

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION  
OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR  
2015 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE  
PROGRAM**

---

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 26, 2014

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

**CURRENT READINESS OF U.S. FORCES**

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:36 p.m. in room SR-232A, Russell Senate Office Building, Senator Jeanne Shaheen (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Shaheen, Donnelly, Hirono, and Ayotte.

Majority staff members present: Jason W. Maroney, counsel; and John H. Quirk V, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: John D. Cewe, professional staff member; Ambrose R. Hock, professional staff member; Anthony J. Lazarski, professional staff member; and Daniel A. Lerner, professional staff member.

Staff assistants present: Daniel J. Harder and Brendan J. Sawyer.

Committee members' assistants present: Patrick T. Day, Joshua Lucas, and William Scheffer, assistants to Senator Shaheen; Rachel H. Lipsey and David J. Park, assistants to Senator Donnelly; and Karen E. Courington, assistant to Senator Kaine; Bradley L. Bowman, assistant to Senator Ayotte; and Peter H. Blair and Robert C. Moore, assistants to Senator Lee.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JEANNE SHAHEEN,  
CHAIRMAN**

Senator SHAHEEN. Good afternoon, everyone. I'm going to call this hearing to order—this is the Subcommittee on Readiness and Management Support—and thank our witnesses for being here, and also for your service to the country.

I'm pleased to be joined by my colleague, the ranking member of the Readiness and Management Support Subcommittee, and, of course, the other New Hampshire Senator. We sometimes call this the New Hampshire Subcommittee. But—

Senator AYOTTE. Exactly. [Laughter.]

Senator SHAHEEN. But, anyway, we are going to try and expedite opening statements this afternoon, because, as you may have heard, there are votes that are happening shortly. And so, we want to get through as much of the testimony as we can before we have to adjourn to—recess to go vote and then come back. So, I will submit my testimony for the record, and—

[The prepared statement of Senator Shaheen follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator SHAHEEN. But, I would like to say, at the start of the hearing, that we are all very saddened by the tragic events 2 days ago at the Naval Station Norfolk. It reminds us all of our collective responsibility to keep our shipyards and installations safe. And I know there's an investigation going on, but, as we await the outcome of that, we certainly are all thinking about the families and the victims and the shipmates who are affected by this tragedy, and our prayers go with them. So, I hope, Vice Admiral Cullom, that you will convey that to the Navy.

So, I turn it over to my ranking member to see if she would like to make any comments.

#### **STATEMENT OF SENATOR KELLY AYOTTE**

Senator AYOTTE. Yes. First of all, I want to thank the chairman.

And I also want to pass along my condolences to those who have suffered at the Naval Station at Norfolk.

And I just want to thank you all for being here. This is a very important time for us, with what's happening around the world and with the challenges we face for our military.

I will be submitting my statement for the record.

[The prepared statement of Senator Ayotte follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator AYOTTE. But, most of all, I want to thank each of you for your leadership during very difficult times and challenging times, and the sacrifice not only you've made, but also your families. So, we look forward to the testimony today.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

So, joining us this afternoon are General John Campbell, Vice Chief of Staff for the Army—welcome; General John Paxton, assistant Commandant of the Marine Corps; General Larry Spencer, from—Vice Chief of Staff for the Air Force; and Vice Admiral Phil Cullom, who's Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Fleet Readiness and Logistics. And I'm sure they sent you because Senator Ayotte and I were both here, and you know we'll ask you about the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard. So—[Laughter.]

Thank you all very much. We'll begin with you, General Campbell.

#### **STATEMENT OF GEN JOHN F. CAMPBELL, USA, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. ARMY**

General CAMPBELL. Ma'am, thank you very much.

And I have provided a written statement. I'd ask you take that for the record. I would like to provide some opening comments, though.

Chairman Shaheen, Ranking Member Ayotte, thank you very much for the opportunity to come today and discuss the readiness

of your U.S. Army. I appreciate your support and commitment to our soldiers, our Army civilians, our families, our wounded warriors, and our veterans.

Today, the Army remains globally engaged with more than 66,000 soldiers deployed, including about 32,000 in Afghanistan and about 85,000 forward-stationed in over 150 different countries.

I'd like to start by thanking the Congress for passing the fiscal year 2014 Consolidated Appropriations Act. This measure provided the Army some relief from previous Defense spending caps, and gives us predictability in fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015. While the restoration of some funding in fiscal year 14 helps the Army restore readiness, it is not sufficient to fully eliminate the void in core capabilities created over the past decade of counterinsurgency operations, and made greater by sequestration. The current level of fiscal year 2015 funding will allow the Army to sustain the readiness levels achieved in fiscal year 2014, but will only generate the minimum readiness required to meet the Defense Strategic Guidance. The anticipated sequestration reductions in fiscal year 2016 and beyond severely degrade manning, readiness, and modernization efforts, and will not allow us to execute the Defense Strategic Guidance.

To really understand our current and future readiness, I need to quickly provide context with what happened in fiscal year 2013. And due to fiscal year 2013 BCA spending caps, the Army canceled seven Combat Training Center rotations and significantly reduced home-station training, negatively impacting the readiness and leader development of over two divisions worth of soldiers. Additionally, 12 years of conflict have resulted in extensive backlog in our leadership education and training programs due to reductions of schoolhouse capacity. Those lost opportunities only created a gap all the way from 2004 to 2011, and—because we are focused exclusively on counterinsurgency. In the event of a crisis, we'll deploy these units at a significantly lower readiness level, but our soldiers are adaptive and agile, and, over time, they will accomplish their mission. But, their success will come with a greater cost of higher casualties.

Further results of sequestration in fiscal year 2013 include the deferment of approximately \$716 million of equipment reset into fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015. Sequestration also postponed the reset of nearly 700 vehicles, almost 2,000 weapons, and over 10,000 pieces of communication equipment, Army pre-positioned stocks, and numerous soldier equipment and clothing items. The Army was forced to cut routine maintenance for nondeployed units; thereby, creating an additional 73.5 million in deferred maintenance costs that carried over to fiscal year 2014. All together, sequestration resulted in the release of nearly 2,600 civilian and contract personnel, eroding critical trade skills in fields such as engineering.

Affordability is driving the need to reduce the total Army end strength and force structure. The Army is in the process an accelerated drawdown to 490,000 in the Active component, 350,000 in the Army National Guard, and 202,000 in the U.S. Army Reserve by the end of fiscal year 2015. By the end of fiscal year 2017, we will further decrease end strength to 450,000 in the Active, 335,000 in

the Army National Guard, and 195,000 in the Reserve component. These cuts are disproportionately on the active Army, and they will reverse the force mix ratio, going from 51 percent Active and 49 percent Reserve in fiscal year 2012 to 46 percent Active and 54 percent our Reserve component in fiscal year 2017. So, we'll have a greater preponderance in our Reserve component, both our National Guard and our Reserve.

In conjunction with these rapid end-strength reductions, the Army is innovatively reorganizing the current operational force and eliminating excess headquarters infrastructure in order to provide greater combat power across remaining brigade combat teams. The Army will also restructure our aviation formation to achieve a leaner, more efficient and capable force that balances operational capability and flexibility across the total Army.

As we continue to draw down and restructure over the next 3 to 4 years, the Army will have readiness and modernization deficiencies. Fiscal realities have caused us to implement tiered readiness as a bridging strategy. This concept refers to maintaining different parts of the Army at varying levels of preparation. Under tiered readiness, only 20 percent of the total operational force will conduct collective training to a level necessary to meet our strategic requirements, and we have accepted risk to the readiness of multifunctional and theater support brigades, as well as in home-station training, facilities, equipment sustainment, and modernization. Forces deployed in Afghanistan will be fully prepared for the security assistance mission, but not for other contingencies. Forward-stationed units in the Republic of Korea will remain ready, as will those dedicated to the Global Response Force.

Uncertain and reduced funding has degraded our installation readiness and infrastructure. Base operation support levels remain under-resourced and need to be a future priority as additional funds become available.

This year and next are critical to deciding the fate of what is the greatest Army in the world and could have significant implications on our Nation's security for years to come. Cuts implemented under the Budget Control Act and sequestration have significantly impaired our readiness.

Further, I'm concerned about the impact to Army base funds in fiscal year 15 if the Overseas Contingency Operations, or the OCO, budget request is not acted upon by the start of the fiscal year. Absent approval of OCO funding, we would be required to support OCO-funded missions with base funds, which would immediately begin degrading readiness across the total Army.

As we continue to draw down the Army, I can assure you that precision, care, and compassion will be hallmarks of our process. Ultimately, the Army is about people. And, as we downsize, we are committed to taking care of those who have sacrificed for our Nation over the last 12 years of war. Required reductions will force out many quality, experienced soldiers. We have created the Soldier for Life Program to assist those departing and separating from the Army, and a Ready and Resilient Campaign to ensure that we care for our soldiers and their families, which ultimately improves our readiness. Our wounded warriors and our goals to our families

remain a top priority, and we will protect programs that support their needs.

I thank you again for your steadfast and generous support of the outstanding men and women of the U.S. Army. Please accept my written testimony, again, for the record. And I look forward to your questions.

Thank you very much.

[The prepared statement of General Campbell follows:]

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

And I apologize, we've got about 3 minutes left for a vote, so I think we're going to recess for about 10 minutes. Hopefully, we can get this vote in, and the beginning of the next one, and we'll back to hear the rest of the testimony.

So, thank you. [Recess.]

Let me officially call the hearing back to order. Senator Ayotte will—is about a minute behind me. And, as usual, the votes took a little longer than expected. So, I think we're going to continue with the testimony.

If I could ask—I hate to do this to all of you, having given General Campbell more time, but if you could limit your remarks to about 5 minutes, that might help us get through the testimony quicker.

And what we're going to try and do in the next votes is switch off so that either Senator Ayotte or I are here during those votes.

So, General Paxton, if I can ask you to begin.

Thank you.

**STATEMENT OF GEN. JOHN M. PAXTON, JR., USMC, ASSISTANT  
COMMANDANT, U.S. MARINE CORPS**

General PAXTON. Yes. Thank you, Chairman Shaheen. And, to you and Ranking Member Ayotte and the rest of the committee, I appreciate the opportunity to report on the readiness of the U.S. Marine Corps.

Today, your Corps is committed to continuing to remain our Nation's force in readiness and a force that's truly capable of responding to any crisis around the globe at a moment's notice. As we gather today, there are 30,000 marines forward-deployed around the world, promoting peace and protecting national interests and securing our defense. There are more than 6,000 marines today in Afghanistan, and they continue to make a huge difference to our Nation, our allies, and the world.

In all, your marines who are forward remain well trained, well equipped, well led, and at the highest state of readiness. That readiness was proven many times, but at least twice significantly in the last year, where the Corps displayed its agility and responsiveness. First, in November, in the aftermath of the super typhoon that struck the Philippines, and then shortly thereafter, in December, with the rescue of American citizens over South Sudan in December. In both of those, it demonstrated the reality and necessity for maintaining a combat-ready force that's capable of handling today's crisis today. Such an investment is essential to maintaining our national security and our prosperity in the future.

So, we appreciate—I appreciate the opportunity today to talk about readiness and our ability to maintain it in the future, and

how that is tied imminently directly to the fiscal realities that our Nation and our Department of Defense face in the budget crisis.

As our Nation continues to face fiscal uncertainty, we're making the necessary choices to protect our near-term readiness and to place the Marine Corps on the best trajectory to meet all those future defense requirements. I look forward to elaborating on examples of the choices that we have made and how they impact our training proficiency, our equipment maintenance, and our unit readiness, to name a few.

As we do navigate the fiscal crisis, and as we talk here today, I would just remind that we look at things through five lenses or five pillars around the Marine Corps. Our first pillar is to recruit and retain high-quality people. The second one is to maintain the highest state of unit readiness. The third one is to meet all the combatant commanders' requirements for our marines. The fourth one is to ensure that we maintain appropriate infrastructure investments. And the fifth one is to keep an eye on the future by investing in capabilities that we'll need to meet tomorrow's challenges.

And, with that, ma'am, I will curtail the rest of the oral statement and ask that you take the written statement for the record. And I look forward to your questions.

Thank you, Senator.

[The prepared statement of General Paxton follows:]

Senator SHAHEEN. Thanks very much. And we will certainly include the full statement for the record.

General Spencer.

**STATEMENT OF GEN. LARRY O. SPENCER, USAF, VICE CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE**

General SPENCER. Madam Chairman, Ranking Member Ayotte, thank you for the opportunity to share the Air Force's current readiness posture.

Readiness is critical for your Air Force. The Air Force's range, speed, and agility enable us to quickly respond to national missions, and gives our Nation an indispensable advantage that we must retain as we plan for an uncertain future. Whether responding to a national security threat or humanitarian crisis, your Air Force is expected to respond in hours, not days, from home to anywhere in the globe.

The cornerstone of our success depend on airmen who are highly trained, well equipped, and always ready to defeat any adversary across the range of operations, from the present-day COIN environment to a highly contested one. Decades of sustained combat operations have stressed our force and decreased our readiness to unacceptable levels. Our airmen have performed exceptionally well in the counterinsurgency and counterterrorism fights in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility, as have all the other—our other joint and coalition partners. However, our focus on the current fight has seriously impacted our readiness to effectively operate in contested environments and against potential adversaries that have access to ever-increasing levels of advanced warfighting technology. We will continue to maintain our ability to respond to today's requirements, but we must also regain and maintain our

ability to effectively operate in the most demanding threat environments.

The bottom line is that, from a readiness perspective, we know we are not where we need to be, but our fiscal year 2015 PB submission sets the conditions that enable us to begin the road to recovery in the years ahead. But, we will need your help to get there.

The Air Force defines “readiness” as the ability, at the squadron level, to provide distinct operational capabilities within the required timeframe. This means we need to have the right number of airmen, with the right equipment, trained to the right skill level, and with the right amount of support, force structure, weapons, and supplies to successfully accomplish what the Nation asks us to do. A good readiness plan depends on an optimum level of health in all of these areas while also balancing time between critical operational and training commitments.

Sequestration has cut the Air Force budget by billions of dollars, so our only option is to reduce our force structure. We cannot retain more force structure than we can afford to keep ready. As such, readiness requires more than just flying hours and exercises. Our plan involves preferred munitions, developing training environments, both open-air ranges and virtual simulated environments that accurately replicate the threats we may face, and modernization efforts that help us maintain our technological advantage in war. Readiness also includes facilities and installation support, because, whether it’s Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri, home of our B-2 fleet, or Kunsan Airbase in Korea, home of the Fighting Wolfpack, in many cases we literally fight and power-project from our assigned bases.

Weapon sustainment health is also critical to our readiness plan. For example, as a former vice director of the Oklahoma City Air Logistics Center at Tinker Air Force Base, I was able to see firsthand how our major logistics complexes contribute to the sustainment and readiness of aircraft such as our B-1, B-2, B-52, E-3 AWACS, and KC-135, as well as repair and management of 19 different types of aircraft and mission—missile engines. Said another way, while adequate flying-hour funding ensures the aircraft on the ramp are ready to fly, weapon-system sustainment funding ensures we have adequate numbers of aircraft on the ramps. Keeping aircraft in the air, satellites in space, and protecting our network systems require a team effort and is a synergy of critical skills, tools, and capabilities that culminate in the ability to deliver combat power for the Nation.

To be clear, last year’s sequestration trigger placed the Air Force readiness posture at an unacceptable level of risk that we are still working to recover from. The abrupt and arbitrary cuts caused the Air Force to stand down 31 Active-component squadrons, 13 of which were combat-coded. Today, less than 50 percent of those combat squadrons that were stood down have returned to their “pre-sequestration” levels of readiness, which, again, were already less than required. The loss of time and experience flying, maintaining, supporting, and integrating those aircraft equated to a loss of critical readiness for our airmen across our operations, maintenance, logistics, and support force. If we miss training opportunities or our squadrons are forced to stand down, it takes—it may

take months, or even years, to regenerate that global combat power, and we negate the responsiveness that is one of the—one of air power's inherent advantages. We desperately need your help to de-trigger sequestration, going forward.

Guiding our strategy and budget process were the Air Force's unique capabilities and the requirements to gain and maintain readiness for the full spectrum of operations. We describe full-spectrum operations as operations that span the range of low-intensity conflict to major regional conflicts against near-peer adversaries. We appreciate the temporary relief of—the Bipartisan Budget Act provides. It puts us on a gradual path to recovery. But, our analysis indicates it will not fix the Air Force readiness during the FYDP. Air Force readiness is heavily influenced by ongoing operations as time and resource is consumed in supporting current operations limit opportunities to train to the full spectrum of potential operations.

As demonstrated recently after the conclusion of major combat operations in Iraq, there will continue to be a high demand for Air Force capabilities, even in the wake of post-combat drawdowns of deployed ground forces. If we are not able to train for the scenarios across the full range of military operations and continue with critical modernization efforts, we face unacceptable risk to mission accomplishment and to our joint forces.

To conclude, Madam Chairman, today's Air Force provides America an indispensable hedge against the challenges of an uncertain future. Properly trained and equipped, your Air Force can set the conditions for success in any conflict in any region of the world whenever we're called upon. Sequestration and the demands of sustained combat operations have decreased our ability to train across the full spectrum of operations. We have a plan to slowly fix our readiness, but we need your help to make sure we can get there. With your support, we can make the right cuts and provide our airmen with the resources they need to prepare and to respond when called upon.

Thank you, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Spencer follows:]

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Vice Admiral Cullom.

**STATEMENT OF VADM PHILIP H. CULLOM, USN, DEPUTY CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, FLEET READINESS AND LOGISTICS, U.S. NAVY**

Admiral CULLOM. Chairman Shaheen, Ranking Member Ayotte, first let me express Admiral Ferguson's appreciation for your invitation to testify, and pass on his regrets that he was unable to attend. I appreciate the opportunity to be with you today to discuss the readiness of our Navy, and I'm grateful for the chance to be at the table with these distinguished leaders of our Joint Force.

It's my special honor and privilege to represent the 633,000 men and women of the Navy, sailors and civilians, who deliver a ready Navy every day.

In the recent testimony, the Chief of Naval Operations and Commandant both emphasized that the most important thing the Navy/Marine Corps team does for the Nation is to deliver ready, forward



presence. In fiscal year 2013, Navy worked hard to preserve readiness during the extended continuing resolution and budget sequestration. This year, we have given priority to readiness again in how we apply the funding you provided above the sequestration level. The Navy continues to deliver ready, certified forces forward, and we will not compromise on that. It is a fundamental element of our responsibility to our sailors and their families and to the combatant commanders.

With the budget you've provided for this year, fiscal year 14, we're meeting our forward-presence commitment to the combatant commanders, we are able to execute the depot maintenance plan for our ships and aircraft, and we have restored our normal training and readiness progression within the fleet.

Our maintenance plan continues to execute the reset of surface ship material condition after a decade of high-tempo operations, but, because of the need to drydock ships for much of this work, it must continue for at least 5 more years. To do all these things, we accepted increased risk in two of the mission areas of the Defense Strategic Guidance due to slowed modernization and restricted ordnance procurement. We also continue a significant level of risk to the long-term viability of our shore infrastructure.

The Navy budget submission for fiscal year 15 continues our commitment to the readiness of the force, but also continues to carry forward the risks I mentioned. To sustain readiness at this level, we have proposed a phased modernization plan for 11 *Ticonderoga*-class cruisers and three *Whidbey Island*-class LSDs. This plan ensures the availability of 11 modernized cruisers through the 2030s, when they would otherwise be past their service life and require replacement, all at a time of expected ship construction funding limitations while building the *Ohio* replacement strategic deterrence submarines. While we accept some capacity risk in the near term, without this approach we face even greater challenges to sustain the readiness of the fleet as a whole.

Despite the DSG mission risk and challenges to near-term capacity, the President's budget provides a way forward to a ready and capable Navy in 2020. If we must return to sequestration levels in fiscal year 2016 and beyond, we will continue to strive to have a ready Navy, but it would require us to become smaller and less capable. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines are the finest we have ever had, and they go into harm's way every day. Each of us at the table has led them in forward operations. Navy leadership greatly appreciates the work of the members of this committee to support our sailors. We must ensure that we continue to provide them the right training and capable equipment to meet the challenges they face today and will face in the future.

I look forward to your questions.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Cullom follows:]

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you all very much.

You've all referred to the effects of sequestration on readiness. Can I ask you to talk a little bit more about the specific capabilities that we will lose and, if we continue sequestration into fiscal year 2015, what the impact will be on our ability to do surge capacity? And also, if sequestration continues beyond that, to what extent

are the effects from those cuts reversible, and at what point do we then have a very long period in order to reverse damage done by the cuts? And I don't know who would like to go first on that.

General PAXTON. Thanks—

Senator SHAHEEN. General Paxton?

General PAXTON.—Senator Shaheen.

I would just give you, on the—in the case of the Marine Corps, probably the most immediate example, in terms of a capability that is at risk and then the time to regenerate. And I'd refer to our fixed-wing aircraft—for example, the F-18s now—we have what's called “out of reporting cycle,” and that's when we have either maintenance that needs to be done on the aircraft or parts and supplies that are delayed in arriving there. And the Commandant was on record, a year ago, about stating exactly where our “out of reporting cycle” was for the F-18s, and then what he predicted would be the case with sequestration.

We are—most of our fixed-wing squadrons have 12 aircraft, give or take. And the prediction was that we would have eight or nine that would be on the line—it would be three or four offline—and that we were at risk of getting down to seven or eight. So, we would have four or five aircraft that you could not maintain.

Indeed, even with OCO money, even with some reversions from cash, we are, this year, many of our squadrons, between six and seven aircraft that are on the line, and we have five or six that are “out of cycle reporting.” So, we are up around the 46- or 48-percent mark for “out of cycle reporting.” We estimate that that will continue, at least for the next year.

So, those are aircraft that, not only do you not have on the line, but, at the same time, you have the same number of pilots there—

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

General PAXTON.—so, you have the same number of pilots training on fewer aircraft. You then have to sequence that with night-illumination cycles to get time flying with goggles. You have to sequence it with ships' availability, which is a whole different challenge that Admiral Cullom can talk about—so you get deck bounces to keep qualified.

So, in essence, what it is, is it's a downward spiral. Is it reversible? Absolutely. So, if the money were to materialize, if you will, we could buy the parts and we could perhaps hire some more civilians, we could fix the backlog of depot maintenance, but it would take us months to do it. It wouldn't be days or weeks; it would be months to do it. And, with each time, the month would affect another deployment cycle for, for example, another Marine Expeditionary Unit that goes out.

I'm not sure if that answers your—so, it is reversible, but it would take a while, ma'am.

Senator SHAHEEN. Well, it's certainly very helpful. So, if sequestration played out through the remainder of the years that the Budget Control Act projected, are there capabilities that we just plain-old lose at the end of that?

General PAXTON. So, I'll go very quickly through that question, Senator, and then turn it over to General Spencer.

So, we absolutely lose capabilities, and the regeneration time would then be exceptionally long, because what we would do is—

in the case of the Marine Corps, we don't want to mortgage your near-term readiness, so we would continue to source the two MOUs that are out, east coast and west coast, and the next ones behind them. So, the result would be, instead of having a uniformed or maybe a little bit of a bathtub in readiness, we would be forced, as some of the other service Vice's said, into some degree of tiered readiness, and then you would have no surge capability, then you would be unable to do that, because you would have entire squadrons where there were either no aircraft or no trained pilots.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

General Spencer?

General SPENCER. Yes. Madam Chair, just to be clear, at the sequestered—you know, we have the sequestration level, and the PB which is above that. In general, we tried, as best we could, to put reversible things in between sequestration and the PB. Just in case the sequester stood, we could reverse those. But, I want to be clear, the sequestration level, those cuts are not reversible. Let me give you some specific examples. And I know there's been some—some of the reductions we've proposed already have been—some might have been controversial, but if we go—if we go to the sequestration level, we will divest the entire KC-10 fleet, the—that entire fleet of tankers. We will stand down and divest all of our Block 40—Global Hawk Block 40s. We will stand those down. We will—as you probably know, we were on our way—we're at 50 orbits of ISR now, growing to 55—we would have to reduce that to 45 orbits. We would have to reduce investments in our KC-46 fleet, our F-35s. We'd have to slow—reduce the number of buys. Same with the MC-130J. And would go right on down the line. You know, we'd make cuts in S&T, cuts in new engine technology, stop radar ISR sensors, slow readiness—it would slow our readiness recovery, infrastructure. I mean, there are thing—at the sequestration level, we're not talking about coming back from that. I mean, we would have to take out fleets, significantly impact our readiness, and there's no reversibility in there.

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am.

Senator SHAHEEN. General Campbell?

General CAMPBELL. I'd just add that, you know, for the Army, it's \$75 billion over the next 5 years, and, for the Army, it's about people. And so, we're cutting brigade combat teams, we're cutting end strength. But, our guidance really is to keep a balanced force, so we're really mortgaging the future of all our Services here. We're not able to put the right money into our science and technology. We're not able to put our money into modernization of equipment. And so, we just keep pushing this to the right, and we just get smaller and smaller.

The other thing that we don't talk a lot about is the morale, the impact it's going to have on the All-Volunteer Force as we move forward. And I think that's pretty critical as they see us continue to come down, continue to come down, and then not provide them the right resources to properly train. For the Army, going from 570 on the active down to 490, down to 450; with full sequestration, we go down to 420,000. And the Chief and Secretary of the Army have said we cannot do the Strategic Defense Guidance at 420. 450, it's at significant risk. We go below 450, that's sort of that redline. But,

again, that's the people, and that's trying to keep in balance. We can keep more people, we can keep more force structure, but then we have zero readiness, we have no modernization. So, for us, it's a balance. And at the 450/335 for the Guard, we're at that redline balance where we need to be.

But, I'm really worried about the number of people that we have to bring down. And going from 570 to 490, we've been able to do that with attrition, for the most part. Going from 490 to 450, going to get much, much harder. And this has been on the backs of these great men and women over the last 12 years, and what we're going to have to do with involuntary separations is going to be pretty huge here. I can talk—if you want that.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Admiral Cullom, I'm going to come back to you, but I'm going to give Senator Ayotte a chance to ask questions first.

Senator AYOTTE. Admiral, why don't you answer that, because it's an important question, in terms of the impact on sequestration on the Navy. And also our shipyards. I mean, Senator Shaheen—are obviously concerned about the attack submarine fleet and our capacity to keep the right workforce and make sure that we actually have the capacity we need, particularly—it's so needed, obviously, not just in the Persian Gulf, but also in the Asia-Pacific region.

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am. Thanks, Senator, for the—letting me respond to that, because, for us—as you know, we start out as a tiered force from the very get-go, so we kind of don't have a place to go if we're looking to be able to get to a lower level, a sequestered level, in that regard. We probably need to look no further than what happened as a result of the last year on sequester. The two air wings that we took down to a tactical hard deck, we—the others were down to minimum hours that they needed to be able to deploy. There was an impact to the FRCs, that General Paxton was mentioning. That left us with work in process that was actually on the factory floor, if you will, at the end of the year. That's the first time in a long time, at the end of the year, that we actually had airframes and engines that were not—that were just sitting on the floor, and the backlog behind it. So, that is a pretty significant impact.

Then you go to the impact on the public yards. And, as we saw that—and you see that every day up in New Hampshire—is the hiring freeze and the overtime and the furloughs. That delayed the starts, and it's extended the availabilities of the ships. So, there's a real impact to those things.

If we go to a sequester level, and we stay at that level for any length of time, we really think that that limits our options and limits the Nation's decision space, because it compels us to go back and actually inactivate a carrier strike group—that's both the carrier and the air wing that goes along with it—because there's nowhere else to get enough money to be able to do that.

And there's a long-term impact, as well, on surge-ability, the additional contingency operation capacity that we would have for those—the carrier strike groups—that would support, in case a contingency comes up, and that they have to be ready within 30 days.

And, additionally, modernization and recapitalization would also be dramatically reduced. So, a pretty significant impact.

I mean, we saw—even just in terms of presence, there was a 10-percent drop in global presence as a result of the sequester, just the last time. That was just for 1 year. When you start to extend that over several years, it has a cumulative effect that is decidedly not good.

Senator AYOTTE. Admiral, we've heard, in the past, testimony about what the size of our fleet would be if we went down the sequestration road, not only over the fiscal year DP, but over the full window. And do you have those numbers, both the overall size of the fleet, as well as the attack submarine fleet?—which—you know, even with building two replacements of *Virginia*-class submarines, we're, I think, only meeting half the combatant commander requirements now.

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am. As the CNO mentioned the other day, the combatant command demand signal over the—the request and the requirement that we have out there is for 450. That's what it would take, is 450 ships, to be able to do what they need us to do. And, under sequester, that would—could take you down to the sustainable force, to the 240–260 range, in that ballpark. And—

Senator AYOTTE. Right.

Admiral CULLOM.—of course, with ships that are aging out, that's one of the reasons behind the cruiser phased modernization. We would like to keep as many ships around as we can to handle contingencies in the—

Senator AYOTTE. Listen, I think we all agree. I think that we've got to go over and vote, and I guess we're going to come back and continue. I don't know if that—

Senator SHAHEEN. I think we are. We've got two more votes, so I think, rather than trying to run back and forth, we're going to recess again, go do those two votes, and come back and finish the hearing.

Senator AYOTTE. Great.

Senator SHAHEEN. So, thank you for your patience, everyone.

Senator AYOTTE. Thanks. And we'll come back. There are obviously many more questions, given the concerns we have. [Recess.]

Thank you. Senator Shaheen is on her way back, and I'm going to just continue the questioning that we were on when I left.

And I—what I wanted to follow up was—talking to, General Campbell, you, as well as General Paxton. As I understand the force reduction levels that are proposed for the Army, as well as the Guard and Reserve, here's what I'm—here is what I'm trying to understand. Even if we don't—even without sequestration, we're proposing significant reductions, are we not? Because even without the sequestration, we're assuming—because there's some plus-up in the proposal that—in addition to sequestration, as I understand—that's been submitted to us by the administration. And with that, we—we're brought to 420 Active, 315 Guard, 185 Reserve. Is that right?

General CAMPBELL. Ma'am, the 420/315 is with full sequestration.

Senator AYOTTE. That's with full sequestration.

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am.

Senator AYOTTE. Okay. Where are we without full sequestration?

General CAMPBELL. Well, we're trying to hold at 450/345.

Senator AYOTTE. Okay. That's what I wanted to clarify.

So, here's what I need to understand. What risks are we taking on by doing that? And what I mean is, let's say we have one conflict to respond to. Let's say that, unfortunately, we have to respond to aggression by North Korea, where none of us wants to end up in a land war, but let's say we had to go into a land war. What are we able to do? In other words, even with the 450, what are we able to do? With the 420, with the sequestration, what are we able to do? And what risks are associated with that?

Because I think it's really important for people to understand what we're—we used to have a theory that we could fight two conflicts, then we went down to one-and-a-half conflicts. Where does our posture now leave us, in terms of ground forces, General? And where our—where is our posture left if we go forward with sequestration? And I'd love to hear from both of you on this point, because, obviously, the Marine Corps is experiencing reductions, as well.

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am, thank you for the question.

What I'd tell you is, start worst case first. So, at full sequestration—and General Odierno testified this yesterday—that we would have—the Army leadership feels we'd really have a hard time to do a prolonged multi-phased major contingency operation. So, in the past, as you talked about, we could do two different places. We've gone to, really, one, and maybe hold off on the other.

Senator AYOTTE. Yes.

General CAMPBELL. At 490—

Senator AYOTTE. Like Iraq and Afghanistan.

General CAMPBELL. Right. We couldn't do that at 420.

Senator AYOTTE. You cannot do that at 420.

General CAMPBELL. No, ma'am. So, at 490, we feel comfortable that we can complete Defense Strategic Guidance. And there's a little bit of risk there. At 450, that risk goes much higher. Below 450, we don't think we'd be able to do it.

Senator AYOTTE. So, when you describe a 420, which is the sequestration scenario, and you say one major contingency, you even seemed to qualify what we'd be able to do in that one major contingency. Can you help me understand that?

General CAMPBELL. Yes, depends on what exactly you're dealing, for how long, what mobilization you get—you have to go through.

Senator AYOTTE. How—

General CAMPBELL. It took us 2 to 3 years to grow brigades from scratch. So, people talk about, "Hey, it's easy to reverse this." It's not that easy. Two to 3 years. So, what Congress gave us with Iraq and Afghanistan were these temporary end-strength relief and some wartime allowance; that really helped us as we grew over the last couple of years. Remember, we had brigades where we had to drop down to two maneuver battalions to get the right number of brigades over into Iraq when we had the surge. We're now trying to make those brigades back, because we know we need to fight with three maneuver battalions, plus a reconnaissance piece, and we're trying to reorganize those brigades back and make them

more capable. Going to 420, we would not probably be able to do that.

Senator AYOTTE. Wow. That's—

General PAXTON, what would you say with regard to our ability to, you know, fight a conflict? And where would be left, in terms of our capacity?

General PAXTON. Yes, if I may, Senator, you know, build the context first.

So, we were about 185 on 9/10—

Senator AYOTTE. Yes.

General PAXTON.—and we grew up to 202, and that was with congressional authorization, congressional funding. We knew we were going to have to come down, that that was unsustainable, with both conflicts. And we had studied this in great detail. So, the optimal size for your Marine Corps is 186–8, and we have testified to that. And that's a balanced and a ready Marine Corps.

If sequestration—full sequestration BCA kicks in, the next level of balance for us, which we don't like but could do, is 175. And that's what we've testified to. At 175, we have, for example, 21 infantry battalions. And if the balloon goes up, it's a one-MCO force, and we're all in, everybody goes.

Senator AYOTTE. So, everyone.

General PAXTON. Now—

Senator AYOTTE. There's nobody left behind.

General PAXTON. No. I mean, the story, at that point—and it may take time, as General Campbell said. I mean, some of these are phased arrivals, so some of our op plans—and we'd have to answer this in a classified session—

Senator AYOTTE. Sure. Sure.

General PAXTON.—but, some of them will arrive at different times, and that—we will use that time to see what extra monies we could get to build readiness. But, we would be flowing according to that op plan and that timeline.

Senator AYOTTE. How do we deal with issues like dwell time? How do we deal with issues like—

General PAXTON. Yes. Well, the one—if I can, the 175 force is—as we spoke about, 2 weeks ago—

Senator AYOTTE. Yes.

General PAXTON.—that's at a 1-to-2 dwell.

Senator AYOTTE. Okay.

General PAXTON. I mean, that stays at 1-to-2.

Senator AYOTTE. Good.

General PAXTON. 186–8, we could get many units back close to a 1-to-3 dwell, which would be optimal.

Senator AYOTTE. Which is where we're—all these—

General PAXTON. But, at a BCA force, and all in, that's at a 1-to-2 dwell, too. And we believe, because of the 1-to-2 dwell, that our steady-state demand signal may be one of the most pressing circumstances, even if a major theater war, major contingency operation doesn't happen. Because just, as we said before, to sustain aircraft readiness, ship readiness, people training, we're going to be pressed to sustain that in the long haul, Senator.

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am, if I could just add to that.

Senator AYOTTE. Yes.

General CAMPBELL. So, at a 420, some of the assumptions that went into the planning to bring it down to even those lower forces were assumptions like we would not rotate. Okay? We would not rotate forces. So, I just think that's a flawed assumption. You know, see what we've done in Iraq and Afghanistan.

Senator AYOTTE. What does that mean, if you don't rotate forces?

General CAMPBELL. That means they go over, and you stay.

Senator AYOTTE. Well, how do our—you know, how do our men and women in uniform—what does that do, in terms of—it seems to me that their morale, the issues that they—

General CAMPBELL. Right.

Senator AYOTTE.—need to be able to have some, obviously, dwell time and to be—not that you wouldn't have dwell, but they're staying. I mean, that's a huge issue for them.

General CAMPBELL. That was one of the assumptions, yes, ma'am. And it was that—the other assumption was, whatever we did would be over very quickly.

Senator AYOTTE. So, this is not a sustainable assumption. I mean, that's not—you can't ask—

General CAMPBELL. Right.

Senator AYOTTE. You know, we can ask them, but we—the damage we would do to them would be—

General CAMPBELL. Right. And if—

Senator AYOTTE.—irresponsible.

General CAMPBELL.—you have an assumption that's—you're going to be gone for X amount of time—

Senator AYOTTE. Yes.

General CAMPBELL.—and come back, as we've seen over in Iraq and Afghanistan, that's not a very good assumption, either.

Senator AYOTTE. No, it isn't.

General CAMPBELL. And I didn't even get into the number of aircraft that, you know, we're going to lose through BCA. Right now, with the aviation restructure, it would take about 600-plus on the Active side, about 111 from the Guard side; 3 combat aviation brigades would go away—1 on the National Guard, 3 on the Active. So—I mean, there's a lot of—the multifunctional brigades—we talk in terms of brigade combat teams all the time, but brigade combat teams are only 30 percent of the total force, total Army. There's a lot of other stuff that we do every single day.

The combatant commanders have all the set-the-theater forces, so 35,000 soldiers every single day do theater logistics, intel, signal, for all the combatant commanders. And at some point, we're going to have to go back to the combatant commanders and say, "Hey, we can't do that." And, as you know, the world we live in today becomes more dangerous. So, many of the things that we continue to do for emerging crises, like a THAAD in Guam, Patriots to Turkey, all that is covered underneath our base. We're—you know, that's something we have to take out of that we don't POM for.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you. Thank you. Appreciate it.

Senator SHAHEEN. So, as I understand, the Army budget brief suggested that units will continue to build progressive readiness and achieve the highest training and readiness levels, based on available resources. Am I correct in that, General?



General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am. I talked about tiered readiness, so—

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

General CAMPBELL.—progressive readiness is really what we've had the last 12 years with an R4 Gen—Army Force Generation model, where there's predictability, and you went through and, at certain times, you continue to have time to build up. You had a LAD date, or a Latest Arrival Date, in either Iraq or Afghanistan, and so you had time to build up to that. And all of our units went through that and progressive modeled both the active and the National Guard.

Tiered readiness really focuses on certain units, and that's where the money has to go to. So, everybody going to Afghanistan, if you're in Korea, if you're the Global Response Force, you get the resources. Everybody else, you have what you have, and your training readiness will continue to go lower and lower and lower. So, that's—

Senator SHAHEEN. And—

General CAMPBELL.—the difference.

Senator SHAHEEN. And that's what we're looking at if we're looking at year upon year of sequestration, is that correct?

General CAMPBELL. Absolutely.

Senator SHAHEEN. The tiered—

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am.

Senator SHAHEEN.—readiness?

And can I just ask the other branches, Do you—are you also looking at tiered readiness? I know that some—General Spencer, you said you don't have tiered readiness.

General SPENCER. That's right, Senator. We can't—without—again, without going classified—based on the timing that the Air Force is required to show up in the war plans, we cannot do tiered readiness; we have to be ready to go right now. We couldn't do it.

Senator SHAHEEN. Is that also true of the Navy, Admiral Cullom?

Admiral CULLOM. Senator, the—for us—and I said that the Navy was in tiered readiness, and had been for 200 years ships at sail. That's really—when General Campbell was talking about the progressive readiness, that's, in essence, what my definition, if you will, was of tiered readiness, where only the folks that are going out to deploy—or those that are in a surge capacity that are needed to be able to deploy.

To give you an example, for this year, although we say we have two carrier strike groups that are out there, right today, and we can provide a certain number in surge capability, the reality is, is that a good portion of our carriers, and the carrier strike groups associated with them, will actually be deployed and underway sometime during that fiscal year. So, it isn't as if those carrier strike groups stay at a tiered readiness level that is perpetually at a certain level and then continue to grade down. They're always in a cycle of working out for that deployment and then ultimately deploying. But, during a given year, just because two are out there, that doesn't mean that—in this case, for this year, six of nine carrier strike groups will actually be deployed or operating out at sea and away from American shores.

Senator SHAHEEN. And how about the Marines, General Paxton?

General PAXTON. Yes, Senator Shaheen, we do not tier readiness, either. We have units, obviously, that are in different readiness cycles, depending on when they just came back from deployment and when they may have to go again. In a sequestered—in a BCA force, though, if we go to a 1-to-2 dwell and then the balloon does go up, it's obvious that, at some point, we have to look at something other than either full readiness or no readiness.

If I may, there's two issues here, and I—let me—I'll pile onto what General Campbell said a little while ago. In—even in a 1-MCO, regardless of where that theater of operation may be, we're all in. So, the issue then becomes that there are no combat casualty replacements, there are no extraneous—

Senator SHAHEEN. Right.

General PAXTON.—extra logistics. There is no surge capacity to deny, to delay, to deter anywhere else in the world. We're all in, in that one fight.

So, in essence, when we get together in uniform and we talk about this, we're not presenting national command authority options, because it's an option of one: everything goes. And then the units that go, you can't even distinguish on the triangle whether you want a well-trained, well-equipped, or a well-maintained unit, because you're going to get what you get. So.

Senator SHAHEEN. Admiral Cullom, I want to go back to follow up on Senator Ayotte's questions about the workforce at our public shipyards. Obviously, this is a concern for us, as—with the Portsmouth Naval Shipyard as part of our State. And there's a graph here, that I think everybody has, that shows the number of—the aging out of our shipyard workforce and depot workforce. And one of—it's a concern that we've been hearing in Portsmouth, at the Naval Shipyard, that there are a lot of people with a lot of years in, and they're looking at the future, with continued sequestration and potential furloughs continuing, that it's discouraging people, not only in terms of staying beyond—once they get their years in, but also discouraging our ability to recruit and retain new workers who are going to be able to achieve that level of experience.

I had a chance to raise this with Admiral Locklear earlier this week, and he talked about the importance of our shipyards to making sure that we have the readiness we need to function.

And I wonder if you can talk about how you view recruiting people to replace those workers that we're going to be losing, and how we can continue to retain that level of expertise.

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, Madam Chairman.

The—that's a great graph, because what it really shows you is that, due to the RIFs of some junior personnel that we had on board the shipyards back during the 1990s timeframe—it was really the whole decade between 1990 and about 2000—during that timeframe, when we RIF'd those, those would be the people that, today, had they stuck around, had they been here, would be our experienced technicians. And so much of what we do today, you know, really does require some pretty high technical ability.

We went from 8 shipyards and, I think, about 70,000 workers down to 4 shipyards with 21,000 workers. And so, that kind of very clearly shows you that they all left.

And so, now we're faced with a pretty junior workforce. And we're doing a lot of great work in mitigation at the shipyards. The folks from Naval Sea Systems Command have put significant investment in the training of personnel and in additional supervision, to help bring those—the young workforce that we have there now—to develop those skill sets, to learn from those people who have been around, and to bootstrap our way back to the experience levels that we, in fact, need.

Now, that does imply, and does end up producing, some amount of other indirect costs to it, but it's necessary if we're going to provide the technical skill sets that we need with the very complex platforms and ships that we have today.

Senator SHAHEEN. I just want to ask one followup to that, because a number of you have mentioned the effect of morale on continuing budget cuts and looking at continued furloughs in areas. To what extent is that going to influence our ability to continue to recruit good people and retain them at our public shipyards and depots?

Admiral CULLOM. Ma'am, I think there will be a challenge with that. We are very lucky, very blessed, to have civil servants that work in the shipyards and amongst all the commands. And even, you know, in the Pentagon, we have civil servants that just do tremendous, tremendous work, and have a great deal of experience.

The challenges that our folks in the shipyard are experiencing, they're—we ought to be very concerned about whether or not they will be able to continue to show that, what I call, "psychic income." It's what they get because they know they're doing very important things, that they are producing ships. And I'm the beneficiary of many a ship that was produced up in the yards up there; and I've got to tell you, they are well built by craftsmen who care about—

Senator SHAHEEN. Yes, they are.

Admiral CULLOM.—knowing that young men and women are going to man-up those ships and take them to sea and in harm's way. And we can't afford to lose them.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

And, General Campbell, would you like to comment on depots and whether—

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am.

Senator SHAHEEN.—there's a similar issue?

General CAMPBELL. I mean, the same thing. Our—you know, we have some great civilian employees out there. We've got to build that trust back with them. Most of them hung with us, despite, you know, 205,000 put on furlough, loss of 20 percent of pay for 6 weeks, not knowing how long that's going to go on. It also impacted families, because many of the workers would work in hospitals or clinics that would impact families, and we had to cut down that. Negative pay—on the morale—no pay raises for the last 3 years, no incentive pay. So, they're leaving to go seek employment in the private sector. And they're very, very dedicated, but they look to the future, and they say, "Hey, you can't tell us, you know, what's the predictability out there." And that's been our—I think, all of our's biggest frustration, is to deal with the unpredictability of the budget issues that we've been facing for the last couple of years.

And I think we could—we did it last year; we all had to do that. If we have to do that again this year, then I think that there'll be more of a mass exodus.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you.

General Campbell, can you tell us what—what are you going to have to do with involuntary terminations, both at the—assuming there's no sequestration with the proposed budget from the administration, assuming we do have sequestration—what's the scenario there?

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am. As we've gone from 570, working our way down to 490 on the active side, most of that we've been able to do with normal attrition. So, in the end—and we're probably about 520 today—but, as we get down to 490, probably only about 5,000 will be involuntary separation. But, involuntary separation is really a big category. It's two-time non-selects for different promotions, it's people that reach what we call an RCP point that they've been in at certain rank too long, it's us going back and being very tough on reenlistments and just saying, "Hey, you cannot reenlist. You're qualified, but, you know, as we look at everybody here, you're not as good as this next guy. We've got to keep the very best." There's a QSP, where we take a look at our senior noncommissioned officers and how much time they have, and some of those have to go.

So, 5,000 is really getting down to 490. When we go from 490 to 450, that number's going to go up significantly. Talking to our personnel folks, it's probably going to be in the neighborhood of about 35,000 involuntary separations that we're going to have to work with. And if we go from 450 to 420, that number's going to go up more.

And so, we've done colonels and lieutenant colonels this year, with a selective early retirement. All of those were eligible for retirement, and we worked through that, some great counseling, and it was about 150 lieutenant colonels, probably 100 colonels, when we worked through that piece. But, we're now working on captains and majors, and those numbers will be much larger. And these are young captains that could be company commanders in Afghanistan today, come back and tell them, "Hey, thanks for your service." So, it's going to be very, very tough.

Senator AYOTTE. Yes, that is tough. And also, what about employment for them? I mean, you're going to be putting a lot of people out—

General CAMPBELL. Well, ma'am, we have this thing called Soldier for Life, where we really do work hard on transition from—

Senator AYOTTE. Right.

General CAMPBELL.—you know, a year-plus out, provide them the right skill sets to help them get jobs as they get out. Industry is working with us, a lot of partnerships to do that, so we're very, very thankful. You know, we have to pay the unemployment if they can't get jobs. And last year for the Army, it was above 500 million that we paid in unemployment. So, it behooves us to continue to work hard to make sure that we set all of our soldiers up. And they're all going to be better citizens for it, they're going to provide

to the country as they get out, whether they've served a couple of years or all the way through retirement. But, we work very hard on Soldier for Life, and we're appreciative of all the great support that we have with partnerships out there with business in many of the communities.

Senator AYOTTE. Sure. But, I think that it's important, unless I'm missing something—we're doing this pretty quickly. It's not the way we would want to do it. Right?

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am. I think, from 570 to 490, we were able to set a time and a ramp that we thought we could work personnel policies to take care of our soldiers—

Senator AYOTTE. Right.

General CAMPBELL.—and their families. Now from 490 to 450, much quicker. 450 to 420—

Senator AYOTTE. Yes.

General CAMPBELL.—much quicker, and it's going to get much harder.

Senator AYOTTE. I don't know, General Paxton—obviously the Marine Corps is smaller, what—

General PAXTON. We are smaller, ma'am, so the exact same challenges that the Army has, we have there. We do not RIF right now. We don't have any intention to RIF. We don't see the need to do that. But, how you shape the force and strike the balance between the sessions and how many new folks you bring in, and then how you properly grade-shape the force so you could get equitable reenlistments, equitable promotions, equitable opportunities for command—I mean, there's a lot of hard work that goes into that. So, the ability to predict what the money would be, the ability to predict what the timeframe would be, as General Campbell brought up, is really critical. And BCA just accelerates the speed with which you make some of those decisions.

General CAMPBELL. Ma'am, just to add on, because—to put it into context. To keep it going and to continue to grow for future, we have to bring in about 60,000 new soldiers every year. We have to bring in about 4,000 new officers every year. And so, despite coming down, we still have to bring that in, to continue to grow the right grade structures as we move forward. So, that's going to continue to make it tougher, as well.

Senator AYOTTE. I don't know if the Air Force and Navy want to add anything on this, but—

General SPENCER. Senator, I will. I wanted to go back to the—if you don't—if I could, the earlier question on the depots, because that's a really—

Senator AYOTTE. Sure.

General SPENCER.—big deal for us with the—with our civilians.

You know, we didn't treat our civilians very well last year. I mean, we sequestered them, we carried thousands of vacancies, we then furloughed them. And they hear rumors. You know, every time a cut comes up, "Why don't you just go cut more civilians instead of taking the cut there?"

And, coincidentally, I have two sons; one works in a shipyard in Newport News, the other works as a computer operator for DIA. And, I've got to tell you, they both called me last year, saying, "You know, should I get out of DOD?" They are committed to service like

I am, and so they want to be a part of the Department, they wanted to serve their country, but they're—they've got families. And so, fortunately, they didn't jump ship, if you will, but they were really worried.

And so, I just think we need to be really careful about our civilian employees. I mean, we—just in the Air Force, as an example, we have 180,000 civilian employees. Roughly 4—between 4- to 5,000 of those work in the National Capitol region, so I think, sometimes, there's a view that all civilians work—are in staff jobs, and—not that staff jobs are not important, but the vast majority of our civilians are out, turning wrenches, they're out at depots—you know, for example, at our training bases—I'll just pick one, Laughlin Air Force Base, in Texas; they do aircrew training, they train new pilots—their entire maintenance of their fleet, T-38 fleet's all done by civilians. And so, when we start talking about cutting civilians or laying off civilians, that's really direct mission that we're cutting.

Admiral CULLOM. Ma'am, for the Navy, we don't see a need for a RIF, but, like General Paxton, there are the issues associated with force-shaping, and then, for us, the reallocation to be able to fill gaps at sea. We have gaps on many ships at sea, and we need to reallocate our current force structure to some of those ships.

Senator AYOTTE. I wanted to ask you—I think I'll start with General Campbell, in particular, General Paxton—OCO. So, as I understand it, from when—after the last piece of equipment leaves Afghanistan, you're going to need 3 years of OCO funding to reset. And can you tell me, is there a firm commitment to include this reset funding in the budget?

And you know what I always find fascinating about OCO around here? Everyone looks at it for everything, to fund every—every project, “Oh, we're going to fund it with OCO.” But, can you tell us what you're going to need for OCO funding in the coming years?

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am. I mean, the critical piece is what you just said there. So, we've been very consistent, since—I was a colonel back in the Pentagon in 2004–2005, when we talked about having the ability to reset our equipment 2 years after we came out. That's now 3 years after the last piece of equipment comes out to be able—it'll take to reset all that equipment.

Today, we have about \$15 billion worth of equipment in Afghanistan. We need 10 billion of that back to be able to reset. There's 5 billion that we can work with the Afghans, with other countries, that we can divest, but we need to get 10 billion of that back.

But, we've been very consistent, about 3 years to take care of all the aircraft and all the ground combat vehicles to come back in. And we do use the OCO for the training piece, because that's outside of the—everything going to Afghanistan, we've been able to use at OCO. But, last year, when we had the sequestration issues, we had to take from the base, because of the OCO issue, at about \$3.2 billion.

And so, as I talked about in my opening statement, if we can't get the OCO at a certain point, then we have to go back into the base, because we're not going to leave our men and women without what they are—what they need in Afghanistan. But, that'll impact readiness, in the end.

General PAXTON. So, Senator, we are continuing to move our gear, what we call R4OG, which is a recapture, reset, reconstitution of our gear. We've brought about 79 percent out of Afghanistan, to date, but when General Campbell and I testified in front of both of you last year, it was closer to the 3-year mark for the Marine Corps. At that time, it was 3.2 billion. But, due to a lot of hard work over the last year, that delta now is down to about 1.2 billion or 1.3 billion. So, we're going to need probably 2-plus years and about 1.2 billion, and hopefully in OCO monies, that's what we'd like to plan around, to get that gear reset, ma'am.

Senator AYOTTE. Good work on the number.

General PAXTON. Thanks.

Senator AYOTTE. Yes.

General SPENCER. Senator, if I could add—because we—reset is one thing, and we have reset requirements, as well, but there's another part. You may have heard the term "OCO to base." I mean, we went in—as some of the other Services—we went into—we are coming out of Afghanistan and Iraq with more bases than we went into it with. And so, there is this enduring requirement of, like, al-Udeid, al-Dhafra. Those bases have been coined "enduring." And so, right now, those bases are being funded out of OCO. And so, in addition to having to reset the force, we've got to figure out what we're going to do with our budget to now absorb these enduring bases that remain.

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am, on the Navy side—and I'd actually kind of divide it, really, into three areas—our OCO—as you said, there's a lot of stuff that goes into that, and certainly there's an enduring piece for the Navy, as well. And, on the enduring side, ship maintenance and aviation depot maintenance, there's certainly a good portion of that that definitely funds enduring things. It also—for CENTCOM facilities like Isa Air Base or Fujairah or Jebel Ali, are also funded with that.

There's also this—the reset piece for the Navy, because we've been resetting, if you will, in stride, but we've also been double-pumping our carrier strike groups. And, as we've done that, there wasn't the time to be able to do a lot of the reset. So, reset, for us, of 10 years of operations—and, as you know, because you—with the drydocks up there, there's only so many drydocks, and getting them through that takes a certain period of time. For us, that's about a 5-year process to—because they drydock once every 8 years. So, that's going to take us a little bit longer on that reset piece.

And then there's the continuing operations piece. And what I would suggest is—although Navy is at 9 billion for '14, in the total OCO amount, and that will certainly come down as we pull out of Iraq. If we look and think about, "Well, gosh, that should go back to where it was prior to September 11," the Navy, prior to September 11, was somewhere a little bit north of about \$1 billion a year for our supplemental monies. It's going to take more than that, in the kind of continuing operations that we have in this extraordinarily complicated world, particularly with the balancing—rebalance to the Pacific, as well.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Senator HIRONO.

Senator HIRONO. Thank you, Madam Chairman.

And, General, I appreciate your thoughts about the importance of the civilian component to our mission. I agree with you.

Admiral CULLOM, the Pearl Harbor Naval Shipyard Apprentice Program provides an opportunity to train and educate young people in the workforce, providing for development and retention of the best and the brightest, and ensuring that we attract and retain the most capable workforce and provide for educational and professional development. I have had the opportunity to many—to attend many of the graduations each year of this excellent program, and have spoken with the graduates, and they consider the work at the shipyards to be of utmost importance. It's part—it's what they do to serve the country. And, for a number of them, it's generational, that their fathers and, you know, the—generally, the fathers—even if it's women, who are now being trained more and more. So, this is important work.

Given that we have been so successful with this program in the past, what are your thoughts about the future of the program? Is it right-sized? Does it need to be expanded? Especially as we see the experience level in the shipyards going down for the foreseeable future.

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am. Thank you for the question and your thoughts about it, because it certainly is, it's a family tradition for many families, from generation to generation. In some cases, it's three, four generations who have been serving in that way to ensure that we have the kind of ships—and I would also suggest, the aircraft in our aviation depot maintenance facilities, as well.

And the training programs are absolutely essential. The more technical our aircraft and ships become—without that—they're not just out there busting rust on the deck of the ship, they're actually out there doing some pretty complicated repairs and also, in many cases, helping us do the modernizations that are pretty essential for the ships to be relevant for far into the future.

I think we're happy with where the program is right now. I think there are opportunities for us to look at where that can be expanded, where it fits within the work that we have to do. And certainly, as we were just talking about, with reset, there'll be plenty of work to do.

Senator HIRONO. Well, I note in your—this is your chart? Whose chart is this?

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am.

Senator HIRONO. So, 2014 and beyond, increasing experience in your workers, if training and investment are maintained. Is that a big "if" for you, or do you expect that it's all going to happen?

Admiral CULLOM. The training will—is continuing. And we have a fairly good program for that. As we were just talking about, the training programs are essential to be able to build that level back up so that we get beyond just having apprentices that would get into the journeymen, and we really develop that expertise. And we're in the process of doing that, but we're also kind of recovering from that whole decade between 1990 and 2000, where we sent many of those junior workers—RIF'd them and sent them away. And, in that process, we lost—I would say we created a notch of experience.



Senator HIRONO. So, are you saying that we're doing enough, we're putting enough resources to train the workforce that we need to keep our shipyards and, basically, our military going—Navy?

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am. Yes, ma'am. I think we are. And, you know, it's a fine balance with that, because if you put too much into that, then you add to the cost associated, the indirect cost associated with that. But, clearly, you know, we're trusting the judgment of our shipyard commanders and the shop personnel, the shop foremen, to ensure that they are making the case for which training programs are the most relevant, and we evaluate those all the time. Naval Sea Systems Command evaluates those for the—for how effective they are and what they're doing. So, I think, for right now, we're okay.

Senator HIRONO. Well, we know that—you know, there's been a pretty big cut to the MILCON funds, and that's important. But, then, so, too, are resources for the restorations, sustainment, and modernization funds and keeping our shipyards at their peak form and capabilities. And I know that there's pressure everywhere in the Defense budget; tradeoffs have to be made while managing RIFs. So, to you, Admiral, how important are these funds to the shipyards, and what is your outlook for sustainment, restoration, and modernization at our shipyards?

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am, you're exactly right. We recognize that the shipyards are absolutely critical to being able to maintain our warfighting readiness. And to be able to do that, they have to have the infrastructure in the shape that it needs to be, to be able to properly support, so the lights work, so that the plumbing and the equipment works and they can be able to do the repairs.

The budget funds the most critical of the deficiencies related to productivity and safety, but we are, right now, working very aggressively to look for opportunities, either through reprogramming or realignment, to try to be able to get that funding up to the 6 percent, where it should be.

Senator HIRONO. Thank you, Madam Chair.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Senator Donnelly.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you, Madam Chair.

This would be to all of you. I'm concerned about the persistent issue of suicides among servicemembers. And it's often considered a personnel issue, but I also consider it a readiness issue, as well. And, as we look at this, I was wondering—as you look at it, do you also consider this a readiness issue, as well as a personnel issue?

General CAMPBELL. Sir, absolutely, sir. And, as you know, we've been working very, very hard with a lot of different programs, partnership with outside of each post camper station. The Army's—all the Services have taken a hard look at this. We're putting behavioral health providers—we've raised those numbers at each post camper station, and we've made behavioral health teams at the brigade level. We did that in Afghanistan, and it really helped out. We're bringing it back to CONUS. We've increased behavioral staff by 150 percent, where it was 1,300 in 2003, to over 3,200 in 2013, so we continue to work through that.

Each post camper station does a holistic look at all behavioral health, all suicides, everything we kind of put under the umbrella

of ready and resilience. And resilience, for us, is about providing soldiers, family members, civilians some of the skill sets to help them when they face some of those hard things in life, whether it's relationship issues, financial issues. And by looking at resiliency, it really is tied to readiness. So, you know, one suicide is bad. We continue to work through all those.

It's much, much tougher for our National Guard and our U.S. Army Reserve, based on the geographical dispersion that they have the availability to get to some of the post camper stations, but they're doing some very innovative things in each of the States, with partnerships outside of—with armories, that kind of thing. So, we'll continue with that program.

Senator DONNELLY. A recent report that came out indicated that some of the members who this—who committed suicide, when they looked, they said there were previous mental health or suicide thoughts before they ever joined. And I was wondering if there's any look at how we can improve or update our screening process.

General CAMPBELL. Sir, that—we've been looking at that very hard. I don't have the numbers here with me that talks about the number that we think had some sort of behavioral health issue before they came in. And I think, with some medical testing, with some biomarkers that they've been working here for a couple of years, there'll be some tests that we can do in the future that could help, maybe, identify that a little bit better.

Our screening continues to get better. Returning from deployments and identifying soldiers at high risk, and being able to make sure that we cover down to provide them resources. But, we've got to switch gears a little bit and make sure we do that as soldiers come in, as well.

Senator DONNELLY. I was fortunate—Ranking Member and I—Ranking Member Ayotte and I were in Israel just a few days, and, when we were there, we were fortunate to get a briefing from the IDF, the Israeli Defense Forces, their suicide prevention team. And one of the things they have done is, they have pushed it pretty far down into the chain of command to have people who are looking and keeping an eye out. And basically, instead of up here, it starts down here and works up. And so, a lot of the leaders right there on the ground are the ones who are telling people higher up in the chain, "Look, this person is struggling a little bit, and we'd love to get him help."

And I just recently got a report back from the DOD, and they said, "Well, you know, we're not seeing that that provides much help." And so, I would like to say, here, that, when we talked to the IDF, their numbers dramatically were reduced, the lower they went into the chain of command, so that people who are with them every day could just give a heads-up to other folks, saying, "This person's really suffering a challenge now." And I just want to—if you could take it back to the DOD that—they may want to take another look at this—

General CAMPBELL. I don't know who you talked to in DOD, sir, but I think all of us would tell you, the lower that we get that—you've got to know everything about that soldier—where he lives, if he's married, not married, financial issues. That's all about being good teammates and taking care and having a battle buddy. And

I think all of the Services do that very, very good, and we'll continue to look at other ways to make sure we do that. But, you know, if we can set policy and procedures at the four-star level, it doesn't matter, it's got to happen on the ground with battle buddies taking care of each other, making sure that they understand, if they have an issue, that there's no stigma to going to get help.

And we have folks, like Medal of Honor recipient Ty Carter, who's come back, had some issues. His platoon sergeant grabbed him, said, "Hey, you need to get some help." He became suicidal. He got that help, now he's really, you know, a spokesperson. And if somebody with that type of valor can go forward and say, "I need help," you know, we've got to continue to spread the word. But, it starts at the lowest—

Senator DONNELLY. Well, we really appreciate your help and your words on this, because, you know, having a good teammate, as we work with DOD on this, to enable us to, as you said, have your battle buddies be able to give that information, we would appreciate the chance to work with you so we can try to further educate some of the other folks who are working on this issue. Thank you.

In regards to force structure, General Campbell, you and I were fortunate enough to get a chance to talk a little bit yesterday, and I know there are going to be—there's proposals that are out there. The proposals that are out there, how would you characterize them, in terms of referencing what the force structure looked like pre-September 11 to today? Are they going to be fairly similar, in terms of mix, or how would we look at that?

General CAMPBELL. Sir, I think—well, first off, it depends on whether we go to full sequestration or not. So, if we get help from Congress not to go to full sequestration, that will really help.

But, what I would tell you is that it's got to be a balance. And we're trying to balance the end strength, the force structure, the readiness, and the modernization. Prior to September 11, the active Army was at about 483–484k; we're going to down to 490, then down to 450. The National Guard was probably at about 350, they went up to about 358, they're going down to 350, then maybe 335.

So, it's going to be lower than pre-September 11. And, as you know, the world we live in continues to be dangerous, but we are doing some things to help ourselves out, to remain in balance, to reorganize the brigade combat teams, both on the active and the Guard side, to make sure we have the most capable things—most capable brigades that we can have. But, they're going to be smaller.

Senator DONNELLY. Okay.

General CAMPBELL. There are some very tough decisions, as we go forward, on aviation restructure. We talked a little bit about that.

Senator DONNELLY. And other tough decisions are in areas of compensation in other areas, as well. And, as you look at compensation changing some of the ways it's going to be handled for the future, do you think that will—if there are compensation changes, do you think we'll still be able to retain the quality and the people we need to protect and defend our Nation? And that would be for any of you.

General CAMPBELL. Sir, I'd—you know, we talked a little bit about it earlier, about the morale and the impact. And what I think we really have to do is make sure we do a holistic look, and we don't keep piecemealing these soldiers and these families, say, "We're going to take some of this, next year we're going to take this, next we're going to take this," and do a one-time, "Here's what it is," because—I mean, they understand that we have to get smaller, they understand that they have to pay a little bit of sacrifice here, but they also understand that they're part of one-half of 1 percent in this Nation that stood up and said, "Hey, send me to protect everybody else."

Senator DONNELLY. Right.

General CAMPBELL. So, they deserve something special; and everything that we can do for them, we ought to do.

But, we're not trying to—what we're really trying to do, I think all the Services would tell you, is, we're not trying to take away, we're just trying to slow down the ramp of where we're at on compensation. And we're very blessed, over the last 12 years, for what Congress has provided us and all of our soldiers. But, the cost of a soldier today, both for medical and everything else, has gone up incredible. And we can't continue on that path and be status quo without making some very, very tough decisions, and we just have to be smart how we go about it.

Senator DONNELLY. Well, I would like to pass on to you—and, I know, Senator Ayotte, as well, and Senator Shaheen and everyone in this committee—Senator Ayotte and I were also in Afghanistan, and, when we were there, the parliamentarians from their country said to thank all of the members of our military for everything they've done to try to provide them with a country where their kids can grow up in peace, where their families can grow old, and when their country can have a solid future. So, I wanted to pass on, from all of those folks—and there was a number of them—how much they appreciate everything you have done to give them that chance.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you very much, Senator Donnelly and Senator Ayotte, for sharing what you heard in Afghanistan.

Gentlemen, I think everyone here would agree that our men and women who are serving in our military are among the best and brightest in this country, and we probably have the most outstanding force we've had, certainly in my lifetime, and probably in the history of this country. But, there have been some high-profile scandals recently that I think we need to ask about as we're talking about the impact on readiness.

Admiral Cullom, there was a recent cheating scandal at the Navy Nuclear Power School in South Carolina. There was a—some more scandal in the Air Force. And there have been several very high profile stories about leadership on the part of some of our leaders serving in the military, and their leadership styles and questions about bullying and other behaviors. And I wonder if you can talk about what systemic efforts are underway to address these kinds of challenges, if there are any.

I know that there are investigations underway of both of the scandals that I mentioned, and I'm not going to ask you to comment on those, but just, if you would, to—if you can talk about

what efforts are being looked at to address some of these challenges.

And I don't know who—Admiral?

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am, I'll start out.

With regard to the Nuclear Power School issue, it certainly has the direct attention of the Navy leadership. Admiral Richardson is the head of Naval Reactors, is certainly very involved in trying to get to the heart of this. And we will follow up with Congress when the investigation is complete.

The safety—as you know, the safety of the nuclear powerplants is—has been something of paramount importance to us, and we've done, I think, a pretty good job over well over 55 years in doing so. But, that doesn't come without a constant vigilance that you have to have for what the appropriate standards are for personal responsibility, for the rigorous oversight that you have to have for a program like that, as well as the highly trained personnel and the—and what you put into them to instill them with the right standards on it. And the foundation of the conduct throughout the Navy really is integrity, on all these issues, but particularly acute in that area.

I'm a nuclear-trained officer, myself, and I can tell you that I'm pretty confident that the knowledge and the standards are there. There are a few people that choose not to follow those. But, we have to make sure that we look at and that we examine. And what we are in the process of doing is examining that right now to get to the heart of it.

But, the culture there, as well as the culture throughout, I think, all of our Services, is that it demands accountability—accountability for these things and that we have to make sure that people understand what they need to achieve, what they need to get to for that.

From the leadership side of the house, CNO has instituted a Navy leadership development strategy to strengthen our profession and to reemphasize those things. And that involves professional ethics, modules that are incorporated through—not only at the flag officer level, but all the way on down to newly commissioned officers. And that's certainly one thing we think will certainly help, from the leadership perspective, but it's got to be instilled from the ground all the way up. And that's what generates the trust, the trust that we have for each other as battle buddies, the trust that we have—that, frankly, families have. When they offer up a young man or woman into the service of their country, that's what they expect out of the leadership in charge, is that they will have that trust and have that sense of accountability for it, and to ensure that we all operate by the right standards.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

General Spencer.

General SPENCER. Senator, we're similar to the Navy. And I can tell you what I do know so far about the, sort of, cheating scandal. As you know, we have our young nuclear officers—they take tests—periodic tests, and the—some were found to be cheating on the tests. What was interesting, though, is, we found that they weren't cheating to pass the test, which is a score of 90, they were cheating to score 100, which—and we're confident that they know

their job, because we—as soon as we heard about it, we retested, not only them, but all three missile wings, and they all had—they had a pass rate of 96 percent. So, we know they can do their job. They are tested in a simulator periodically. We watch them do their job. We have—we give no-notice inspections. We know they can do their job. But, there was something there that we're getting to the bottom of, one, about—you know, there is no excuse for cheating, period, so that's an issue that we're addressing, but this sense of 100 versus 90, and why is that so important, it's also sort of got us to examine training versus testing. In other words, is it more important to just miss a question and then someone explain to you why you missed the question, or is it more important, you know, to—so, we're weighing that testing versus training.

You may be aware, in terms of ethical behavior—the Secretary of Defense is in the process of standing up an ethical office similar—now, all of us meet every week, with the Secretary of Defense, on sexual assault, and—so, he's having a similar structure for ethical behavior, as well.

Senator SHAHEEN. Oh, I was not aware of that.

Do either of you want to—

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am, if I could just add to that. You know, I think, for all of us, it comes down to—we talk about the three C's: competence, character, and commitment. And we've really got to continue to work through that, and trust between soldier to soldier, trust between soldiers and their leaders, and trust between the soldier and the American people. In some areas, we've—you know, we've lost a little bit of that, based on some of the incidents that you talked about.

What I would tell you, though, is, as I see it—and I work all the general officer discipline as a Vice; I think all the Vices do that for Active, Guard, and Reserve—the number is very, very small.

Senator SHAHEEN. Sure.

General CAMPBELL. I mean, high profile makes the paper, and we hold ourselves to a higher standard. We should. That's what the American people expect. But, it's a very small number. And it's not like a newspaper person has a “aha” moment and they've found out something. We give it to them. We do the investigations. They—we give the information to them. And so, it's not like they're doing investigating reporting you'll find somebody.

I feel very confident, and still confident, that, you know, we still have the very best men and women that come in. But, we've got to continue to get better. We're doing 360-degree surveys on lieutenant colonels, colonels, commanders, command sergeant majors now, so they get an assessment of how their peers, how their subordinates feel. We do much more on command-climate surveys at all different levels. Larry talked about the Secretary of Defense's meeting on sexual assault. We do that every single week, the Vices go. All the Services are doing best practices from each other, to help each other out, to continue to go.

And, I think, you know, we have to come back and show you that we are making a difference, and continue to keep the trust of the American people. I think you know that all the Services, as they do their polls every year, are very, very high in trust of American people.

So, this is a very small percentage. That doesn't mean it's good. We've got to continue to do everything we can to get better. But, I feel very confident that we're working at this very hard.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

General Paxton, anything you want to add?

General PAXTON. As always, General Campbell hit it all, ma'am. I mean, we've increased the 360-degree surveys. We've increased command-climate surveys. You know, as is always the case, even if you have great people and good habits, every now and then you just need to turn the lens inward, and maybe you've focused on some training or focused on some deployment or focused on some retrograde, and you just need to go back and kind of reinstall some basics. Commandant, himself, has done that with his ethics lecture, his heritage brief, his reawakening brief. So, we're comfortable that we've got the right people focused on the right issues here, ma'am.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you.

General Spencer, I wanted to ask you—obviously, we took the program—the Special Victims' Counsel Program that was in—being done as a pilot in the Air Force, and really took the lead on that, and extended it throughout the forces with the recent legislation we passed to address military sexual assault. This is something that I think is a very important step forward to make sure that victims have advocacy for them and within the system.

So, I just wanted to see, from your perspective, how your program was going, because it's really the first one that we're going to extend to now working to extend to the rest of the Services.

General SPENCER. Sure. Thanks, Senator. I mean, in a word, the program has been great. And, you know, we're cautiously optimistic about what we're finding, but, you know, our reporting is up, which we think is good. And, in fact, 10 percent of our reports that go up are for those that had sexual assault before they even came in the military. So, we think we're restoring confidence in the system to report.

One of the big things that we point right at the Special Victims' Counsel for is our restricted or unrestricted rate has gone up 41 percent. So, people—a victim or an alleged victim who's—who works with the Special Victims' Counsel is now a lot more willing to come forward and pursue the case. So, that's been a real success story for us.

We've had 681 clients since we started this in January 2013. Ninety-two percent say they were extremely satisfied with the service, and 98 percent said they would—if they knew of another victim, they would recommend a Special Victims' Counsel. So, we—it has worked very well for us, and it—and we think it's been very successful.

Senator AYOTTE. Well, excellent, because you're going to lead the way for the rest of the forces as they implement this program. So, I'm glad to hear that it's going well in the Air Force, because, obviously, all of you will be implementing this program and looking to the Air Force for their experience on it, and I think it's a really important step forward for victims.

I wanted to get back to General Paxton, because I knew there was something you wanted to add on OCO, and give you that opportunity, if there's something you wanted to—

General PAXTON. Thank you, Senator. I had almost forgotten.

This goes to bridging the point that General Campbell made and that General Spencer made when Senator Shaheen was asking earlier. Just to remind her that, as we look at asymmetric warfare throughout—out there in a asymmetric world, we obviously want to organize, train, and equip our people to succeed on the most dangerous battlefield. And, in order to do that, the gear that we have purchased has become more expensive, and there's more of it. So, it's roughly costing us five-and-a-half times more to equip a soldier or a marine today than we did on September 10, and three-and-a-half times more to equip the battalion or the grassroots-level unit, in terms of moving capability, a vehicle that'll withstand an IED, that has an V-shaped hull, ESAPI plates for the individual, enhanced com gear, optics for the rifles, night-vision goggles, things like that.

So, number one, that's the cost in OCO to equip them. And then, number two is, as they come back after 12 years of the fight, we have to figure out what that right balance is, how much of that we hold, how much of the old stuff we get rid of. Our motor pools need more room, our armories need more room. So, we want to make sure that the good money that you provided for us, and the sound investment we made on behalf of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines, is actually retained. So, that's some of the money that we'll need when we talk about reset. The reset has a bigger scope, back here in CONUS after the war.

Thank you for—thank you, Senator, for coming back.

Senator AYOTTE. Thanks.

And, General Campbell, something that I've been hearing feedback on, and I just want to get some thoughts on. So, what I've been hearing feedback on is—I understand the active Duty reductions. Don't like them. But, also, there's reductions proposed in the Guard and Reserve. And cost efficiency—when they're deployed, I understand they're the same cost; however, when they're not deployed, my understanding is that the cost structure is less for Guard and Reserve.

So, I think you can make an argument that, even though you're reducing Active-Duty Force, you wouldn't necessarily reduce Guard and Reserve. And I wanted to get your response to that issue, because it keeps coming back to me from, you know, leadership of the Guard and Reserve, to understand why we'd be doing that, in terms of cost efficiency.

Understand that I think the reductions are too low, overall, so that puts that issue aside for a minute, but I'd like to hear your thinking on that.

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am, thank you.

And the same thinking with our Secretary and with our Chief, to—when we had to take a look at cuts, that we would disproportionately cut the active first, because we grew the active both for Iraq and Afghanistan. So, the initial round of cuts, going from 570 down to 490, we really didn't touch the National Guard, and not



really much on the U.S. Army Reserve. And that was okay, again, as we grew.

But, it's not just about costs. And there are many elements of the National Guard that are cheaper, and it's designed that way. But, once mobilized, as you talked about, they do become as expensive, or more expensive. The armor brigades and the aviation piece is more expensive, just based on time to train and get ready to go.

Again, there's nobody bad, here. We need the total force. We need Active, we need Guard, and we need Reserve. We just have to balance, you know, the size of each, and where we go with it.

There are certain pieces of the Guard that have to be at a certain readiness level all the time, just like the active. Same thing with the U.S. Army Reserve. But, we don't need all of them at the same time as the active.

You know, I'd go around and talk to soldiers I commanded in Iraq and Afghanistan. I had National Guard soldiers with me. And what they would tell me is, they loved being in the National Guard. They loved the predictability, they loved being a citizen soldier. And if they wanted to do it 24/7, they would have stayed on the active side. They don't want to do that. They want to have a family, they want to have their other business.

And so, that's why the Secretary of Defense, years ago, said, "Let's get this BOG dwell of 1-to-5. We'll keep the Active at a 1-to-3." Many of our units, like our aviation, we could not get to the 1-to-3, and many times we're below the 1-to-2 overall for our aviation.

And I'll just very quickly talk the aviation restructure. Because of sequestration, if we want to continue to have the very best aviation capability in the world, on the rotary side, we can't go status quo. That's why we've made some bold shift to try to get rid of some legacy aircraft, continue to modernize the Black Hawks and the Chinooks and the Apaches that we have, to move forward. If we don't do that, it's really going to put us in a bind and cost additional money that we'll have to take out of readiness.

But, the numbers, again, we're going to disproportionately take out the active. That's okay. We're going to go to about a 54-percent reliance on the Guard and Reserve, verse about a 46 percent on the active, and have more reliance on the Reserve and the Guard as we go forward.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you.

I wanted to talk—raise something, an experience that I had in Afghanistan, and wanted to get, particularly, your take on it, General Campbell. So, I heard a lot from our Special Forces and Army guys on the ground about the A-10, for understandable reasons, because obviously I've been pretty out there on the A-10. And what I heard—for example, I had a Special Forces guy come up to me, saying, "You know, the night before, the A-10s really saved our butts, because they were out with the Afghan national forces in the lead, and our Special Forces were with them, and this—the support that the A-10s provided was critical in that setting, because it was a close-contact setting."

So, I wanted to just hear—you've commanded in Iraq and Afghanistan. What has been your experience with the A-10, in terms of—because the feedback I was getting repeatedly on the ground

were from the guys that are really taking the fire every day for us, was, "This airframe is important." So, what would—what's been your experience with it?

General CAMPBELL. Yes, ma'am. I mean, commanding 101st and RC-East, where we had A-10 capability to come in and provide that close-air support to our soldiers in very bad terrain, what I think the soldiers on the ground, both the special operators and conventional force, would tell you is, it's a game-changer. It's ugly, it's loud—

Senator AYOTTE. I know.

General CAMPBELL.—but, when it comes in, and you hear that [mimicking A-10 engine noise], it just makes a difference. And so, it would be a game-changer.

But, I fully understand, you know, the very, very tough choices that the Air Force has to make, just like the Army, as we go forward. And, you know, what we've asked the Air Force is, "You have to provide us the very, very best close-air support." And I'm confident that they will.

Senator AYOTTE. Yes. I think we need to understand, though, that it's not going to be the same, and—for our guys on the ground. They have a different opinion, in terms of whether our other airframes can really provide the same kind of protection that they feel like they're getting from the A-10.

So, I thank you all. And I wanted to ask your experience there, because I just wanted to share with everyone what I heard from just the guys on the ground. And I wasn't even asking about it. For some reason, they knew I was involved in this issue.

So, thanks.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

I only have a couple more questions. But, one of them is—as you all know, one emerging requirement from combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan has been the development of an enhanced performance round for firing so that it could penetrate better both hard and soft targets. As I understand, that means we had to develop a new bullet that could actually penetrate in some places where we had not been able to with lead, and that tungsten has been used, rather than lead, in those bullets. I also understand that one of the benefits is decreasing groundwater contamination and pollution, which sometimes occurs from those lead bullets.

So, I wonder if you can give us any update on how successful those EPRs are, and whether we expect to continue to use those kinds of bullets.

General CAMPBELL. Ma'am, I think the soldiers on the ground, and what I've seen myself, is that the M-855 Alpha 1, the EPR round, is much more effective. You know, we were designing a bullet that would be lead-free, but what this does is did that, and it also provides more penetrating power. You know, we—and so, guys will tell you, as we sit there taking shots at that in the past, or they may have taken a shot, it went right through, it didn't knock that insurgent down. This does the job. So, it's making a difference, and has saved lives over there.

Senator SHAHEEN. Okay, thank you.

I assume everybody has the similar experience?

Admiral CULLOM. Ma'am, on the Navy side, we haven't really used the new 855 Alpha-1. Our special operators, however, still use the old 855, and we still have several more years worth of that inventory left, but certainly understand that that—that the new one provides greater capability.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you.

My final question has to do with uniforms, because I'm sure you're all aware that we put language into the Defense bill last year on combat and camouflaged utility uniforms. And I understand, in this era of limited resources, that this is one place where there might be some savings. I also understand that, as part of the language we put into the Defense bill, we were expecting some implementing guidance to foster greater collaboration among the branches.

So, I wonder if you all could speak to what the status of that guidance is, where we are as we're looking at trying to improve development and cooperation among the various branches with respect to uniforms. Combat uniforms. I should be clear.

General PAXTON. Thanks, Senator Shaheen. So, I'll start, and the pass to my battle buddy, here.

As you know, in the case of the Marine Corps, we have two separate and distinct uniforms. Same pattern, actually patented. And so—and we have shared some of the technology behind those uniforms. The Army, I know, I think, is the executive agent for some of that testing there. So, I think, as in everything that we do, there's a high degree of collaboration whenever, wherever possible, in terms of technologies and designs, whether it's visibility from infrared at—or at night or cold weather or wet weather or drying or wicking or things like that. So, I think we're all committed to continue working together to get the best technology and the best capability out there that—because we want to equip the soldier, sailor, airman, and marine to survive on the modern battlefield. So, I don't think there's any reluctance to share ideas and things like that.

I mean, as you can probably see from the four of us sitting here, we each have a high degree of culture and a real, you know, positive commitment to keeping those cultures. I mean, I really like soldiers, airmen, and sailors; I just happen to love marines. [Laughter.]

So—but, we're committed to share, and we're committed to reduce costs, to the best way possible, ma'am.

Senator SHAHEEN. General Campbell, would you like to add to that?

General CAMPBELL. Ma'am, I'd agree with General Paxton. You know, the Army is committed to making sure we provide our soldiers the very best equipment. That includes the uniforms. We're very thankful, over the last 12 years, of the ability to adjust and make changes to uniforms very quickly when we found out that the ACU that we went to, probably in 2004–2005 timeframe, which was much better than the uniform we had before that, and it worked well for Iraq, it worked for a little bit in Afghanistan, but, as we saw up in the mountains up in RC-East that it didn't work, we had to go to more of a multicam. We were able to get the money

from Congress to be able to make those changes and adapt very quickly.

And I think we're committed, as all the Services, to make sure that we're responsible, based on the budget and where we go, and to work together. We're in testing right now, over the next several months, from March til about October, on a couple of different types. And I think we're sharing that with all of the Services to make sure we're on the same sheet of music as we go forward. I mean, that—it makes sense that we just have to get better to be more fiscally responsible. Uniforms is just one of those things we'll take on.

Senator SHAHEEN. So, should we expect some guidance anytime soon on this?

General CAMPBELL. I don't think we're going to have the testing piece, for us, until probably the end-of-October timeframe. And then I'll make sure that our folks are tied in with the Marine Corps and the other Services.

General PAXTON. I mean, I think we've worked with the committee, ma'am, and with the full Senate, so, I mean, we're quite comfortable with the uniforms we have, and we've got a commitment out there that, if there are changes in either composition or material like that, we'll continue to work within the existing pattern, so we'll minimize the cost, and then we'll share those technologies with other Services. Yes, ma'am.

Senator SHAHEEN. Good. And everybody is in agreement that that's the way we ought to be operating?

Admiral CULLOM. Yes, ma'am. And the collaboration really is very strong and ongoing, and we're—our Naval Supply Command, NAVSUP, has gotten a great deal of information from both the Marine Corps and the Army and Air Force. And I'll leave—

Senator SHAHEEN. Okay, thank you.

Well, given the hour, I don't have any further questions at this time. We will leave the record open until end of business on Friday for any other questions that may be submitted for the record.

Let me, again, apologize to all of you for the need to recess this hearing and to go vote. I hate to take your time to do that, and we will try and schedule better in the future.

And again, thank you, to all of you and the men and women you represent, for what you do to ensure that this country is secure.

This hearing is adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 4:54 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]