

**HEARING TO CONTINUE TO RECEIVE TESTI-
MONY ON THE ACTIVE, GUARD, RESERVE,
AND CIVILIAN PERSONNEL IN REVIEW OF
THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2013 AND THE FUTURE
YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM**

WEDNESDAY, APRIL 25, 2012

U.S. SENATE
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 11:33 a.m. in room SD-106, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Jim Webb (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Webb, Graham, Brown, and Ayotte.

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

Majority staff members present: Jonathan D. Clark, counsel; Gabriella E. Fahrner, counsel; and Gerald J. Leeling, counsel.

Minority staff member present: Richard F. Walsh, minority counsel.

Staff assistant present: Jennifer R. Knowles.

Committee members' assistants present: Gordon Peterson, assistant to Senator Webb; Ethan Saxon, assistant to Senator Blumenthal; Brad Bowman, assistant to Senator Ayotte; Sergio Sarkany, assistant to Senator Graham; and Joshua Hodges, assistant to Senator Vitter.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JIM WEBB, CHAIRMAN

Senator WEBB. The hearing will come to order.

The subcommittee meets today to receive testimony from the military services on military and civilian personnel programs contained in the administration's national defense authorization request for fiscal year 2013 and for the future years defense program.

I would like to begin this hearing by thanking everybody for adjusting their schedules. As you have been informed, we have a series of votes that will begin in approximately 1 hour. So I am going to summarize my statement, at the end of which I will have my full statement entered into the record. And then I think we previously asked that the civilian assistant secretaries give a brief overview of theirs. All of the other statements will be entered into

the record. The written statements will be entered into the record, and hopefully we can allow enough time for members who wish to ask questions to use this next hour in a fruitful manner.

And as always, the hearing record will be open until close of business tomorrow if there are written questions for the record for any of those of you who are here today.

We have today the senior leaders responsible for military and civilian personnel matters within the services. We will discuss, as always, the plans and programs for fiscal year 2013 and also specific budget items in furtherance of this subcommittee's oversight responsibilities.

We have Thomas Lamont, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; Juan Garcia III, Assistant Secretary of the Navy for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; Daniel Ginsburg, Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Manpower and Reserve Affairs; General Thomas Bostick, Deputy Chief of Staff, U.S. Army; Admiral Scott Van Buskirk, Chief of Naval Personnel, U.S. Navy; General Robert Milstead, Assistant Commandant for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, U.S. Marine Corps; and General Darrell D. Jones, Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower and Reserve Affairs, U.S. Air Force.

We had originally scheduled this hearing for a few weeks ago. At that time, General Milstead was recovering from some very serious surgery. We are pleased that you have successfully recuperated, although you might have been better off being able to avoid this hearing a couple weeks ago. But we are very happy to have you with us today, General.

As I stated at our oversight hearing with OSD witnesses in March, we have got some very serious challenges here. General Schwartz, Air Force Chief of Staff, called these challenges with personnel programs "the monumental defense issue of our time." These challenges, as everyone knows, have been made more difficult by the Budget Control Act.

Much of the subcommittee hearing last month was devoted to the TRICARE fee issue. I am not going to go into that in any detail today. Just suffice it to say that it is an issue of great concern to me and some other members on this committee.

We are concerned about the planned reduction of large numbers of military personnel, more than 120,000 across service components. I have been able to have personal discussions with a number of you about that issue. It may come up again today.

The Integrated Disability Evaluation System does not seem to be working. I have been able to have discussions again out of this hearing room with people about that. It is being implemented worldwide. There are some 23,000 servicemembers in the system that at least by our count, that are still awaiting some sort of resolution.

We are interested in examining the roles and opportunities for service by women. The Marine Corps, particularly, has had an interesting week in that regard. We will have a discussion about that.

Sexual assault prevention and response remains a priority, as always, for our subcommittee.

And another priority is the many discussions we have had regarding total force mix of military personnel, DOD civilian personnel, and contractors. This has come up a number of different times. It was a major part of our hearing last year. It will come up again today.

And lastly, we continue to be interested in the DOD and Services' efforts to eliminate, reduce, and reallocate 140 general flag officer positions and 150 Senior Executive Service positions.

At the outset of the hearing, I think it is important for those of us who are on this end of the table to express our great appreciation to all of you for what you and the people who serve alongside you do every day to make our country more secure and also to make the Department of Defense a better functioning place.

With that, Senator Graham, welcome.

[The prepared statement of Senator Webb follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will just forgo an opening statement and look forward to receiving the testimony.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

We have received a statement from the Reserve Officers Association, and if there is no objection, that will also be entered into the record and any longer statement, Senator Graham, that you have. And I had mentioned earlier, my own opening statement will be entered into the record.

[The information referred to follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator WEBB. So with that, we will start with Secretary Lamont. Hopefully, you can summarize in about 3 minutes or so your statement.

STATEMENT OF HON. THOMAS R. LAMONT, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE ARMY FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS; AND LTG THOMAS P. BOSTICK, USA, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF G-1, U.S. ARMY

Mr. LAMONT. I will try to do it in half of that, if you do not mind. I have truncated my lofty words and will rely upon our written statement.

Senator WEBB. Your written statement in full will be entered into the record.

Mr. LAMONT. Thank you.

Chairman Webb and Senator Graham and members of this committee, thank you for taking the time to explore the issues that are so critical to the men and women in our all-volunteer Army and to our National defense both today and in the future.

It is an honor to serve as the Army's Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Reserve Affairs.

After a decade of war, the Army is poised to draw down both our military and civilian forces. We must do this smartly and compassionately. Thousands of individuals will transition out of military and civil service after serving faithfully and honorably. They will need the support of the Nation and deserve quality transition assistance.

Wartime experiences over the past decade have taught us that we must have a total Army. The Army National Guard and Army

Reserve provide 51 percent of the Army's military end strength for around 16 percent of the base budget. We look forward to working with you to transform the Army National Guard and Army Reserve into an operational force that provides not only ready access to 1 million trained soldiers but also an historic opportunity for our Nation to achieve the most cost-effective use of its army.

We are increasingly aware of the physical and emotional toll a decade of war has taken on our force, and we are committed to providing quality assistance to soldiers and family members who are struggling with issues such as substance abuse, depression, post traumatic stress, and sexual harassment and abuse. These issues affect readiness and weaken our force. The Army continues to take aggressive action to promote health, identify and reduce risky behaviors, and prevent suicides. Further, at all levels of the Army, we are reinforcing the Army value of respect in order to establish a climate where sexual harassment, sexual assault, and hazing will not be tolerated.

While we transform to a smaller Army, we remain dedicated to improving readiness and building resilience in our soldiers, civilians, and families. The Army must not and will not sacrifice readiness as it draws down. We will emerge from the forthcoming budget reductions a leaner force but one still capable of and committed to meeting our obligations to the Nation, the American people, and the dedicated men and women who serve. Although our Army will become smaller in the coming months and years, we will preserve the quality of our All-Volunteer Force. This fighting force will retain the confidence and pride of the American people as it has for more than 236 years.

I appreciate the support of the committee and your commitment to taking care of our soldiers, civilians, and families. The well-being of our force, regardless of its size, is absolutely dependent upon your tremendous support.

Thank you very much, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Lamont and General Bostick follows:]

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Secretary Lamont.

Now, General Bostick, your full written statement will be entered into the record, and you, I know, will be receiving some questions during the question period.

Secretary Garcia, welcome.

STATEMENT OF HON. JUAN M. GARCIA III, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS; VADM SCOTT R. VAN BUSKIRK, USN, CHIEF OF NAVAL PERSONNEL, U.S. NAVY; AND LT. GEN. ROBERT E. MILSTEAD, JR., USMC, ASSISTANT COMMANDANT FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS, U.S. MARINE CORPS

Mr. GARCIA. Thank you, Senator. I also will be short.

Chairman Webb, Senator Graham, and distinguished members of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to speak about the sailors, marines, and civilians who comprise the Department of the Navy.

There have been many successful changes in the Department of the Navy since I testified before you last spring. We have 23 female

officers assigned to submarines, with more being assigned in the very near future.

Last year I spoke of new Navy ROTC units at Arizona State University and Rutgers. This year I am pleased to report that we are expanding our ROTC presence at Harvard, Yale, and Columbia as part of our goal to make naval service a viable option for the young men and women from all regions and all segments of society.

In addition to ensuring our manpower and personnel policies meet our country's security requirements, it is my honor and privilege to represent and advocate for the more than 800,000 sailors, marines, and civilian employees. We are always prepared to respond to the needs of our Nation.

Both sea services will strive to meet their operational requirements with as an efficient a force as possible. For the Navy, this means continuing to move sailors from shore support functions to sea duty to enhance operational readiness. Such a shift not only means fewer sailors will be available for important work ashore, but also that sailors will, on average, spend more time at sea away from their families. For the Marines, the reduction of nearly 20,000 in end strength coincides with the planned withdrawal from Afghanistan.

Our highest priority remains the care and recovery of our wounded, ill, and injured servicemembers. The Department of the Navy is leading the way in innovative, therapeutic treatments of our wounded warriors. At the National Intrepid Center of Excellence, the department is pioneering research into diagnosis and treatment of traumatic brain injury and post traumatic stress disorder, but more work remains in this area.

I wish to thank the committee members for your continuous and unwavering commitment to support the Navy and Marine Corps and the brave men and women who as sailors and marines serve bravely in Afghanistan, spend months at sea apart from their families, combat pirates in the Indian Ocean, board drug runners in the Caribbean, guard embassies throughout the world, conduct humanitarian missions whenever and wherever needed, and perform countless other missions, often under unimaginably demanding conditions and circumstances. Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Garcia, Admiral Van Buskirk, and General Milstead follows:]

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Secretary Garcia.

And Admiral Van Buskirk and General Milstead, your full statements will be entered into the record at this time. And we will also get back to you during questioning.

[The prepared statements of Admiral Van Buskirk and General Milstead follow:]

Senator WEBB. Secretary Ginsberg, welcome.

STATEMENT OF HON. DANIEL B. GINSBERG, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE FOR MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS; AND LT. GEN. DARRELL D. JONES, USAF, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR MANPOWER, PERSONNEL, AND SERVICES, USAF

Mr. GINSBERG. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Webb, Ranking Member Graham, and members of the subcommittee, General Jones and I would like to thank you for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of more than 700,000 airmen, Active, Guard and Reserve, and civilian who make up the most capable aerospace and cyberspace force the world has ever known. We know that you and members of the subcommittee are keenly interested in the well-being and support of our airmen. We must start by thanking you all for everything that you have done to support them each and every day.

In the past year, our Nation's airmen have performed magnificently, carrying out operations precipitated by Arab Spring, major natural disasters, homeland security missions, and ongoing overseas contingencies in Afghanistan and the conclusion of our Iraq operations.

As you know, it is vital to visit our airmen firsthand and see their contributions and challenges they face every day, and we can assure you that from Japan to Florida, from Wyoming to Kandahar, your members of the United States Air Force are laying it on the line for the Nation every single day.

It is due to the quality of our All-Volunteer Force that your Air Force can project focused military power to achieve strategic, operational, and tactical objectives globally in support of our National security interests.

We have no higher priority than taking care of our airmen and ensuring that they have the resources and support that they and their families need to stay focused and ready to perform the demanding missions we assign to them.

As this committee already is well aware, the Air Force had to make very hard choices in this year's budget submission. We had to reconcile top-line reductions with our requirement to fulfill our global commitments and maintain acceptable levels of readiness while still sustaining key quality life and core services for our people. Despite a difficult budget situation, the Air Force is committed to providing cost-effective medical care services and programs to maintain a healthy and resilient force. We must support our people to meet the demands of high operation tempo and persistent conflict. Developing and caring for our airmen will remain a key focus as we continue to become more efficient and develop smarter and more agile approaches to our achieving security objectives.

Again, on behalf of Secretary Donley and General Schwartz and all of our airmen, we thank you for your commitment and support to our Air Force and we look forward to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Ginsberg and General Jones follows:]

Senator WEBB. Thank you very much, Secretary Ginsberg.

And, General Jones, both of your full statements will be entered into the record at this time.

I am going to ask three questions, and then I am going to move along to whichever other Senators on the subcommittee wish to ask questions.

First, Secretary Ginsberg, let me ask for your clarification on something. When I was in the Pentagon, the way the budget process worked was, first, the services got together with their different components. They got the budget submissions. They argued against

a top line. They figured out their budget. Then the different services presented their budgets to OSD, and I sat on the Defense Resources Board for 4 years. The Defense Resources Board would examine the service budgets. They would challenge different components of it. You came up with a DOD budget signed of by the Deputy Secretary of Defense and eventually by the Secretary. That was then brought to OMB. OMB scrubbed it. Then you had a DOD budget, and it came over here to the Congress. And once it came over to the Congress, DOD as a whole was expected to support that budget.

Is that the way things work?

Mr. GINSBERG. Yes, sir. I think that is fundamentally the basic outlines of the way it works today. We develop our budgets through what we call the corporate process. What that really does is bring together every component of the Air Force, every office that has equity in the budget, and we develop a program that is, of course, meeting the strategic guidance the President lays out then within the fiscal realities and we submit it to OSD. And the other services have a chance to look at it. We develop a program and then we submit it up through OMB.

Senator WEBB. And it is a corporate process.

Mr. GINSBERG. Yes, sir.

Senator WEBB. For instance, a little more than 20 years ago, there was an Air Force chief of staff named Larry Welch who I had served in the Pentagon with and who was widely expected to become Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. He went over to the House side and had a discussion with Les Aspin about a tradeoff at that time between Minuteman and Midgetman missile programs, how much money would go into one or the other. And he made a statement that he would personally support—in his opinion, he could personally support something that had not been in the budget. By the time he got back to the Pentagon, he was reprimanded by the Secretary of Defense.

There was an article in the New York Times yesterday about the Air National Guard lobbying the Hill against budget cuts that were in a scrubbed budget. Are you aware of that effort?

Mr. GINSBERG. No, sir. I read that article. I do not know specifically what that was referring to. No, sir.

Senator WEBB. It said for 2 months the Air National Guard, with the help of Governors from every State, has been battling the active duty Air Force over proposed budget cuts. I can hear Senator Graham wanting to get to the mic here. [Laughter.]

What do you think about that?

Mr. GINSBERG. Well, sir, maybe this—I do not know exactly what that is referring to again. So, of course, there you have the adjutants general of the United States who are sort of the chief military advisors in the State role to their Governors. When they are the adjutants general, they are—

Senator WEBB. What if they are over here in uniform?

Mr. GINSBERG. What is that?

Senator WEBB. What if they are over here in uniform?

Mr. GINSBERG. Well, it depends on what business they are carrying out, sir.

Senator WEBB. If they are carrying out this particular business mentioned in this particular article.

General Jones, have you got a thought on that?

Mr. GINSBERG. I cannot comment on a specific hypothetical. Sir, I do not know exactly again specifically the specific situation.

Senator WEBB. General Jones, have you got a comment on that?

General JONES. Senator, I can tell you—I am familiar with the article you are speaking of. When we prepared the budget, it was a budget that was designed to look at the new strategy, a balanced approach, and that is certainly what the Chief and the Secretary feel like they need to bring forward that balances the requirement for the Guard, the Reserve, and the active duty to coexist to support each other in a role that allows us to use each to their strengths. And I feel like that is the proposal that was laid out by the Chief. Obviously, some people have opinions of the proposals and the details of it. But I really feel like the budget was something that was put together. The proposals were vetted. They were discussed, and it was a collaborative effort or a cooperative effort. Not every decision was agreed upon 100 percent, but when you have to make decisions, they will not all be agreed upon.

Senator WEBB. We may end up coming back to that or someone may end up coming back to that.

General Milstead, you and I had a discussion about this. This is the front page of the Marine Corps Times this week. Grunt training for women starting now, infantry school admissions, new combat tests, et cetera. As you know, the Internet is abuzz with this decision. There are a lot of people wondering what the inception of it was, what the plan is. I think this is an opportunity maybe for you to explain how this decision took place, how you project this moving into the future as well.

General MILSTEAD. Yes, sir. It is important to put that story and the story that was in the New York Times as well in context. It is also important to make sure that folks understand what it is and, more importantly, what it is not.

Assignment policy for women has not changed. We are not training women to be infantry officers. We do not have that authority. That authority resides with Congress.

What we are doing is doing a deliberate research. And if I may, the NDAA 2011 directed the OSD and the services to review the policies and the laws and the regulations that pertain to women in the service and to report back. They stood up a working group with members from all the services and they reported back in February. That report included a request—a request—from Congress to conduct an exception to policy and what we call a pilot program. It also asked for the authorities. It stated that they were removing the collocation restriction. And then the Secretary further directed—

Senator WEBB. Just for clarification, what was that request? What was the nature of that request when you said the report included a request for a pilot program? All MOSs?

General MILSTEAD. A request to take open MOSs—thank you—a request to take open MOSs and drive them—or not drive them, but to establish them at a lower level. For instance, in the Marine Corps, we did not have women below the division level in certain

MOSs. So it was a request for an exception to policy to take a woman in an MOS that she is already authorized to serve in and put her down to the battalion level. And we intend to do that as part of the research.

The Secretary further tasked the Commandant and the other service chiefs to come back to him in 6 months and give him a recommendation on their personal recommendation. So what we are doing is we are doing a measured, responsible, and deliberate research, a comprehensive plan, so that the Commandant, when he does give his recommendation to Secretary Panetta, it will be based on an analysis. It will be based on quantitative information and on research, and it will be an informed recommendation.

Senator WEBB. To clarify the record, because there are a lot of people who are following this, what I understand that you are saying is that this is pursuant to a request by the Secretary of Defense. The opening up of infantry schools, et cetera is pursuant to a request by the Secretary of Defense for the Commandant to give him a report in 6 months on feasibility.

General MILSTEAD. That decision was ours. It was we felt that if we could take volunteers—and they are volunteers. They have to be volunteers under the protocols—take women officers when they come out of the basic school, women volunteers, subsequent to the MOS that they will be going to, to attend the infantry officer course, not to become infantry officers, but to see how they do and to capture data which will be given to the Commandant which will allow him to make an informed recommendation to the Secretary how we proceed.

Senator WEBB. I mean, we need to understand the origins of this experiment. That is why I am trying to get it clear for the record. The NDAA gave a broad recommendation, as I understand what you are saying. Then the Secretary of Defense gave a further request that within 6 months certain recommendations from the services come to the Secretary of Defense?

General MILSTEAD. That is correct.

Senator WEBB. And this is pursuant to that request?

General MILSTEAD. And the decision being within our own wire. It is the Marine Corps. He did not tell us to open IOC. The Commandant—we came to him with a research plan and said we want to push people down to the battalion level, assess that. We want to take some women. We want to put them into IOC, see how that comes up. We want to come up with common gender-neutral standards. We want to do a test based on physical fitness for both men and women to see what the level playing field is. And it is all to come to the Commandant and allow him to make an informed recommendation to the Secretary of Defense on the way he thinks that we should proceed.

Senator WEBB. So when a male officer finishes IOC, is he automatically entitled to one of two MOSs? Right?

General MILSTEAD. Yes, sir. That is correct.

Senator WEBB. So if a female officer finishes IOC?

General MILSTEAD. If a female volunteer attends IOC, it is not for the purpose of getting the 03, 02, or 02, 03 MOS. She will not receive that MOS.

Senator WEBB. But if she successfully concludes—

General MILSTEAD. Even if she successfully completes. This is not to make female infantry officers.

Senator WEBB. You are going to get a lot of comment on that.

General MILSTEAD. Yes, sir.

Senator WEBB. Secretary Lamont, very quickly because I wanted to ask a question of each of your service representatives. 8 years ago this week, I spoke at the Army Infantry School on a lessons learned package that they had talking about my experiences in Vietnam. That night, we had a reception at the commanding general's house, and they informed us that Pat Tillman had been killed. I think, first of all, it is a little sad that we are not remembering what this individual did for the respect of the military leaving millions of dollars behind and voluntarily enlisting and going over and serving.

But what happened after that, the way that his death was characterized, wrongly characterized, apparently even when the Army knew it was a friendly fire incident, and the existence of private communication inside the general officer corps warning the Army that this was a friendly fire incident—even his family did not know it—was a really tragic circumstance for the family and I think a stain on the Army's reputation.

We then had an incident at Wanat where certain commanding officers were held accountable by a CENTCOM investigation and then their accountability was removed by the Department of the Army subsequently.

And we just had an incident not too long ago with a soldier who apparently was shot by his own platoon leader accidentally during a night engagement but was left on the battlefield when others were evacuated, and there does not seem to have been a lot of accountability.

Maybe, General Bostick, you would like to comment on it, either or both of you. What is the Army doing in terms of reinforcing the notions of the accountability of senior leadership?

Mr. LAMONT. I am certainly aware of the situation with that captain, as I recall. Actually I think he may have been a 1st lieutenant at the time. As I understand it, it was at night. They did not have awareness of where the fallen victim was until later. And I do know he was reprimanded. Unfortunately, I also understand he was subsequently promoted. But I do recall that there was a significant review. And in fact, the Secretary, as recently as 3 weeks ago I think, met with the father of the young victim.

Do you recall any more of the circumstances of that?

General BOSTICK. Well, first, our heart goes out to all of the loved ones that have lost soldiers on the battlefield.

And we realize that in our Army and the way we fight, we place huge responsibilities on the shoulders of young sergeants and lieutenants and captains. And they have to make on-the-spot decisions that sometimes are life-threatening type decisions. We count on them to do that every day.

We also count on leaders to train them and to be accountable for their behaviors. And when things go wrong—and they always will in war—then we expect to thoroughly investigate each one of these incidents. And that is what happened in each of these.

And I can tell you in the case of Wanat, my wife taught that young man when he was in elementary school. So for us, it had special meaning, and I know the parents very well. I know Joe Campbell, Hondo Campbell, who was asked to review the situation by the senior leadership of the Army, took in the new evidence that came on board, and he made his decisions. And the Secretary of the Army stood by those decisions.

But I think in each one of these cases, our responsibility is to make sure that if an investigation is due, it is thorough, it is proper, and that we report back to the families and we provide the care and compassion that they need to get through it.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

Senator Graham.

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Lamont, you mentioned efforts to deal with sexual harassment and sexual assaults in the Army and the military in general. Is there anything this subcommittee can do or tools we can provide or money we can appropriate or recommend to be appropriated that we are not doing?

Mr. LAMONT. I would hesitate ever to say you do not need to give us any more money. But on the whole—

Senator GRAHAM. And you do not have to give a definitive answer today.

Mr. LAMONT. Right, and I appreciate the opportunity to do that.

I think we are making every effort, frankly, to create the kind of professional climate that gives to every soldier the dignity and respect that he or she deserves. I do not know that it is a money question. Although under the new NDAA requirements that we shall have sexual assault counselors and victim advocates at the brigade level, we understand that our numbers would suggest roughly 980 personnel. And the fact that we are under a civilian cap now at OSD will in itself create some problems because we will have to have a mix of both civilian and military to meet those requirements. I think right now that is the only thing that I would suggest that we would need from this committee.

Senator GRAHAM. Can I ask the same question of the Navy and the Air Force?

Mr. GARCIA. Sure, Senator. I would say that we believe we have the resources and the commitment and the emphasis on the issue, that we do not need any extra tools. You asked this question. At the end of a month, our “sexual assault awareness month” where every unit in the Department of the Navy has just had four separate stand-downs over the course of this month to emphasize the priority that our leadership has in ending this scourge of sexual assault and harassment across the force.

I am certain you are familiar with the SecDef’s new guidance on convening special court materials at the O6 level on a special victims unit.

Prior to this across the department, we have trained our NCIS personnel from dedicated field experts in capturing and sustaining and protecting evidence in crime scenes. Our JAGs and our SJAs are trained in the most effective prosecution strategies where appropriate, expedited transfer for members who request it within 72 hours. That is all on the response side.

If I could take one more second to speak to the prevention side. Every new sailor or marine in our department right now, when they go to their A school, their first training school, will receive bystander training, bystander intervention training. Every leader, enlisted leader and officer leader, will be trained in ensuring their command environment eliminates the stigma for an individual, preventing an individual from being willing to report such an incident.

And you may have followed—I guess it has been about 3 weeks now. Our Secretary, our Commandant, our CNO rolled out our new 21st Century Sailor and Marine Initiative, and a key cornerstone of that, the readiness piece, includes an effort to end sexual assault and acknowledge the undeniable correlation, the link between irresponsible alcohol use—close to 50 percent of our sexual assaults involve it in some way or another, and that is why we are introducing the use of breathalyzers that I suspect you are familiar with.

So I think we have the tools to combat this.

Mr. GINSBERG. Senator, we of course—there is absolutely no place in the Air Force for sexual assault. And this is really everyone's responsibility. It is a command responsibility. It is every airman's responsibility to not just go after those who perpetrate this action but also to create a climate that reduces the likelihood of this occurring. We are not just following up the direction, of course, that of Secretary Panetta who has, as Secretary Garcia laid out, mentioned later a whole series of actions from elevating the level for a disposition of case to the O6 level, but we are also taking a number of steps on our own, including putting \$2.4 million for additional OSI inspectors.

As Secretary Lamont mentioned, though, there is going to be an additional resource requirement with the additional victim advocates, the full-time victim advocates. And we are going to address that in the fiscal year 2014 budget.

Senator GRAHAM. I think the committee would appreciate in writing anything that you need from us, UCMJ changes, regulatory changes, funding requirements, new positions, so that we can say in Congress we have done everything within our power to help you do a job that needs to be done and, quite frankly, has to be dealt with more seriously. So if you could do that in the next week or 2, we would appreciate it.

Senator Webb brought up the conflict between the Reserve component and active duty component in the Air Force. And I just want to say I have not been visited by anybody from the Air Guard to tell me what to do or not do about the proposed force structure. I have decided that on my own, right or wrong, that 5,000 out of the Air Guard and Air Reserve and less than 1,000 out of the active-duty force is probably not the right mix. And some of the airframes that we will be retiring—I am not so sure that is wise. In a down-sized world, you have got to have the right mix of active duty, Air Reserve, Air Guard personnel.

The Council of Governors entity—what is the latest on that?

Mr. GINSBERG. Sir, I think you have received—

Senator GRAHAM. Yes, I think we got it yesterday.

Mr. GINSBERG.—some correspondence, but their proposal from Secretary Panetta is to bring back—it is basically to put back 24 C-130 and about 2,200—

Senator GRAHAM. Right.

Mr. GINSBERG. And, sir, if I could just talk about that. Obviously, we talked about hard choices in my opening statement. This is, of course, one of the many hard decisions that the Air Force had to make. We had a new Strategic Guidance that came from the President that talked about being more flexible, agile, told the Air Force that we were going to have a very high operational tempo over the long term.

At the same time, we had the Budget Control Act, \$487 billion off the DOD top line over 10 years. And for the Air Force, that meant about \$54 billion over a 5-year period over our FYDP.

So in order to meet the strategy and to be responsive with the limited resources, we had to feed in overseas presence. We had to maintain rotational demand and make sure that the operational tempo was manageable across not just the Guard and Reserve and active. So we were really concerned about balancing the budgets on the backs of our people.

Senator GRAHAM. I got you. I met with General Breedlove and Secretary Donley and had a real good discussion about what went into the decisionmaking process.

The question for me and I think Members of Congress is \$487 billion, given the threats we face—is that too much? And I think certainly we need to do north of \$400 billion, but when it comes to the Air Force, the Reserve component got hit pretty hard.

And this Council of Governors negotiation I think is an appropriate thing for you to be doing because they are affected by the decisions. And hopefully we can find some compromise that people will feel comfortable that we have got the right mix particularly in the Air Force. I do not think it is really a concern in the other services.

But my final question is as we go forward in a down-sized environment of having to reduce the military, the Army by 80,000, what should the Nation know about future conflicts in terms of how we meet future land engagements? Hopefully we do not have another Iraq, Afghanistan war anytime soon, but the possibility of a large land force being deployed is not unheard of or impossible to imagine in the future.

General Odierno told the Appropriations Committee that if we had another Iraq-like conflict where you had a large number of forces deployed over a fairly significant period of time, that with the reduction of Active-Duty Forces of 80,000, that 50 percent of that combat power and support power, personnel, would have to come from the Reserves and the Guard. Does that surprise you, Secretary Lamont?

Mr. LAMONT. Not greatly. Clearly we are going to be in need of a significant operational Reserve. To the extent that we have the trained and ready forces to support a smaller Active component, it is absolutely essential.

Senator GRAHAM. And the only reason I mentioned that is I think that probably is true, and that does mean the Air Guard and the Air Reserve who do the fighter and the refueling and the trans-

port—we have got to look at the Guard and Reserve anew. If our active duty component is going to be reduce to the point, at least on the Army side and probably to the Air Force side too, where the next major engagement will be one out of two people will be a Guard member or a reservist for a very long period of time, we will have to come to grips with that as a Nation. Is that where we want to go? If we want to go, we will have to plan for it because I do not think anyone has ever planned for that before.

Mr. LAMONT. I think we have to be very careful because as we reduce the active component of the Army, we may very well find it necessary to shift further capabilities into the Guard and Reserve. And if we are going to do that, then we better make sure they are trained and ready to go. So as we get into the budget process, we have to ensure from our standpoint that we have the sufficient funds for not only full-time support to assist the Guard and Reserve, but to also have the training monies. We are very good right now on the equipping level, but we are a little concerned that we have sufficient and adequate funding to train them at the readiness level that we know we will need to do.

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Senator Graham.

Just as an aside on your very important question, when I was responsible for the Guard and Reserve programs in the 1980s before this current evolution that we see in Iraq and Afghanistan, the way that the total force was designed at that time was approximately half of the combat support and about two-thirds of the combat service support, as I recall, in the Army was in the Guard and Reserve. They wanted to keep the immediate deployers, the combat units, fully manned up to, I think, 18 divisions at the time. We are probably going to end up with a similar formula as we draw down.

And, General Bostick, what was the Army's active duty strength on September 11? Do you recall? The point being, just to get to it, is that the number you are going down to now is slightly above where it was on September 11. Is that not correct?

General BOSTICK. Yes, Senator. It was about 482,000- 483,000. We are going to come down to 490,000.

Senator WEBB. Are you comfortable with that number? Is the Army comfortable with that number?

General BOSTICK. Well, I think, Senator, given the strategy that has been laid out, we are comfortable given the assumptions that we can make. As you know, we are never very good in the assumptions that we make about the future, but given the assumptions that we have made, given the strategy that we have outlined, we are comfortable that if we stay on the ramp that we are on in terms of drawing down the Army end strength, that we can do this in a reasonable way and take care of soldiers and families as we come down and still meet the missions that we have been asked to do.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Bostick, if I can just follow up on the end strength reductions on a couple of different fronts. First of all, with the 72,000 in end strength reductions in the Army, how much—I call it—call

it what you want. How much latitude did you build in there? How much contingency did you build in there? Where are we in terms of being on the edge of a position where we could put ourselves in a place where we would hollow out our force? As we think about 72,000, how much did we build in there that we may have made a mistake in terms of future contingencies that we are asked to respond to?

General BOSTICK. From an operational standpoint, Senator, I would say again, given the strategy that has been outlined from the President, we look at that strategy, develop a force structure, and then our job is to man that force structure. So based on the strategy and the assumptions that go into that strategy, if we can stay on the ramp that the Secretary and the Chief have asked us to stay on through the end of 2017, there will be risks there but we believe we have mitigated the risk as best we can.

Where we can get hollow is in a number of areas. And a lot of folks think about hollowness of a force in terms of people. But the Chief and the Secretary have said that they need a balanced force, and we are not going to retain force structure to hurt ourselves in readiness, and readiness could be in training readiness, it could be in the quality of life for our soldiers and families, it could be in modernization. So currently the biggest portion of our budget, 45–46 percent of our budget, is in personnel and it is in manning. So we have put the risk in other areas beyond personnel.

Senator AYOTTE. What is our current dwell times and where would the end strength reductions—where will we be with dwell times? And also, can you tell me what the dwell times are in particular for the military occupational specialties?

And if what you have told us thinking about we have an unanticipated contingency because, as you have noted, we have been particularly bad at predicting our next conflict, where does that bring us in terms of needing to reverse the Army's end strength reductions?

I know that is a series of questions, but if you can help me where we are with dwell times, where does this bring us with the end strength reductions. And it is one of the concerns I have about the readiness of our forces.

General BOSTICK. The dwell times—and it is a difficult question to answer simply because dwell is an individual metric. If you add it all up, when I testified last year, the dwell was about 1 to 1.5. Today it is about 1 to 2. But there are MOSs like our aviators, our infantry, and those low-density MOSs that have much lower dwell times. And it varies on grade. So if you are a young junior enlisted, then your OPTEMPO and your dwell is lower than a senior officer or a senior noncommissioned officer. But if you add it up across the Army, it has been a long time that it has taken a reach of 1 to 2 dwell, but we are there now except for some of the key MOSs that I talked about later.

We are very concerned on end strength as we come down. If we come out of Afghanistan as planned in 2014, that is when the majority of—our bigger end strength reductions will happen in 2014 and beyond. So the temporary end strength increase of 22,000 that the Congress and the SecDef have authorized us to have is helping us meet the demands of our deployers. So we have no issues with

meeting our deployer strengths at their late arrival dates, have had no issues with ensuring that they are able to have end strength in addition to compensate for their disability evaluation system, the soldiers that are involved in that. So from an end strength perspective and the glide path that we are on, I feel fairly comfortable as long as we are able to maintain the OCO dollars. As you know, everything above 490 is not in our base. It is an OCO. So that is something that we have to fight for each year.

In terms of your last point on reversibility, we have asked Congress for the ability to increase the affiliation bonus from AC to RC from \$10,000 to \$20,000, and we think that will allow us to put more of our noncommissioned officers and officers that are leaving the Active Force into the Reserves. And what the Chief and the Secretary have asked us to do is put some of our young captains and senior noncommissioned officers in drill sergeant status and recruiting, more of them in those positions and more on the platform in our institutional Army, if you will, so that if we had to grow the Army quickly, the part that we cannot grow is our mid-grade officers, our mid-grade NCOs. So if we have them in some of our school locations where we have pulled them out or converted it to civilian positions, we would have some flexibility to grow the Army.

Senator AYOTTE. And how many are going to receive involuntary termination in terms of officers and non-commissioned with the drawdown, the 72,000 drawdown?

General BOSTICK. I do not have a specific number on that. We have asked Congress for the authorities to have involuntary separations. There will be some officers and there will be some very good noncommissioned officers that will want to stay in the Army and will probably not.

What the Secretary of the Army and the Chief have said is that is our last resort. They want to do this without involuntary separations. And also on the voluntary separations like we had in the 1990s, we open it up to everyone, and a lot of our very best folks would leave.

We think we can manage it, but there will be some especially in the 2014–2015 timeframe that on this ramp will have to leave by other than natural causes.

Senator AYOTTE. General, I would really very much appreciate if you could get us an estimate of how many involuntary terminations there will be both in the commissioned and then the noncommissioned and officers.

Also, I think it is really important for people to understand, as I understand it, that some of those people that are going to get involuntary terminations have done multiple tours for us in these conflicts that we have been fighting.

Mr. LAMONT. Could I just very quickly address a couple of your issues? You have mentioned the dwell time, but just fiscal year 1, we are moving our deployment cycle down to a 9-month cycle. So we hope that will help reduce some of our stress on the force and maybe even eventually, as we reduce in Afghanistan, our dwell time will then rise.

As you say on the hollowing out of the force and our concern with our the assumptions, the problem is the enemy always gets a vote.

We never know what the enemy is going to do. We do not know what contingencies are going to arise, and we must be extremely careful in how we plan for reversibility and expandability as necessary.

And just on some of the numbers, I hate to throw out numbers, but I have seen numbers that will approach in the enlisted category perhaps as high as the mid-20s, 23,000, 24,000, and on the officer contingent—again, these are very rough numbers and all based gain on assumptions and attrition rates, but officers may go up to 4.5 to maybe 5,000.

Senator AYOTTE. Well, that is a very significant number for many who have done multiple tours for us. So I think the American people need to understand that in terms of some of the choices that we are making.

I very much appreciate all of you being here. I have some follow-up questions that I will probably submit for the record on other issues. Thank you.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Senator Ayotte.

Senator Blumenthal.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all for your excellent work in a time of great challenge, and thanks to all the men and women who serve under you.

I have some questions that really relate to the responsibilities that will be increasingly important placed on our Reserve and National Guard and in particular on the transition assistance that we give them as they come, many of them, off active duty to go into the Reserve, which has been a focus of mine, and also on the employment opportunities once they return to civilian life.

And I am troubled by reports—and you may want to comment on them—that there are instances of discrimination. And I do not know how to put it any more politely, but discrimination against reservists or National Guard because of the possibility that they may be deployed and therefore unavailable in their workplaces, number one.

And number two, whatever transition assistance we can give them while they are in the military but also afterward when they are in civilian life, a TAP, transition assistance program, type of assistance. And I know that many of the services—I am most familiar probably with the Marine Corps and what it is doing to expand the transition assistance program.

But I would ask you to comment on those areas of transition assistance and employment opportunity when our reservists and National Guard come off active duty and also the kinds of help we are giving to our veteran services.

Secretary Ginsberg?

Mr. GINSBERG. Senator, thank you. You know, there are a couple issues there that you really raised that are very critical for our Air Force and our future. There is a very key readiness concern there that if our Guard and Reserve airmen do not feel like they have the support of their employers, they are not going to be raising their hands to volunteer for the missions, whether a pop-up contingency or some type of steady state action. So we need to make sure, in addition to the family support and the direct support we provide them, that we have the backing of their employers. And so this is

absolutely vital for our Air Force. And what we have been trying to do is communicate across the force to the families, to the employer partners that we are going to really need our Guard and Reserve over the long term.

And of course, if an airman does have a problem, we of course encourage them to file a real complaint, obviously, to be investigated by the Department of Labor. So very vital there.

But the other issue there, sir, is the one you mentioned about the transition support, and that is a realm where the President has made a very top priority. And we are going to be working to provide the TAP assistance, transition assistance program, available to our Guard and Reserve in a way that really has not been available to them over the long term. So really any Guard and Reserve member who goes on a deployment over 180 days is going to be eligible for a full range of transition programs, counseling, resource databases. That is all going to be put at their fingertips. But we are moving out on that and it is a key concern to us.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you.

Secretary Garcia?

Mr. GARCIA. Senator, thank you for your question.

We too have heard anecdotally accounts of our reservists having difficulty in employment and coming back to returning employers. We have ran each case to ground.

But I think I would have to point out as well the other side of that coin, that on the Navy side alone, we have mobilized 67,000 reservists for yearlong mobilizations over the course of this war. The Navy reservist model is a little bit different. They tend to follow their active duty service. They tend to be a little bit older demographic. And the overwhelming evidence is that supporters, especially against the backdrop of a struggling economy, with these Navy personnel have accommodated in many cases voluntarily paying the differential between their mobilized salary and that which they have made in their civilian capacity. And it is real patriotism.

Our Marine Reserve model is a little bit different. Those cases that have run up against the regulations and the law, and those cases—we have ran each one to ground.

Secretary Ginsberg mentioned the work we are doing with our counterparts at Labor and OMB and VA in fleshing out the details of the Veterans Opportunity to Work Act, the bow work.

But above and beyond that, the TAP reform that both services are doing, initiatives like American Corporation Partners where heads of a stunning number of companies across America have reached out to serve as mentors for our separating personnel as they go through TAP. Within the Department of the Navy, our efforts to—every separating member to keep them on the team to the maximum extent possible—for example, at NAVSEA which is our largest civilian hiring entity, we set a goal of hiring 365 departing members last year, one a day, and we hired 500. And we have set a goal for 300 this year. So TAP and the transition process is receiving full priority.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I do not mean to disparage employers in general. I think that the instances of alleged discrimination or non-hiring are a small minority, but as Secretary Ginsberg said, they create disincentives that may have a ripple effect or ramifications

beyond that. And I agree with you. My impression is that employers really want to do the—the vast majority of them want to do the right thing.

Let me ask about—I am very interested. I know Senator Graham has asked about sexual assault, and I commend the Secretary of Defense and all of you who have taken a really increasingly hard line on that issue. But I want to ask about an unrelated—and I would like to follow up in questions because I want to give my colleagues a chance to ask some questions. Suicide prevention. How are we doing? Any progress to report? Any comments for us?

Mr. GARCIA. I do not want to steal the—I had the opportunity to respond to Senator Graham's question earlier. General, do you want to start this one off?

General MILSTEAD. Well, of course, one is too many, and nobody is dancing in the end zone, but we are doing better. If you look at the numbers, calendar year 2009 was kind of the dark year for us. We were at 52. The next year we came down to 37, and this past year we were at 33. So the glide slope is right, but again, until you get a 0—and so far this year we are at 12, a little bit ahead of where we were last year. But I am not sure what that means.

But we continue to work this. In the Marine Corps, we have given this to our NCOs. We continue with our training. Now we have got a training program for our junior marines, for our NCOs, and then for our young officers and staff NCOs, our platoon sergeants and our platoon commanders. But the NCOs—those are the guys that have their fingerprints all over the guys and gals, where we see this, the young ranks.

And so we are optimistically hopeful, but this is something that you will continue to work at until we have zero. And as you are well aware, Senator, this is a national problem. It is just not within the military. But it has got the Commandant's attention. It has got all the services' attention.

Admiral Van Buskirk: Senator, I would like to add we are also putting more resources towards it, and just recently we have added—we have operational stress training teams out in the fleet concentration areas that can be out there among our sailors, our men and women, out there so they can help train our leadership to identify the signs of increased stress with our servicemembers and then additionally be a resource that they can actually go on board the ships to help counsel our people as well.

24/7 hotlines as well that we are manning to ensure we have the people available to counsel at any time a person has some indication that they may have some problems.

So I think adding that and adding additional leadership focused to this is critical. But certainly we do not like the trends we are seeing across the services and we want to continue to combat and put the resources against it, sir.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you.

Mr. GARCIA. If I could just punctuate that point, Senator. I think in some part what makes this such an agonizing problem, each of us reviews the Op Reps each morning of the night before, and to try to discern a pattern in these cases is so difficult. Across the Department of the Navy, we will typically see about five and a half suicide events per day, that is, ideation attempts or, in the worst

case, the act. And it is not rare to have days, five and a half more incidents, where the members involved have never deployed. It is difficult to make the correlation, the formal link, between the operational tempo and the deployment piece.

It took me a while to get to this point. What I take some comfort in is that an ideation event, if it does not culminate in an attempt or, God forbid, the actual act, I want to believe is a sign that we are making progress in that a sailor or marine knows the resources to go to. His shipmates, his fellow marines are recognizing the tell-tale signs and are reaching out and getting information to the right people.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you. Well, thank you all. I really appreciate your excellent answers. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Senator Blumenthal.

Senator VITTER.

Senator VITTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thanks to all of you for your service. And in that vein, by the way, we just had Navy Week in New Orleans associated with commemoration of the War of 1812, and I got to meet a number of servicemembers. They happened to all be Navy. But I tell you what. We have a lot of problems and a lot challenges, but it is not the young people in the military. So thanks for your leadership and thanks for them.

I have some questions focused on some concerns I have with the cuts and proposals as it affects Louisiana. And let me put it in context. Look, these are very tough budget times. There are going to be a lot of decisions that are not popular to different States, and we all get that.

I think what frustrates me and some other members is two things for me.

Number one, in a lot of these cases we are not given and we do not see, even after digging, a clear metric and a clear justification and rationale.

And number two, in a lot of cases, I see jointness going out the window at a time when greater jointness, including greater efficiency, is more necessary than ever. In some of these decisions, I personally see sort of the stovepipes hunkering down and sacrificing jointness and through it, greater efficiency.

So that is the context of some of these concerns and questions.

Specifically the Air Force—and I will ask you, Mr. Secretary—is recommending to cut out the 917th Fighter Group at Barksdale, the A-10s there. Now, when we looked into that, when we asked the folks on the ground in Louisiana, including the Army folks at Fort Polk who they help train, we found out—those folks on the ground said that about 70 percent of all of the joint Air Force/Army training at Joint Readiness Training Center at Fort Polk use that 917th Fighter Group during the Green Flag East exercises. So there was tremendous appreciation of that participation in that joint training.

When we asked the Air Force—I just got a letter from the Secretary, and his response was that the same 917th group, “has only fulfilled its requirement, meaning that training, once over the last 3 fiscal years.”

Now, this is not a 10 percent difference of opinion. This is different planets. And so it is very concerning to me when you get wildly different statistics and numbers behind a decision. How am I to reconcile those wildly different statistics?

Mr. GINSBERG. Senator, I certainly will reconcile the numbers for you. We will go back and validate and we will certainly get back to you on that.

I will say a couple things. One is on the decision to retire the A-10s, that was based on our force planners' assessment of what the future demand was going to look like, what was the range of scenarios that the Department of the Air Force would have to support the joint warfight in and what was the overall capacity of aircraft that were needed for that. A decision was made to take down more A-10s than F-16s because the F-16 is a multi-role aircraft versus the A-10 which is more single purpose. So that was the decision to take down—that was the approach to take down the capacity.

In terms of where the specific units were in the distribution among the Guard and Reserve, it was similar to what I talked about. The thought was similar to what I mentioned before, that in order to maintain the overseas presence and to maintain sort of an acceptable level of operational tempo across our force, to do more of those reductions in the National Guard and Reserve. So that was the overall thought process there.

And, sir, I would just like to highlight that. If there is a unit at JRTC that is in the box, ready to go deploy, whether it is the 917th or an A-10 unit from Moody Air Force Base in Georgia, that is a valid requirement, and in the same way that the Air Force plugs in with its service counterparts down range, it will do so here in order to make sure that our comrades are ready to go and that we can train like we fight every day. So that is something we will be working through.

But, sir, I do want to make sure we are providing you all the information that you need.

Senator VITTER. Certainly I would like that follow-up and reconciliation.

More broadly we have asked for specific savings numbers and analysis for that, as well as Louisiana National Guard 259th Air Traffic Control Squadron from DOD. The only thing we have gotten are conclusory statements or sort of the decision or a letter with a paragraph explanation. We have constantly, many times over, asked for a specific cost savings assessment. If you can get that to us more broadly.

[The information follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator VITTER. On the 917th, if it is true that they have participated in a big number, a majority—folks on the ground say 7 percent of that training at Fort Polk—what will be the replacement for that type of training?

General JONES. Senator, I think it is important that when they talk about what will be the replacement, not that they ask for what type, what specific aircraft, but what capability. And that is where we were stuck with the tough decision to have to eliminate single capability aircraft to go with multi-role aircraft so we could bring in something that could do more than just one thing. And so what

we would be providing them is a multi-role aircraft that could perform the same function the A-10 was performing.

And, sir, if I could just go back and comment on one thing you said earlier about jointness, the question of services hunkering down and trying to back away from jointness—I really do not agree with that. I would have to tell you that having served in the U.S. European Command when I was a younger officer, having been the J-1 at U.S. Central Command during much of the conflict when General Abizaid was the commander, we are all so bought into jointness that it would be impossible for us as a department to walk away from how we fight now. We fight as a joint, integrated team. Our leadership teams are integrated. Our relationships across the services have been solidified. And that is the only way we will be going to war in the future.

Senator VITTER. Okay. Well, to follow up that thought, regarding this A-10 decision, let me ask your Army colleagues when in the process was the Army consulted regarding the impact of this A-10 decision? How early or late and who was consulted about that on the Army side?

Mr. LAMONT. I frankly cannot respond to that. I will have to take that for the record and find out. I assume it would be within our G-3 staff, our training and operational concerns.

General BOSTICK. Senator, we will go back and find out, but I would agree with my Air Force colleague. We will never walk away from jointness, and any opportunity that we have to train is going to be a good opportunity for the country. So just like we cannot walk away from the Reserve component, we cannot walk away from jointness and the combined nature of how we fight is the only way that we can do this.

Senator VITTER. Well, if you all could follow up because I think it would be an interesting test of this debate to see when in time and at what level the Army was actively in a meaningful way consulted on this decision.

Mr. LAMONT. We will find out.

[The information referred to follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

Mr. GINSBERG. Senator, could I just say that during the development of our budgets, each Service's plan is vetted through the other Services, and of course through our Office of Secretary of Defense overseers. So there are sort of smaller forums and larger forums. We have our programmers, all the force management—excuse me—the plans and programs. We call them the “eights.” They regularly review the budget submissions towards the tail end, once each service is developed, and then our budgets go through something they call the Defense Management Action Group, the DMAG, and that is where the services can look before it is submitted to Congress, before it goes to the OMB. Every service gets to peer into what each other service is doing. Also, there are lots of communications back and forth where we highlight some of the big issues that are going to be coming forward in the year ahead.

Senator VITTER. Okay. Well, I will look for that follow-up, and I appreciate it.

And, Secretary Ginsberg, again on the Air Force side, Global Strike Command is a relatively new command at Barksdale.

Senator WEBB. Senator Vitter, I am going to have to interrupt you because we are on a 7-minute clock, and a vote has been called, and I know Senator Brown wants to ask a question. You could submit that question for the record—

Senator VITTER. I will submit that for the record. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WEBB.—as can anyone else on the subcommittee before close of business tomorrow night.

Senator Brown?

Senator BROWN. Thank you. I will be brief. Thank you.

How much time do we have before the vote?

Senator WEBB. The vote has been called.

Senator BROWN. I will be done long before then. Thank you.

So, General Milstead, first of all, I am encouraged to hear that General Amos is opening up some slots for the training of women at Marine Corps Infantry School right down the road in Quantico. I want to commend him for that.

And I read a quote from General Gray who said every marine is first and foremost a rifleman. All other conditions are secondary. And I agree with that also. I am a strong proponent of women in combat, providing they fit the qualifications.

Where do you think the perception comes from that somehow female servicemembers could, quote, compromise the mission? Have you heard that? Do you think it is relevant? Do you think it is something that is being handled appropriately?

General MILSTEAD. Sir, again, I do not believe the Senator was in here when I first responded to Senator Webb's response that this is research so that the Commandant can make an informed recommendation to the Secretary.

But we have approximately a little over 13,000 women marines. I have been in combat twice with them. They are in combat. That is a misunderstanding of a lot of people. Our women are in combat. I am a Cobra pilot. We have women Cobra pilots. But we are talking a difference between closed and open MOSs. Our women marines, just like our women sailors and our women soldiers and our women airmen, make a great contribution and have made a great contribution, and we have no inclination at all in turning our back on that.

Senator BROWN. Well, it means a lot. I appreciate the effort and I will convey that to General Amos.

And I know, Senator Graham and I and others are deeply concerned about the Air Force, and I think the Army has struck a good balance between Guard and Reserves and regular Army. And the Air Force—I got to tell you I am not quite happy with the way things are shaking out. I feel that the Guard and Reserves are getting the short end of the stick. A lot of the input that has been given I feel has fell on deaf ears.

You know, I am deeply concerned about the fact that the Air Force has kind of taken all the toys and holding them and then really having a difficult time sharing and especially because I feel we get a very good value for the dollar in the Guard and Reserves especially in Massachusetts. Some of the units are at 70–80 percent mission-capable and yet we are going to take away that—destroy some of those teams and shift and adjust. And it is deeply, deeply

concerning to me. So if we were to make these irreversible cuts to the Guard based on disputable facts or flawed assumptions, could that be reversed? Could those actions be reversed, do you think?

Mr. GINSBERG. Well, Senator, we have really struck a balance, given again the strategic demands—

Senator BROWN. Well, you have been given guidance from Pannetta, but then you have gone and done it how you felt it was appropriate. Is that a fair statement?

Mr. GINSBERG. Yes, sir.

Senator BROWN. The Army has done the same thing, but they have a different model.

Mr. GINSBERG. Well, sir, we just looked at what the demands were going to look like over the future, what were the war plans that we would have to fulfill, what are the rotational requirements, and then we had to, again, sort of balance those considerations with fact that there was a very significant change in our resourcing over the fiscal year plan.

Senator BROWN. Yes, but the resourcing—you are going to get a better value for your dollar with the Guard and reservists. And you know that the OSD Reserve Affairs report basically said the method of calculating the baseline costs and capabilities of the Guard and Reserve—without having the appropriate information, is it possible the service chiefs are assuming key data that would show how to preserve the greatest amount of military capability at the lowest cost or not?

Mr. GINSBERG. Well, sir, there has been a lot of discussion about the costs, of course. And if there is a way to do a mission more cheaply and to get it done, we are going to do that, sir. The challenge has been when you are using the Guard and Reserve in a very high operational intensity, that some of the cost benefits become more ambiguous. It is hard to—

Senator BROWN. But if you shift some of the active components to some of the Reserve bases like has been done in the past, you are going to get that good value for the dollar and also stretching out the mission.

Mr. GINSBERG. We foresee a very intense deployment schedule for the Guard, Reserve, and the entire force, and like I said, as you are using them more intensely, again the cost differences among the various components become more ambiguous.

In the meantime, sir, we also have to be, of course, concerned about what is the demand that is placed on the force and what is the stress level that we put on everybody. And we are concerned that if we get these balances wrong, that a member of the Guard and Reserve is going to have to deploy at an intensity that will just be unacceptable to them, and our airmen are going to walk with their feet not just on the reg AF side but across our entire force.

Senator BROWN. I do not know if I agree with that assumption. I have been in 32 years. I have met with all the Guard and Reserve air components in Massachusetts and throughout, and I will tell you what. This conversation is not over. If it is not going to be addressed by you guys keeping and staying at the table, we will handle it in committee and we will do it for you. I mean, I do not know how else to say it. We will make sure we play a very active role.

Unfortunately, we do have to get down and vote, but I do have a question or two for the record I will submit.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Senator Brown.

Again, all members of the subcommittee will have till the close of business tomorrow to submit any further questions for the record.

I thank all of you for your testimony and for your continued service to our country.

This hearing is closed.

[Whereupon, at 2:20 p.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]