEY. No, sir.

General SCAPARROTTI. No.

Chairman LEVIN. Will you ensure your staff complies with deadlines established for requested communications, including questions for the record in hearings?

Admiral HANEY. I will.

General SCAPARROTTI. I will.

Chairman LEVIN. And will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to congressional requests?

Admiral HANEY. I will.

General SCAPARROTTI. I will.

Chairman LEVIN. Will those witnesses be protected from reprisal for their testimony or briefings?

Admiral HANEY. They will.

General SCAPARROTTI. Yes.

Chairman LEVIN. Do you agree, if confirmed, to appear and testify upon request before this committee?

Admiral HANEY. I do.

General SCAPARROTTI. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. And do you agree to provide documents, including copies of electronic forms of communication, in a timely manner when requested by a duly constituted committee or to consult with the committee regarding the basis for any good faith delay or denial in providing such documents?

Admiral HANEY. I do.

General SCAPARROTTI. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Let us have a 7-minute round this morning to start with for our first round.

Admiral, let me ask you about the New START treaty which is now being implemented. It was ratified in the Senate in December 2010. Do you support the New START treaty?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, yes, I do.

Chairman LEVIN. And on the question of missile defense, in your answers to the prehearing policy questions, Admiral, about the idea of possibly deploying a future east coast missile defense site, you made several important points as follows.

First, you said you support proceeding with the environmental impact statement process that we required in last year's law in order to inform future decisions about such a site.

Second, you said you agree with General Dempsey and Admiral Winnefeld that additional analysis is needed, including analysis of the missile threat from Iran, before making a decision on whether to deploy such a site in the future.

Third, you said you agree with the assessment of Vice Admiral Syring and Lieutenant General Formica on the importance of enhancing our future missile defense sensor and discrimination capability, which they see as a more cost effective and less expensive near-term alternative to deploying an east coast site.

Can you explain this issue of sensor and discrimination capabilities and how they would benefit our homeland defense?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, thank you for that question.

As we work missile defense and look to the future, it is very important that we are able to discriminate what is coming at us, whether it is a decoy, whether it is a warhead, and be able to address that threat at the right opportunity with our missile defense capability. So as we look at prioritizing our efforts, it is so important that we invest properly in the sensing part of this because that way we can balance the equation of our CONOPS and how we address the threat missile per missile.

Chairman LEVIN. Admiral, in the missile defense area, Secretary Hagel and other senior leaders have said that before we deploy any more ground-based interceptors, we will first have to conduct successful intercept flight testing to demonstrate that they will work as intended.

Do you agree that we need to make sure that the GMD system, including both the CE1 and the CE2 kill vehicles, and demonstrate the success of the system in intercept flight test before we deploy any more GBIs, any more ground-based interceptors?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think it is important that we continue to deploy our CE1s, which have been proven through tests. I also think it is important that we fly before we buy as we look at the CE2 variant so that we can assure we have the reliability that is required in order to address the threats now and into the future.

Chairman LEVIN. General, relative to Korea, I believe it is important that we see to it that the primary responsibility for defending South Korea during a time of war lies with South Korea and that the responsibility for wartime operational control be turned over to

the South Koreans as soon as practicable. It is a sovereign nation and sovereign nations should be responsible for their own national defense in time of war, particularly after the length of time that they have been gaining in capability.

Right now, the plan for the transfer of wartime operational control to the Republic of Korea is set for no later than 2015. Do you agree with that timetable?

General SCAPARROTTI. Senator, thank you.

Yes, I do agree with the timetable. It is a bilateral agreement, Strategic Alliance 2015, to turn over operational control by December of 2015. I think it is a good plan and it includes milestones that ensure the capability and our integration of forces together to provide the readiness that is needed on the peninsula at the time of that transition. And I think we should move forward with it.

Chairman LEVIN. Will you do everything you can, if confirmed, to ensure that the transfer is not delayed any further? It has been delayed two or three times before.

General SCAPARROTTI. Yes, sir. If confirmed, I will do everything possible to ensure that we stay on track with Strategic Alliance 2015.

Chairman LEVIN. Now relative, General, to Camp Humphreys, the Army has proposed a public/private venture to build family housing called the Humphreys Housing Opportunity Project, or HHOP. Essentially private developers would build the housing complex and DOD would pay rent in the form of an overseas housing allowance for servicemembers that live in the units.

The problem is that the Army has proposed a rental rate of \$3,900 per unit per month, which represents a huge increase in the housing allowance rate for servicemembers assigned to the Camp Humphreys area, a rate which currently averages around \$1,500 per month. So if HHOP were built as planned, a soldier assigned to Camp Humphreys and living off base would receive on average about \$1,500 per month while a soldier living in HHOP housing would receive on the average \$3,900.

The committee's analysis suggests that the rent paid to the private developer for HHOP units would cost \$630 million more than the standard overseas housing rate over 20 years. Moreover, the approval of that higher rate would set a very troubling precedent by using personnel pay accounts to finance a military construction project where the project costs are considered too high to be funded through military construction accounts.

Now, in the current budget environment, it is hard for me and a number of other members of this committee to see a persuasive rationale for a plan that would commit the U.S. to pay out of DOD personnel accounts an OHA rate two and a half times greater than what has been determined to be reasonable in the Camp Humphreys area and that would then cause this inflated cost to be included in the personnel accounts over the next 20-plus years.

I do not know whether you have had a chance to review this project or not, General, but first, if you have a comment, would you share it with us? And in any event, will you get back to us with a more detailed assessment?

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, I have reviewed the Senate Armed Services Committee's review of this issue, and I have taken a look

at U.S. Forces Command's review of the issue. And if confirmed, I will take a close look at this issue and consider other options to ensure that we can care for our command-sponsored families, as well as maintain the readiness that we need in the Peninsula. And I will come back to the committee, if confirmed.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much.

Senator Inhofe?

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral Haney—well, both of you actually. One of the problems we have in confirmation hearings is it is hard to get answers when they have not assumed that position yet, but you both have a background in the positions that you are going to be moving to. And I think you are both excellent choices for those positions.

Admiral Haney, you had stated in response to the chairman here, his question about did you support the New START treaty and you said that you did. I have to say that I did not.

I look at the New START treaty—and there were a lot of commitments that were made at that time in order to get the votes necessary to pass it. It was a close call in the

United States Senate. Recently General Kehler said—and I am quoting him now—I remain concerned that maintaining a safe, secure, and effective deterrent requires a substantial modernization effort that comes in the midst of a very difficult financial period. Well, modernization is what we were talking about. That was a commitment that was made that has not yet reached its fruition in terms of modernizing. And I am concerned about this.

The other concern I had about the START 10 treaty was in the area of the tactical nuclear weapons. Now, would you have supported it more had that been included in terms of the ratio or the numbers of tactical nuclear weapons that Russia has as opposed to what we have? The ratio is about 10 to 1. What is your feeling about the tactical nuclear weapons?

Admiral HANEY. Senator Inhofe, as you have addressed, modernization is important to us, and I would hope that we can continue to do the modernization of weapon warheads, platforms, as well as the industrial base that supports it.

With regards to the tactical nuclear weapons, as we went into New START and with any treaty, it is important that we are able to not just reduce but be able to also verify that the obligations per that agreement are, in fact, able to be carried out. We were able to do that from the basis of warheads, strategic warheads, as well as launchers in the New START treaty.

Personally, I would love to see the world with less tactical nukes, nuclear weapons. The same type of rigor has to be in place in order to have an agreement by which we can reduce tactical nuclear weapons such that they are verifiable, negotiated where they make sense. And I would not sit here and even attempt to debate the importance of the reduction of tactical nuclear weapons—

Senator INHOFE. Yes, well, the question then was would you have supported it more vigorously if they had included the tactical nuclear weapons in the New START treaty.

Admiral HANEY. Senator, only if we had verifiable means by which we could verify both the other side, Russia, was carrying out an appropriate obligation.

Senator INHOFE. Okay. Well, the warheads are going to be reduced, I think 1,550. As we move down and we are reducing, it would seem to me that the modernization program is more important as we are going through a reduction. Would you agree with that?

Admiral HANEY. Yes, Senator, I would agree.

Senator INHOFE. Now, there has been some discussion about doing a unilateral reduction. I cannot remember the exact words, but it was whether they do or not. What is your feeling about a unilateral reduction that would be done outside of the treaty that would be addressed by this committee?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think it is very important that any further reductions are negotiated. Period.

Senator INHOFE. That is good, and I agree with that.

The chairman covered the CE1 and the CE2. I would only say that for us to be in a position where our GBIs are going to be where we want them to be, it is going to require more testing. Would you not agree with this?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I absolutely support more testing.

Senator INHOFE. All right.

General Scaparrotti, we just returned not long ago from Korea. That is a tough one. You are dealing with a guy that is not a rational person. He does all these things that I mentioned in my opening statement. To start out with, would you think dealing with such a person as that, that our current strategy of diplomatic isolation and economic sanctions would stop someone like Kim Jong-un from acquiring a nuclear weapons capability?

General SCAPARROTTI. Senator, I think that our present strategy is correct. I think that we have to be persistent and consistent with that strategy. I also believe that in terms of, if confirmed, the position that I will take there, I will have to do everything that I can in mil-to-mil relations in order to bring other countries in the region to bear as well. I think the more influence we have both in the region and internationally—and I will have an opportunity to help with that, if confirmed, as the Commander of the United Nations Command—will be helpful in our strategy as well. I share with you the concern about his uncertainty.

Senator INHOFE. That is a kinder way of putting it than I would.

I think when we are looking at sequestration, we are looking at budget cuts, and this does not happen in isolation. And there will likely be a reduced carrier presence and U.S. warship presence in the Pacific. Do you think that makes someone like Kim Jong-un more likely to miscalculate or to be more militarily aggressive? What kind of reaction do you think he would have to our reduction of our fleet?

General SCAPARROTTI. Senator, I think that the potential impacts of sequestration, in terms of the reduction of our naval forces, which you mentioned, would likely undercut our deterrence in his eyes and may lead at least to a greater possibility of miscalculation.

Senator INHOFE. Yes. That is kind of a scary thought.

My time has expired, and I appreciate your response.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

Senator Reed?

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

And welcome, Admiral Haney and your family, and thank you for your service.

General Scaparrotti, welcome and your family. I have had the privilege of working with General Scaparrotti for about 10 years now very closely from his days as commandant of cadets at West Point through the Commander of the 82nd Airborne Division. And thank you for your service, sir, and your family's.

Admiral Haney, one of the issues that we face is modernization of our nuclear deterrent. My understanding is the bulk of our deterrent missiles are at sea now. Is that a fair estimate?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, that is a fair estimate in terms of warheads.

Senator REED. And the modernization of our submarines, which deliver and launch those, potentially, missiles, is a key priority for the National defense in terms of the *Ohio* class?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, the replacement of the *Ohio* SSBN is critical to our nuclear deterrent strategy and capability.

Senator REED. You know, again, we are committed, I believe, to maintain the triad of air-launched missiles as well as ground-launched missiles, but since we have the bulk of our assets at sea in terms of warheads, that would seem to me to be sort of the first priority in terms of modernization of the delivery system at least. Is that consistent with your views and the strategy?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, first, the flexibility of having a triad is also very important to our deterrence strategy. Since the *Ohio* class platform is nearing its end of life, it is very important that we replace it in addition to the calculus you just mentioned.

Senator REED. And one of the things that is going to be required is support from the Department of Defense to do that because the issues you deal with cut across service lines. There has to be, I think, a national commitment to modernization of the whole triad. But, again, since most of our—with no pun intended—eggs are in these submarines, we have to do that first and we have to do it with defense-wide resources. Is that your view too?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, it is not in my purview as far as how they are paid for in terms of defense-wide, but very important that we in fact move forward with that critical platform.

Senator REED. Thank you very much, Admiral.

Just a final question. We are in the midst of a doctrinal shift similar to the late 1970s and early 1980s when we developed the air-land doctrine. Now it is the air-sea battle. And you gentlemen will be in the midst of that. General Scaparrotti will be in Asia in South Korea, and the bulk of our pivot diplomatically and strategically is towards the Asia-Pacific area. And the air-sea battle is comparable in terms of that doctrine.

One of the key factors that we did not have to worry about quite as much back in the 1970s–1980s with the air-land battle was cyber. And as your responsibility, are you fully worked in—you and your staff—with developing this new doctrine particularly when it comes to cyber?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, if I have got your question right, you are asking relative to air-sea battle and cyber. I would say that the

air-sea battle is a concept. It is a concept I work in my current capacity as the Commander of the Pacific Fleet across the joint services and with the Pacific Command Commander, Admiral Locklear, and his team. It includes all of our capabilities and effort to include cyber.

Senator REED. Let me go ahead and I will, for the record, ask additional questions on this point. But a concern I have is that, you know, air power, sea power—we have been doing that for about 200 years. This is a brand new, relatively speaking, dimension. And it seems also, given what we have read in the press, that some of our potential competitors have very sophisticated asymmetric powers with respect to cyber. And when we develop this air-sea battle—and it will pertain to General Scaparrotti too—we have to make sure that we can communicate, that we can command, we can control, et cetera. And that might be the most key aspect of this new doctrine. So I would hope that you and your command would be very much engaged in it.

Let me turn to General Scaparrotti now. General, we have a series of joint exercises with the South Korean forces in Foal Eagle, Key Resolve, and others. Can you give me just a preliminary estimate of, one, their value and, two, your intentions going forward with these joint exercises?

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, these exercises—as you know, they are large, they are joint, they are combined. And we do those regularly throughout the year. I think they are essential to the readiness that we need to maintain on the peninsula. I also think they are essential in terms of the integration that we are trying to attain and the improvement in both our forces and of Republic of Korean forces. The very milestones that are laid out in Strategic Alliance 2015, for instance, can be best tested and developed through the use of those exercises because those are the times when we can bring together all of the services as well as combined forces of both us and the ROK military.

Senator REED. Again, as has been mentioned before in previous questions, one of the key actors that influence the Korean Peninsula is China. And recently, they have made some statements or the statements have been attributed to them as suggesting to the world and to the North Koreans that their ultimate goal is denuclearization, which would be a positive step forward. Just in general, your view on their role and your view of how you can help facilitate the diplomacy between not just South Korea and the United States but South Korea, China, Japan, the United States.

General SCAPARROTTI. Yes, sir. I agree. I think China is key to the influence here on North Korea. As a part of my present duties, Director of the Joint Staff, I took part in the talks that were just held with China on economics and security, and they did make the commitment to a denuclearized peninsula.

So I think, if confirmed in my next duty, I have a relationship now that I have begun to establish with the deputy chief of staff of Chinese forces. They know me. And then second, in terms of my position, if confirmed, I also have that mil-to-mil relationship that I will develop with South Korea and with the other countries in the region. And I think those mil-to-mil relationships are very impor-

tant to progressing to our objective of denuclearization of the peninsula.

Senator REED. Thank you very much, sir. Thank you, gentlemen. Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Reed.

Senator Ayotte?

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, Chairman.

I want to thank you, Admiral Haney and General Scaparrotti, for your service and for the sacrifice of your families too. We appreciate it.

I wanted to follow up, Admiral Haney, on the question that Senator Inhofe asked you about reduction of our nuclear deterrent and particularly our deployed strategic nuclear weapons.

The President, as you know, recently did announce that he was going to seek a one-third reduction of our deployed strategic nuclear weapons. And it was not clear in his speech at all whether that was something that he would only accept through negotiated reductions with countries like Russia or whether this would be something he would consider doing unilaterally.

If you were to seek to do that unilaterally, what would your advice be to him on a unilateral reduction of our nuclear deterrent?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, thank you for that question.

My advice would be that we negotiate a bilateral agreement that also has verifiable components to it so that we can ensure that the said reduction would work.

Senator AYOTTE. So just to be clear, you would oppose a unilateral reduction.

Admiral HANEY. Senator, that is correct.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you.

And how important do you believe it is before we seek any further reductions that we fulfill the modernization requirements of the New START treaty in section 1043? And I know that you were well aware, of course, as the deputy commander of those requirements that you have already been asked about. How important do you believe that we fulfill that modernization requirement before we seek further reductions?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think it is very important that we modernize our industrial base in order to maintain sustained the weapons that we have. Each will be even more critical as you reduce the number. It is so important that we have a secure and a safe and effective nuclear deterrent, and that industrial base supports that.

Senator AYOTTE. If we are continuing to diminish the resources toward our modernization efforts, which is essentially what is happening right now under the New START treaty, do you think it is advisable that we further reduce our nuclear deterrent without meeting those responsibilities?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think the reductions relative to the New START treaty, as agreed upon, is satisfactory. I believe from the knowledge I have—I do not currently work in that business, but from what I understand, for the fiscal year 2014 budget, the President's budget supports the modernization of that industrial base. With sequestration, it is a question in my mind to how well we will be able to do that with further cuts across the board in all our accounts to include this modernization you mentioned.

Senator AYOTTE. Well, and my point is this. When the President announces that he is going to seek a third reduction, it seems to me that unless we further fulfill our commitments to modernize our current deterrent pursuant to the existing treaty obligations, then that would in my view not be advisable particularly if we do not know that we have modernized what we have now, which we know is important to do to make sure it works.

And in that regard, I wanted to ask you about the recent Missile Defense Agency test that the chairman asked you about of the CE1 kill vehicle. And one of the issues that I see with that is that this issue of our missile defense program needs to be prioritized. And in fact, is it not true that the last time the CE1 kill vehicle had been tested was 2008?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, it is my understanding that the CE1 has gone through a number of tests, and as a result of the combined tests, it is an effective and operational capability today.

Senator AYOTTE. Well, the first flight test we have had, General, was since 2008. So here we are, 2013. And the last time we had a flight test of it was 2008. It seems to me that if we are going to have a commitment to our missile defense and making sure that the capabilities are there, that we need to put resources in it that are going to further testing. And in fact, what troubles me is the administration, even prior to sequestration, was cutting funding for this program.

So as we go forward, I hope—what do you believe the priorities should be in terms of making sure that our missile defense programs are supported?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, my priorities would be the day we invest in sensors, we invest in reliability of the missiles that we are using, both CE1 and CE2, and we do adequate testing to ensure that reliability exists.

Senator AYOTTE. And with regard to an east coast missile defense site, you said to the chairman that you felt that there were further analysis of the missile threat to Iran. Do you dispute what has been the report from the National Air and Space Intelligence Center from earlier this month that concluded Iran could develop and test an ICBM capable of reaching the United States by 2015?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I am not here to dispute what you just said.

Senator AYOTTE. So what further analysis do we need to conduct? You know, we missed it when it came to the North Korean nuclear threat, and I would hate to see us in that position with regard to Iran. Would you agree with me that if we had an east coast site, particularly with the cancelation of the SM-3 Block 2B program, that it would provide additional battle space in response to an ICBM missile from Iran to the east coast of the United States?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I believe we have to continue to study how we are going to address that. As I mentioned earlier and truly believe, that we have got to also get the sensing right so that as we fire our individual missiles to address this problem, that we have the right targeting with that. I also support, as far as the east coast launch site, that we move forward with the environmental impact statement, the EIS, in order to allow us an option in the future.

Senator AYOTTE. General, my time is up, but I will follow up because in the written answers and also to the chairman you have talked about additional analysis about the Iran threat. With the reports that 2015 is when they may have ICBM capability, I am not sure what we are waiting for around here for additional analysis because we know, even with the EIS going forward, it will take several years for us to stand that type of site up, and by then, they have the missile and the east coast does not have the battle space opportunity that it should have to fully protect the east coast of the Nation. So I appreciate it, and I will follow up with you on that.

I want to thank you both. And I will have a follow-up for the record with you, General Scaparrotti. I appreciate it.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Ayotte.

Senator Udall?

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, gentlemen. I want to also add my voice to the members of the committee to thank you, and I think more importantly, you all agree, your families for your service and the way in which you have been supported by them.

Admiral Haney, I chair the Strategic Forces Subcommittee. As you know, I look forward to working with you in that capacity, when you are confirmed, on these important issues that have not only military but historical significance.

General Scaparrotti, it is good to see you again. I know we are going to work together too given the proclivities of the North Korean leadership and the challenges that you will face as the head of USFK.

Admiral Haney, if I could turn to you initially, and I want to pursue the same line of questioning you have been hearing this morning from all of us. Are you confident that the President's proposal to reduce the number of deployed strategic nuclear weapons will allow us to maintain an effective nuclear deterrent and to be able to fully respond to a nuclear attack?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I fully support, as stated in my earlier questioning, that the New START treaty numbers make sense to me and that we ought to continue to march toward that goal.

I also fundamentally believe that we should always, as good stewards, look for the right balance in all of our capability. I have not studied this piece, and if so confirmed, I would be willing to come back to this committee in a classified setting to further address this balance of our capability that we will need for the future.

Senator UDALL. Let me follow that with a question, and I think you can respond up to a point, given this is an open hearing.

If reductions were made, we would be able to maintain those weapons that were reduced in a status that would allow them to be redeployed if a situation demanded. Is that correct?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, it would really depend on any future agreement that we would have in terms of what were the basis and parts and components of said agreement relative to what we would retain and what we would not.

Senator UDALL. Some of the present agreements, if I am correct, do allow that, though, as an option. Is that fair to say? Some of the treaties that are in place today.

Admiral HANEY. Yes, sir, that is my understanding.

Senator UDALL. So the weapons are kept in a warm status of they are kept in a stockpile.

Admiral HANEY. That is correct. The New START treaty addresses both deployed and non-deployed warheads and also addresses launchers.

Senator UDALL. Talk about the benefits, as you see them, that are associated with the proposed changes to our nuclear employment strategy. Do you believe the benefits, in other words, outweigh the risks?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I believe the benefits relative to the New START treaty provide us the adequate numbers of nuclear weapons and launchers to address the threats now and into the future.

Senator UDALL. Let me move to modern conventional weapons. There are some who I respect and I think many respect who say that modern conventional weapons have provided us with the capabilities that once would have been required by nuclear weapons. And am I correct in saying because of those advanced conventional weapons, we simply do not need as many nukes as we once did to accomplish the same objective?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I would say that as you look at the number of nukes, our combined capability is also important as a country. When you look at how many nukes we had—nuclear weapons—during the Cold War and just the significant quantities we have had, if you were to look at that graph from about the 1950s on, it is pretty interesting in how we have made significant reductions while still retaining quite a few weapons.

So I fundamentally believe that we have to be careful and look at all of our capability, similar to what was stated in the Nuclear Posture Review in 2010, that that is also part of our country's capability and what we can bring to bear if so threatened. But as long as other countries have nuclear weapons, we are required to have a safe, secure, and effective means to address that.

Senator UDALL. I think we all agree on that point. And you are saying that the conventional arsenal that we have today is advanced and it complements our nuclear weapons capability as well. Is that what you are saying?

Admiral HANEY. Well, it complements. What I am also saying is I do not have a magic equation that says this number of precision guided munitions equal this capability because we are talking about a significant difference in destructive capability when we look at a nuclear weapon.

Senator UDALL. Admiral, let us turn to the modernization of the B-61 bomb. Do you support that current modernization plan? And what would be the consequences if the United States did not modernize the B-61?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think the B-61-12 modernization program is very important to our Nation, and I fully support it. I also believe that we will be at risk if we do not support it because through its modernization, it also reduces the number of other nuclear weapons that we have today and brings it down to one type model series for nuclear surety and in order to have a safe, secure platform for our use, but particularly in terms of the tactical nukes associated with our DCA program.

Senator UDALL. You paid me the honor of a visit and we talked about this particular plan. We also talked about your willingness to work with Senator Sessions, who is my ranking member on the subcommittee, and myself to bring down the costs of the B-61-12 program. And I heard you imply but I want to make sure for the record that you have a chance to clarify further. You will work with us to bring down that price tag and do everything possible to create some efficiencies. Is that correct?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, if so confirmed, I will work hard to look at costs in every program U.S. Strategic Command is associated with.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for that answer.

Chairman LEVIN. Let me interrupt you, Senator Udall. We only have a minute left in this vote. There was a miscommunication here. At any rate, we are right at the end of the vote. So we only have about 5 minutes to get there. We are going to have to recess for 10 minutes or so because none of us have voted yet. We will call the cloak rooms and let them know that we are on our way. So we are going to have to recess. Sorry to interrupt you. If you get back, then we owe you a minute or 2.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Okay. We are going to hold off on that. Senator Donnelly is here and he can continue.

Do you want to finish?

Senator UDALL. Could I just finish the question for the record, Mr. Chairman?

Chairman LEVIN. Sure.

Senator UDALL. And then I would be happy to defer to my wise colleague from the Hoosier State, Senator Donnelly.

I will ask this for the record, Admiral. On the issue of electromagnetic spectrum management, I think you are well aware of the discussion that is underway. I think if we had public access to that bandwidth, it would be a great economic benefit. I know we also cannot negatively affect DOD mission.

Do you believe that the lower 25 megahertz of that spectrum could be vacated within the currently proposed timeline without unduly affecting our military and our military missions?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think as we go forward here in the electronic spectrum, as much as it is also becoming extremely utilized, that we have to be very careful that costs associated with taking the EM spectrum away in areas where the military is using right now because there will be a cost associated with migrating those equipments to a different EM band.

Senator UDALL. So I hear caution in your answer but I want to continue to work with you on this important what I think is opportunity but we also have to do it right.

So thanks again, gentlemen, to both of you. I look forward to working with you after you are confirmed. Thank you.

Senator Donnelly?

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

It is great to be with both of you. I want to thank you for your service to the country and to your families for everything you have done on behalf of this Nation. We are very grateful to all of you.

Last Saturday, July 27th, marked the 60th anniversary of the Korean War armistice. I would like to recognize our servicemembers who currently serve and have served in the Republic of Korea and thank them for their service.

One such Korean War veteran was Army Lieutenant Colonel Don Faith, a Hoosier who was posthumously awarded the Medal of Honor and was buried in Arlington Cemetery just recently. His body was recovered from North Korea in 2004 as part of a joint U.S.-DPRK recovery team.

Currently 5,500 U.S. servicemembers are still MIA in North Korea. General Scaparrotti, what conditions are necessary for resuming recovery operations in North Korea so our missing-in-action soldiers can be brought home to their families?

General SCAPARROTTI. Well, sir, first let me say that I fully support efforts for repatriation of our servicemembers, their remains. It is an obligation that we have, I believe, as a Nation. If confirmed as the U.N. Commander, as a part of those duties, I will have particular duties regarding the arrangements for the repatriation of remains.

I think in terms of what we should do, I think to go forward, we should ensure that it is within the priority of our other national interests and, second, that we can assure the security of those individuals that we would put into North Korea to retrieve the remains and do the operation there.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you.

Admiral Haney, recently the National Air and Space Intelligence Center put out a report regarding ballistic missile systems and said China has the most active and diverse ballistic missile development program in the world. It is developing and testing offensive missiles, forming additional missile units, qualitatively upgrading missile systems, and developing methods to counter ballistic missile defenses.

When we look at that and we know that with our missile defense systems, the last three tests have failed, how do we rectify that situation?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, as we look to the future here, it is very important that we are able to continue to work our missile defense solutions across the board but, in particular, to get our ground-based interceptor solution set operating with the confidence we expect. We have had numerous tests over the years of the CE1 variant and it is operational, and it is operational to the extent that it is currently protecting our country. As we look at the future, it is important that we get the CE2 portion of this also correct and that we look at the full range of options as we look at addressing the missile defense threat.

Senator DONNELLY. And one of the other concerns that I have is, you know, as we look at the east coast missile defense system more, the suggestion of whether or not we need one, folks have said, well, there is no point in going further with that because we do not have the other system even working right. Do you think that we are in effect—I guess what I would say it is almost like—I think we are able to do two things at one time. Do you see a need for an east coast missile defense system?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I see a need for us to look at other options, options in general, of how we address this problem. I am fully supportive of moving forward with the environmental impact statement, which is fully supported, as we go forward while at the same time making sure we get our sensing right so that we can further refine our capability in terms of being able to attack these missiles with our current programs.

Senator DONNELLY. And you were kind enough when we met to talk a little bit about this issue with me, but I just wanted to mention it again and that is in regards to counterfeit parts. It is an extraordinarily dangerous situation when these parts are used in equipment that protects our soldiers that are servicemembers depend on.

Is there a way to use facilities like Crane Naval Warfare Center in Indiana to minimize DOD's risk of receiving counterfeit parts in the military supply chain?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think it is very important that we continue to work hard as a country and as a military to look and avoid counterfeit parts. This is a very important area as we look at our current posture but also as we look at the future with the number of systems with chips of various capabilities in so much of our military apparatus.

With regards to how we do that, if so confirmed, this is an area I will look at and from that standpoint, if so confirmed, come back to you relative to Crane. I have not been to Crane. This is one of the areas in the early months, if so confirmed, that I will want to get around to see our various capabilities in the country and be able to address that more formally.

Senator DONNELLY. We would be honored to have you come.

And, General, in regards to North Korea's ballistic missile systems, what do you think their intent is?

General SCAPAROTTI. Well, sir, I think North Korea, as you know, has an aggressive ballistic missile program. They have hundreds of short- and medium-range missiles. They are developing intermediate-range and intercontinental ballistic missiles. They see that as prestige for their regime. They see it as a means of extending the regime's security. They see it as a manner of deterrence against the United States and our influence in the region, as well as the other regional partners. So I think the regime itself sees their ballistic missile system as very important.

In recent years, their conventional forces have been declining in capability, and it is the money that they are putting into asymmetric systems like the ballistic missile system, their special forces, cyber, et cetera that I think they have changed their strategy toward.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you very much, General, Admiral. Thank you both for your service.

Mrs. Fischer?

Senator FISCHER. Thank you, Senator.

Thank you, Admiral, and thank you, General, for being here today, and I thank you for your service. I thank your families for their sacrifice through the years. And I can see you should be very proud of the families that you have raised while serving your country. Thank you very much.

Admiral, I want to thank you again for taking the time to come and visit me in my office. I thought we had a great discussion, and I would like to just follow up, if I could, a little bit on the issues that we touched upon in my office.

I had asked you about our relationship with Russia and your views on that relationship, but we did not have the opportunity to discuss their views on missile defense. So I would ask you, how do you think the United States should deal with the Russians' repeated demands for legal limits on our missile defenses? And how do you define the term "legal limits"?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I do believe, as we have articulated from the Nuclear Posture Review and the Ballistic Missile Defense Review and continued on a journey, we have continued to articulate how our missile defense system is designed to be a limited missile defense system that should not be conceived as a threat to Russia's deterrence capability.

I think as we continue to work with the Russians, we will have to continue the dialogues that have been started to continue to make sure their questions are in fact answered, but at the same time, we have to be mindful that it is important that we defend and have adequate capability to defend our assets, both deployed and our homeland. As I see Russia, that is also a country that is doing some investment in their capability. So the combination of continuing to have discussions and negotiations I think is important for our future.

In terms of defining the legal limit piece, that is an area, if so confirmed, I would like to look at more closely and come back to you.

Senator FISCHER. Do you believe that it should be our decision as a country, as a Nation, on where we deploy our defense systems and the numbers that we use in those deployments?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think it is important, as we deploy any of our capability, that we work through our associated analysis as well as work with our allies and partners and countries like Russia in terms of how we come with an integral solution. But as we do that, we clearly have to prioritize what we are trying to achieve is part of that calculus.

Senator FISCHER. Do you believe that we should support or do you support sharing classified data on our missile defenses with the Russians? And if so, would you draw a line and where would you draw the line on how much to share?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, that is a very good question. The business, in terms of information sharing, is one that has to be looked at closely, both looked at from a standpoint of how we look at the world today and how we look at the world in the future. And I think as we look at information sharing, which we do with a variety of countries on different subjects, for missile defense, that is one that, again, has limits and bounds. As I sit before you, I could not in an unclassified forum talk about that but would look forward, if so confirmed, in the future to have an opportunity to continue that discussion.

Senator FISCHER. Thank you. I appreciate your offering to do that. I think it is an important point and it is one that we need to have a conversation about. I thank you for that.

You mentioned that you support more testing for missile defense. Do you believe that our current budget can adequately do that? Do you think we need more resources, especially given some recent test failures? And what would you advise if you are confirmed?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, if so confirmed, this will be an area that I would want to look at closely. Number one, whenever we talk about adding more resources, it is very important first we look at what our resources we currently have are doing for us, and I am a big believer that we have to be careful before we just come out and ask for more without doing some rigorous reviews of what we are spending money on.

I do believe, though, when we look at testing, testing covers a full gamut, partially testing that you can do without launching in space as you narrow down and do the analysis associated with componentry. So I know this last test is being under review and, until so confirmed, unable to see the results of that work, it is hard for me to give you an answer that would be substantial. I look forward to that, if so confirmed, in the future.

Senator FISCHER. I would assume from some of your previous statements, though, that you do believe that we need to have equipment that is going to work and make sure that it can do the job. Is that correct?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, that is very important for us to be able to achieve for the future of the defense of our country and for our deployed forces as well as our allies.

Senator FISCHER. Thank you.

We talked a little bit about the new facility that is being constructed at STRATCOM in my State and that hopefully it is on schedule and it will continue to move forward at the speed that it needs to move forward at so that we can update the resources that we have there at STRATCOM. Do you have anything you want to add on that about the value that that facility will have for STRATCOM? I know you were assigned to STRATCOM. I believe it was in 2010. So you are familiar with the area, and I know you are familiar with the planning of that facility. What would you add to that and the value that it has for the mission?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, thank you for that question.

The command and control complex that is being built right now—very important to our Nation in terms of all the missions of Strategic Command and, in particular, strategic deterrence. It is important, as we have talked about here, the warheads, the weapons, the platforms, and the sensors, but without the command and control that connects the relevant information to our leadership, the decisions could not be made in a prompt time. And that is such an important part of our infrastructure and capability going forward.

I thank the Congress for its support for that command and control complex.

Senator FISCHER. Thank you, Admiral. I look forward to working with you to make sure that it continues to move forward. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Senator.

Chairman LEVIN [presiding]. Thank you, Senator Fischer.

Now I believe that Senator King is next.

Senator KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you very much for your service to the country and your joining us this morning.

Admiral HANEY, I have heard a number of witnesses over the course of the past 6 or 7 months characterize cyber as the most serious, immediate threat that we face. The term I have heard, which stuck with me, was the next Pearl Harbor will probably be cyber.

Given that, do you think that the Cyber Command, which is under your proposed command, should be set apart and elevated to its own unified combatant command?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I am a fan of a command and control structure that allows us to win would be my first overarching statement.

As we look at how we are aligned today with Cyber Command as a sub-unified command under U.S. Strategic Command, I believe the work is ongoing and in fact is working in a very synchronized fashion with delegated responsibilities to U.S. Cyber Command.

My first principle would be the first part that we have to keep intact is the NSA and Cyber Command under the same hat, as we have it today, and that that synergy is so important to our country going into the future. That piece we have to continue and we have to get it right. So as we look at a future and particularly as we grow our cyber capability, I believe there may come a time where Cyber Command as a separate combatant command will be appropriate. But I think as we are applying our next dollars in terms of the manpower we need to address this threat and in terms of the tool sets we need to address this threat, that that is important because as we do step into moving Cyber Command as its own combatant command, there is also a price to be paid there as well in overhead. So right now, I think we are fine in our current alignment but I am not opposed for some time in the future for Cyber Command to become its own combatant command.

Senator KING. Since the 1950s, our strategy with regard to nuclear weapons has been deterrence, mutually assured destruction, and that presumes a level of rationality in one's enemy. What is our strategy for deterrence of madmen with nuclear weapons, people that are not necessarily rational, whether they are state or particularly non-state actors? What is our sort of overall strategic thinking about, as I say, particularly non-state actors who at some point in the reasonably near future may be able to obtain nuclear weapons?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think that is an area particularly where the Nuclear Posture Review of 2010 articulated a strategy which we continue, point one being that it is important that our efforts in terms of combating weapons of mass destruction continue. We have had the initial operating capability of the standing joint force headquarters for elimination, for example, in the business of having that capability, the business of being able to have our country's capability of knowing where the nuclear weapons, as well as the other weapons of mass destruction, are and to work hard to avoid having this kind of capability fall in the wrong hands.

Senator KING. So it is an intelligence function. Is that what you are saying? Principally our defense against non-state nuclear weapons is essentially knowing who has got them and how to prevent them?

Admiral HANEY. I think, Senator, this is also in the spirit of reducing the number of weapons that exist in the world. It has been part of that Nuclear Posture Review and the strategy that our country has been striving to achieve. It is not just an intelligence function. It is a whole-of-government function. It is a function that U.S. Strategic Command is also heavily involved in to detect, deter, and prevent utilization of that type of weapons.

Senator KING. But you understand what I am saying. I mean, the strategy of deterrence may work with Russia but an Iranian terrorist cell who thinks that if they die in a holy war, they are going to go straight to heaven—deterrence is not necessarily a viable strategy. So what is the strategy?

Admiral HANEY. Well, the strategy is to continue to work across our whole-of-government apparatus in terms of ensuring that countries that harbor folks that want to do harm to us in whatever means—there is some work that occurs diplomatically. There is work that occurs militarily. And this business of knowing where things are is also a very important part of that strategy to address the threat in addition to the elimination of that threat.

Senator KING. Thank you.

General, in the full preparation of our committee, I want you to know that we are preparing you today for Korean winters—the air conditioning in this room. We want you to be ready for cold weather.

General SCAPARROTTI. Thank you, sir.

Senator KING. This past Saturday I had the honor to visit with a number of Korean War veterans at the 60th anniversary of the signing of the treaty at Panmunjom. A little statement. Of course, you know Korea is often characterized as “the forgotten war.” But in looking at the situation where we have got a very vigorous country of 50 million people in the south and a miserable despotism in the north, I cannot think of too many wars that made as much difference as that war did if you look at the stark difference on the two sides of that narrow line. So it certainly should not be a forgotten war.

A question that I am sure you are going to have to deal with in the next several months. To what extent is the sequester going to affect readiness in Korea?

General SCAPARROTTI. Well, Senator, I think it will affect readiness in Korea at some point. Presently U.S. Forces Korea enjoys a very high priority in terms of funding and resources. So just after the forces deployed in harm’s way, Korea is on that level because we have to be ready to fight in Korea tonight. It is that uncertain. So we have enjoyed that kind of funding.

If confirmed, I intend to keep a very close watch on our readiness levels, the resources that we have. And I think my concern would be as we reduce our funding, particularly if we go into full sequestration, we know that we have seen a reduction in the forces now already or their readiness, and that would be extended into the next year and, of course, become worse over time. The forces in

Korea depend on potentially a rotation of forces, but certainly the forces that would come forward if there is conflict on the peninsula. So I think that is the impact as we look to the future.

Senator KING. Well, I hope perhaps for the record you could provide some analysis because it is now looking more and more like full sequester in 2014 is a likelihood if not a certainty—some analysis of what the impact would be and how it would be allocated because it is very important for us to know, as we are debating and discussing sequester and what the alternatives are, that we have a realistic picture of the impact. And my understanding, from talking to other people in the Pentagon, is that the sequester in 2014 is going to be a much more serious, widespread impact than it was in 2013 because of the lack of low-hanging fruit, if you will, of unexpended funds and those kinds of things. It is going to be a higher level of impact. And so perhaps for the record you can give us some serious analysis of the impact on Korea. We need to have that information.

General SCAPARROTTI. Senator, presently we already see the impact on readiness just in this fiscal year, as you mentioned, in fiscal year 2013. You know that the Army has the majority of its brigades now at a lower training level focusing on company-level training, for instance. For those brigades who are either not deployed or those who are about to deploy, those two categories maintain the training levels they need to be ready for that deployment. But all other brigades have come to a lower proficiency level and resourcing.

The Air Force, you are aware, has already grounded 12 air squadrons, as I understand it. The Navy has cut back on ships going to sea and the maintenance that they are providing. So that is the short term.

But as we take those cuts today, you will see a much deeper cut in readiness as we go into 2014 and beyond because that begins to compound itself. Pilots who have not flown take much longer to get back up to combat proficiency. Brigades who have not trained in the fundamentals, particularly the integration of combined arms at a higher level, take much longer to train and it is more expensive. So I think as time goes on, we see our readiness coming down and that is of concern.

How does that impact U.S. Forces Korea? First of all, it is the forces that we may rotate there. They would take longer to be ready for the mission that they are going to do. If it were forces that had to be deployed in response to, say, a provocation, we would probably take some time here in the States to train that unit to the readiness level that we believe they need to be at to do the job before they deploy. So arriving forces might be delayed as a result.

Senator KING. Thank you. I appreciate that, and any additional information you could provide us for the record would be helpful. Thank you.

General SCAPARROTTI. I will, sir. Thank you.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator King.  
Senator McCain?

Senator MCCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Admiral HANEY, you just came from the command—or leaving the command of the Pacific fleet. How is the littoral combat ship working out?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, we had the USS *Freedom* deployed today in the western Pacific.

Senator MCCAIN. Based out of Singapore.

Admiral HANEY. Operating out of Singapore, sir. And in fact, it has been involved in a variety of exercises and operations since it has been out there.

We also have two other littoral combat ships, the Independence and the Fort Worth, that are operating out of San Diego and working, in the Independence case, the mine warfare module. So I am happy to report we have three out in the Pacific today, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. My question was how is it working out.

Admiral HANEY. Senator, it is working out very well in terms of our ability to take this first platform, a research and development model, and get it out in the Pacific to do real work. Clearly with it, we have learned a lot, but we are right now about to swap the second crew to that platform about halfway through its 8 months deployment in the case of the *Freedom*. The other two are continuing to work through the various—

Senator MCCAIN. I would like for the third time to ask you how is it working out. Are you satisfied with its performance? Are the modules being replaced on time? Are the cost estimates what they should be? So please answer the question, Admiral.

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I would—

Senator MCCAIN. I can get a status report whenever I want one. I want to know your view as to how the littoral combat ship is working out as far as its ability to defend our interests in the Pacific.

Admiral HANEY. Senator, currently it is working out very well from an ability to deploy it and get it to do its work. The platform itself, both varieties, have moved forward, and my personal view is that that part is also working out well. We have learned some things that have been incorporated from *Freedom*, LCS-1 to LCS-3, and those improvements I believe are right on target.

If there is one area that requires more work and that we have been working as a Navy to get there is the mission modules of the different varieties. The current module deployed with the littoral combat ship number one is working fine, and I am looking forward to—it is a little early for me to give you the prognosis on the Independence mine warfare mission module, sir.

Senator MCCAIN. General, there have been plans to move our troops in South Korea to a base further away from Seoul. How is that progressing?

General SCAPAROTTI. Sir, presently those plans are underway. They are being worked with our ROK counterparts as well. Primarily right now, we are making plans for the ability to make those moves to—

Senator MCCAIN. Have we gotten cost estimates yet as to how and who would bear those costs?

General SCAPAROTTI. Yes, sir, there are cost estimates at this point. It is shared costs with our ROK counterparts as well as our

own payment. I am aware of the issues with the cost today. As I said, we are——

Senator MCCAIN. Roughly what costs are we talking about to complete the contemplated move?

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, in terms of the land partnership plan, which is the one that we pay probably the most part of, it is about \$880 million for our portion of that land partnership move, and that has to do with the forces north of Seoul.

The Yongsan relocation plan is a plan paid primarily by the Republic of Korea for the move of the services and the forces right around Yongsan in the headquarters area.

Senator MCCAIN. Now in, quote, paying for the move, does that mean paying for all of the installation that is necessary there?

General SCAPARROTTI. My term, sir. In those plans, it is the payment for the construction of facilities to support the troops, and there is also housing included in this as well for families, et cetera.

Senator MCCAIN. Do you think it is a wise move at this time for the South Koreans to reopen that facility, manufacturing area, north of the DMZ?

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, I think that if the two countries can come to terms on their agreements and, as South Korea said, so that it would not be used as leverage again, that is a platform that can be used then to perhaps develop communication and reduce the tension between North Korea and South Korea.

Senator MCCAIN. I thank the witnesses.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator McCain.

Senator Blumenthal?

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you both for your service, your extraordinary careers of service, to our Nation. Thank you to your families as well for their contribution and service.

Let me begin, Admiral Haney, by asking you about the *Ohio* class ballistic missile submarines. I know that you have today, in fact, called then critical to our national defense, and yet as you also know, the program has been delayed by at least 2 years. Is that a wise move?

Admiral HANEY. Well, Senator, the delay with the program has incurred some risk, and that is a risk that we are working through. I would say we can ill-afford to have another delay with this program.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. So another delay would be unacceptable.

Admiral HANEY. That is correct, Senator. Particularly as you look at the aging of the current platform that is beginning to reach its end of life, 42 years is a long time to be operating a submarine.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. And my understanding is that the official explanation has been that the delay will enable more refined development of the weapons platform, of the technology, and ultimately some prospect of cost savings. Is that the reasons that you understand the delay has been implemented?

Admiral HANEY. Senator, I think the delay was implemented for some of that, but it was also a matter of prioritization of resources.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Cost savings, in other words, the unavailability of funds.

Admiral HANEY. Yes, Senator.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. In a more perfect world—not a perfect world necessarily, but a more ideal world, that program would be implemented without the delay.

Admiral HANEY. Senator, that is correct. I will say I know that there is some work that continues to go on in research and development and design development for that platform. So I think in the interim time, good work continues.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. And so, if possible, though, we would recalculate and eliminate that delay, if possible.

Admiral HANEY. Well, Senator, I think we have already started the delay, and you cannot make up for what is already lost. So we are already in that phase.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. But there is no question that we need that *Ohio* class ballistic missile submarine and that we need to provide sufficient resources without additional delay.

Admiral HANEY. Senator, that is correct.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. General, if I could ask a few more questions about the relocation. You know, given the stringency—and you have heard a number of my colleagues talk about the possible continuing of the sequester even though many like myself believe that it would be unwise and really unjustified to apply it as it would be to the defense budget—can you tell me whether canceling the relocation is an option that perhaps we should consider?

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, I cannot say for sure whether that would be an option we would consider. It seems to me that we have made, as a part of the Strategic Alliance 2015, agreements with our ROK allies, and those moves are tied to that. So from the position I am in now, I cannot really comment on whether that is really an option.

But I would say too that those moves help us posture our forces better. So to the extent that we can continue on that line, my judgment is it would be good for the readiness of the force as well.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. You have said it would be good. It is essential for the readiness of the force?

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, if confirmed, I will certainly review that and be willing to come back to you. I do not believe that from this position I have the capability to answer that question fully, but I will be able to once I am on the ground and I can see the impact of both the moves and also the importance with respect to our bilateral agreements.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Do you have an estimate as to what the cost of canceling or delaying the relocation would be?

General SCAPARROTTI. No, sir, I do not.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Would you be able to provide one to the committee?

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, if confirmed, I am willing to provide one to the committee.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you. I would appreciate that.

And I must say I do not have too much doubt you will be confirmed. I expect you have heard much the same from others on this committee. And I certainly will be supporting you in that vote.

What is the overall cost of the project? I have heard the number \$10 billion.

General SCAPARROTTI. Of that project?

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Yes. I am sorry. Of the relocation project.

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, again, I would like to come back on the record. I have heard a lower number than that, but I do not know if that is the entire cost of the project.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. And finally, we hear a lot about readiness and about the impact of sequester on readiness. Could maybe, to give us a little bit more concrete or factual basis for what the impact is, talk about what the effect is on the troops on the ground in Korea who will be under your command, the captains and lieutenants, the sergeants and staff sergeants, how their everyday training, life, and so forth is affected?

General SCAPARROTTI. Sir, if I could, I would like to take that as a general question, not specific to U.S. Forces Korea.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Sure.

General SCAPARROTTI. I have done some checking but I have not checked with those serving today in Korea. And second, they enjoy a very high resource category right now.

But across the force, the reduction thus far in resources and the impact of sequester has resulted in the reduction of training that is being done. The troops are training every day but they are training at a much lower level.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I know I have heard this numerous times, which is why I wanted to specify it to Korea. Does that mean that they are out in the field less, that they are sitting in classrooms rather than firing live rounds somewhere?

General SCAPARROTTI. They may be in the field less. They are likely going to the range less. They are likely qualifying with weapons systems and the vehicle systems that they have less. The pilots are likely flying less.

Now, you asked about morale. That also impacts morale because our young men and women are very proficient. They are very experienced. They know what it takes to be ready for combat across all the Services. They have been in a fight for 10 years. And so when we start to delay their ability to reach that kind—or maintain that kind of proficiency, it affects their morale as well. And also, they are concerned about their future in our force.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you.

My time has expired but I think this topic obviously is supremely important. And I want to thank both of you for your very helpful and insightful answers. Thank you very much.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Blumenthal.

I just have one additional question for you, General Scaparrotti. It has to do with the various approaches to the intense determination of all of us to reduce the number of sexual assaults and inappropriate sexual conduct.

Given your experience at West Point and as a commander, should we take the chain of command out of that decision to prosecute court martials?

General SCAPARROTTI. Senator, thank you.

I strongly believe that we should not take the commander out of the process in terms of dealing with disciplinary issues, in particular in this case, sexual assault. In the military, the commander is central to all that we do. The commander, in fact, is held respon-

sible for his unit, all that it does or fails to do, and he or she is the most important person establishing the climate within that command of whatever size it is. And it is the climate in my opinion that is fundamental to preventing sexual harassment and sexual assault. They are key to that.

I believe strongly that our commanders take this seriously and that we can through training, through oversight, some of the initiatives that have been presented by members of this committee, perhaps some legislation, that can also help us strengthen our ability to deal with this with our commanders in the chain of command.

In the end I would just say I think it is a matter of integrity. We entrust them with great responsibility, special trust as it says in their obligation that they take, and we entrust them with the lives of our young men and women. To not trust them with a portion of this to me does not follow through with what we say and then what we do. So I say that we hold them accountable, train them properly and give them the tools to do that oversight, and then maintain integrity of the system.

Chairman LEVIN. Any other questions?

Senator INHOFE. One.

Chairman LEVIN. Senator Inhofe?

Senator INHOFE. Yes, just one follow-up.

I appreciate your answer very much to that question, General. Did you happen to see the compromise that the chairman and I and this committee put together that would maintain the integrity of the commander but also give some relief in the event that some abuse takes place? Did you see that?

General SCAPARROTTI. I did, Senator.

Senator INHOFE. What do you think about that?

General SCAPARROTTI. And I agree with that. As I said, I think there are some initiatives here that have been proposed that retain the commander in the process, but there are things that we can do in article 60, for instance, which I think yours also contains, that provides less authority but proper oversight. In other words, in this case they would not retain the capability of changing a charge after a court martial is found, which they have today as a convening authority. But that would be left to judicial authorities on appeal. And I think there are things like that that have been proposed in your bill that is acceptable, in the long run will be helpful to this problem.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Senator Blumenthal?

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

If I may follow up again just very briefly. In your career, General, have you acted as a convening authority and decided to prosecute cases of sexual assault?

General SCAPARROTTI. In my time, I believe I have acted as a convening authority in terms of sexual assault. I know that I dealt with this issue as the commander or the commandant at West Point. That is the age group that we have the greatest challenge in in the military, and it happens to be the age group that we have at West Point as cadets. So I became very involved in every aspect of this issue.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Did you take a course in the Uniform Code of Military Justice?

General SCAPARROTTI. Yes, sir, I have both in the courses that we go through as part of our career, but I personally made it a point to go to our legal school both before the time I became a battalion level commander and again before I became a brigade level commander and obtained special court martial convening authority. So I purposely did that to ensure that my understanding and training was honed.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. And using that training, did you decide to prosecute individuals under your command for sexual assault?

General SCAPARROTTI. Yes, I have, sir.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. On how many occasions would you say?

General SCAPARROTTI. I could not give you the number, sir. I know that I dealt with cases at West Point in particular. I would have to go back and review. In first corps, I probably did, just given the number of cases and the size of the element.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. And did you ever decide to prosecute despite a recommendation to the contrary from the judge advocate?

General SCAPARROTTI. No, I never have. I cannot remember an occasion that I have disagreed with my judge advocate.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. So that when you received a recommendation to go forward and prosecute, you did so.

General SCAPARROTTI. That is correct.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. On every occasion.

General SCAPARROTTI. And I would like to say one of the initiatives that we have talked about within the services is the use of judge advocates and those who are specialized in particular crimes. In the case of sexual assault, for instance, I can tell you clearly that I have dealt with it as a convening authority in cases that had to do with murder, and in those cases, I sought not only my JAGs—you know, his opinions, but I also asked that he go to the Army. And we had their specialist in that area provide me advice as well. And I think that is something that we can do in this area with those specially trained.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. You would like to see prosecutors who are specially trained and experienced with expertise in this area of sexual assault because it is a very challenging and sometimes difficult one not just to decide but also to actually proceed and prosecute and try and convict. Am I correct?

General SCAPARROTTI. That is correct.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. And would you also like to see those types of trained and experienced prosecutors involved in the decision to prosecute?

General SCAPARROTTI. I would. And as I have said, I sought that kind of help when I was a convening authority.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I very much appreciate your answers to my questions. As you may know, there is another point of view on the convening authority issue, and I personally deeply respect the solution that the chairman and ranking member have helped to lead. It has been great leadership on this issue in seeking a change. But I also think that we need to treat this crime as, in fact, a predatory heinous crime and that someone with the prosecutorial expertise and experience that you have described may be in a bet-

ter position to make these decisions. So I say that with all due respect. And I really appreciate your answers to my questions.

General SCAPARROTTI. Thank you, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Just to be very, very clear here, now the alternative proposal is to transfer the decisionmaking as to whether to proceed to a trained and experienced JAG or prosecutor. That is not what you support, I gather.

General SCAPARROTTI. That is correct, sir. The Senator said “assist,” and I believe—

Chairman LEVIN. I am sorry.

General SCAPARROTTI. The Senator’s words, the word to “assist.” I believe the commander should still be in the chain.

Chairman LEVIN. When you say that you would like to consult with such a trained and experienced JAG officer and for that person to be involved in that sense to be consulted, that does, I take it from your testimony, in no way diminish your belief that the decisionmaking needs to remain in the chain of command.

General SCAPARROTTI. Chair, you are correct.

Chairman LEVIN. Anything else?

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much.

We are all done. Thank you both. Thanks to your families.

[Whereupon, at 11:22 a.m., the committee adjourned.]