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OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN McCAIN, U.S. SENATOR FROM ARIZONA

Chairman McCain:  Good morning.

The Senate Armed Services Committee meets this morning to consider the nomination of General Mark Milley to be the Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

We welcome you, General Milley, as well as members of the Milley family. As is our tradition, at the beginning of your testimony, we invite you to introduce the members of your family who are joining you. We know the sacrifices your family has made, and we are grateful to them for their continued support of our Nation.

General Milley:  Thank you, Chairman McCain, and thank you, Ranking Member Reed, and distinguished members of the Senate Armed Services Committee for the privilege and opportunity to appear before you today.

And I also appreciate the confidence of the President of the United States.

Chairman McCain:  General, I was going to --

General Milley:  Oh, I am sorry, sir.

Chairman McCain:  -- ask if you would like to introduce your family. First, Senator Reed and I have to emote for a while.

General Milley:  In that case, I shall introduce my family.
[Laughter.]

General Milley: And my wife is here, Hollyanne, off to my left over here sitting next to General Richardson, and my son and daughter are not here. They are both working. My son Peter is down in Texas working in the oil industry, and my daughter is also working in the oil industry and she is based out of Chicago. And I am very, very fortunate to have Hollyanne by my side for the last 30 consecutive years of service.

Chairman McCain: Well, thank you, General, and thank you.

You come before this committee as part of a major transition of American military leadership. If confirmed as Army Chief of Staff, you will serve alongside a new Chairman and Vice Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and new service chiefs for the Navy and Marine Corps.

As part of this team, you will lead an Army of volunteer soldiers that has proven itself time and again over a decade of war in Afghanistan and Iraq. The Army has endured 70 percent of the casualties in those wars, and as we all know, the untold sacrifices of our soldiers and their families did not end with their mission.

As our Nation confronts the most diverse and complex array of global crises since the end of World War II, the next Chief of Staff of the Army will be responsible for
ensuring the total Army, active, guard, and reserve, remains
the most decisive land force in the world. But unless
Washington wakes up to the damage being done to our military
right now by drastic reductions in defense spending, the
Army will be forced to carry out its mission with fewer
dollars, fewer soldiers, and aging equipment.

Over the past few years, the Army’s end strength has
been reduced from a peak of 570,000 active duty personnel to
490,000 troops this year. And just last week, the Army
announced it would cut an additional 40,000 troops over the
next 2 years, reducing its end strength down to 450,000. If
defense spending cuts continue, there is even talk that the
Army could shrink to 420,000 troops. What is worse, only
one-third of the Army’s brigade combat teams are ready for
deployment and decisive operations. In short, the Army is
facing a downward spiral of military capacity and readiness
that increases the risk that, in a crisis, we will have too
few soldiers who could enter a fight without proper training
or equipment.

We are not cutting the Army because the world has
become safer or threats to our security have been reduced.
In fact, the opposite is true. As you have stated, General
Milley, this is a budget-driven force level reduction, and
it rested on a series of assumptions, that we were getting
out of Iraq and Afghanistan and stepping back from the
Middle East more broadly, that Europe was secure, and U.S. forces could depart the continent, and that there was no need for significant deployments to Africa. Instead, we have seen the rise of ISIL, Russia’s invasion of Ukraine, the outbreak of Ebola, and the growing tensions in the Asia-Pacific region.

I think you would agree, General, that when our assumptions about the world change, we must either adapt our conclusions to the new realities or scale back our ambitions to meet our reduced means. Instead, the administration and many in the Congress are trying to have it both ways: asking our soldiers to take on a growing set of missions with fewer and fewer resources. This is not just about reversing the effects of sequestration. It is about replacing the arbitrary spending cuts on defense that were imposed under the Budget Control Act of 2011. That is the only way we will get back to a truly strategy-driven defense budget.

And yet, while I believe there is no strategic rationale for the Army’s end strength to fall below its pre-9/11 level of 490,000 troops, in recent years, the Army’s headquarters and administrative staff have grown at the same time it has cut brigade combat teams. That too is wrong, and it only hurts the Army’s credibility. This committee is embarking on a multiyear effort to make major reductions in
headquarters and administration across the Department of Defense. If confirmed, General, I want you to be a relentless partner in this effort.

Another priority for the next Army Chief of Staff is modernizing the force. The Army faces an enormous challenge in replacing, repairing, and reconditioning its equipment after 14 years of sustained combat. At the same time, the Army must continue to modernize to meet future threats. Programs like the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle and Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle aim to enhance tactical mobility, command and control, medical evacuation, and other critical combat functions while significantly improving the protection and safety of our soldiers.

Accomplishing these goals will require additional resources, to be sure. But perhaps more importantly, it requires the Army to learn the lessons of its failed acquisition programs, a record that has been particularly dismal. From Comanche to Crusader, Future Combat System to the Ground Combat Vehicle, billions of dollars have been wasted on programs that never became operational. These and other failures also reflect the inefficiency and dysfunction that have crippled our defense acquisition system more broadly: unwarranted optimism and cost and schedule estimates, funding instability, requirements creep, immature technology, excessive risk-taking, and concurrency between
testing and production.

There are diverse views on acquisition reform, but one thing is for sure: the status quo is unacceptable. To provide our soldiers the equipment they need to defend the Nation, we simply cannot continue to have blurred lines of accountability and evasions of responsibility inside the defense acquisition system. That is why in this year’s National Defense Authorization Act, this committee adopted reforms to increase the role of the military services in the acquisition process and to create new mechanisms to ensure accountability for results. Among these reforms is an enhanced role for the service chiefs. The Army must ensure that its acquisition programs stay on schedule, within cost, and perform to expectations. And if that does not happen, General, we will be calling you.

General, thank you again for appearing before this committee today, and we look forward to your testimony.

Senator Reed?
STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND

Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And I want to join you in welcoming General Milley this morning. I would like to thank him for his many years of service to our Nation and to the Army and for his willingness to continue to serve. General Milley is joined this morning by his wife Hollyanne. Thank you, ma’am, for your service to the Nation and to the Army. And I also wanted to acknowledge Mary and Peter and wish them well.

General Milley, if confirmed, you will oversee the Army during a time when the United States faces a multitude of challenges abroad. While the conflict areas around the world continue to increase, the amount of resources devoted to the Army continue to decrease. Earlier this month, it was announced that over the next 2 years, the Army would convert two infantry brigade combat teams to battalion task forces. These changes were necessary in order for the Army to continue to reduce its end strength, with a final goal of 450,000 soldiers by the end of fiscal year 2017. In addition to these reductions, the Army also intends to cut approximately 17,000 civilian personnel, although it is my understanding that the Army has not identified which installations will be impacted by these reductions.

If sequestration funding levels remain in place, the
situation becomes much more ominous for the Army. Without any relief from the budget caps, the Army will need to reduce its end strength further to a level of 420,000 soldiers in the coming years. General, I hope you will share with us your views today on how to manage these reductions, if in fact they are called for, and what, if any, impact these reductions would have on the readiness of the Army.

In addition to managing end strength reductions, the Army is grappling with how to modernize the force and increase readiness levels. In recent years, the Army has had to make tough choices on its major modernization programs. As the Army Equipment Modernization Strategy, released in March 2015, acknowledges, “The Army cannot afford to equip and sustain the Total Army with the most modern equipment; therefore, we must acknowledge fiscal realities and we will selectively modernize equipment and formations.”

At the same time, the Army continues to cope with reduced readiness levels. General Odierno, the current Chief of Staff of the Army, testified before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense in March of this year that readiness levels are at historically low levels. Specifically he stated that “today, only 33 percent of our brigades are ready, when our sustained readiness rate should
be closer to 70 percent.”

General Milley, I look forward to hearing your thoughts on how the Army can make targeted investments in modernization while also restoring readiness levels.

The National Guard, has always been an integral component to our Nation’s defense. In fact, today they are probably more integral than at any time in our history. They serve as the first line of defense when there is a natural disaster at home, and they perform a vital homeland security mission. And without question, the role of the National Guard and reserve component played in both Afghanistan and Iraq was critical to our success on the ground.

However, as the Army draws down and resources become more limited, there has been tension between the active and reserve components, the most notable example being the Army restructuring initiative. To ensure that the Army does not make any irrevocable force structure changes, last year, the Congress created the National Commission on the Future of the Army to undertake a comprehensive review of the size and force structure of the Army. The commission has been working diligently meeting with stakeholders, performing site visits, and conducting hearings in order to provide their report to Congress by February 1, 2016.

General Milley, if confirmed, you will be working with
General Grass, Chief of the Army National Guard Bureau, and
I look forward to hearing from you on how you envision the
relationship between the active Army and the National Guard
and reserve components and what, if anything, can be done to
strengthen that relationship.

Finally, I have repeatedly stated that sequestration is
a senseless approach to addressing our Nation’s fiscal
challenges and it undermines our national security and our
military readiness. Defense budgets should be based on a
long-term military strategy, not sequestration-level budget
caps. And the chairman has made this point eloquently and
consistently. And I hope you will share your thoughts on
this topic with the committee today.

Again, General, thank you for your service.

Chairman McCain: General, there are standard questions
that are asked of all military nominees, and I would like to
proceed with those before your opening statement.

The questions are as follows.

In order to exercise its legislative and oversight
responsibilities, it is important that this committee and
other appropriate committees of the Congress are able to
receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of
information. Have you adhered to applicable laws and
regulations governing conflicts of interest?

General Milley: I have, Chairman.
Chairman McCain: Do you agree, when asked, to give your personal views, even if those views differ from the administration in power?

General Milley: I do, Chairman.

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

General Milley: I have not, Chairman.

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

General Milley: I will, Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Will you cooperate in providing witnesses and briefers in response to congressional requests?

General Milley: Yes, Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Will those witnesses be protected from reprisal for their testimony or briefings?

General Milley: Yes, they will, Chairman.

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

General Milley: I do, Chairman.

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

    General Milley: I do, Chairman.

    Chairman McCain: Thank you. Welcome and please

proceed.
STATEMENT OF GENERAL MARK A. MILLEY, USA, TO BE CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY

General Milley: Thanks, Chairman McCain and Ranking Member Reed and distinguished members of the Senate Armed Services Committee for the privilege and opportunity to appear before you today. And I appreciate the confidence the President of the United States and the Secretary of Defense have shown by nominating me to be the next Chief of Staff of the United States Army.

And thank you all for your continued and unwavering support and commitment to the soldiers and civilians and families of what is your Army. And as your Army is the strength of our Nation, our soldiers are the strength of our Army, and all of their families are the strength of our soldiers.

And likewise, my family has been my strength throughout my life. Both my mother and father served our Nation in World War II as part of the greatest generation, with my mother attending the medical needs of soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines from the Pacific at a military hospital near Seattle, Washington, while my father served with the 4th Marine Division in the Central Pacific, making the assault landings on Kwajelein, Saipan, Tinian, and the bloody battle of Iwo Jima as a young 19- and 20-year-old.

Sadly, my mother passed over 20 years ago and my father...
passed just last April, a week shy of his 91st birthday. But I am absolutely sure that they are both very proud from above of their soldier son and will always be a source of leadership and guidance for me in the years ahead.

I am also unbelievably lucky to have by my side, as I previously introduced, for the last 30 consecutive years of my service the most dedicated and strongest woman in the world, my wife Hollyanne. She, like my parents, is a constant source of inspiration and love. For many years, during seven contingency deployments on various operations and thousands of days of training, Hollyanne has essentially been like so many Army spouses, a single parent, who has raised two wonderful children who are now young adults, our daughter, Mary Margaret, and our son Peter, who unfortunately could not be with us today. But it is for them and for all of our children and the future generations that I and all of us in uniform continue to serve and are willing to go into harm’s way to give our todays for their tomorrows.

And I would like to just take a moment to recognize Hollyanne as a representative of all the Army families, of all the Army spouses, and for their incredible resilience, service and sacrifice.

I would also like to congratulate my predecessor, General Ray Odierno, and his wife Linda, who have given over
39 consecutive years of distinguished service to our great Nation. I want to personally thank them both for their tremendous leadership as our Chief of Staff and leading spouse. Our Nation has been well served by this self-less soldier and his entire family.

Chairman, Senators, service in the United States Army is a privilege. It is a distinct privilege. It is not a right. It is a privilege and it is earned the old-fashioned way, through hard work and meeting exacting standards of discipline and excellence.

And your Army’s contract with the American people is a combat-ready force built around our Nation’s most valuable asset, our sons and daughters who become soldiers of character and the best trained and best equipped Army in the world. And our fundamental task is like no other. It is to win and to win in the unforgiving crucible of ground combat. There are many other tasks and roles and missions that your Army can do as part of our joint force, and we perform those every day in support of our Nation’s interest. We assure allies. We deter adversaries. We shape outcomes and build partner capacity and provide foundational capabilities to enable other joint forces in a variety of ways. We have provided needed help to victims of disaster.

But our reason for being, our very reason for being at the very core of what it means to have an Army, it is to win
and to win decisively in ground combat against the enemies of our country so that American citizens can enjoy life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. And every year, 120,000 of America’s sons and daughters raise their right hand to take an oath of allegiance to serve our Nation in the uniform of your United States Army. And in return, we make the commitment to develop them as soldiers, as leaders, and importantly as citizens. These soldiers are the core of our all-volunteer Army, made up of three components, the active, the National Guard, and the Reserve. We are a total Army. We are in fact one Army. We are America’s Army. And all of us from private to general come from the people, and we are dedicated to give our life and our limb to serve the people. And we do it with great pride and a cause that transcends ourselves.

I have huge confidence in our Army today. I have served in it in both peace and war. And right now, we have the most skilled and combat-experienced Army in the Nation’s history. But in this time of increasing instability, of increasing uncertainty throughout the globe, we must squarely face and solve significant challenges as, Chairman, you mentioned, in manpower, readiness and modernization.

If confirmed as the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, I look forward to working with this committee to get the Army the resources it needs. And I also pledge to be a
careful steward on behalf of the American taxpayer whom we recognize we all serve as well.

And finally, if confirmed as Chief of Staff, I want to ensure that the Army meets the expectations of the American people. The American people have expected your Army to fight and win our Nation’s wars at any time, any place, and your soldiers are ready to do that today, as we have done for 240 consecutive years.

Today we have a great Army and we stand on the shoulders of those who came before us. It would be a tremendous honor to lead our soldiers of today as their Chief of Staff. And I thank each of you, without whom we would not even have an Army.

I thank you for the opportunity to appear here today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Milley follows:]
Chairman McCain: Thank you, General. Thank you for your strong statement.

As you know, last week there were four unarmed marines and one sailor in Chattanooga, Tennessee who were murdered. What steps do you believe should be put in place immediately to improve the security of Army personnel in the United States, especially at facilities like recruiting stations?

General Milley: Senator, first as a son of someone who served in the 4th Marine Division, I want to publicly extend my condolences to the families of the four marines and one sailor who were killed. It is a horrible tragedy.

Force protection is a key task for any commander, as it is for all of the leaders in the Army and throughout the military. Specifically, there is a wide variety of both active and passive measures. As you may know, Admiral Gortney, Commander of NORTHCOM, issued out some increased force protection measures, which I will not discuss publicly exactly what those are.

But from my view, there is a variety of both active and passive. From the passive standpoint, there is a variety of hardening things we can do, bulletproof glass, et cetera. Actively we can increase patrols, work closely with the law enforcement.

As far as arming recruiters go, I think that is complicated legally, and there are issues involved
throughout the country, but we will have to come to grips with that, and it certainly should be --

Chairman McCain: The legal part of it can be resolved.

Do you think that they should under certain conditions be armed?

General Milley: I think under conditions, both on military bases and in out-stations, recruiting stations, reserve centers, that we should seriously consider it. In some cases, I think it is appropriate.

Chairman McCain: As regards Afghanistan, should we withdraw according to a preordained calendar-based plan or a condition-based plan?

General Milley: I am in favor of a conditions-based plan.

Chairman McCain: Which right now would you say that the situation would warrant evaluation and revision of the President’s plan by 2017 to have an embassy-based force?

General Milley: Right now, I think talking with John Campbell, General Campbell, the commander of the force in Afghanistan, it is my understanding that the plan is continually under review and that we will execute based on conditions on the ground.

Chairman McCain: But that is your view.

General Dunford has testified before this committee that even with the $38 billion addition, that our Nation’s
military, quote, would remain at the lower raged edge of manageable risk in our ability to execute the defense strategy. Do you agree with that?

General Milley: I do with respect to the Army as we look out, and I concur with General Odierno’s assessment.

Chairman McCain: That we would be at the lower raged edge?

General Milley: I would probably agree with that, yes, Senator. And then I think he testified to significant risk, and if we go to 420,000, as Senator Reed mentioned earlier, we would be shifting into high risk.

Chairman McCain: Do you believe that we should arm the Ukrainians with counter-battery systems with which to defend themselves from Russian artillery and rocket strikes?

General Milley: Senator, I think providing nonlethal equipment is already being done, and I think lethal equipment --

Chairman McCain: I am asking about lethal equipment.

General Milley: Yes. Lethal equipment I think is something we should consider, and I would be in favor of lethal defensive equipment.

Chairman McCain: In your view, do we have a strategy to defeat ISIS?

General Milley: Senator, there is a strategy. I think you are familiar with the nine lines of effort. The
Chief of Staff of the United States Army: And currently there is a strategy.

Chairman McCain: And that strategy also applies to Syria?

General Milley: Syria is part of the overall strategy with respect to ISIS, as I understand it.

Chairman McCain: So you believe that we do have a strategy to defeat ISIS.

General Milley: I think there is a strategy, yes.

Chairman McCain: Do you think it will defeat ISIS?

General Milley: Right now, the way the strategy is laid out, as I understand it, is that it is going to take a considerable amount of time, measured in years, to defeat ISIS if we execute the strategy as it is currently designed.

Chairman McCain: Maybe you could tell me a little bit about that strategy because the President said they have not developed it yet.

General Milley: As I understand it, there are nine lines of effort. The two that concern the military are providing a variety of enabler capabilities to the Iraqi military and also to provide security force assistance and building partner capacity with the Iraqi military.

Chairman McCain: In your experience, do you believe that we need forward air controllers?

General Milley: In my experience, having forward air controllers forward with units provides more effective close
Chairman McCain: Well, I thank you, General, and thank you for your service. And we look forward to moving forward with your nomination. And congratulations, and all of us would also agree that your predecessor is also an outstanding soldier. I thank you.

General Milley: Thank you, Chairman.

Senator Reed: Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Again, thank you, General Miley -- Milley, for your testimony. I get confused because up our way it is usually “Miley.” I do not know what happened.

General Milley: That is in Rhode Island, Senator.

Senator Reed: I know. And you are from Massachusetts, I know.

[Laughter.]

Senator Reed: So forgive me if I mispronounce things.

General Milley: As long as we both like the Red Sox, we are good, sir.

Senator Reed: We like the Red Sox and the Bruins.

Well, I will stop right there and ask a service question, General.

You are facing force reductions, 450,000 active forces, which leads to the question of how do you ensure that you can meet all the requirements that are facing the Army. And several possibilities that you can comment on -- is a much
smoother closer integration with National Guard and Reserve forces so they can come into the fight earlier. That is one. Two, obviously, continuing to operate jointly and train jointly with the Marine Corps, which is a way to augment land forces. And three, to continue or to increase, in fact, joint operations with foreign militaries that are our allies. So could you comment on those approaches? And will that in any way help sort of offset the decline in manpower?

General Milley: Well, first, Senator, I think that the reduction in manpower down to 450,000 for the active force, 920,000 or 980,000 overall for the total force -- and I agree with the current Chief of Staff’s assessment that places the Nation at significant risk, given our global commitments. In order to mitigate that risk, incorporating elements of the National Guard and Reserve component are key, and then working with allies is fundamental. I think all of those are necessary to mitigate some of the risk.

Senator Reed: Specifically with respect to the National Guard, what is your approach? You know, we speak of one Army, and frankly, looking back 30 or more years, it is now much more one Army than it was previously. What are you going to do to make sure that is more than rhetoric, that there really is one consistent Army -- National Guard and Reserve, active -- force?
General Milley: We are already doing many things. As the Commander of Forces Command, I have got training readiness, oversight for the Guard and actual command of the Reserves. There are many thing we are doing right now. We integrate at both of our combat training centers down at Fort Polk, Louisiana and out in California National Training Center. We are fully integrated with Reserve component and National Guard elements. So integration of those forces is key, and we will sustain that and increase that over time.

The second big one I think is we have partnerships. All of our active component forces are partnered with National Guard units, and they are fully integrated for home station training and support each other.

Senator Reed: One of the areas of concern -- and this has been led by Senator McCain’s efforts over many years -- has been acquisition reform. And he, frankly, indicated a long litany of major systems where the Army could not get off the drawing board literally. There are proposals today to involve the chiefs more directly not only with authority but responsibility.

Can you comment about the acquisition process and what you would like to do as service chief in making it more effective?

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.

In my view, I think the service chiefs should have an
increased role across the entire acquisition process where we are responsible for and held accountable for linking the requirements, which we do play -- the service chiefs play a role in that right now. But we are not or the service chiefs are not as engaged as could be with respect to the resources and decisions of actual acquisition. So those three pieces, linking resources, the requirements, and the actual acquisition -- in my view the chiefs should have increased authority to link all three of those throughout the entire process. So not just the inputs of requirements but also the outputs of acquisition.

Senator Reed: Just a final point very quickly is that we have consistently pointed out that readiness is being challenged in terms of brigades when 30 percent of our Army brigades are ready to go, and that is way below. That requires some either massive budget relief or internal reallocation of resources. If you do not get the budget relief, what kind of resources are you prepared to reallocate to get training done?

General Milley: Really, there are three pieces, three levers that any Chief of Staff can use. One is end strength. The other is modernization, and the other is readiness. Our obligation as an Army or any service is to ensure that we have ready forces. There is no soldier, sailor, airman, or marine who should ever go into harm’s way
not fully manned, equipped, well let, et cetera. So no one
should ever go in harm’s way unready. So readiness is the
number one priority. It is my number one priority, if
confirmed, and it will remain the number one priority.

So that leaves only end strength and modernization.
Right now, the Army has taken a lot of cuts in modernization
over time, and then we have end strength. So if confirmed,
I am going to have to take a hard look to make sure that we
balance those three components as we go forward.

Senator Reed: Thank you very much.
Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Chairman McCain: Senator Fischer?
Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
And thank you, General, for being here today.
When we met earlier this month you mentioned two of
your priorities. And as you just said, the first one was
readiness, and you also said investing in future needs.
Do you believe that the future needs will require the
Army to primarily focus on modernizing its current
capabilities, or do you see a shift to new missions and new
capabilities? And I know there has been a lot of talk about
the Army’s role in coastal defense. So where do you see
that headed?

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.
As you said, two priorities exist for any Chief of
Staff really. One is maintaining readiness of the force. Second is to posture the force to be ready at some point in the future. The period of time that I would be looking at in the future, if I were confirmed, would be the 2025-2030-2035 time frame. Right now our modernization strategy is to incrementally improve existing systems. And that is okay for right now. But there are a wide variety of emerging technologies that we may or may not have military application 15 to 20 years from now. We are going to take a look at those. We are going to explore all of those, ask the right questions and see which ones of those apply to ground forces. Many already apply to air and naval forces. So emerging technology is an area we are going to take hard look at, Senator.

Senator Fischer: Do you see a shift, though, to any new missions that are going to be necessary for the Army to acquire?

General Milley: I think the fundamental missions that currently exist in the variety of strategic documents that are out there will remain consistent, and I do not see a fundamental shift in the mission for the Army.

Senator Fischer: Even with the advancement of new technologies by people who are not our friends? Do you see the Army playing any role in that on new missions?

General Milley: The only one that is coming to mind
right now is cyber. We definitely have increased our
capabilities in cyber across the joint force, and the Army
is building a cyber force. So we are going to continue to
look at that because that is critical for the defense of the
Nation and for the Army’s capabilities.

Senator Fischer: And as the current Commander of the
Army’s Forces Command, I know that you are responsible for
providing Army units so you can fulfill the combatant
commanders’ requirements. We heard a little bit about the
force reduction and the impact that that may have. Right
now, are you able to fulfill the combatant commanders’
requirements? And where will it be when we look at a force
that is reduced to 450,000?

General Milley: As Commander of FORCECOM, right now we
are able, Senator, to fulfill the combatant commanders’
requests for forces that have come in. As we continue to
draw down to 450,000 by 2017-2018, I think we are going to
incur increased risk, as the current chief has mentioned, at
the end of it, it will be significant risk.

We will have to see. We do not know what the future
requirements are going to be. Senator McCain mentioned you
got issues in eastern Europe. You got issues with ISIS.
And there is a wide variety of other security challenges
around the world. So if demand continues to increase that
it has in the last year, unanticipated demand, then I think
we will have to reassess our risk assessment.

Senator Fischer: And SOCOM is one of the combatant commands that you support as well. And I have been concerned that reductions across the services are going to impact the conventional force enablers that our special ops guys rely upon. How do you work with them to manage that collateral damage that reductions are going to have on their capabilities?

General Milley: We are very, very closely tied as you might imagine, with Special Operations Command. 80 percent of U.S. special operations comes from the Army. So we are very closely tied at Fort Bragg. FORCECOM headquarters is also the headquarters for the U.S. Army Special Operations Command. So we are joined at the hip.

And one of the big lessons learned that has come out of the last 10 to 15 years of conflict has been the synergistic effect that we have gotten from the interdependence of both conventional and special operations. So we will continue to work with them very, very closely. We have them integrated in all of our major exercises at the combat training centers. We work with them on acquisition development, and obviously, we provide a wide variety of enablers that support special operations. We will keep that linkage. That will not break.

Senator Fischer: Thank you, sir. I appreciate your
commitment to making sure that our military men and women
are able to perform the missions that they are given. Thank
you.

General Milley: Thank you, Senator.

Chairman McCain: Senator Manchin?

Senator Manchin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, General. I want to thank you for your
service to our country and to your family’s support of that
service you have given us.

Sir, you and I have had a good conversation on quite a
few things, and I will ask you the same question I have
asked most of our conferees. What do you consider the
greatest threat that the United States of America faces?

General Milley: As a soldier --

Senator Manchin: The national security for our
country.

General Milley: As a soldier, as a military officer, I
would have to say that it is Russia, and let me explain that
and why. Russia is the only country on earth that retains a
nuclear capability to destroy the United States. So it is
an existential threat to the United States. So it has
capability.

Intent? I do not know. But the activity of Russia
since 2008 has been very, very aggressive. They have
attacked and invaded Georgia. They have seized the Crimea.
They have attacked into the Ukraine. That is worrisome. So I would put Russia right now from a military perspective as the number one threat.

I would also add China, North Korea, and ISIS, along with Iran, including the recent agreement that was signed the other day. Those countries -- I would not put them in any particular order. Each in their own different way represents security threats to the United States.

Senator Manchin: Also, we talked about the obstacles that you are facing or that we are facing by using the National Guard to the full extent, especially the day-to-day operations. If you could expand on that. What are the obstacles that prevent the Army from using its Army National Guard to the extent that they should be, as well trained as they are today?

General Milley: As you know, Senator, the National Guard has been key over the last decade and a half and have served very proudly and honorably in both Afghanistan and Iraq, and they are fully integrated in a lot of our training operations here in the continental United States. It would help if we had greater access to the guard. Right now, the Guard has state partnership programs overseas with a wide variety of countries. There is a lot of exercises in support of combatant commanders that we could use guard forces for. And its operations, current operations. Some
are peacekeeping, peace enforcement such as Kosovo and the Sinai. Others are more active in Afghanistan and Iraq. But fundamentally access to the Guard is key.

And that all links back to the budget. Right now we can only pay for bringing Guard units, mobilizing them, bringing them on under OCO funding, and many of these operations are, in fact, exercises for the COCOM’s and they are not covered with OCO funding. So access and funding.

Senator Manchin: I am sure we look forward to working with you on making that available because I think our Guard could be used more effectively than what they are right now, other than private contractors that we are using. And that would bring me right up to the auditing. What is your understanding of where the Army stands in terms of being ready for a full audit by the end of fiscal year 2017?

General Milley: I have been briefed that both as a FORCECOM Commander but also through the pre-confirmation hearing preparation and briefings I got from the Army staff that the Army is on track and will be ready for the full auditing in 2017.

Senator Manchin: If confirmed, will you make improving the Army’s acquisition system a priority?

General Milley: Absolutely.

Senator Manchin: I think you would understand the concerns that we have with the procurement system that we
have right now, and it does not seem to work very functionally as far as effective or cost-effective especially. And changing those systems -- again, it all ties back to the auditing as quickly as that can be done. And also, do you have any idea on the amount of contractors that we have or the Army is using -- contract forces?

General Milley: I do not know right this minute Army-wide. I do know, for example, I recently commanded in Afghanistan and there were 1.5, one and a half, contractors to every soldier that was deployed over there. So the amount of contractors that we use is significant. I can get you the exact number.

Senator Manchin: If you could, sir, I would appreciate that because I think the cost of the contractors versus using our own National Guard and Reserves -- it makes more sense to use, in my estimation, people in uniform versus people that basically have been in uniform and left for the higher pay that the contractors are receiving. And that is the rub I have had all along. So if you could help with that, I would appreciate it.

General Milley: Absolutely. We will do that.

Senator Manchin: Thank you, sir.

Chairman McCain: Senator Ayotte?

Senator Ayotte: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Thank you, General, and I want to thank your family for their service as well to our Nation.

I wanted to follow up. You confirmed today what General Dunford had also testified to this committee before, that Russia is our greatest national security threat. And I noticed also in your advance policy questions that you stated unambiguously that the Army in Europe does not have what it needs. What does EUCOM need that it does not have, and how important is this as we think about Russia as the most significant threat that we are facing?

General Milley: I think there are two parts to that. One is to assure our allies, and the other is to deter Russian aggression. I think in both cases additional ground capabilities are necessary. The Army is already moving out on that to place activity sets over there and preposition equipment to either reinforce capabilities that are there, forces that are there, or to use that equipment for a variety of exercises. There are a lot of tools in the kit bag we can use, but I do think we need to increase ground forces on a temporary rotational basis in order either to deter Russia or assure our allies.

Senator Ayotte: Thank you.

I wanted to follow up. You, in answer to Senator Manchin, had talked about access to the Guard. And one of the things that we have seen is a program with the Air Force
that is called Total Force Enterprise Active Associate Unit.
So in other words, it is total force. So at Pease in New Hampshire, we have had an active duty association between active duty Air Force and our Guard there that has been really effective.
So I wanted to ask you if that is something that you would take a look at as actually actively partnering certain units together to have these active duty associations because I think this model -- the Air Force has had some good success with it and recognizes, as well, as you have already indicated today, we would not have been able to fight the wars in Iraq or Afghanistan without the Guard and Reserve. And being able to actually do some training and work together with certain units I think makes some sense.
I wanted to get your thought on that and if that is something you would look at as a possibility.
General Milley: It is, Senator. In fact, I met with your TAG from New Hampshire, along with all the other TAG’s east of the Mississippi, about -- I guess it was -- 6-8 weeks ago, and they brought that up. So I am going to try to take a look at that and see where it applies to the Army, if that Air Force model can apply for greater and fuller integration.
As you know, the Guard and Reserve were integrated under General Abrams when he was Chief of Staff right
following Vietnam. The Abrams doctrine has served the
Nation well, and we intend to fully implement that.

    Senator Ayotte: Well, certainly it is a total force
needs in terms of what we need to do to defend the Nation.
So I appreciate your careful examination of that program
which has been very successful at Pease.

    I wanted to also follow up, General. How important is
effective and reliable air missile defense to Army
operations? Because one thing that has been brought to my
attention, we have the Patriot. 13 of our allies also rely
on the Patriot to protect their forces. And yet, some of
our allies have more modern and advanced versions of the
Patriot than our troops have. So I do not agree with that,
and I think this committee very clearly in the defense
authorization -- actually the Army requested $106 million
for Patriot improvement to upgrade our use of the Patriot,
and that was actually accepted by this committee.

    So I wanted to get your sense based on your service in
the Army. What is your assessment of the Patriot air
missile defense system, and do you fully support the
improvement funding that the Army requested for this? And
how important is this to our troops?

    General Milley: Well, Senator, let me take the last
part first, how important it is. To my knowledge -- I am
not a military historian, but I do not think the United
States Army has come under enemy air attack consistently since the invasion of Normandy, and that is because of two things. One, we have the most dominant Air Force, both naval aviators and the United States Air Force pilots and capabilities. We want to retain that forever. And the other piece is because we have a very robust air defense capability that is capable of shooting down income aircraft. Since the modern development of missile technology, that is another component. We have come under missile threat. We were under missile threat in the first Gulf War and even in the second Gulf War. Patriot plays a key role in not only acquiring and then destroying incoming fixed-wing aircraft, but also in intercepting and destroying incoming missiles. So Patriot is a very, very key system to the air defense of our allies and our own soldiers on the ground.

Senator Ayotte: Thank you.
Chairman McCain: Senator Hirono?
Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, General, to you and your family for your service. I appreciated the great conversation we had last week, and should you be confirmed, I look forward to, of course, working with you during your tenure. I know that you realize, General, the importance of milcon funding for readiness, particularly for Hawaii in
light of the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific. And in fact, I spent some 4 hours at Schofield Barracks recently and saw the direct effect on facilities there when milcon funding is cut or deferred. So should you be confirmed, I hope you will work with USARPAC to ensure that their facilities are maintained and modernized where appropriate so that our troops have the facilities necessary to efficiently perform the important tasks we ask of them.

General Milley: I will certainly do that, Senator.

Senator Hirono: Thank you.

I also know that you share my view that the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific is more than just rhetoric. The Navy’s intentions, for example, are to place 60 percent of its ships in this area of responsibility. What do you see as the major components of our rebalance strategy?

General Milley: Well, I think that right now, as I mentioned earlier, two of that list of threats that were asked to me of Senator Manchin included both China and North Korea. So the United States Army plays a key role. Eight of the 10 largest armies in the world are in the Pacific. Clearly, Navy and Air Force and Marines are fundamental to success for U.S. national security in the Pacific, but the Army is too. And we currently have forward-deployed forces in Korea that have made a significant contribution to keeping the peace for the last 60 years since the end of the
Korean War. We also have forces, as you are well aware in Alaska, at Joint Base Lewis-McChord in Washington State, and most importantly, in the State of Hawaii. So there is a considerable amount of Army capabilities in the Pacific that play a key role in supporting Admiral Harris as the combatant commander and supporting Admiral Harris’ PACOM strategy.

Senator Hirono: Well, we recognize that because of the budget issues that certain force reductions were inevitable, sad to say. And of course, while unfortunate, I do appreciate the consideration that was given to the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific and Hawaii’s strategic location and the decisions that were made regarding the cuts to our Army.

Can I expect that, if confirmed, you will continue to give ample consideration to our strategic position -- and that, of course, includes Alaska -- and to the importance of the rebalance?

General Milley: Absolutely, Senator. As we go forward, balancing of the disposition of the Army forces in accordance with the national strategy and balancing that against risk is the key task for the Chief of Staff and I will take that.

Senator Hirono: This committee has spent considerable time on the issue of sexual assault in the military, and it still, of course, occurs and harassment persists in our
military. And from your testimony and our meeting, I know you find it totally unacceptable as well.

However, while efforts are being made to support and encourage victims to come forward, we are becoming more aware of the problem of retaliation.

Can you share with us some of your specific plans to reduce not only sexual assault but also to stop the further abuse by retaliation?

General Milley: Well, Senator, as you mentioned, sexual assault is just -- there is no place for it at all in a disciplined military force. 2 years ago, there were, I think it was, 24,000 reports of sexual assault. That is an Army corps. It is wrong. It is just not acceptable and we cannot accept those kinds of casualties. Really that is what they are. Victims become casualties. We cannot accept a corps’ worth of casualties and think we are going to have a ready Army that can deal with the threats that were mentioned earlier. So it is unacceptable.

The Army has done a lot over the last many years here, and there has been some progress. But it is not nearly enough, and I am fully committed, if confirmed as Chief of Staff, to continue to work the entire problem of sexual assault and bring that to zero.

Retaliation is a problem that has recently surfaced in the last year or so. I saw the recent study which indicated
that 60 percent of victims report that they have been retaliated against, some by chain of command, others by peers. I think that by chain of command retaliation, we can after that pretty fast through a variety of tools and holding commanders accountable. Peer-on-peer is a little bit more complex, and I am going to have to study that to figure out exactly what techniques can be used to eliminate peer-on-peer retaliation.

Senator Hirono: Thank you. This will be an ongoing area of concern for many of us on this committee. So thank you for whatever can do to improve the situation vastly. Thank you.

Chairman McCain: Senator Ernst?

Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And thank you, General Milley. It is great to have you in front of the committee today. I want to thank your wife for being here as well. Thank you for the support that you have given over 34 years or 30 years for your husband. So thank you.

I will not ask about the National Guard. We have had some very in-depth discussions in my office, and I thank you for your willingness to work with our wonderful National Guard and all of those great young men and women that provide a great support system to our active component members. So thank you for that.
I just wanted to mention we do have -- you mentioned
the ties between our active component and the Guard, and we
do have our second BCT from Iowa, the Iowa Army National
Guard, rotating through JRTC right now. So we do appreciate
that partnership.

I want to tag on with a little bit on what Senator
Hirono had also brought up, was the cases of sexual assault
in the military. I was at the West Point Board of Visitors
meeting yesterday, and this is a topic that we discussed.
And you have over 34 years of experience in the Army, and
so you have seen a lot of changes through the years. And so
when it comes to sexual assault and the way the Army reports
this, prosecutes this, we have seen some changes in recent
years. And I would like your takeaway from what we have
seen just in the last few years. And with those changes,
what do you see? Is it improving? The areas where you
think we have seen the most impact. If you could just
expound on that a little bit please.

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.

As I mentioned, there has been some improvement. It is
not good enough, though, but there has been some improvement
over the last couple of years. We know that the prevalence
of incidents appears to be down and the numbers of reporting
is up. So it indicates some shift in trust to the chain of
command.
But I think the key is to prevent and/or intervene up front, and that comes with a change of culture and fully educating the force, a wide variety of training. If an incident does occur, though, the first responsibility for that chain of command is to protect that victim and then investigate fully with professional investigators, CID investigators, and then hold those perpetrators accountable. I think the entire key is within the hands of the chain of command, and that is staff sergeants and platoon sergeants up through first sergeants and company commanders, all the way up through general officers. All of us have to be fully engaged in order to get after that.

A couple of things over 35 years that I have used and seen and have emphasized.

One is the role of the commander, absolutely fundamental. An engaged commander makes the difference between success and lack of success.

Secondly I would say is operate in buddy teams. There is great value in operating and using buddy team approaches like you would in combat.

Third is control of the terrain, which is the barracks. We cannot necessarily control outside the forts, but we surely as commanders can control the barracks. And maintaining good order and discipline is fundamental to the barracks. And lastly is alcohol. We know that in many,
many cases of sexual assault, alcohol is a contributing factor. So maintaining good order and discipline again in the proper use of alcohol is fundamental.

But I think commanders and the chain of command, the sergeants and the captains and the colonels and the generals, are fundamental to getting after sexual assault and bringing it to an end in our Army.

Senator Ernst: I appreciate that very much. And I do see where we seem to have a lower level of incidents. We have a very, very long way to go with this.

One of the points that we raised yesterday at West Point with the Board of Visitors is that it is really difficult when you have someone like yourself or even me with a lot of gray hair standing there telling these young soldiers do not do this, do not do this. I think where we can see a lot of shift in the culture and the environment is when their peers are stepping up and saying do not do it. We have talked about “not in my squad.” I think that is an important step.

We have a long ways to go, General. I look forward to working with you on this very important topic and protecting our sons and daughters as they serve. So thank you very much.

General Milley: Thank you, Senator.

Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.
Chairman McCain: Senator King?

Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Milley, first I want to commend you on your statement. I think it is one of the best statements I have ever heard about the role and mission of the Army. It should be required reading I think for every member of the Army today.

One of the questions you answered to the chairman was that would you commit to provide your personal views, even if those views differ from the administration in power. You said yes to that question. I want to underline the importance of that question. All of your experience, all of your knowledge, all of your wisdom that you have accumulated over the years are of no value if you do not share them. And you will be operating in the highest levels of our Government in a situation that often can be intimidating. And I want to encourage you to remember that question, and when in doubt, speak up. You are where you are because of your knowledge and experience, and you have to share it and sometimes share it aggressively. I hope you will remember that question and remember the commitment you made. I think you have a great deal to offer this country, and I just want to be sure it gets to the table.

General Milley: Senator, I guarantee that. I have been in a lot of combat, and I will be intimidated by no
one.

Senator King: I believe that, having met you, General. A more specific question. Are the Iraqi Security Forces willing to fight?

General Milley: When we left in 2011 -- I was not there in 2011 but was there shortly before that -- and the Iraqi Security Forces were willing to fight. But in the years between 2011 and today, their chains of command have been decimated and they were not getting proper pay and training went down the tubes. So bottom line is that if 3 or 4 years go by and you lack training, you lack money, you lack equipment, you lack spare parts, and most importantly you lack a competent, capable, committed leadership, then you can certainly understand why units fell apart last year during the ISIS offensive.

So I think there is nothing inherently prohibiting the Iraqi Security Forces from a will to fight with the exception of a lack of proper leadership. And that is fundamental from where I sit, and I would like to get a trip over there and talk to our commanders on the ground, talk to General Austin, talk to General Clark, and others. But my assessment is they have the potential and the capability to fight, but they must be led just like any army must be led to close with and destroy the enemies of their country.

Senator King: It seems to me that when we think about
the strategic challenges of Afghanistan, Iraq, Syria, the Ukraine, all of those are local troops with U.S. support in one way or another. And one of the key challenges is how do you teach the will to fight. How do you train? Have we learned that? Are we at a place where we know what the pressure points are to develop, for example, the command mentality that is necessary? Because we are in a series of disputes around the world, none of which involve directly many, if any, U.S. troops. So we are at the mercy of how these local people perform. And I am wondering about the Army’s sort of thinking about how to do training. That may be one of the most essential tasks that the new Army has.

General Milley: We in the Army think that we do know how to develop leaders. The Army does many, many things and does many things well, but we definitely produce lots of good leaders throughout our force on a day-to-day basis. We know also how to do that with other armies, with foreign armies, specifically as you mentioned, both Afghanistan and Iraq. We think we can do that.

Well, how do you do that? Leaders have to have confidence in their personal skills and their competence. That is fundamental. No soldier is going to follow a leader who is constantly lost, who is incompetent, who is a cement head out there and does not know how to shoot, move, communicate, and bring fire on the enemy. No soldier is
ever going to follow that leader. So competence is key and
teaching them the military skills necessary at the level
they are at.

The other piece is the leader has to demonstrate
compassion and love for their soldiers. If they see a
leader who does not actually care for them, they are not
going to follow him.

And the third piece I think is a committed leader, a
leader who is committed to the cause for which they fight.

If those three elements are combined together in Iraqi
leadership at the small unit tactical level and at the
strategic level, then I think the Iraqi Security Forces have
a good chance of prevailing.

Senator King: A year or so ago, Senator Kaine and I
were in Lebanon, and we saw the training program that
involves bringing foreign officers to the U.S. and also
providing the kind of training that you are talking about.
That struck us as a very cost-effective technique,
particularly bringing them here because they get a lot from
their peers when they are at Fort Benning or at Fort Hood or
wherever they are. Is that a program that you think should
be continued, strengthened, emphasized?

General Milley: Yes, I so, Senator, absolutely. It
has been valuable in the past over many, many decades with
many armies around the world, and doing foreign military
exchange and our education system is value added for foreign armies.

Senator King: I am a little bit over time, but a very short question. How long would it take us to go from a 450,000 back to, say, 550,000 if, God forbid, circumstances required it? What is the lead time?

General Milley: Yes, I would have to take that one for the record for the analysis and get back to you. I would like an opportunity to study that.

But to build a brigade, for example, a brigade combat team, call it 3,500-4,000 soldiers -- it depends on the type of brigade you have. To build that from scratch is about a 3- or 4-year period to really get them certified and ready to engage in ground combat operations. So to regenerate that force from 450,000 to 550,000 -- it can be done, but it is not going to be done in a very, very short amount of time.

Senator King: Thank you. Thank you, General.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Wicker?

Senator Wicker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, thank you for your testimony and thank you for coming by to see many of us before the testimony.

I want to ask you about the National Commission on the Future of the Army, which was established by the National
Defense Authorization Act of 2015, and the Army’s Aviation Restructure Initiative, or ARI.

The National Commission’s mandate is to evaluate future missions, evaluate the force mix of the total Army, and evaluate whether combat aviation assets from the Army National Guard should be transferred to the Army.

I understand from sources within the Pentagon that the Army intends to implement certain elements of the Army’s ARI as early as October 1st of this year. As I expressed to you, making these irreversible force structure changes to the Guard before we have had a chance to see what the commission has to say about ARI would not be advisable and does not make sense to me. The intent of Congress was clear. There should be no transfers of helicopters away from the Guard until Congress receives and reviews the findings of the Army commission.

As such, I would like to know your opinion of the ARI plan, which would remove all combat aviation from the Army National Guard. Do you support halting transfers of helicopters away from the Guard until the Army commission reports back in February of next year?

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.

It is my understanding that the transfer by October is in accordance with last year’s 2015 NDAA, and the 2016 NDAA and the one that is under debate right now is the one that
is talking about halting them. So the Army is actually 
executing their last written order, which was last year’s 
authorization, as I understand it. But I will look into 
that, though.

As far as do I support it or not, there are puts and 
takes to this ARI thing. I think the National Guard has 
some good points. The National Guard makes some points that 
they are concerned that it is a slippery slope. I am going 
to take combat capabilities away from them and they will not 
be able to be the strategic and operational reserve. Fair 

But there are also key points on the Army side. One 
fiscal. There is a $1 billion a year savings and $12 
billion over time. I think that is not insignificant given 
the current crunch with sequester, et cetera. And most 
importantly, I think there is a readiness issue. If we do 
not execute this ARI, then I think three of the divisions, 
the 1st Infantry Division, the 10th Mountain Division, 25th 
Division in Hawaii, are not going to have armed 
reconnaissance capability, and we are going to blind three 
out of the 10 active duty division commanders with inability 
to be able to see a battlefield if they were thereby 
committed.

So on balance, I would favor the transfer. However, I 
am going to await the results of the commission and I am
going to pay attention to their recommendations very closely. And I will remain continually engaged with the Guard and try to do the right thing for the total Army.

Senator Wicker: Well, I am glad to know you are going to await the findings of the commission.

And I would just say to you a couple of things. From my conversations with many of our people in the Guard, they believe that for many of the States, such as Mississippi, our program would be set back for a decade. It would take us 10 years to get over the loss of these Apaches, and I think would do great harm to what we have had over the past, and that is that the active Army and the National Guard units have operated seamlessly as one team since 9/11 and it has been good for the country. I think it is unfortunate that policy fights and distrust between the Guard and active Army have become prevalent over the past 5 years.

What is your assessment of the current relationship between the Army and the Army National Guard? And will you acknowledge that the relationship has deteriorated to a point where actually it is unseemly?

General Milley: Well, Senator, as Commander of Forces Command, I deal with the National Guard and the United States Army Reserve on a frequent basis. So I am coming at this from an operational force point of view, from the
fielded forces. I do not see that friction in the fielded
forces. We train together. We operate together. We have
partnerships together. And I have commanded National Guard
forces in both Iraq and Afghanistan.

Senator Wicker: You do not see that in the field.

General Milley: I do not see that in the field. That
is correct.

Senator Wicker: You see it here in the city, do you
not?

General Milley: So maybe some things happen when
people come to D.C. I do not know. But perhaps there is
tension --

Senator Wicker: I have heard that.

General Milley: As I understand it, there is tension
here amongst some of the senior leaders. I will work, along
with General Grass and General Kadavy, to patch up whatever
issues there are.

From a personal perspective, I think there is one Army.
That is it. There is one Army. We all wear the same
uniform and it says United States Army on our chest, and
that is the way we have to approach it. The United States
Army cannot conduct combat operations in a sustained way
overseas without the use of the National Guard and the
Reserve. We just cannot do it. We can do short-term
operations, but sustained ops cannot be done without the
Guard and Reserve. It is one Army. They are critical to our success.

Senator Wicker: Well, thank you very much for that. This conversation will continue. We had it privately in my office. We are discussing it publicly today. And I think we can acknowledge that the National Guard is a very integral part of what your mission will be. And I hope these issues can be resolved in a mutually satisfactory manner.

Thank you very much for your service.

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.

Chairman McCain: Senator Donnelly?

Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, General, thank you and your family for all you have done for our country. And thanks for taking the time to come to my office. And I just wanted to follow up on that discussion.

In regards to military suicides, we talked about the importance of pushing situational awareness down the chain of command. You know, when I met with the Israeli defense forces, they said what was critical in reducing suicides was pushing it down the chain of command so the squad leader, the platoon leader, who could identify it right on the spot, could help. I was wondering what your plans are to make sure that at the squad level, the platoon leader, the
leaders of those squads and platoons are aware of the challenge and are ready to try to help in eliminating it.

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.

As you know, I have been in command a lot, and suicide is a horrible, tragic thing to see in a unit. The effects, obviously, on the family, the unit, et cetera are just like you would have a killed in action in combat. It is terrible. It is horrible.

But I think in terms of how we get after it, situational awareness is key. Because the Army has done a lot over the last couple years to increase situational awareness of the signs and the symptoms and then the techniques of intervention, our numbers have dropped considerably in suicide. So that is one point is to continue sustaining and actually increasing situational awareness.

The second is to continue to reduce the stigma. Behavioral health, mental health -- my view is there but for the grace of God, go I. The human psyche is a very fragile thing, and any one of us, regardless of how many patches or ranger tabs or anything else anyone has, is not so hard, not so tough that they cannot break under a certain, correct combination of stressors and pressures. And we have to be alert to those signs and symptoms, and we have to reach out and be literally our brother and sister’s keeper.
That attitude has to happen throughout the force. It has happened considerably better than it was in previous years. In the last few years, it has improved significantly, and that is what I think is contributing to the reduction in suicides is the increase in situational awareness, the reduction of stigma, and then the intervention on the part of junior soldiers at the most junior level.

Senator Donnelly: Well, I would encourage you in your new position to really birddog this and to make sure that the squad leaders and the platoon leaders know, hey, let us know if you see something going sideways for one of the guys, one of the men and women, let them know there is no stigma and that they should get help. And I know you will do that.

I wanted to switch to Iraq. I was there recently, met with your folks, our whole team. And it was right before the push into Ramadi and Fallujah began. And the discussion was just as you said. It is a question of good leadership for the ISF, the Iraq Security Forces. And so as opposed to this plan or that plan, I would love to hear your unvarnished advice on what you think our role should be in helping the ISF, the Iraqi Security Forces, get their leadership back together. What can we do best to help them do that?
General Milley: Senator, I would like also the opportunity to get over and visit and talk to the guys on the ground to answer that question in a more informed and holistic sort of way.

But based on what I know now and my own experience in both Iraq and Afghanistan, there is a wide variety of things we need to and should do to help the Iraqi Security Forces in our advise and assist levels of effort. As I understand it, the constraint right now is not so much on what we are doing, but on the amount of trainees the Iraqi Security Forces are providing for our trainers to do. So maintaining a robust train, advise, and assist effort, Security Forces assistance effort, with the Iraqi Security Forces over a considerable length of time is going to go a long way to shoring them up.

What Senator McCain mentioned earlier about JTAC’s forward I think is something that should be seriously considered to improve the effectiveness of the enablers, the close air support that is being provided. I think advisors going forward with units again is something that should be seriously considered. However, there are lots of issues with that with security of our people and the risk associated with it, et cetera.

But bottom line is there are things we can do. I would like an opportunity, though, Senator, to talk that over with
commanders on the ground and give you a more informed answer at a later date.

Senator Donnelly: Great.

I am about out of time. I would just ask you to remember in regards Iraq -- and I know you will -- when you said the Army’s mission is to win. We have to win there too in order to have success in Syria and to help the Iraqi forces have that kind of leadership.

And the last thing I will say is our Article 5 responsibilities under NATO with Latvia, Estonia, Lithuania. In Korea, their motto, as you know, is “fight tonight.” We have to make sure we have the same kind of readiness in those areas because we have the same obligations to those countries. They have said they would stand with us. We need to do the same for them.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Tillis?

Senator Tillis: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Milley and Ms. Milley, congratulations. Thank you for your service.

General Milley, I want to start maybe with going back to something that the chairman mentioned in his opening comments. And incidentally, I am sorry I had to step out. I have got a competing committee meeting over in Judiciary that I have got to go back to.
We have sequestration, which I think to a person we all recognize is devastating. We have to get rid of it. It is bad policy. It should have never been implemented.

What are your thoughts, though, about ways that we can save money? In new your position -- and I look forward to supporting you in this nomination. But what areas in your opinion do we have the opportunity to bend the cost curve or increase productivity, and how would you go about doing that in your new role?

General Milley: I think there are at least three areas that should be seriously considered. Senator McCain has already referenced them. One is I think we have to take a hard look at overhead. The Army, but not just the Army, the military across the board, all the services, to include Department of Defense are a very, very large organization with a big bureaucracy with a significant overhead.

Second is acquisition. As already previously mentioned, there is a considerable amount of cost and in many cases waste in the acquisition process. We need to get that under control.

And a third and final piece that I think is worth taking a look at, there is a wide variety of emerging technologies that could, in the out-years, 15-20 years from now, lend itself to automated processes and reducing either manpower or manpower costs, compensation costs, over time.
And those would be three pretty big areas that I would want to take a look at if confirmed.

Senator Tillis: Thank you.

We have Russia creating a looming threat in Europe. We have the Pacific and China’s expansion or, I should say, increased activities there. We have the ongoing war in the Middle East, the fight against Islamic extremism.

General Odierno, I believe said that a 50-brigade Army should be adequate to keep these threats in check. But now we are on a trajectory for about a 33-brigade Army. Do you think that managing or facing those threats is possible with a 33-brigade Army?

General Milley: Senator, are you talking active brigades? Are you talking the total Army brigades? Because right now, total Army, we have 60 brigades today. We have got 32 in the active component today. The plan that was announced a week or 2 ago will take us down to 30 brigades, active component, and we will lose two out of the Guard. But the bottom line is --

Senator Tillis: That was the active, the 33 brigades.

General Milley: I think from a total Army perspective, we have got adequate capacity, numbers, of brigade combat teams to handle the contingencies that are currently on the books. If we do not drop below the 980 force, we have adequate capacity, size, but that is with significant risk.
That risk is incurred in terms of time, the time to the fight, the time to mobilize Guard units, the time to get them trained, certified, et cetera, and get them to the fight. And then it is also significant risk and potential casualties.

And the second piece is not just capacity but capability, the readiness of the force and how capable it is to handle that type of fight, which is a different fight than what we have been dealing with for the last decade and a half.

So we have got a ways to go in terms of improving our readiness with respect to the higher end type of combat operations.

Senator Tillis: General Milley, I just want to close by saying I look forward to you being in this role. You were one of the first people to reach out to me back before I was even sworn in to offer information and help me ramp up. You were very generous with your time when I spent several days down at Fort Bragg, and you have been up here several times. I know you to be a very approachable, direct person. I think you are going to be a great addition as the Chief of Staff.

Thanks again to you and your family.

Chairman McCain: Senator McCaskill?

Senator McCaskill: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
General, thank you. As everyone has expressed, we appreciate you coming by our offices and a chance to visit one on one, and I certainly appreciated that.

I want to talk about the cuts and sequestration and the issue that we have in front of us in the next 90 to 120 days here in Congress.

The installation-level cuts that the Army announced earlier this month are based, of course, on us shrinking to 450,000 soldiers. As you know and have talked about this morning, there is a significant risk that these cuts will not be the last. If Congress does not provide some relief from sequester-level caps, the Army will be forced to cut an additional 30,000 active duty soldiers.

This year, the Republicans are attempting to get around the statutory budget caps by using the overseas contingency operations, or the war fund, which does not have to be paid for. It can be put on a credit card. Would you buy back force structure using this war fund?

General Milley: Senator, we would prefer, if possible, the budget be in the base. But as the recipient of the money, we will take the OCO if that is the only mechanism that we can in order to sustain readiness, end strength, and modernization.

Senator McCaskill: Let me ask one that I think is even more difficult because then it kind of tramps on whether or
not the OCO is being used appropriately because there is also an obligation you have to only use the overseas contingency fund for what it was designed to be and that is, an off-the-budget, unpaid-for, on-the credit-card to be used in an emergency for the purposes of a contingency operation. That is why it is called the contingency operations.

In your advance policy question for this hearing, you noted that our technological advantage over current and potential adversaries are at risk. We invested in the base budget in technology and research for decades to get us to the point that we are today where we are the most technologically force in the world. If we want the young men and women we will send to war in the future to have the same advantages that the men and women have today with our technological superiority, can you make long-term research and development investments using a fund that was designed only to apply to a contingency?

General Milley: I would have to get back to you on the actual legal use of that fund relative to long-term research. I think the answer would be no. I think OCO funds are specifically targeted to named operations, overseas contingency operations. But I would have to get back to you to see if that could be used. I do not think it could, but I will check and get back to you, Senator.

Senator McCaskill: The frustrating part of this is the
only difference between the commitment to put this $40 billion in the budget between my friends and colleagues and us on this side of the aisle is the willingness to acknowledge that we are spending the money, is the willingness to say this belongs in the base budget, let us put it in the base budget, let us not use an artifice, a gimmick, phoniness, to pretend that somehow we are not making an investment in the base needs of our military but rather in an overseas contingency operation.

And it remains a great frustration to me and one that I am hopeful that we can work out so that we do not go down this path and create this precedent that I think is very dangerous for the long-term stability of our military and your all’s abilities to do your jobs in terms of planning and coordinating and having what you need going forward. I just think it is a very, very irresponsible precedent. On sexual assault, I know that several members have talked about it to you already. I do want to mention I know you are getting after the retaliation. I will continue to monitor that.

But I want to mention briefly at the end of my time the incredible training that is going on at Fort Leonard Wood for the investigators of sexual assault. This is a special set of training that must occur, and I would like your commitment -- the forensic experimental trauma interview is
now being trained throughout the military and frankly in the
civilian world. The expertise that has been developed at
the fort on this is unparalleled in terms of how you get
after a sexual assault investigation, particularly
interviewing a victim. I would like your commitment to
familiarize yourself with that training and a commitment
that you will continue to fight for the adequate funding so
we can actually get these perpetrators behind bars so they
are not, in fact, besmirching the amazing and wonderful
military that we have in this country.

General Milley: I will absolutely take a deep look at
that. As I understand it from reports I have, it is the
best practice and it leads the Nation in its skills.

Senator McCaskill: It does. It does, in fact.

And my thanks to you and your family for your service.

Chairman McCain: Senator Sullivan?

Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Milley, good to see you. Thank you for your 35
years of service and to your family who I know has
sacrificed a lot.

I wanted to talk -- I have a number of questions, as
you can imagine -- about the Army’s decision to cut 40,000
troops recently. I know that you were not in the ultimate
decision-making but you are going to be tasked with
implementing this and maybe relooking at it. So I would
appreciate some of your thoughts and views.

You know, General Dunford last week talked about the importance of the military and DOD focusing on and implementing the defense guidance from the Congress. You know, I gave examples of if the CNO was told by the Congress 11 carriers we need or the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, we need A-10’s, even though the service does not like it, they do it.

So one of the things that I am concerned about is in the current NDAA, we have a lot of focus on the Pacific rebalance, and there is very strong language, very directive language. The United States forces under the OPCON of PACOM should be increased. Any withdrawal of the United States forces outside the continental United States Asia-Pacific region would therefore seriously undermine the rebalance. A lot of focus on the rebalance. It was put in there to provide credibility to strategy that this Congress bipartisan supports.

So I have been quite concerned that the Army’s decision pretty much ignores this. With all due respect to Senator Hirono, I do not think the decisions were inevitable. As a matter of fact, I think that what was just announced takes a huge chunk, not only increasing forces, not only keeping them the same, but dramatic increase. As a matter of fact, of the 40,000, a huge proportion was from the Asia-Pacific
So the idea of fighting tonight, maintaining the rebalance -- I think it is all undermined. I think it is dramatically undermined. And I think our allies are going to see it undermined.

So do you think that the President’s rebalance strategy has been undermined by dramatically reducing forces despite this Congress’ defense guidance to the Department of Defense to not do that?

General Milley: I do not think it has necessarily been undermined, Senator. From an Army perspective, about 20 percent of the Army’s combat power is in the Pacific, even with the reductions.

But more to your point, though, I agree that the sense of the Congress should absolutely inform decision-making, and we should take that seriously and I think we will.

Senator Sullivan: But it does not look like you did in this case.

General Milley: Well, as you know, I was not in this --

Senator Sullivan: I know. Again, General, I have the utmost respect for you. I am talking about the Army’s decision which now you are going to have to defend. The Department of Defense, the Army did not -- did not -- abide by the defense guidance of the Congress. Period. If they
read that NDAA amendment.

General Milley: I will take a hard look at the entire issue, and I look forward to working with you on it. But I do think, Senator, that the Army has substantial capabilities committed to the Pacific.

Senator Sullivan: But they have been significantly increased in the last 2 weeks, according to this decision. The only airborne combat brigade in the entire Asia-Pacific has now been gutted.

General Milley: I would say that the airborne brigade was brought down to a battalion task force with the specific intent and design that it could be reversed if funding becomes available over the next couple of years. That brigade does not go to a battalion, I do not think, until late 2016 or 2017. So it is designed to go to a battalion task force with the intent of reversing it if funding is made available.

Senator Sullivan: Do you think our allies were supportive of this? I mean, the idea of fighting tonight in Korea -- that BCT was the reserve cavalry for any contingency in Korea that can get there in 7 hours, a very capable, mountain, cold weather unit. Do you think that our capability in Korea has been decreased by this decision?

General Milley: The Army, Marines, both have significant ground capabilities that are positioned
throughout the continental United States, Hawaii, Alaska, Fort Lewis, Washington, and Okinawa that can respond. We think that it is a capable response to mitigate the threat given the current situation.

Senator Sullivan: Mr. Chairman, I will have more questions in the second round. Thank you.

Chairman McCain: Senator Gillibrand?

Senator Gillibrand: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Ranking Member, for this hearing.

Thank you so much, General Milley, for your service. Thanks to your family. You have done extraordinary things, and I am so grateful that you are continuing to serve our country.

I want to talk a little bit about combat integration. I want to applaud the Army for taking steps towards eliminating combat exclusion policies for women by opening up over 20,000 combat engineer and associated skill positions to female soldiers in June.

As you look at the positions that still remain closed, what reasons might there be for the Army to ask for an exception to policy for a position?

General Milley: The only reason at all, Senator -- and there has been no decision yet, but everything revolves around standards and readiness. So the military occupational specialties that remain closed currently are
infantry armor, some forward observers in the field artillery, and then special operations, special forces.

There is a gender integration study ongoing right now by Training and Doctrine Command. There is a similar study ongoing by the Marines. They are both crosswalking their data. I expect to see that information, if I am confirmed, probably in September-October and will have to make a decision or a recommendation to the Secretary of Defense whether to seek a waiver or not. And so I will take a hard look at all that data and make that call at that time.

Senator Gillibrand: Well, we have seen the success of the cultural support teams in Afghanistan and how vital women were to those missions to gather vital intelligence as to where terrorists were, where weapons were being housed from women and children in those homes. So I do hope you will focus every effort to make sure our best and brightest and all of our best and brightest are serving.

I was concerned about the recent news regarding the eight women who failed the first phase of the Army Ranger School for the second time due to their inability to accomplish subjectively evaluated leadership tasks. These women were already officers, ranging from captains to majors with years of leadership experience. Why do you think that class of women -- why do you think these women were in such a historically high attrition rate? And do you find it
alarming that the U.S. military academy at West Point is
graduating leaders who, after 5 to 6 years of service, are
not able to complete leadership tasks that are successfully
accomplished by specialists and private first classes?

General Milley: Senator, Ranger School is a very, very
hard course, male, female, no matter who you are. That is a
hard course with a high attrition rate. So the women that
failed -- one of the key tasks that they failed were
patrolling tasks, leadership skills, which because they are
not in the infantry already, they have had a limited
opportunity to train to those. I expect that those skills
would improve over time. But right now we have three women
who are in the mountain phase, as of yesterday anyway --
still in the mountain phase of Ranger School, and we are
observing that to see how that goes.

The broader issue of women in the infantry, women in
armor, et cetera -- again, there is a very detailed study
going on. I want to take a hard look at all that and make
sure that the standards are being met in the readiness
force.

As to whether women can fight or not, there is no
doubt. I have seen it personally, up close and real. There
is no doubt in my mind that women can engage in ground
combat with the enemies of our Nation because they have done
it. They have been doing it for 10 years.
Senator Gillibrand: I also want to associate myself with the remarks from Senator Ernst, Hirono, and McCaskill about sexual assault in the military and how important it is for this committee that we solve that problem.

I do want to just note one thing from your testimony. Retaliation is not a new issue. In fact, we have been measuring retaliation over the last several years because of our DOD surveys. And one of the biggest challenges we have and why Senator McCaskill raised it is this year’s survey -- 62 percent of survivors were retaliated against, perceived retaliation, because they reported these crimes. That is the same statistic as 2 years ago. It is the same as the 2012 survey. So we have a real challenge here with retaliation.

And to be clear, the retaliation is fairly diverse. 62 percent is -- 53 percent is social retaliation, peer-to-peer. 35 percent is administrative action. 32 percent is professional retaliation. And 11 percent is punishment for an infraction. So if you look at all those factors, 35, 32, and 11, arguably more than half of the retaliation is through the chain of command. So please do study that because there is an issue of perception by female members of the military of discrimination. They said in 60 percent of sexual harassment cases and sexual discrimination cases, it came from the immediate commander. So you are talking about
unit commanders who are perhaps creating a toxic climate. And so that command climate really needs to be looked at aggressively to make sure that these female soldiers know that they can succeed and that their immediate supervisor does not have it out for them.

General Milley: I will make that a focus area, Senator.

Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

Chairman McCain: Senator Lee?

Senator Lee: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, General Milley, for your service to our country and for your willingness to be considered for this position.

I really enjoyed our visit last week when we met and enjoyed getting to know you a little bit better.

I want to first join my colleagues in condemning the deplorable attacks against our service members in Chattanooga last week. I pray for the friends and family members and the colleagues of the five service members who lost their lives, and I pray for a quick recovery for those who were injured.

The attacks in Chattanooga last week were the latest in a string of deadly assaults on military personnel in facilities in the United States, including Fort Hood and the Navy Yard, as well as a number of attacks that were planned
but that, quite fortunately, were disrupted before they could be carried out. In the coming months, I hope our military leaders and Congress can work together and work in an efficient, effective manner to figure out how we can better protect our men and women in uniform from these types of attacks in the future.

One of the concerns that I have heard repeatedly from service members in Utah and elsewhere is that they feel inadequately informed by military leadership about some of the persistent threats against themselves, their families, and the facilities where they happen to work. They see threats on the news or through social media, but they do not feel like they have been given enough information about what is being done to protect them or proper guidance on how to protect themselves at or away from their workplace.

General, what is your assessment of how such information is being disseminated through the Army and, if confirmed, what you might do to improve the effectiveness of information and guidance that is coming from Army leadership on these threats to our homeland and to our service members in particular?

General Milley: Senator, unfortunately, in today’s world, there is no rear area in this battle against the terrorists of ISIS or any other terrorist organization. The rear area of the United States is, in fact, vulnerable, and
we have to do a better job at making sure that vulnerability
assessments, information awareness is out there with our
soldiers and their families. There is no doubt in my mind
we have to increase that throughout the force, throughout
the total Army, and indeed, throughout the entire military,
those things like what to look for, signs, indicators of
warnings, of reconnaissance and surveillance by the enemy,
by the terrorists on a particular compound or against a
particular person.

Unfortunately, though, a lot of these type of attacks
are very ambiguous. This one in Chattanooga may or may not
have had recon ahead of time or any kind of indicators ahead
of time, may or may not have been a lone wolf. We do not
know yet. It is too early in the investigation. But a lot
of times, these things are very ambiguous. So both active
and passive defensive measures at all of our installations,
with all of our families, with all of our soldiers, sailors,
airmen, and marines is going to be a necessary requirement
in the current environment.

Senator Lee: Thank you. I appreciate your insight on
that.

I next wanted to follow up on some questions that
Senator Wicker asked and some comments that he made.

Among the most contentious issues in this committee
over the past 2 years has involved the Army’s Aviation
Restructuring Initiative. Now, I understand the Army has been put in a difficult position by budget reductions, and over the past several years has been exploring a number of options to maximize combat power while at the same time figuring out how to cut costs.

Congress has similarly been taking a hard look at this, which is why the Commission on the Structure of the Army was established in the NDAA.

If confirmed, will you commit to thoroughly reviewing the Army’s Aviation Restructuring Initiative and working closely with Congress, once the commission report is delivered next year, to help us figure out the best path forward on restructure issues?

General Milley: I absolutely will, and I look forward to reviewing that commission report.

Senator Lee: What do you think are the biggest threats that, should you be confirmed, you will have to prepare the Army to address in the coming decade?

General Milley: I think the Army’s fundamental mission of engaging in ground combat, winning in ground combat -- I think that mission remains sound, and I anticipate that mission will remain so in the future.

Senator Lee: The three key tasks in the national security documents that are out there is to assure our allies, deter opponents, and if necessary, fight and win on
the ground. And all of those are going to be challenges in
the years ahead as we go forward.

Thank you very much. I see my time has expired. Thank
you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Sullivan?
Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, you talked about budget constraints and
looking at ways to reduce those. One that you did not
mention is making sure there is no overlap in terms of core
competencies and missions. I am assuming you think a core
competency of the Army -- I certainly do -- is the airborne
brigade task force, the ability to deploy anywhere on a
moment’s notice, kick in the door.

General Milley: Airborne operations are a core
competency in the United States Army. That is correct.

Senator Sullivan: So one of the things that I have
been somewhat concerned about is when you look at the Army’s
Pacific Pathways mission -- my office has been asking the
Army for weeks now on what the costs of that are. We have
not been able to get any answers on that. But to me, do you
see the value, in terms of our Nation’s defense, of BCT with
regard to the Army or putting soldiers on naval shipping
with helicopters and doing expeditionary maneuver throughout
the Pacific? What is a higher value for the Army?

General Milley: I think they are both of value to the
Army. And I do think that Army forces on shipping and moving them around the Pacific has been done really for over a century. That is how the Army moves, by air and by ship.

Senator Sullivan: You do not see that as redundant to the Marine Corps’ mission in the Asia-Pacific?

General Milley: No, not at all. And the reason I say that is because they complement each other, but the Marine Corps core competency is amphibious assault not just movement by sea. What we are really talking about for Pacific Pathways is the strategic movement of Army forces over the ocean. We are not using any gray hulls anyway to do that. We are using black and green hulls to do that.

Senator Sullivan: So if you had to choose, though, in austere budget times, would the Army want to focus on airborne core competencies or a mission that in some people’s view looks somewhat redundant to another service’s?

General Milley: Well, frankly, Senator, the Army has to do both.

Senator Sullivan: No, but I am just asking if you had to choose. In this kind of austere budget, you have to choose.

General Milley: We have to be able to do both. We have to. We do not have a choice. We have to maintain both capabilities, forced entry capability for vertical insertion airborne assault, and we have to be able to move forces,
both air and sea, to reinforce in a variety of
contingencies.

Senator Sullivan: We would appreciate it -- I would
appreciate if we can get some numbers on the Pacific
Pathways in terms of costs.

General Milley: Sure, absolutely.

Senator Sullivan: I want to turn to another issue,
kind of emerging threat issues. You know, you and many
others who have testified have talked about Russia as a
principal threat, and certainly that is the case in the
Ukraine.

I want to emphasize and talk a little bit more about
the Arctic. And you have probably seen in the last just few
weeks there have been articles. I just got this in the
airport today. Russia has made military buildup in the
Arctic a strategic priority. There is article after article
about the Russians moving huge force posture, huge force
structure, four new BCT’s, big operations that nobody is
even aware of that are taking us by surprise all through the
Arctic.

You have probably seen this map that has new airfields,
11 new airfields, 40 Arctic icebreakers, some nuclear-
powered. The U.S. has these forces here. That is it. This
recent decision we are going to remove a key capability of
these and we have this as our strategy. This is the 2013
DOD Arctic strategy. It mentions climate change five times and in a footnote mentions Russia. This is a joke of a strategy.

And I think during our deliberations for the NDAA, the Congress recognized that this is a serious issue, a serious new threat environment. So we had an amendment that came through the NDAA that focused on our interest in the Arctic, the need for a much broader assessment, for a much more serious look in terms of OPLANS, in terms of a military strategy. And that passed unanimously.

But what I was wondering, when you look at -- so the Secretary of Defense has to put forward this strategy within the next year. And yet, our most capable Arctic forces, before we even do the analysis, before we do the planning, before we do the OPLAN, we are going to remove the most capable, indeed the most lethal Arctic warriors that we have. And as you know, General, it takes a long time to become proficient in the Arctic.

So I am wondering what your thought on that is, and if confirmed, I think it make sense to do the analysis first, to do the OPLAN first, to do the strategy first before we move any force structure. Would you commit to work with this committee to hold off on moving Arctic forces, particularly given the dramatic threat increase until after the Secretary of Defense and others have put together an...
Arctic strategy, has defense guidance from this committee and this Congress? Do you think that that is the most logical way to do the planning?

General Milley: I appreciate that, Senator. And I agree with you. I think that having an OPLAN first and then figuring out your task organization second is the right sequence, and I think that is in fact what is about to happen. I think as you already mentioned, the Arctic OPLAN, the Arctic strategy is going to get reviewed by OSD, and General Dunford mentioned that the other day.

Senator Sullivan: Well, there is no OPLAN. There is no strategy unless you want to call this a strategy. So, I mean, there is a lot of work that needs to be done.

General Milley: There is a lot of work that needs to be done, and it is under review, as I understand it. And I think you asked General Dunford to produce an OPLAN, and I think he committed to doing that and I look forward to participating in that and will work with that over the course of the next year.

The forces in Alaska do not get reduced, according to the decision I think I heard, until end of 2016 and 2017. So an OPLAN first, reduction of forces second if still required. And I will work with you on that.

Senator Sullivan: Good, because to me, again, I think it makes strategic sense to put together the plan, see what
the combatant commanders need in terms of troops, see what
the new threat level is, and then make the plan on troop
levels once you are informed by a real strategy, not a
13-page document. Thank you.

Chairman McCain: General, I just would like to say
that Senator Sullivan raises this whole issue of the Arctic
and the recent Russian moves in that region. We need to pay
a lot more attention to it. We see our friends in Norway,
in particular, but also Sweden, Finland, those nations there
that are experiencing things like Russian overflights and
Russian submarine activities and other -- I believe that the
Russians have -- what is it, Senator Sullivan? 50-some
icebreakers?

Senator Sullivan: Close to 40.
Chairman McCain: Close to 40 icebreakers. I think we
have one. Is that correct?
Senator Sullivan: Yes, sir.
Chairman McCain: So we have got a very full agenda,
but the Arctic I think is another area that we have to be
concerned, particularly given Russian behavior. Even
Sweden, which is traditionally, as we know, a very neutral
nation, has become extremely concerned about Russian
activity in their territorial waters. And as we see climate
change -- as we see areas of the Arctic opening up to being
areas of navigation, this is an area that I hope we will
spend some time on. And I thank Senator Sullivan for his
attention and involvement in what is, I view, a looming
situation with Russia.

I thank you, General.
The committee is adjourned.
[Whereupon, at 11:21 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]