House Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense Holds Hearing on

President Obama's Fiscal 2014 Budget Proposal for the U.S. Navy and Marine Corps

7 May 2013

FRELINGHUYSEN:

The subcommittee will come to order. Good morning gentlemen, thank you for being with us.

Chairman Young has been unavoidably detained and will perhaps join us later, he asked me to proceed and welcome everybody on his behalf.

This morning the subcommittee will hold an open hearing on the posture and budget request of the Department of Navy. We'll focus on -- on Navy and Marine Corps personnel training and equipment readiness and we'll also touch on acquisition issues to gain insights into the department's priorities and decision making.

I would like to welcome the Secretary of the Navy, Ray Mabus, Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral John Greenert and Commandant of the Marine Corps, General James Amos. Welcome to you all.

General Amos, we missed you -- missed having you with us last year, but General Dunford filled in for you very ably and we recently saw him in his new role as Commander of the International Security Assistance in U.S. Forces Afghanistan.

And General Amos, on behalf of our entire committee, we extend to you and the Corps our greatest sympathy at the loss of your -- another two Marines and we recognize the -- the loss to their families and to the -- to the Corps as we do obviously the loss of other soldiers in -- in recent weeks. So on behalf of the committee, we extend our greatest sympathy to you and to the Marine Corps.

(UNKNOWN)

(OFF-MIKE)

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Oh please do.

Thank you all for being here today, I'd sure I can safely speak for every member of this subcommittee in thanking you for your service to our great nation.

Gentlemen, we look forward to hearing how you will be able to craft a workable budget for fiscal year 2014 although we understand that it remains very much a work in progress, depending on how the sequestration reductions are absorbed in fiscal year 2013.

We're all very concerned with the state of the Navy ship building program, the Navy's new stated requirement for fleet size stands at 306 ships down from a long stated but never achieved fleet

size of 313 ships. The long term ship building forecast submitted with this budget shows that the Navy will reach the -- its requirement of 306 ships in 2037, a full quarter of -- of a century in the future.

It seems that every year this subcommittee is assured that the ship building plan is sufficient for our nation's requirements and just as frequently the satisfaction of those requirements sift further into the future.

Secretary Mabus, you've been quoted as saying that the Navy has placed 43 ships under contract since you've been in office, but a good portion of those ships don't seem to be the classic combatants such as large cruisers, guided missile destroyers, the submarines normally associated with the U.S. Navy's dominance.

While some of the ships certainly are the classic type, several of them are small combatants like the littoral combat ship or auxiliary ships like the mobile landing platform or transport vessels like the joint high speed vessel; in other words to our -- our way of thinking, support ships, there are -- there are likely, even a couple of oceanographic research vessels being counted.

Also of concern in this request is the incremental funding of a Virginia-class submarine. There have been 18 Virginia submarines appropriated and authorized prior to this one. We fail to see what makes this submarine so special and critical that it requires you to violate your own longstanding full funding policy that is spelled out so clearly in your own financial management regulations.

Incremental funding of end items equates to buying merchandise on a credit card and letting balances accumulate. Since the practice started with aircraft carriers several years ago, it certainly has not resulted in the Navy's ability to purchase more ships. In fact, we say the opposite is true. In this -- in this case, $950 million of fiscal year 2015 funding that could go to purchase new equipment will now be required to pay off the Navy's fiscal year 2014 debt accumulated as a result of incrementally funding this submarine.

This will be further exacerbated by the sequestration as we understand that $300 million of the requirements for fiscal year 2013 submarines had been deferred to the out years and will require payment in future years.

Additional out year requirements will most certainly result from other ship building programs as a result of sequestration further eroding what the Navy can purchase in the future.

We think these times of budget uncertainty more than ever will require budget discipline and not such funding devices.

Despite all of these challenges, as we've always done in the past, this subcommittee worked hard to ensure that the Department of

Navy is ready and able to conduct the very important missions you've been given.

This year, more than ever, we will have to work together to ensure the best possible -- that the best result possible is achieved.

So we welcome you. We look forward to your comments and informative -- and a very informative question and answer session.

Now let me turn to our Ranking Member, Mr. Visclosky for any comments or statements he'd like to make.

Mr. Visclosky?

VISCLOSKY:

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. I would associate myself with the chair's remarks. I thank the gentlemen for their service and welcome you to the committee today.

Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

(OFF-MIKE)

MABUS:

Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Visclosky, members of the committee, first, let me thank you all for your unwavering support for the Department of the Navy, our sailors, our Marines, our civilians and their families.

General Amos, Commandant of the Marine Corps and Admiral Greenert, Chief of Naval Operations and I could not be prouder to

represent those steadfast and courageous sailors, Marines and civilians. No matter what missions are given them, no matter what hardships are asked of them, these men and women serve their nation around the world with skill and dedication.

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

As the United States transitions from two land wars and central Asia, to the maritime defense strategy announced 16 months ago, our naval forces will be critical in the years ahead. This strategy, which focuses on the Western Pacific, the Arabian Gulf and continuing to build partnerships around the globe requires a forward deployed, flexible, multimission force that is the Navy and Marine Corps, America's away team.

Within this strategy, we have to balance our missions with our resources. We are working under Secretary Hagel's leadership on our strategic choices and management review to assess how we deal with the budget uncertainty facing the department as we go forward.

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

Thanks to the efforts of this committee and your congressional colleagues, we have an appropriations bill for this fiscal year but sequestration is still forcing us to make across the board cuts totaling more than $4 billion from our operations and maintenance accounts and about $6 billion from our investment accounts. These cuts will have real impacts.

We have prioritized combat operations in central command and deployments to Pacific command. However, we've had to cancel a number of deployments to Southern command.

In order to maintain our priority deployments in 2013 and '14 to meet the global force management allocation plan funding shortfalls will cause our unit at home to cut back training and maintenance, pilots will get less flight time, ships will have less time at sea and Marines, less time in the field.

It will take longer for repair parts to arrive when needed, our facilities ashore will be maintained at a much lower level.

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

We're working to make sure that our people are resilient and strong after more than a decade of very high operations tempo with programs like 21st century sailor and Marine.

With this, we aim to bring all the efforts on protection and readiness, fitness inclusion and continuing service together as one coherent hold. This encompasses a wide range of issues from preventing sexual assault and suicide to fostering a culture of fitness, to strengthen the force through diversity to ensuring a successful transition following four years of service or 40.

In the Marine Corps, we continue decreasing manpower to meet our new in strength of over just 182,000 by fiscal year '16. But we're doing this in a way which keeps faith with Marines and helps retain the right level of noncommissioned officers and field grade officers and their experience.

We're also working to make sure that our sailors and Marines have the tools and platforms they need to do the missions they are given. One of the most important of these is our fleet.

MABUS:

As you pointed out, Mr. Chairman, the Navy of today has 47 ships under contract. For a little history, on September 11, 2001, the U.S. Navy had 316 ships. By 2008, after one of the largest military buildups in American history, that number was 278. In 2008, the Navy put only three ships under contract, far too few to maintain the size of the fleet or industrial base and many of our shipbuilding programs were over budget, behind schedule or both. One of my main priorities as secretary has been to reverse those trends.

Today, the fleet is stabilized, and problems in most of our ship building programs have been corrected or arrested. We today, as I said, have 47 ships under contract, 43 of which were contracted since I took office, as you pointed out, and our current ship building plan puts us on track for 300 ships in our fleet by 2019.

The way we power our ships and installations has always been a core and vital issue for the Department of the Navy. We continue to lead in energy, as we have throughout our history from (inaudible), to coal, to oil to nuclear the Navy has led and moving to new sources of power and every single time it's made us a better war fighting force.

Today, for Marines making power in the field to alternatives on land, on and under the sea, and in the air, the Navy and Marine Corps are powering innovations that will maintain our operational edge.

Building partnerships, building inter-operability and the capacity and capability in our partners is a crucial component of our defense strategy. This strategy directs that this be done at a low cost, small footprint, innovating way. This is precisely what the Navy and Marine Corps do.

The process that we use to craft the department's budget request was determined, deliberate and dedicated our responsibility to you and to the taxpayers. And, like both the House and Senate budget resolutions we do not assume that sequestration will continue in fiscal year '14.

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

Thank you very much.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Admiral Greenert.

Good morning.

GREENERT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Visclosky, distinguished members of the committee it's my pleasure to appear before you today to testify on the Navy's fiscal year 2014 budget and posture.

I'm honored to represent 613,000 active and Reserve sailors, Navy civilians and families who are serving today.

This morning I'll address three points: Our enduring tenets for decision making, our budget strategy for 2013 and the subsequent carry over from '13 to '14, and our intended course for 2014.

Two important characteristics of our Naval forces describe our mandate, that we will operate forward where it matters, and that we will be ready when it matters.

Our fundamental approach to meeting this responsibility remains unchanged. We organize, man, train and equip the Navy by viewing our decisions through three lens' or what I call tenets. And, they are, war fighting first, operate forward, and be ready. Regardless of the size of our budget or our fleet, these are the three tenets or the lens through which we will evaluate each of our decisions.

If you refer to the chart provided -- in front of you -- you'll see that on any given day we have about 50,000 sailors and 100 ships deployed overseas providing forward presence. The orange bow ties on the chart represent maritime cross roads where shipping lanes and our security -- our security concerns intersect.

A unique strength of your fleet is that it operates forward from U.S. bases -- represented by a circle there -- and from places provided by partner nations which are represented by squares. These places are critical to your Navy being where it matters, because they enable us to respond rapidly to crises, enable us to sustain forward presence with fewer ships, by reducing the number of ships on rotational deployment.

In February we faced a shortfall of about $8.6 billion in our F.Y. 2013 operations and maintenance account. Since then, thanks to the efforts of this committee in particular, we received a 2013 appropriation in March.

In accordance with our priorities and our tenets, we plan to invest our remaining 2013 O&M funds to fund our must pay items such as contracts, leases, and utilities and reimbursables, to reconcile the 2013 presence with our combatant commanders, and to conduct training and maintenance for forces next to deploy and to prepare to meet the 2014 global force management allocation plan. And we will restore critical base operations and renovation projects.

Although we intend to meet our most critical operational commitments to the combatant commanders, sequestration leaves us about $4.1 billion in operations and maintenance short, and $6 billion in investments short in this year. This will result in our surge capacity to fully mission -- surge capacity of fully mission capable carrier strike groups and amphibious ready groups being reduced by about two-thirds through 2014. Further, we will have deferred about $1.2 billion of facility maintenance as well as depot level maintenance for 84 aircraft and 184 engines.

All combined, our operations and maintenance, and our investment shortfalls will leave us about a $9 billion carry over challenge into F.Y. '14. A continuation of sequestration in 2014 will compound this carry over challenge from $9 billion to $23 billion. Further, accounts and activities we were able to protect in 2013 such as man power, nuclear maintenance, and critical fleet operations will be liable to reduction in 2014.

Our people remained resilient in the face of this uncertainty and frankly chairman I've been amazed throughout this process with the patient, the dedication of our sailors and our civilians.

Our 2014 budget submission supports the defense strategic guidance. It enables us to maintain our commitments to the middle east and rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region. We prepared our 2014 budget with the following priorities: Deliver overseas presence in accordance with the global force management allocation plan, continue near term investments to address challenges in the Middle East and Asia-Pacific and develop long term capabilities at the appropriate capacity to address war fighting challenges in the Middle East and Asia-Pacific.

Our budgets submission continues to invest in the future fleet. We've requested $44 billion in ships, submarines, manned and unmanned aircraft, weapons, cyber and other procurement programs like the joint strike fighter, littoral combat ship, unmanned aerial vehicles, the DDG-1000 and the P-8 just to name a few.

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

We continue to fund important capabilities such as a laser weapon system for small boat and drone defense, which we will deploy aboard the ship Ponce (ph) in the spring of 2014. Also in 2014, we will deploy on the carrier Herbert Walker Bush a successfully tested prototype system to detect and defeat advanced wake homing torpedoes.

We continue to grow manpower by about 4,600 sailors net compared to our plan in last year's budget. These new sailors will reduce our manning gaps at sea, enhance the Navy's cyber capabilities and improve our waterfront training.

We will continue to address critical readiness and safety degraders, such as sexual assault, suicide, operational tempo increases and (inaudible).

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

And i thank you.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, Admiral, for your testimony.

General Amos good morning.

AMOS:

Chairman, good morning, Ranking Member Visclosky, members of the committee I'm pleased to appear before you today to talk about the 2013 posture of the United States Marine Corps.

I'm equally grateful to this committee for what you did last February as you stood forward in support of the Department of Defense. Clearly, H.R. 933 would not have passed had it not been for the dedication and faithfulness of this committee. So on behalf of my secretary and Admiral Greenert and our men and women of the Navy and Marine Corps, thank you very much.

For more than 237 years, your corps has been a people intense force. We've always known that our greatest asset is the individual Marine. That has not changed during 12 years of hard combat. Our unique role as America's premier crisis response force is grounded in the legendary character and war fighting ethos of our people.

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

Sergeant Major Berret (ph) and I recently returned from Afghanistan and can attest to the progress there. Marines have given the Afghan people a vision of success and the possibility of a secure and prosperous society. The people of the Helmand province have a strong sense of optimism about their future. Afghan security forces have led the way now in every operation. Our commanders and the Marines now tell me that their -- their Afghan partners overmatch the Taliban in every way and in every single engagement.

Focusing a bit more tightly on the reality of today's security environment, it's clear to me the intrinsic value of forward Naval presence. With declining resources to address the world's security challenges, forward deployed sea-based Naval forces are affordable and just make sense. They proactively support our

nation's security strategy by shaping and deterring and rapidly responding to multiple crisis, all while treading very lightly on our allies and our partners sovereign territory.

Amphibious forces are a sensible and unmistakable solution in preserving our national security. Naval forces -- and the Marine Corps in particular -- are our nation's insurance policy, a hedge against uncertainty in an unpredictable world. A balanced air-ground logistics team, we respond in hours and days, not weeks and months. This is our raison d'etre, this is what we do.

This year's budget baseline submission of $24.2 billion was framed by our following service level priorities. First, we will continue to provide the best trained and equipped Marines to Afghanistan. Second, we will protect the readiness of our forward deployed rotational forces. Third, we will reset or reconstitute our operating forces as our Marines and equipment return from nearly 12 years of combat.

Fourth, as much as is humanly possible, we will modernize our force through investing in the individual Marine first, and by replacing aging combat systems next. And lastly, as ever, we will keep faith with our Marines, our sailors and our families.

AMOS:

We remain committed to these priorities in F.Y. '13 despite significant reductions in our facility sustainment and home station unit training accounts due to the loss of $770 million in operations and maintenance funding from sequestration. To maintain readiness in those units that are deployed and those that are next to deploy, I have paid the bill with infrastructure, and sustainment monies. I have accepted a level of risk in F.Y. '13 to ensure the corps' deployability, and relevance in the uncertain times we currently live in.

But sequestration in F.Y. '14 and beyond will drive me to reduce levels of readiness that I cannot responsibly accept. To pay my bills, I will begin major force structure reshaping efforts next year within America's 911 Force. Reshaping efforts that will directly affect our ability and capacity to respond to emerging crises around the world. Ladies and gentleman, your Marine Corps is aware of the fiscal realities confronting our nation. During these times of constrained resources, we will be responsible stewards of scarce public funds. We will continue to prioritize and make the hard decisions before coming to Congress.

I am acutely aware that our success as Marines is directly linked to the unwavering support of Congress, and the American people. It has always been that way. Once again, I thank the committee for your continued support, and I am prepared to answer your questions.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, General. We've got a high level of interest this morning. I thank everybody, all of the members for being here on time. We want to have as many rounds of questions as possible, so I'm going to yield my time to Ms. Granger.

GRANGER:

Thank you, and thank you Secretary Mabus, General -- oh, yup -- General Amos, and Admiral Greenert, thank you for your service and thank you for being here. I have one question only, and that's for General Amos. You've been a really unwavering supporter of the F-35, and helped keep us on target to make that happen because you have repeatedly said how important it is to the Marines. So I'd like you to tell us how the training of F-35B is going at Eglin for the Marine Corps?

AMOS:

Congresswoman, thank you for the opportunity. In fact I was down there on Saturday. I was down at a memorial services for our explosive ordinance disposal, Admiral Greenert and I were there, and I took the time to go over to the training squadron at Eglin Air Force Base, VMFAT-501. 13, F-35's, two of them belong to the United Kingdom. We are partnered with them, and they are outpacing their training -- their planned training. They're ahead of schedule. They have completely trained two pilots, completely through the syllabus. It's exciting times down there.

We've stood up our first squadron, our first what we call, fleet squadron out in Yuma, Arizona. It has four planes, and has begun training out there. We'll get two more planes by the end of this month, and 16 by the end of this year. So, things are actually on track, or ahead of schedule, Congresswoman. Thank you.

GRANGER:

Thank you very much. That's all I have.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Ms. Granger, thank you. Mr. Moran?

MORAN:

Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Several issues, but let me focus on one because it's particularly current. I was just shown an article that came out this morning in Bloomberg. Information that was classified. But I guess now that it's out in the press, it's -- we can talk about it publicly. It's with regard to the LCS, and it addresses some of the issues that some of us have raised in the past. This was the Perez report, a Navy spokeswoman said that it identified areas where the program needed improvement, and further development.

Of course, construction costs have doubled -- exactly doubled from $220 million to $440 million per ship. But to quote some of the

report, the Navy -- and the Navy did acknowledge that the vessels are being built to the service's lowest level of survivability. Now some of the quotes, the ship is not expected to be survivable, and that it is not expected to maintain mission capability after taking a significant hit in a hostile combat environment. Even in its surface warfare role when all armaments are working as intended, the vessel is only capable of neutralizing small, fast attack boats.

And it remains vulnerable with ships with anti-ship cruise missiles that can travel more than 8 kilometers, or 5 miles, according to this report. Now, Iran has 67 such vessels, according to a chart in the report. So, it's not going to do us much good in a situation like that. The LCS, again in quotes, "Is ill-suited for combat operations against anything, but small, fast boats, not armed with anti-ship missiles. And the vessel's beam, or widest width, may be a navigational challenge in narrow waterways and tight harbors." I could go through a lot more of the critical observations, but you know the bottom line is what we have -- this subcommittee has expressed concern about in the past.

A -- a combat ship that doesn't survive in combat, is marginally -- only marginally useful. And we're now in the context of sequestration, we're furloughing folks, we're cutting back on programs. So I do think we need to address the appropriateness of putting as much money as we planned to, 50 to 55 ships. I guess it's now down to 52. Two different variants, we've questioned that. I think we ought to get on the record, an explanation of why we continue to move forward in the manner that we do? I -- Mr. Secretary, I think you'd be the best one to respond to this?

MABUS:

Congressman I appreciate the chance to talk about LCS, and I'm going to talk about the program, and I'm going to ask Admiral Greenert to talk about the combat capabilities of this -- of this ship. This has become one of our best performing programs. It -- it certainly did not start that way, but by having the two variants

compete against each other, based mainly on price, prices came down dramatically. And while the first of each variant's 10 ship buy will cost $439 million, the last ship of that buy will cost $350 million. So, the price is coming down fairly dramatically, or actually dramatically.

When Congress was briefed in the early part of the last decade about the cost of this ship, it was estimated that it would be $220 million as you pointed out, without a -- with a commercial hull, without a combat hull. We changed that, but it was also seen that the weapons systems would be far more costly. These ships are coming in, if you count the weapons systems, at almost exactly the total price that Congress was briefed on more than a decade ago. We have two great shipbuilders building these; Austal in Mobile, Alabama, Marinette in Wisconsin. And they -- the ships are coming out now under budget, and on time.

The ship itself, which has the modular construction so that you can drop one weapons system in and take another one out, thereby not making it a single mission ship, and not having to build a new ship when technology changes. These weapons systems, the anti-surface, anti-submarine, anti-mine warfare, are in development now. All are in the water. All are associated with ships, and they are in a spiral development. So as technology improves, so will those weapons systems.

(CROSSTALK)

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Let me just jump in here. I think Mr. Moran is focusing obviously cost vulnerability, and I do want to make sure that every...

MABUS:

I'm sorry.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

...we have two rounds of questions here, so Admiral if you can briefly address the issue of vulnerability, and then we're going to move on to Mr. Crenshaw.

GREENERT:

The ship is designed, what we call level-1. There is a level of, if you will, survivability. And we said level-1. And what that means is, you take a hit -- if the ship takes a hit, it is able to survive and then it returns to base. It doesn't stay and fight. And it depends on what you want to -- what the mission of the ship is, and what you're willing to pay for that. It is designed, and it has met the standards of that level. So if the criticism is that we made the decision on a level-1, as opposed to 2, or 3, then it -- that's a criticism. But it is -- it is built to those design standards.

It is testing appropriately so. I could paint you a picture, Congressman, really, my goodness where you drive a ship into a -- a certain scenario, and it's vulnerable to being overwhelmed by cruise missiles. All of our ships, even the very best, which are quite capable. We don't send ships

out alone, as sole platforms to do it all. We -- we do this in packages. We are up, if you will, improving the -- the armament on the ship. And we will continue to do so. Lastly we assign -- the study is over a year old, the one that was published. We've done a lot since then. We've had a Littoral Combat Ship Council, and we've had the ship inspected by our in-serve, who -- which is -- are very objective.

We're taking a lot of actions, and I'd be happy to talk to you in more detail offline if you want?

(CROSSTALK)

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Mr. Moran, we're going to have to -- I want to get us a couple of rounds of questions in here. I think you...

MORAN:

Yeah, I didn't want to answer -- I didn't want to ask a question, but I did want to make a quick response to a point that was made, just for the record if I could?

FRELINGHUYSEN:

If you'd make a quick response...

MORAN:

Sure.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

...and then we're going to go to Mr. Crenshaw.

MORAN:

...because in the report it says that the war game demonstrated that getting all the right people and equipment on station to conduct the exchange of personnel and equipment, could take several weeks. And that process removed LCS from the tactical fight. So the point that was made, I think is -- is subject to some question. But, thank you Mr. Chairman.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Mr. Crenshaw?

CRENSHAW:

Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you all for being here today. Particularly Admiral Greenert you were in my district last week, and I appreciated -- that was well-received. But I think the committee members should know that when I got up to speak the lights went out, and the mike went off.

(LAUGHTER)

FRELINGHUYSEN:

It could happen today too!

(LAUGHTER)

CRENSHAW:

The sequester evidently had an impact in -- in that area. But before I -- two quick questions. I want to ask the secretary maybe just to clarify the issue of strategic dispersal, because you know after Secretary Hagel was here, there was -- it got a little fuzzy but, I don't want to rehash the whole history. You --- you know that before we had an all nuclear carrier force, that we had two home-ports on the East Coast, and three on the West Coast. Now we have all nuclear, and we only have one on the East Coast.

CRENSHAW:

And there has been some study, and the quadrennial defense review said we ought to have two home-ports on the East Coast, we have three on the west.

So -- so, just clarify for me and -- and the subcommittee that -- that what's -- what's our -- what's the Navy's current policy on strategic dispersal of nuclear aircraft carriers.

MABUS:

Congressman, the Navy continues to support strategic dispersal of our -- of our carriers and of all of our ships. And last year, purely as a budget decision, we deferred the movement of one carrier and its strike group, but it was not canceled. It was merely deferred.

CRENSHAW:

Thank you, sir. And a question to Admiral Greenert. We talk a lot about ships, and at one time we wanted to have 313. There was a time we wanted to have 600, and then I hear you talk about those that are under contract.

And I guess my -- my question is it seems like we still need ships. And we asked you to do a lot of things. Chase pirates off the coast of Somalia, interdict drug runners in the Caribbean, very (ph) humanitarian aid in Haiti, send destroyers to the Mediterranean.

All those things, but I guess I have to wonder when -- when -- when the decision was made to decommission seven cruisers that seemed not to be obsolete and still had some life left in them, I think it was this committee as well as the -- I guess the other committee in the House and the two committees in the Senate said we think it'd be better not to make a short-term budget-driven decision, but to actually modernize those ships and keep them a little bit longer.

And so we put some money for modernization, but I think the plan now is to still decommission those in 2015. If that is the case, if I were to ask you, do you think we need less ships, you'd probably say no. So why -- why are we -- why are we still planning on decommissioning those cruisers?

GREENERT:

We don't need less ships. I'll go on the record with that, Congressman. You're right there. The issue is strictly budget driven. In '13, we described (ph) Budget Control Act compelled us to do what we did in the fiscal year '13 submission.

You're right. This committee did provide the funds to -- for '13 and '14 for those ships. And our situation in '15, as I mentioned, I have carryover from the sequestration in '13 into '14. '14 is uncertain. '15 is even more uncertain, so it's very difficult. We're in no better shape in '15 than we were in '13, sir, strictly budgetarily speaking. And so I -- I can't predict that.

Lastly, I would say when we submitted our '14 budget from the Navy, it was before public law 113-6 came in, which gave or provided those funds. And so we were kind of crossing, if you will, in the night. We were out of sync in that regard, so we couldn't even consider it in that regard.

CRENSHAW:

Are there any plans to reprioritize? I mean, that's what we did I think, you know, in terms of our appropriations process to try to find some money. Is that something you all are thinking about, or is that just kind of out the window in terms of '15?

GREENERT:

I assure you, Congressman, I'm always thinking of ways to retain and sustain force structure as a balance. As stated before, 306 is my goal. The soonest I can get there in balancing our ship to you (ph). We've got a lot of things to do always in the consideration, sir.

CRENSHAW:

Thank you. Thank you very much.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Ms. McCollum?

MCCOLLUM:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to first thank -- thank all of you for being here today. And I'm going to ask you to expand on the pervasive issue of sexual assault within our military ranks.

According to your own department's own numbers, an estimated 19,000 sexual assaults occurred in 2011 alone. Of the estimated 19,000 incidents, only 3,193 sexual assaults were reported, and far fewer went to trial.

As you're aware, the news broke yesterday that firmly demonstrates how pervasive sexual assault is. Just this past weekend, one of the chiefs of the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office was arrested for not (ph) other than a sexual assault. He was in the Air Force, but I'm -- you know, you would think this person would have been vetted, that there would have been due consideration to have had a top-notch person put in that office.

So it's pretty unbelievable to women all across this country, and I'm sure to the men and women who wear the uniform who are living up the high standards and high codes that you expect your service men and women to live up to.

But we absolutely need to do more about this. And recently I had written a letter to the chairman of this committee where I was hopeful that we would be having a briefing or a hearing on sexual assault in the military and what we can do to help you with this.

Now I noticed in your testimony, you addressed it. The highlights of the Department of Navy 2014 budget, please, I prepare to be corrected, didn't see it in here at all. So I'm glad you addressed it in your testimony, but I'm wondering if you could elaborate a little more on what you're doing. And I don't mean the videos that you're showing the recruits, what you're really doing to prosecute, hold people accountable and to...

MABUS:

Congresswoman, I would be very happy to do that. And I ask my colleagues to do it as well. I have been asked if I'm concerned about this, and my concern is no, I am angry about this.

I think you're absolutely right. This is an attack on -- on the men and women in our military. It is a crime. It is -- if somebody was walking around taking random shots at people, we would figure out a way to fix it. And I think that we've taken a lot of actions, and I think we're making progress.

First, I'm the only service that has a sexual assault prevention office that reports to me. And their budget is under my budget. And I apologize for it not being broken out, but -- but they have a strong budget there.

Second, I think we are beginning to learn what works in the fleet. For example, we took a hard look at our recruit training at boot camp. We found that there were relatively few issues there, but where the issues came were at the school right after that -- at a school that came right after boot camp.

So we've become far more intrusive there with things like shore patrol. Things like working with local hotels to make sure that if parties are going on that we know what's going on about it. Things like bystander intervention to make sure that sailors or Marines know that these are shipmates that are being attacked and they have a responsibility to intervene.

We are rolling those things out across the fleet. The commandant and his sergeant major has gone worldwide talking to Marines and stressing the importance of this. The CNO has done likewise. We cannot afford as -- we cannot be a great military force as long as we have attacks like this occurring inside the military.

And we are working I hope in the right direction. And I think that at least the early -- some of the early feedback we're getting from some of the actions we're taking are positive. But as long as there's a single sexual assault, it's too many.

AMOS:

Congresswoman, thank you for asking that question. It's an issue. It's a problem. It's a crime. And in my service alone in fiscal year -- actually calendar year 2011, we had 334 sexual assaults both restricted and unrestricted combined. As you imply or talk about in that report, the numbers are four to give times higher than that. That's the reality of it.

So the issue is in my service we've got 14,020 females as of this morning in the United States Marine Corps, 7 percent of our population. So if I took that 334, you just multiplied it times four or five, the numbers are up there at 12,000 or so, and you start taking -- excuse me, 1,200 or so.

And you start looking at the population and you realize that -- that the stark reality is it could be 10 percent of my female population is being sexually assaulted, and from a variety of different things. From -- everything from just touching to saying bad things to something really heinous happening.

It's a crime. And I tell you, we started last summer under the secretary's actual guidance and motivation, we started last summer to change our culture. We, as the secretary talked about, our major (ph) and I traveled around the world. Twenty-seven different presentations to every officer and staff NCO in the Marine Corps saying, we've got to stop it.

I brought every general officer in for two days this last summer. Brought all the sergeants and majors in. So we started a campaign plan. It really began in earnest probably around September. So we are just into phase two. Phase one was a complete reorganization of our legal community.

We have doubled -- I just got the statistics, and it's part of the report that Congress will get to you yesterday or today. We've doubled the amount of convictions, the amount of prosecutions and the amount of convictions, just in the last 12 months.

So we're heading that direction. I'm determined to change our culture. And I apologize to this committee for the shameful behavior of my Marines.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Admiral, would you respond as well to -- and then I'm going to move to Mr. Calvert.

GREENERT:

Ma'am, I would characterize it as a safety problem and a readiness problem in the Navy. I, like the secretary, am angry about it. But more importantly, I think we're focused and have some tangible things in place.

You're right. We can't train our way out of this. But in order to change a culture, you've got to make sure that our people aware of the problem. So we've done some -- some very good actions I think on training them. OK, they're trained.

Next, we've got to get the reports right so we understand the problem. Where is this happening? How is this happening? What are the demographics of it? So that when we -- and get away from the stigma of not reporting so that we can now go to those places. And what I mean by that is we've had some success in the Great Lakes area. That's where our recruit training is and our A schools. Those are initial schools.

Through efforts done by leadership there, we've reduced the reports of sexual -- the reports of sexual assault have reduced by over two-thirds, 66 percent of two years. What are they doing right? We've took those best practices and recently applied them to San Diego. And it involves getting businesses involved, getting leadership involved.

There's shore patrol now going and look at on base, off base where people gather and get away from the occasion where things are going in the wrong direction based on what we know about the previous events.

GREENERT:

We've talked with the mayor in San Diego, with the businesses. They're very much on board, like they were in the Chicago area and Great Lakes. And we're starting to see some changes there. I'm not declaring victory in San Diego. I'm just saying we're starting to see some tangible reductions there.

Next, I would -- we're going to -- we're going to do the same thing in Japan and also in Naples going to the places where we're finding these -- these things are occurring.

Lastly, I'd say, again, with regard to prosecution, we've worked with NCIS and have reduced the time to -- to do adjudication from 300 days in many cases down to about 80 days on average cases over the last six months. So it's coordination with the law and with the -- the, if you will, the officials in that regard. And it's taking care of the victims, we've increased by 66 numbers and that was our goal to get sexual assault victim advocates as well as counselors.

So it's a series of things going on ma'am, but it's looking for what is the tangible means that we can measure it and understand where to go from here and adjust.

MCCOLLUM:

Thank you and I hope that the committee does do a briefing or -- or a hearing on that because we need to help them that are trying to do the right thing but it is a stain on anyone who wears the uniform when -- when another person's at fault and -- and I want to lift that -- that stain away from all the men and women who serve in our military.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you Ms. McCollum, this is a very important issue.

Mr. Calvert?

CALVERT:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I hope that the Navy and the Marine Corps does a better job in vetting their people in sexual assault in the United States Air Force. This -- I guess this weekend the Air Force Chief of Sexual Assault Prevention, Lieutenant Colonel Jeffrey Kosinski was arrested for sexual assault. That doesn't -- doesn't look good to our United -- our United States military.

One comment that was made about our ship vulnerability, Admiral, and all ships are vulnerable like you say and -- and one thing I know you've been putting in a lot of (inaudible) said in your testimony is defense mechanisms whether they're laser or other mechanisms against this wave runner type torpedo or missile which really is very frightening to -- even to your -- your carrier groups.

Do these defensive mechanisms have a lot of promise to them that you believe that -- that these ships can be protected by these mechanisms?

GREENERT:

I -- I believe so, sir.

We -- we have compelling evidence, that is we -- we've done a number of runs that the laser works with -- with regard to that. That's why we're going to take it out to the Gulf for two reasons, put it in CIT-2 (ph) and see how does it perform in the heat and waves and all that and it's also a quick turnaround. So...

CALVERT:

Is this -- is this the laser or the rail gun?

GREENERT:

This is the laser.

CALVERT:

Laser.

GREENERT:

The rail gun is electromagnetic giant capacitor that generates energy that flings a large, if you will, hunk of metal, a projectile great distances at huge, huge energy and so when it hits, it makes a tremendous -- it makes an explosion like; but it's not explosive so you don't have to go through all the care and feeding that goes on with putting explosives and have an ammo bunkers. You're just having large chunks of metal, if you will on board, quite simple.

But yet, anyway, to answer your question, yes sir. I -- I -- we feel much better and the help of this committee, by the way, putting better guns on our patrol craft over there, better guns on our carriers, better guns on our destroyers and cruisers over there that counter small craft.

We have better ISR. You -- you detect them coming, you can prepare yourself accordingly. But I think this laser technology has great promise. That's why we're -- we're going to put it out there and check it out.

CALVERT:

OK.

Mr. Secretary, one thing -- I -- we've discussed this, is there one -- and that's not just the Navy, but is there any major procurement program that you know of that's on budget and on schedule?

MABUS:

Yes, there are.

(CROSSTALK)

MABUS:

The Virginia-class submarine, the DDG-51, LCS...

CALVERT:

LCS is on -- on -- isn't the price...

MABUS:

Yes, it is.

CALVERT:

... the price on that has gone up significantly in the last (inaudible) years.

MABUS:

The price on that has actually come down by more than 40 percent from the first four ships that were -- were built. We are, as I said to Congressman Moran, the first...

CALVERT:

The initial cost in those ships, those original four, aren't -- aren't they substantially higher than they thought they were going to cost?

MABUS:

I'm -- I'm sorry.

CALVERT:

Wasn't the original four LCS ships substantially more expensive than what we thought they were going to be?

MABUS:

Absolutely and it was a program that was...

CALVERT:

They're bringing them down 40 percent, that's getting them back to just a little bit more than what we thought that was going to be. I mean...

MABUS:

You're -- you're absolutely right. The... when -- when...

CALVERT:

But isn't that part of the...

MABUS:

When -- when the -- when the LCS program -- when I got there, it was -- and this is a technical term -- a mess.

(LAUGHTER)

It -- prices -- prices were out of control, and that's why I made the decision to -- to make the two variants compete against each other, based mainly on price and prices came down. Prices came down dramatically by 40 percent from the first -- first four ships. But prices continue to come down.

We have a ten ship block buy from each manufacturer. The first ship of the class will cost $439 million, the last ship of each one will cost $350 million. Each one of the same ship is costing less which is the way procurement programs should operate.

CALVERT:

Well I -- I would hope so because it seems, from my perspective, and I think from the committee's perspective that most of these procurements aren't on time or on budget.

I -- the submarine program was brought to -- up in the earlier part of the hearing and back in the old days, you had one individual, I don't know if that's the right answer, one individual that was responsible for the submarine program and it seemed to work and he took the -- took the responsibility. And it seems that these program managers in the military, and I again, it's not just the Navy, but just kind of come and go, come and go, come and go and nobody takes responsibility.

And the -- the F-35 for instance, how many program managers have we had in the F-35 program since its inception? I don't think we could -- could count them.

MABUS:

Four.

CALVERT:

Four or so.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

If -- if you could briefly reply, we're going to -- then we're going to move on to Mr. Owens.

CALVERT:

But anyway, that's my -- I -- I think we just need a lot of work on the procurement system that we have in the United States military to -- to build -- to build these weapon systems that approximating the -- the original estimates.

CALVERT:

Congress, I agree with you absolutely and I am proud of where we are in the Navy now on that and one thing on the Virginia- class submarine, the last one that came -- that we commissioned, the

weld name the USS Mississippi, came in a year early at $170 million under budget.

CALVERT:

OK, thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Mr. Owens?

OWENS:

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you for coming in to testify today.

To follow on some of Mr. Calvert's questions, as we move forward in the environment we're current in, have you prioritized in your budget those programs that you feel are absolutely essential, particularly in light of rebalancing into the Pacific? And how have you gone through that prioritization in terms of how you will refocus assets in the Pacific and also how you acquire new -- new assets?

MABUS:

Well, we -- we're going to rebalance the Pacific in four ways.

One is the -- the force structure movement and the charlet in front of you describes that. As you -- if you flip it over and you look at '14, '18, '20, you'll see how we are operating forward and -- and moving our ships out to the Asia Pacific. So it's force structure and that's aircraft and ships.

Number two, capability. We sat down and benchmarked the challenges in the Western Pacific toward ASW, electronic warfare, electronic attack, strike and cyber and said that is the theater we

benchmark against and we've invested in capabilities to that benchmark.

Three, we also have migrated, if you will, home ports toward the Western Pacific so that by the end of this decade, while 60 percent of our ships in the West and -- and 40 percent in the East (inaudible) home ported.

And lastly, it's in an intellectually capacity, improving and increasing the complexity of exercises in the Western Pacific may not be generating a whole bunch more, but those that we do with the -- with India, with Indonesia, with Japan, Korea and all of our partners out there much more comprehensive and complex.

It's all of that brought together makes up the rebalance, Congressman.

OWENS:

Thank you.

General?

AMOS:

congressman, we -- we are all with regards to the rebalance in the Pacific, but to a larger degree, to answer your question right up front, we have gone through now as a result of sequestration and prioritized everything -- everything from -- from the training we get for sexual assaults, suicide prevention, family readiness, operations and maintenance, forward deployed forces, getting ready training and preparation for deploying.

And then we've racked and stacked those so it's almost an inverted pyramid kind of thing where we've got a lot of things up at the top of this thing that we're going to and divest ourselves of as we work our way down towards the more important things. The things that we're protecting or the reorientation of our forces in the Pacific. We've just

put our third infantry battalion in the Pacific and whereas we had one in there a year and a half ago. We just put our force back on the ground in Darwin, Australia. We're training in Guam, we're training in the Philippines. So we're committed to the reorientation in the Pacific to support the president's strategy. So that's all prioritization for us.

There are things that are going to fall off over the next year. But we have a list and we're just going down those things and we're saying, OK, that's not nearly as important. I'll give you an example.

There were some things that we were going to buy new in the way of ground -- ground equipment. We simply can't afford to do that. We've asked ourselves a question, what is good enough? So our seven ton trucks that we've been driving for the last seven or eight years in Afghanistan, good enough? Yes.

We've got 23,000 Humvees. We weren't going to keep those Humvees; well, we're going to recapitalize probably 14,000 to 15,000 of them, send them back to the depots and they will be good enough over the next seven or eight years.

So the answer to your question is we are absolutely prioritizing and we're committed to the Pacific.

OWENS:

Thank you very much.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

OK.

Mr. Bonner?

BONNER:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I was going to talk about joint high speed vessels but since my friend from Virginia mentioned LCS, I want to invite him and everyone on this subcommittee down to Mobile, where one of these two ships are being built and I would challenge you, if you've not seen it, then you would better informed about this issue and it is important. And -- and I say that with all due respect because he is a friend.

And I think we ought to go to Wisconsin and Mississippi and Virginia and other places where our -- our military vessels are being built. I think that's something that we haven't done enough of, with all due respect, Mr. Chairman, to see on -- boots on the ground of the industrial base that we often times talk about.

BONNER:

I don't think there's been a secretary in my 30 years of working here as a staffer to someone who's served as the subcommittee chairman of two different subcommittees on this appropriations committee or as a member of this subcommittee itself I have never seen a service chief who's been more hands on, more innovative, more thoughtful of thinking outside the box and -- and who has addressed some of the concerns that initially were raised about LCS and the former governor of Mississippi it was not lost on me the name of that ship, Mr. Secretary.

(LAUGHTER)

(UNKNOWN)

Being your next door neighbor.

But -- but I want to give the admiral a chance to respond to Mr. Moran's question about war games scenario, and -- and I want to follow up on what my good friend Mr. Calvert raised as well.

You know, I talked with the Bloomberg reporter. He didn't even come to Mobile. And, I don't think you can really assess the

aluminum hull variant whether it's survivability or whatever, if you're not gonna come out and -- and kick the tires so to speak.

(UNKNOWN)

For the record I never talked to him.

BONNER:

Well, no -- but -- but I talked to him for over an hour. And -- and Forbes, another respected news source, came out with a separate analysis of LCS just a couple days ago, which talks about the innovative new measures that LCS makes available.

So, in the remaining time of my question I'll ask both the secretary and admiral.

(UNKNOWN)

You put on a pretty good defense, I must say.

(LAUGHTER)

(UNKNOWN)

We know there's a question in there.

(LAUGHTER)

BONNER:

Well the -- the question is this, the world's a different place. One of your predecessors was in Mobile a few days ago who was involved in trying to get to 600 ships maybe. We're not gonna be there. We'll -- we'll hope to get up to 300 ships.

But, you've said publicly before, Mr. Secretary that this is part of the Navy for the future. That -- those are my words, not yours. Yours were much more eloquent. Tell us a little bit in the remaining time

that I leave you about how you envisioned it, because I can only imagine that in the shallow waters off the coast of Africa or in -- off Indonesia or the Philippines, that this ship and others like it, like joint high speed vessels can play a major role in the Navy of the future.

(UNKNOWN)

Thank you, Congressman

And I'm tempted to just yield my time to you.

(LAUGHTER)

(UNKNOWN)

That's not permitted actually.

(LAUGHTER)

BONNER:

We're gonna keep rolling here.

All hands on deck. We want to get a couple of rounds in here.

GREENERT:

You're right, this is one of the crucial platforms for us, for the future. In fact, LCS-1 the freedom arrived in Singapore a few days ago. Both the CNO and I are going out to meet her in -- in Singapore, and we're planning to deploy four LCSs by 2016 to Singapore.

The straits of Malaka, all the waters around there, it's a perfect ship to operate in that environment,a and also with the navies in that region. The same things goes for the Arabian Gulf, and one of the things about survivability that the CNO pointed out is that, we don't send these ships out by themselves in hostile environments. They're part of a -- of a strike team. They -- they each have their own unique -- unique missions, but the -- the capabilities that LCS

both variants bring is -- is crucial, and will be an important part of the Navy's stretching far into the future.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, Mr. Bonner.

I know you're shy and retiring. You've made your point, well taken.

Ms. Kaptur.

BONNER:

Mr. Chairman, please make sure that the record notes retiring is -- is an adjective used to describe...

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Absolutely,

BONNER:

I don't want to get any rumors out.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

I don't want to be visited by Sunny Callahan (ph), thank you.

(LAUGHTER)

KAPTUR:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all for your great service to our country. And, I have several questions, I'll try to be brief.

First of all, General Amos, on page 24 of your testimony you talk about resiliency and some of the challenges to that, and what you

were doing inside the Marine Corps to help those who have suffered war related injuries including TBI and PTS.

I wanted to encourage you to include any assistance you could to Ohio based Lima company in Brook Park, Ohio. That sustained -- there were over -- there were 46 Marines, I believe, who were killed in Iraq in Alabar (ph) province, two Navy corpsman, and then more recently one in Afghanistan to make sure that, that unit is attended to and all of their -- all the survivors in that unit they sustained enormous losses.

And we thank the Corps, and we thank their families for their great sacrifice for our country.

I wanted to associate myself with the remarks of Congresswoman McCollum on the sexual assault issue, and just comment that I agree with her for a need for a special hearing on that, but I also would encourage you and I'm sure you're doing this already with the volunteer military, statistics are showing us that a larger number, quite a substantial number of people who are coming into all of our services have experienced violent behavior in their own homes and families prior to enlistment.

And I think there are probably ways of checking on sexual assault even in -- in the homes as you look to enlist. And I think there's a lot that can be done to prior to service. So I would just ask you to focus there, I'm sure you already are, but I wanted to add my words of concern and support there.

Secretary Mabus, I think you're a great Secretary of the Navy, and I read with interest the article that was in yesterday's paper, USA Today -- let's see if I brought it with me -- ah, yes, here it is -- and how many of our colleagues got to see this, about a military that could be more powerful by focusing on energy independence.

I can honestly say, your branch of the military has had more aggressive interest in this than some of the others I had expected

more of.I want to compliment you on that. I want to thank you for being focused on the future not the past and some of the inventions I see coming out of the Navy honestly I would have lost money had I bet on Navy being the branch that would be taking such an aggressive lead, even though Navy is in our family.

But, I am just so impressed with what you're trying to do in terms of living in the future and getting us into military partnerships with people who share our political values, rather than living this paradox of partnerships with un-democratic places just because we need their fuel.

So I encourage you on in those efforts, all of the research that's being done through the Navy, any deployment to the civilian sector, you have a supporter here, I will help you in any way that I can as one-five hundred and thirty-fifth of this institution in terms of energy independence.

But I just -- it's mentioned early in your testimony, Mr. Secretary, General Amos you talk about it in your testimony and the people that I represent thank you so very much.

I wanted also to as a little bit of a different question relating to nuclear weapons, and that is, any comments you may have, any one of you on our -- the nuclear weapons that we have their suitability and capability as we move into this century to meet the needs of today and tomorrow. And knowing everything you know about the weapons that you have carried if you had to trim some aspect of the nuclear weapons program, where would you look?

(UNKNOWN)

Well, Ma'am, I'll -- I'll comment first, we -- we have to be sure that the weapons that we have and the supporting systems are modernized first. The stockpiles, the weapons themselves and as I get the -- the systems they employ.

And it's really about the confidence that, if we're going to deliver one we can deliver it where it needs to go and be accurate. Once we have that, then there's this sense that -- a feeling of confidence that what we have -- you don't have to have as many because you don't have to deliver as many if you will because you're not sure they're gonna go precisely where you may want them to go. That would be step one in my view.

And that is-- there is a program underway to do exactly that, the D-5 which is our missile of today. It's got an extension program, and an upgrade program. All of our submarines, which I can speak to, have upgrades in -- in their systems to be sure once again that they preform far to the right -- that would be better -- in their requirements.

So that is, to me, the most important part, modernization.

KAPTUR:

OK, thank you very much.

Is my time expired?

FRELINGHUYSEN:

It -- it has.

KAPTUR:

Could I just say -- five seconds, could I just...

FRELINGHUYSEN:

You -- you -- you and I serve on energy and water, and you and I will make sure that the nuclear stockpile we have is reliable.

KAPTUR:

Yes, that's why I asked the question.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Even though, I know...

KAPTUR:

That's why I asked the -- I just wanted to say, Mr. Chairman, also if I might, in terms of the drug trade, for the record, I would be very interested in the Navy's observations about Afghanistan and what has happened with the increased productions of plans for heroin and what is happening on

the drug side as we try to rotate out of there. There's no more significant problem that my region faces in terms of crime up in the Northern part of our country, than drugs.

Now, they don't necessarily come from Afghanistan, but I would be very interested in how you see that...

FRELINGHUYSEN:

For the record, we'll take that question.

Gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. Cole.

COLE:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, thank you, gentlemen for your service.

I have to tell you I'm still reeling from my friend form Alabama's fervent defense of LCS and just for the record, if there as tough as the Crimson Tide front four, if you can assure me that, than they'll be good enough.

(UNKNOWN)

"Roll tide."

COLE:

OK, "roll tide."

I've got actually, a little bit more of an operational question to ask you gentlemen, and you may not be able to fully discuss it, but parts of it you will be.

One of the things that -- I was not in favor of what we did in Libya, but I was so impressed by the manner in which we did it, and how quickly particularly the Navy was able to put assets at the disposal of the president that just did an extraordinary job, you know, on the fly, and with us deeply engaged in other parts of the world.

We're at a really unusual and difficult situation, I think, for all of us right now. We've got an unfolding crisis in Syria that the president may or may not have to do something with, we've got a continuing challenge of the nuclear capability efforts in Iran and we've had a lot of saber rattling in North Korea. And, obviously you're two services -- particularly, Mr. Secretary your responsibility to the Navy and the Marine Corps will be heavily engaged in all three of those things.

COLE:

So, I'm curious, are you comfortable that you have the resources and we have the capabilities to give the president the options that he would need if something that none of us wants to happen happened in any of those areas, let alone in - you know, they could actually converge in some ways and you could be dealing with more than one at a time.

MABUS:

Congressman, to answer your question directly, I'm absolutely comfortable that we have the assets that we would need. And that is the Navy and Marine Corps' job, is to give the president options.

And you - you pointed out Libya. I think you're - on the fly, you said we sent a big deck amphib there, which provided their air cover. We didn't have to send a carrier. We - we had one of - one of our

amphibs. We also had a submarine firing Tomahawk missiles, and we had a destroyer firing Tomahawk missiles. So we have multi-mission, very flexible platforms that can do a lot of different things depending on the mission. And - and so I am comfortable.

And as long as this - this committee has been very, very helpful in terms of providing that. And the ships and the platforms, the weapons systems that we are buying for the future I think will meet the - the needs that will come up in the future.

GREENERT:

In summary, Mr. Cole, I think I said we got to be where it matters, when it matters. And I bring your attention to the chart I provided. As we proceed through this decade, we will be out and about in more places, but what's most important are the places, the Bahrain, the Roda (ph), the Sigonella, all those, you know, that you - that we operated from to to be able to do.

The Japan. If it wasn't for the four deployed Naval forces, we couldn't be on a station in a matter of a couple of days providing the missile shield that was necessary during that period of heightened tension.

And so ships matters. The numbers matter. No question. Ships forward matter most, in my view. I'm very comfortable that we can do the offshore option. And where you see Navy on this, think Marine Corps as well. That's our partner.

COLE:

And thank you very much for making the point about how important the staging areas that our allies provide us are. Because I get quite a few questions at home, why are we over there doing this, and always try to say it provides us capability that we want to have. This is not just a favor we do for our friends. It's also very important for ourselves.

One other quick question, then I'll yield back my time. And - and probably directed at you, Secretary, but maybe also at you too, General Amos. We've clearly - and you touched on some of this in your testimony - got a tremendous challenge in resetting forces. We're coming - we're out of Iraq and we're drawing down in Afghanistan.

And we've done a lot of that, frankly, as a committee on the fly through OCO over the years. And that's beginning to come down pretty dramatically too. So, one, are - are you going to have the resources to do the things that you - and how concerned are you that perhaps when we should have, we didn't put all the things in the regular budget that we should have? We sort of were

funding them on a not- reliable basis and not something that you can easily count on going forward.

MABUS:

The Navy and Marine Corps have been pretty aggressive in moving money from OCO back to base for some of the reasons you - you just mentioned.

We clearly need some OCO sustainment for not only the Marine Corps coming out of the second ground war in Afghanistan, but also the Navy for the support we give from - from the sea. We use OCO, for example, for about 20 percent of the maintenance of our ships simply because of the increased operational tempo.

We reset in stride - the Navy does. The Marine Corps - I believe the number is a little over $3 billion, $3.2 billion that the Marine Corps will need to reset the Marine Corps, the new Marine Corps when it comes out. And we will need - we will need OCO for - for that because that is clearly a wartime - wartime expenditure.

Finally, I would say that as we draw down the Marine Corps to our new 182-1 size level, the way we do that and keep faith with Marines, not - not telling anybody to go home early, but - but

bringing it down consistently and prudently, requires some OCO funding as well because this - that surge that went up to 202 was in direct result to the two wars.

COLE:

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. chairman.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, Mr. Cole. Mr. Womack, thank you for your patience. I know you're on the - almost on the tail end. We got a few other members as well.

WOMACK:

Call me forward deployed down here.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Formerly in the Sinai, right?

WOMACK:

I thank the gentlemen for their service. And you know, the secretary was bragging (ph) on the USS Mississippi. It should be noted that in a previous life, you did serve on the USS Little Rock. So...

MABUS:

I did, and I had the privilege of naming the new USS Little Rock.

WOMACK:

That's correct. Mr. Chairman, I've just got one question. It's not my intent to provide a softball question for the benefit of the commandant and the chief. It is my intent to realistically portray and allow these two gentlemen an opportunity to maybe take us a little bit further down into the weeds on readiness.

General Amos, as I was reading your brochure that is in front of us, in that brochure you say that you create options an decision space for our nation's leaders. I have to believe that sequestration, indeed an enduring sequestration, will have an impact on those options and perhaps on that decision space.

So take the time that you need in - in - and I'm going to give Admiral Greenert the same opportunity perhaps with transit times and other things meaningful to his force. But take the time that you need to help us out with what we are doing to affect the readiness of our Marine Corps.

AMOS:

Thank you, sir. You're absolutely correct. I alluded to it in my opening comments that we're paying for readiness for this year for all those forces that are - that are certainly forward deployed overseas in the Pacific, and we have a bunch of them.

We have them on amphibious ships, we have them on carriers, and we certainly have our combat forces on the ground in Afghanistan. We are keeping those at the highest state of readiness, and we're moving operations maintenance (inaudible) around within the Marine Corps, within my authorities to be able to do that.

We have the next tranche of units fixing to go to Afghanistan. The next ones fixing to go on - on our amphibious ships, and those that are fixing to go on carriers, and those that are going to deploy to the Pacific. We have moved money into those to ensure that they are at the highest state of readiness so that those forces are ready to provide options.

When things happen bad, the president and the National Command Authority need to be able to say, OK, let me put this on pause for just a second and figure out what it is we have to do. It's not always exactly clear what the next step is.

Assisting them in doing that quite often is Naval presence, a ship pulling off the shore. An amphibious ready group with 2,500 Marines is a pretty formidable deterrent in anybody's mind. It'll catch people's attention and maybe quell the - a little bit of the anxiety and allow the National Command Authority to have that decision space.

So ready forces forward deployed do that, Congressman. What's going to happen in sequestration the way we're headed right now - and this is - this is not - I'm not wringing my hands. It's fact. Sequestration is law. It came in on March 2 and we are - we are planning accordingly.

And - but our readiness next year for our non-deployed combat units, our battalions, our squadrons will be below 50 percent. In other words, 50 percent - it will be what we call C-3 and C-4. C-1 and C-2 is what your readiness levels you - the combatant commanders want to deploy at, want to force it to come into the theater.

We'll be at C-3 or C-4 for greater than 50 percent of those non- deploying units. In other words, the units that are - that are still back home, whole cloth units that are ready to go or should be ready to go at a moment's notice.

So that is the reality of what's going to happen. We are not going to be able to maintain 182,000 Marines. We're on our way down there. It sounds good. You feel good when you say that number, but sequestration is simply not going to allow that to happen. We can't afford it.

I mean, so we get into capacity now, to your question, to your point, Congressman. We will reach a point in the future where the capacity, the depth on the bench, the - the - it's not the B team, but it's the backup team that's fixing to go next, will not be ready.

So for me to be able to maintain a level of readiness, I've got to get in there and adjust manpower, structure, equipment, investments,

all that stuff so that the force that I do have - in other words, whatever the Marine Corps is going to look like is in fact a ready force. It will be a smaller force, and you'll have less capacity.

I think this is - we're headed that way. I mean, I just - I'm making plans for it right now and I just want - I just want us to all go into this with our eyes open.

WOMACK:

Admiral?

GREENERT:

Thank you, sir. The situation now is we have one ship - one carrier strike group in the Western Pacific, it's - most people pay attention to it, and one in the Arabian Gulf. And that's - that's fine for now.

But what we don't have - we normally have three amphibious ready groups and three carrier strike groups ready to respond. And that - when ready to respond, that means they are fully mission capable, they have their essential task lists trained up. We have one of each now, and we usually have three. So that's - that's before you take $4 billion of shortfall and roll it into F.Y. '14.

We will - as the commandant said, we have invested in making sure that the next to deploy are - they're training now. The maintenance is getting done on those, and those next to deploy will deploy. But those that are back here, your surge force, your response force, will drift further into a more unready position, if you will, a C rating - a lower C rating, C-3, C-4.

So to give you a number, we normally have maybe half of the ships who are getting ready to deploy at C-3, C-4, and can be ramped up relatively quickly. We'll now have two out of three at C-3, C-4. So it's the response force that takes the issue at first.

GREENERT:

We will be able to make up almost all of the ship maintenance that was deferred here when we were in the continuing resolution as we get through the remainder of the year, assuming we get the reprogramming that the - that the Congress will consider here shortly.

Next year, again, you roll over what was $9 billion and if you add $14 billion, again $23 billion, there'll be a lot of ship maintenance that we'll have to defer and I have a similar issue with the commandant.

You have to balance the force structure you hold today, the fleet of the future and the readiness. You have to have a ready fleet. You have to be able to respond like the commandant said. So we are out where it matters, ready when it matters first.

So the problem will be do we retire more ships and how many? Well if the sequestration levers -- numbers we're looking at, if it rolls year by year by year, that could get up to 30 ships retired and so instead of being at 295 at the end of this decade, I could be at 265 -- 270, somewhere in that ballpark, it depends on how you distribute the numbers. There are many scenarios, that's one.

So the -- the -- the last point I'd make is the industrial base. The ship industrial base today is very tightly wound. We have two major builders in five total shipyards. If we start unraveling multiyear procurements, some of the -- the great performance Secretary Mabus, very true that he articulated earlier, performance will start unraveling. We won't get that great cost and we won't have, therefore, that performance. And if you start falling behind in there, it took us a long time to get where we are today which is pretty good performance by the ship builders. That will drift and I don't know how long it'll take to get it back.

Thank you.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, Mr. Womack, excellent questions. And that's why we're so focused on the -- the number of ships actually that are prepared for combat. Support is one thing, but ships that are prepared for combat...

Mr. Kingston and then Mr. Ryan.

KINGSTON:

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Admiral Amos, I wanted -- excuse me, General Amos, I wanted to mention Townsend Bombing Range which is on page 21 of your testimony...

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Move your mike a little closer to your mouth.

KINGSTON:

We don't really need to engage in it now, but you're proposal is to expand it from 5,000 to 28,000 acres, that's real important land for a very small community that does not have a large economy and that hurts their ability to grow. It's right next to I-95 and it's fairly good real estate; not prime, but next to prime real estate, literally. And there's big pushback by the county and -- and I share their concerns. It -- it's a big grab.

We've been working with your folks on it but so far, I -- I don't think the sensitivity to the local concern has been there to the level that it has been. In fact, some of it's been kind of insulting, that OK, we'll open up an office down there. Well that's not the same as the county's ability to attract an industry or, you know, build a complex of neighborhood development that would really add to their tax base.

So, I just wanted to, you know, make sure that you know, we have a lot of concerns about that and my office can't speak for the -- the Senators about it, but I know that the locals are -- are very worried about the big expansion of that bombing range in Townsend. So, I just wanted to mention that.

Admiral, I -- I have to ask you a question that -- that not trying to drag in Benghazi to this hearing -- hearing, but -- but I have to respond to your response to Mr. Cole when you said that what your goal is to be where it matters when it matters.

How does that apply to a Benghazi or a future Benghazi, you know, on a -- on a disconnection because surely right after Libya, there were troops nearby and available, maybe not within a couple of hours, but that discussion is being held, of course, as you know. but talk to me about how that would apply because it seems to me that was just one of the lowest points for America in the last year in terms of letting four of our citizens die when there were assets nearby. So again, the theme -- and I like the theme, I think every American, everybody would agree, be where it matters when it matters, but we weren't there for our fellow citizens. So can you talk a little bit about that?

GREENERT:

Yes sir.

As -- as one that organize, trains, equips and provides for the combatant commander, I -- I keep referring to the chartlet and it is -- is what are we doing to increase forward as much as feasible, naval forces, as the commandant and I were saying, to be able to respond.

And so we are building ships that can help support that. We have a ship called the mobile landing platform, which is volume, persistence, seaborne, out and about that can support when it's used in a float forward staging base with a deck so would...

KINGSTON:

So would (inaudible) don't want to -- I don't want to interrupt you, but I don't want you to run the clock out either.

GREENERT:

Providing those ships forward and -- and providing the platform...

KINGSTON:

So -- so would that prevent a future Benghazi where we would say, hey look, you had folks on the ground, you had folks in the water, you had folks in the air nearby to make sure we don't lost another ambassador or if something like that happens?

GREENERT:

It's -- it's -- I -- I can't speak to the exact details of that because I just don't have that knowledge here. But it's -- I would like to shorten time distance at every conceivable effort and -- and be in those key and critical areas, the maritime crossroads.

So if you look on there, and you look at the places and -- and around where we'll have the vessels, the right kind of vessels, those that resonate with the needs of the combatant commanders of the future, that's what I'm about.

KINGSTON:

Mr. Secretary, somewhat related to that, I've always been curious as to why Libya and Tunisia are in AFRICOM and Egypt is in CENTCOM even though they're both sort of Arab-Africa. It would appear to me that they would be better off being in CENTCOM. But do you have any thoughts on that? And would that have made any difference in Benghazi or would we have a greater understanding of kind of the Middle Eastern type nation even if it's in Africa if it was in another command?

MABUS:

Congressman, I -- I don't know why -- why the line was drawn where it was and to the C&O's point, we try to have forces forward deployed, forward stationed and flexible and ready to meet any eventuality.

The -- one of the things that the Marine Corps has stood up is a special purpose Marine Air Ground Taskforce for very rapid response for any sort of situation that -- that may -- may happen and it's -- it's being stood up in Europe now.

KINGSTON:

Well, like Mr. Cole, I appreciate what's going on in Sigonella and Aviano, Vicenza, another branch, but Rota and so forth and I think you are in the right place that you need to be. I just want to make sure that the connections are there.

MR. Secretary, I have one -- one more question if I have time. On the green fleet, I think that has been an admirable investment, but I think that with sequestration budget cuts in general and the high expense of it, it might be -- and the fact that the USDA is not kicking in as they should be and you're brunting the whole cost of it, is it not time to say, look, we're going to have hold this for a future, you know, a future Navy?

MABUS:

I think, in fact, just exactly the opposite, that we cannot afford not to do this now, Congressman. In the last two years, F.Y. '11 and F.Y. '12, the Navy has gotten almost $1 billion additional fuel bill because of the spikes in the price of oil. We can't afford that, that comes out of operations, that comes out of platforms. We have got to have a cost competitive domestically produced stable fuel supply and that is what we're doing.

Well actually, agriculture has kicked in, its...

KINGSTON:

Oh, they -- they have?

MABUS:

... its entire amount, yes sir.

KINGSTON:

OK.

Thanks.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Mr. Ryan?

RYAN:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you Admiral, General Amos, Mr. Secretary, thank you. I would like to just on Mr. Kingston's issue with the -- the local issue there, we have a 21,000 acre Camp Ravenna in Ohio and we would welcome you to come up so if we can make a deal here, Mr. Kingston.

(LAUGHTER)

So much for -- so much for southern hospitality, that's all I'm going to say.

(LAUGHTER)

KINGSTON:

It's only bombs, it's not...

RYAN:

At ease -- at ease.

I'd also like to say with Mr. Bonner's comments, I think that would be a great trip for us to reengage the defense industrial base and I look around this committee here and I see members of Congress from older industrial areas like Toledo or Youngstown or Gary, Indiana and many in the south like Mobile, how we can work together as a committee to drive this investment back into some of these older communities. So I think that would be a great opportunity and love to work with you on that.

The issue I want to get to is the issue of suicides within the Navy and the Marines and then also suicide prevention. And I know both in the Army and in the Marines there have been experiments in innovative approaches to try to deal with preventing post traumatic stress and I won't get into the whole science like I did in the last hearing. But the more and more we learn

through neuroscientific research the more and more we're finding out how the brain works and the more we're finding out how we can actually build up resiliency in our brains.

So I want to -- I want to thank Navy research and Navy health research and also the Army for looking at alternative ways to build up this resiliency. So, I guess I would open it up to everybody, but I know General Amos and I have talked about this on several occasions, but if you can just comment on what you think some of the better programs that you have implemented for increasing resiliency and preventing post traumatic stress in the long run. Because I know there -- there have been a couple of studies and what it's showing is that there's actually a depletion in cognitive ability before we even leave -- before the soldiers and Marines and airmen even leave, there's a depletion, so they're already starting below their baseline level. So I think this is very important and just General Amos, if you could start?

AMOS:

Congressman, I'll be happy to.

And you're right, we've -- we've talked about the mind fitness. We're continuing that program right now and -- and -- and I think I'm very enthusiastic about it and O&R, you know, Office of the Naval Research is funding that for us. So I'm (inaudible) that.

But I was just at Camp Pendleton just probably three weeks ago and -- and spent time in the advanced infantry immersion trainer, the improved -- I mean this is -- this is -- so to point, how do you take a young -- a young Marine who's never been in combat and not only -- not only immerse them in the -- the chaos and the anxiety and the -- and the absolute abject fear of what's going to happen next and get them to a point where they're listening, they're thinking, they're actually able to operate as a team cohesively in a -- in an environment that is just absolute chaos?

AMOS:

And we built about five or six years ago, the original immersion trainer where we actually inside a factory made it like the street of Ramadi and Fallujah and the smells and noise, the -- I mean everything, the language, the -- the -- everything, to include munitions going off and flying over your head.

We've just -- we spent through -- through -- Congress has helped us to build a new facility, and we opened it about a year and a half ago. And, that really allows a unit to go through. It's platoon- sized unit that will go through this thing.

So -- so how does that fit with resiliency?

You've got to be able to help a young man or woman understand that they're going to be OK, that -- that -- so their mind doesn't just trip out on them to the point where it maybe never recovers again. In other words, you're -- you're not able to reach back and pull that back.

So, if we gradually build them into a - into an environment where we're actually kind of building callous on them, so to speak, we found that, that helps probably more than anything else. It also makes them more survivable, because the first -- it -- it's -- the statistics are proven. If you can

survive the first two or three major fire fights, then you have a very good chance of surviving the rest of the deployment. So we do that.

But, beyond that -- to the left of that -- so that's an important part, but to the left of that is spiritual fitness with our chaplains, physical fitness.

All of this fits in there to make the whole Marine or whole sailor to where you actually are now resilient enough to where when you get a Dear John letter from your girlfriend or your wife -- and that's a big deal with regards to suicides, and you know that -- when things begin to unravel at home and you're -- and you're -- and you're just -- you're up to your neck in the things that you are up to in combat, you're able to just say, OK, I'm gonna be all right (inaudible).

And so it's spiritual fitness, it's -- it's mental fitness, it's physical fitness, it's combat readiness. The best thing we can do is -- is immerse them in this kinds (sic) of behavioral training before they go to combat (ph).

RYAN:

And -- and I think it's important too to recognize that, that training is great prevention, but it also is helpful after when -- when these soldiers and Marines get back some of the skills that they're learning early on are the same skills they would need to deal with those situations when they get back.

AMOS:

Sir, you're absolutely right. In fact, what's interesting is, they've found in some of the more severe cases that many of them will

actually take the young Marine and put him back in that immersive trainer that I was just talking about, and then dialed back the experience to get him back to where it was beforehand. And it sounds crazy, but it works in -- not in every case, but in some cases where you can recreate it and you just dial it back, and say, you're gonna be OK.

So you're absolutely right sir, thanks for your support (ph).

(CROSSTALK)

RYAN:

Thank -- thank you, Mr. Amos.

I'd just like to add one comment that -- the similar techniques are being used for kids in schools that have some levels of post- traumatic stress. I mean, if you're a kid living in a tough neighborhood and (inaudible) is a school or family where you see kids -- other kids get killed, and you're not 20, you're eight.

Some of these same techniques and skills are being used in schools and health care and as I mentioned last time, I think it's something that this committee could really make a push on whether it's in the military schools or in other schools around the country they can save us a lot of trouble and money in the long run (inaudible) thank (inaudible).

(UNKNOWN)

Thank you, Mr. Ryan.

Admiral Greenert, Bill Gertz reports often on defense spending and assessments of capabilities, and he, yesterday, had a pretty interesting perspective on the Pentagon's most recent assessment of China's military power.

And, he wrote, and I quote, "China is building two new classes of missile submarines, in addition to the eight nuclear missile submarines and six attack submarines that are being deployed as part of an arms build up that analysts say appears to put Beijing on the war footing," end of quotation marks.

Deputy Assistant Defense Secretary for East Asia David Helvey told a briefing yesterday that the Chinese are deploying an aircraft carrier killing ballistic missile, two new stealth jet fighters, a new road mobile intercontinental ballistic missile in addition to three other new ICBMs. A particular concern of the Pentagon is the deployment near Taiwan of a precision-guided DF-2 ID-anti-ship ballistic missiles. That's quite an arsenal. That's quite a -- a statement.

You sort of -- you do represent the tip of a spear in the Western Pacific and we constantly have this challenge where the Chinese are out there in force access issues, where do you see -- where do you see the Chinese going relative to some of these -- these systems?

And -- and getting to Mr. Womack's -- you're response to how -- how capable are -- we are as a nation meeting these potential threats?

GREENERT:

Well, staying within the classification of the room, I'll take to the very population discussion on the DF-21 D the anti- ship ballistic missile.

The -- you gotta look at it as a kill chain, I think, Congressman. In other words, to do such a thing, you have to have the sensor, you have to detect a ship, you have to recognize it is a ship, you have to then be confident that you got it well enough, then you gotta have a tracking solution, then you gotta be comfortable you can launch; it launches, it's going in the right direction, then it has to adjust itself.

So at that point, you can spoof it, you can jam it, you can try and shoot it down, and as it gets closer you can put a wall of led up.

And, that -- that whole chain of events has to successfully occur if you're the other side within -- in a defensive measure, you gotta break a couple of those chains, and that's what we look at, frankly. So it is -- many people focus on the bullet on the bullet. So, what I would tell you, it's sort of comprehensive. But in the classification of this room there's a lot of effort going on, has been, and we're making good progress. And I'm pretty comfortably where we are.

Where are they going? Well, Congressman, we own the undersea domain. I mean, I have a lot of empirical data that tells me exactly that. It would appear to me, based on the construction program -- and it kind of is logical that -- that China wants to marginalize...

(UNKNOWN)

They're -- they're building a lot of subs.

GREENERT:

They are.

(UNKNOWN)

They're building a lot of diesels. They're building nuclear subs.

GREENERT:

They are.

They are, yeah, and they have a lot of old ones that they need to replace, they're kind of junkie. And -- and so -- and they're moving in that direction, but they're not there yet. And, so our job is to remain owning the undersea domain.

(UNKNOWN)

So what -- what about the blue -- their blue navy, their projections?

GREENERT:

Their blue navy -- their projections, frankly we had a conversation...

(UNKNOWN)

There -- there's a challenge sometimes in this room here we -- we over the years some of your predecessors have sort of discounted the -- the growing China military build up, but in reality the Chinese are getting really geared up here.

GREENERT:

They're absolutely capable individually...

(UNKNOWN)

And I don't mean to put them in an adversarial way, but in reality constantly even though sometimes people discount it, they are -- they are challenging us on the high seas in what they consider to be their -- their back yard, which seems to be a growing back yard, where traditionally we've had -- we've -- we've had access.

GREENERT:

Yeah, I would say, Congressman, they're reasonably comfortable operating within what we call the first island chain, and that would be the Philippine Islands, Japan down through Singapore, in toward China. They view that as their -- what they call the Near-sea. And they're pretty comfortable operating there.

They have very capable individual platforms that they are now starting to put to sea. The ability to network, to bring them together in an effective manner is -- is somewhat of question, but I would submit, we have an opportunity here as well to operate together, and we'll work in that very direction. Doesn't have to be adversarial.

(UNKNOWN)

They -- they are -- they seem to be -- have a pretty adversarial situation in terms of their relationships with the Philippines, with Vietnam, that -- that's -- not only do we -- are we confronted, those countries are confronted as well. And, obviously the Philippines have been a -- a strong ally of ours.

GREENERT:

There are episodically as in territorial claims there are some issues there, but there's also cooperative issues also going on between the Chinese, the Vietnamese and -- and the Philippines regarding piracy, smuggling and other issues. And, I would submit, China's gonna take part in RIMPAC '14, Rim of the Pacific exercise in 2014, in a very tangible substantial manner. It's a big opportunity, Congressman.

(UNKNOWN)

So you -- it -- it does or doesn't worry you about their arms build up here?

GREENERT:

It -- I'd just say I'm vigilant. I hate to say worry yet, because I'm not necessarily worried. Very vigilant, and we need to pay attention and understand the intent. And challenge them on that intent.

FRELINGHUYSEN (?):

Mr. Visclosky?

VISCLOSKY:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

A couple of quick comments. One, two of my colleagues have mentioned the issue of sexual assault, and I would add my voice to theirs. I don't have a question, but I realize all the intense pressure you're under between continuing resolutions, sequestration's your responsibility. I have no doubt about your sincerity in addressing the issue. We just urge persistence every day in the uniform services, and appreciate your good efforts.

Secondly, in the conversation with Mr. Ryan about suicide, Admiral, I note that there is a task force and they're looking to revise the current collection of 123 suicide programs in the Department of the Navy. And, my first impression reading that number is, if I have 123 programs I don't have any.

So would hope that as the task force examines that, that there's some focus on the programs that work, and we certainly address that.

A couple of questions, and I realize we want to get to another round, so I guess more I'm asking for your impressions if you would and if you want to fill the answers out for the record, that'd be great.

Admiral, you mentioned in your testimony that today the weight is about 10 percent smaller than it was 10 years ago, that the time away from home per ship on average is about 15 percent more. We have the rebalance towards the Pacific, the question really is, what programs are in place dealing with the operational tempo, both as far as the force structure of the ships as well as Navy support?

And, again I have two more quick questions I'd like to slide in. If you would just give me a capsule summary.

GREENERT:

Well to -- to lower the operational tempo, first, you got to man -- fill in the gaps that are in the ship, because if people are not transitioning off the ship, because they're on hold so that they can --

because the ship needs them then you have the individual tempo, I-tempo, that's what we need to track, and we are.

GREENERT:

We used to do this 10 years ago, 12 years ago. We've kind of -- I've revised it. So I'm tracking the individual tempo and not just the ship, but you've got to have the capacity in the shipyard to make sure everybody gets out of the shipyard, gets trained, and is ready to deploy, so that those that are on deployment aren't filling in longer than they need to be, so that the rotation is proper.

We've got to man to make sure the gaps, as I mentioned before, are -- are properly done there. And then I would say -- because I mentioned before, operating forward, if you look on the chartlet, as we migrate more ships forward and these opportunities in Rhoda, in Bahrain, in Singapore, you have -- you're not doing as many rotational deployments. It takes four ships on the east or west coast, to keep one forward. One's there, one's on its way back, one's on its way over, and one's in deep maintenance. So the more we can get out, and about in these places, the less wear on rotating ships and forces out there.

VISCLOSKY:

I understand that you're about 7,000 sailors short of its goal as far as at sea manning. What types of personnel initiatives, and tools are available to you? Will the opening of previously closed billets to women help you? How do you plan to address that problem?

GREENERT:

The -- what's available is urging people to go to sea. So you pay them a bit of money to shorten their time, their...

VISCLOSKY:

You're in the Navy. Doesn't everybody want to go to sea?

GREENERT:

That could be a topic for another discussion, there.

(LAUGHTER)

They do. There are many that do, yes, sincerely. But urge people to get to sea. Then sea duty has to be where you -- a clear message. This is where you hone your skills, and where you advance. That's where you make your career. And so, I want to sharpen that focus and make sure our folks understand, and that our walk is better -- you know equals our talk in that regard. And we're -- we're working on that, in that regard. So you want to incentivize people, if you will, to go to sea. And that -- that will help with our gaps. Plus, we're growing.

In our submission, as I mentioned, a net increase of 4,600 in our 2014 budget, and -- and we're increasing by 2,000 in F.Y. '13, despite these, you know, interruptions, if you will. So, we're growing, and part of it is covering those gaps.

VISCLOSKY:

Admiral, thank you very much. Next question if I could, Mr. Chairman? Mr. Secretary, on the dispersal of capital ships. On the east coast now all of our carriers end up at Norfolk. At one point, and of course it was almost an aberration, you had five carriers in one port. On the west coast, they're dispersed between three different ports. Is it a money issue as far as that dispersal on the east coast? I'm thinking of five carriers, in one spot, a one moment in time?

MABUS:

It is a money issue. As I explained to Mr. Crenshaw a little earlier, it had been the plan to put a carrier and strike group in Mayport. But in order to do that, you have to build a secure nuclear facility.

VISCLOSKY:

I'm sorry did -- if you've covered that with Mr. Crenshaw, I missed that. If you covered that for the record, I'm done. Sorry.

FRELINGHUYSEN (?):

Thank you Mr. Visclosky.

Ms. Granger?

GRANGER:

This will be very quick. One thing I -- I like the idea of us seeing what we're talking about, and making a trip -- I'd like us to go to Texas, see the Joint Strike Fighter, which is one of our largest, and -- and the most unique. But on the sexual assault, several years ago I was -- served on the Board of Visitors for the Air Force Academy. And we had a -- a very serious scandal about

sexual assault, and spent a long, long time studying the issue, and really getting into attitudes, and what could be done physically with rearrangements and it -- it was very good work.

It was very painful, but it was very good, and I would certainly suggest that you look at that because it -- it pertained to lots of things. And one thing that was really startling was the attitude. And the attitude at the academy at that time with professors and students, 20 percent did not believe that women should be in the military, and were very negative toward -- toward having them in there. So their attitudes were different, if you're talking about your team. Thanks.

MORAN:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman I -- I'm very much tempted to point out that the committee is concerned that the manning plan for the -- the Littoral Combat Ship is unrealistic, and unsustainable. Because no other ship requires contractors throughout the entire

deployment to handle regular maintenance requirements that are traditionally handled by the sailors themselves. We have to have contractors onboard. But since Joe is no longer here, and because I sense my father, who was a Navy commander is rolling over in his grave, I'm going to move over to the Marines.

So, General Amos, the Marine Corps intends to declare the F-35 operational capable by 2015 with software, it's called build 2B. But you know that the software is not capable for full mission capability. You have to have this software called build 3F, and that's not available until 2017 at the very earliest. The -- Admiral Greenert, on the other hand, has taken a much more deliberate approach, he says that the F-35C won't be operationally capable until he has this updated software in place. So I guess the question is, why is the Marine Corps intent on declaring operational capability on a fifth generation fighter that simply will not be able to execute the tactical missions that are assigned to it, because it doesn't have the software that is capable of doing that?

AMOS:

Congressman, the fact of the matter is, is that the program officer, program manager, General Bogdan went on record here just a little bit ago, saying that he had confidence the 2B software would be ready to go in time to meet the IOC of the Marine Corps 2015. The software in 2B will provide a more capable platform than we currently have in the entire United States Marine Corps today. It will provide an airplane that will deliver more weapons, be more capable, be stealthier, have more capabilities, more information assurance, more information dominance, than anything worth flying today in the United States Marine Corps.

So why wouldn't we want to be able to have that airplane? It's not going to deploy until 2017, that's the first deployment. But the IOC definition is ten airplanes, pilots ready to go, maintainers ready to go, the software system with regards to the maintenance of the airplane ready to go, ships capable, we'll have the boxer ready to

go. We've got the WASPs ready to go now. If our nation needed that airplane, this will be the sole fifth generation squadron that will be available to the entire United States. I would say that that's a pretty good risk that we can assume, Congressman.

MORAN:

Well, Mr. Chairman and I won't ask any further questions, but with regard to the risk, it -- this less advanced software is not able to execute the full range of direct admission sets. The Navy is waiting until we have the more advanced software before it declares the F-35 is IOC, operational capable and the Marine Corps is -- is going with software that's -- we were told is not operationally capable. So, I do think it's an issue, but I'm not going to pursue it further, because there are others that need to ask questions. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FRELINGHUYSEN (?):

Thank you Mr. Moran.

Mr. Crenshaw?

CRENSHAW:

Just -- I have a quick follow up question about the cruisers, but I wanted to thank Mr. Visclosky for raising that question, and assure you I didn't tell him to ask that question.

VISCLOSKY:

And if the gentleman would yield for one second, because I -- I didn't realize you had had that conversation. If you could for the record, attach a dollar amount as to what we're looking for? And is that built into your five year plan, I'd appreciate it. I'm sorry. I thank the gentleman.

CRENSHAW:

And I'd be -- I'd love to sit down and visit with you about some of the things that we -- we've talked about, because I do think it's important. But on the cruisers, I didn't get a chance to ask you the money that we put in, in '13 and '14 to do the upgrades and modernization, is there a plan? Because I know you said in '15, you're still thinking about decommission, but is there a plan to use those monies that we set aside?

GREENERT (?):

There is, sir. In accordance with the bill, and that plan has been put together and is on its way to be briefed...

CRENSHAW:

Can you tell us anything about it? Because I mean as we get ready to markup the bill, it would be important to have that.

GREENERT (?):

I -- I believe -- and again I'll give you the -- for the record, it's about -- it's in increments, $250 million operating costs and some upgrades for some of the cruisers. And it -- and you got to watch the schedules, and that's where we kind of get into this. We got it now, instead of the beginning of the year, so we do our best through '13 and into '14.

CRENSHAW:

Great, well it would be helpful when we get ready to markup. Thank you, Sir.

FRELINGHUYSEN (?):

Just -- just for the record, the cruisers that you're referring to, are they going out -- they're going out of the fleet at some point in time, is that right, or not?

GREENERT (?):

At some point in time...

FRELINGHUYSEN (?):

They are. So, they are part of -- what's -- what's actually the fleet size at the moment?

GREENERT (?):

The fleet size at the moment is 283 ships.

FRELINGHUYSEN (?):

83, and how many are actually operational? The ones that you refer to, are they operational, or are they in dry dock getting reworked?

GREENERT (?):

They're operational.

FRELINGHUYSEN (?):

They're operational?

GREENERT (?):

Yes, Sir.

FRELINGHUYSEN (?):

OK. Thank you, Mr. Crenshaw.

Ms. McCollum?

MCCOLLUM:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, I can't invite you all to a military base in Minnesota, but you can go see the USS Minnesota submarine. I wanted to talk about something that we haven't touched on directly, but indirectly it -- it effects recruiting and retention. And I had the opportunity to be at Pendleton back a while ago, and saw what you were doing for, not only military construction for your --

your Marines, but what you were doing with the public/private partnership that you have with housing.

And so my question is, as you're moving forward with those projects, sequestration and budget cuts, what does that do to that? Because that can have a direct impact on retention. And even -- even recruitment, if you're recruiting people with families. Word -- word gets out whether it's -- whether you take care of your -- your sailors, and Marines. And also what you're doing -- and this is probably more to Pendleton, what you're doing to reduce your energy footprint, to be more energy efficient on -- on -- on -- at Pendleton, and maybe what you're doing at other bases too?

MABUS (?):

Congresswoman, thank you. On -- on the PPB matter, and you know this, that has been one of the great success stories, I think in the Department of Defense and for us in the Marine Corps, we're not completely built out as far as transitioning the homes. We've got a few more home projects -- in other words, tranches of homes in the PPB (ph) project line.

I'll have to get back to you and tell you exactly which ones and how many. I know we've got some more at Twentynine Palms. But as I look at the Corps writ large, and I look at the barracks and the military construction that this committee has supported for the last -- for us, for the last four or five years, we're talking billions and billions of dollars. Our barracks are better than they've ever been before. So the quality of life for our young enlisted Marines living on board the base, which is important to us, has never been better than it is today.

So that's the first point. And that actually helps with regards to retention and just morale and discipline because we've got them on the base. We're taking -- we're paying -- we've got eyes on them, so we're watching them.

The housing situation is just about that good. I mean, it's an incentive for Marines when -- not particularly when they come in, to sign up from the recruiter's office, but when they're at that decision point at the four-year mark and they're trying to decide, "OK, do I want to stay in the Marine Corps?" You recruit a marine; you retain the family. And so the families have an awful lot to say about this with regards to quality of life.

So, I just -- from where I sit right now, it's never been better. As we draw the force down, my sense is, and especially as it relates to barracks, we're probably going to finally get to a point where we've got just about the right amount of barracks as we have, because we've never built enough. We'll probably get to a point where we'll have just about the right amount of new barracks for the right size force. And I think it will probably be the same thing for housing.

But there are other projects underway, and I'll make sure that I get you that information.

GREENERT (?):

Simply put, we had a huge housing deficit and they were substandard. Today, really as a result of public-private ventures, over 90 percent of Navy housing is private-public venture. As the commandant said, it's high-quality and we would have taken decades to get there using military construction.

So, some contracts are better than others with -- and we're learning more, but it's working quite well, and we find out constituents' families are very happy. It's a very popular measure.

Lastly, I'd say these are contracts, ma'am, and even in a sequestration environment, we have to live up to our contracts.

AMOS:

I'll take the energy part. We're doing a lot on both more efficiencies. The Marines at Kaneohe Bay, for example, measure the energy that goes into each house. If a Marine and family use less energy than the benchmark, they get money back. If they use more energy than the benchmark, they owe a little. And the energy usage, it's dropped dramatically with no compromise to the quality of life.

We're also doing alternative energy at places like Kaneohe Bay, at Twentynine Palms, at China Lake, at facilities all around the country. And we will be at a gigawatt of renewable energy in public- private ventures like the housing by the end of this decade.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, Ms. McCollum.

Just for the record, General, do we have any more gang barracks at Pendleton or have they all been done away with?

What I'd call "gang barracks," if I remember -- not there, but the Army.

(CROSSTALK)

AMOS:

Let me -- let me get back to you on that thing. I don't want -- I'm really bullish on where we are. But we used to call them the "flat tops" out there, which were absolutely...

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Well, it looked like hell the last -- I haven't been out there for a while, but...

AMOS:

They did. I don't think we've got them, but I don't want to give you a definitive answer.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

OK. OK, thank you.

Mr. Calvert?

CALVERT:

I'm just happy everybody's bringing up Camp Pendleton. It's a wonderful base. You all need to come on out.

Speaking of Camp Pendleton, there's one thing that we have -- we've done a wonderful job. I give David Hobson a lot of credit, our former colleague, these public-private partnerships on bases all around the world and how that's been a very successful program, putting together great housing for our military.

But the fire stations at Camp Pendleton are getting a little long in the tooth. I think they were built in 1941 and haven't changed a lot. So I just thought I'd bring that up, since I hear from the -- the...

(LAUGHTER)

... you know, just bring that up. Everything else (inaudible).

FRELINGHUYSEN:

We don't have any more earmarks, so just add it to the list.

CALVERT:

(inaudible) bring it up.

AMOS (?):

Congressman, they're historical landmarks and we can't...

(CROSSTALK)

CALVERT:

That's it.

All right, one thing that's also getting kind of long in the tooth is I was out at Yuma and those Harriers are getting pretty long in the tooth. I imagine they're pretty costly to maintain also. And we can talk about the F-35 and the Marine Corps variant, how much longer can you safely fly the Harriers?

AMOS:

Sir, the -- interestingly, you'll be surprised when I tell you they actually have the most service life, between the F-18s and the Harriers. What happened right around 1999, 2000, we took those airplanes and remanufactured them. We sent them back to then- McDonnell-Douglas, now Boeing, and they took them completely apart. And they rebuilt those airplanes and gave them -- they breathed new life into them -- probably a remanufacturing like we've never seen in an airplane.

So, those airplanes will actually begin to -- the final ones will begin to expire in flight life around 2028, as I recall. Now, our F- 18s are going to expire in service life long before then. So the last Harrier, as we transition the -- to the Joint Strike Fighter, the very last squadrons that will transition will be the Harrier squadrons -- not across all Harrier squadrons, but the very last airplanes that actually go to Davis-Monthan will be the Harriers.

CALVERT:

And Mr. Secretary, the -- on the -- back on the submarine -- on the Virginia Class submarines on your advanced funding in F.Y. '14, '15, obviously that's outside of carriers and amphibious ships, we haven't done that type of funding before -- this split funding and counting on advanced appropriations. Why did you go that method versus the traditional method of funding for the ships?

MABUS:

In a very short answer, the amount of money available. But I would point out, just as you did, that we have split-funded amphibs and carriers. This is not incremental funding because the -- this committee and Congress would make a decision for full funding and we'd split it over two fiscal years.

You've already done advanced procurement for this 10th submarine. And the -- the overwhelming logic for this is that by putting the 10th submarine in in this five years, so two a year, into the multi-year will save us $150 million per boat. So it will be in five over the -- over the 10 boats.

CALVERT:

That's a good answer. Thank you.

One last question. I don't know if this is for the admiral or the secretary. The new electronic magnetic launch capability that is going on the new CVN -- is all the technicalities worked out? That's working fine? And everything's going well with that program?

GREENERT (?):

Well, the -- the science and the engineering is worked out. Now, we've got to continue the tests. So when you say "technicalities," there will be hitches here or there. But with regard to "does it work," it works. We've launched several things from it. Now, we need to install it and test it, and get through that testing period.

CALVERT:

And thank you for your service. We appreciate your time.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, Mr. Calvert.

Ms. Kaptur? And then we're going to move towards winding down.

KAPTUR:

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Two questions. Mr. Secretary, yesterday in USA Today, they had this article about defense spending $15 billion a year on fuel; 60 percent of it from foreign sources. And in the Department

of Navy, your goal is 50 percent total energy for the Navy from alternative energy sources by 2020.

Does the department have a goal of reducing that foreign dependence? And I agree with your goal of 50 percent alternative energy by 2020, but can't we speed it up a bit? And how much of the 2014 budget request is devoted to securing these alternative energy sources? That's my question to you.

And then, General Amos, I wanted to ask, on the amphibious combat vehicle, I would -- what is the current status of the program? And how does it relate to the joint light tactical vehicle? How do those two programs fit together, if at all?

And I would just ask you, following on what Congressman Ryan talked about, the parts of the country that have suffered under enormous unemployment for a very long time related to the defense industrial base and what's happened to our over-ground transportation industry, please look at the fourth seacoast. Please look at the Great Lakes area. It doesn't get as much attention, although I will say Marine Week in Cleveland last year was a huge

success, General. We thank you for that. We invite both you and the secretary to the Cleveland City Club to tell us about the Navy.

But we often feel neglected up there. You know, there's the Great Lakes Training Station. But if you look at the number of Marines and naval seamen that come from our area, we had sailor of the year from Toledo, Ohio a couple of years ago. And we ask you to think about our region as an integral part of this nation's defense. And again, we invite you there.

So Mr. Secretary, on the alternative energy question, and General Amos on the alternative amphibious combat vehicle. OK.

MABUS:

Thank you, Congresswoman.

The goal is to move from buying these foreign sources of energy to a domestically produced stably priced source. And the 50 percent goal is not just at sea, but also onshore. So it's Navy-wide -- Navy- and Marine Corps-wide. We're on track to meet that and meet it at very competitive prices.

In terms of the budget, what I would like to do is get you a detailed written analysis of the investments we are making and the payback time that those investments will -- will return the money and we will continue saving money. It's a long, but a very good story. And I would like to do that in writing, if that's permissible.

KAPTUR:

Are your goals attainable in view of what's happening with sequestration?

MABUS:

Yes, they are.

(CROSSTALK)

KAPTUR:

And then, General Amos?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

General?

AMOS:

Congresswoman, you remember in the fall of 2010, Secretary Mabus and I and Secretary Gates met to talk about the expeditionary fighting vehicle at that time, which is our swimming tractor that brings Marines ashore. We agreed to cancel that because of a host of reasons which you're very familiar with.

In the last two -- a little over two years, two-and-a-half years, we have invested as much brain power and capital to determine, OK, what is it the vehicle that will replace the EFV -- that actually will replace the current vehicle we have which is 40 years old? What should that look like? How fast should it go? What should the capabilities be?

And even as importantly, how much can we afford? What's the cost on that? OSD last year, they produced -- they published the results in July, did an analysis of alternatives and confirmed the requirements for the Marine Corps to have a vehicle that will come out the back end of an amphibious ship and carry Marines ashore.

You only come out of a ship one of two ways -- you either fly them off, or you come across the surface. And we need both capabilities for the future.

So they confirmed that. And they were prepared to kind of lead us into the -- a solution. I put all that on hold, because I wanted to get one more bite at the apple. I wanted to make sure that we absolutely got the requirements right.

So that's where we are right now. We have this -- we have the final study group, analysis group, that will report back to me in the fall of this year. And at that point we'll make the determination on cost.

We've got two contractors heavily involved in this right now, BAE and General Dynamics. They're joined at the hip on this thing. So we've got kind of -- it's more than best of breed, it's actually the best of both corporations helping us come up with the art of the possible.

We'll make a decision probably late fall, early next year, because this is the direction we're going to go. And we'll get on with the -- the contract for an amphibious combat vehicle.

(inaudible) the Joint Light Tactical Vehicle is -- was designed to be a replacement for the Humvee. It's a utility vehicle. We're gonna buy 5,500 of these things right now. So we're in it. It's completely different. It's just to haul Marines around on the battlefield.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Thank you, Ms. Kaptur.

Thank you, General.

Mr. Cole then Mr. Womack.

COLE:

Thank you, and I'll be quick. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I just really have one question, and I want to make sure I understood something right and maybe ask you, Mr. Secretary, to elaborate on it.

And let me just say, as a preface, look, all of us in here, on both sides of the aisle, hate sequester. We really do. And we appreciate what -- what you have to deal with and the other service chiefs. And I -- I would suspect that if the powers that be sort of above this committee could come to a larger deal, you would find both sides of the aisle on this committee we'd probably be supportive of that, so that we could restore some of what has been lost and some of what's created such difficulty.

Now, if I understood your original testimony, you made the point that you were planning for sequester, you were planning as if it was extended. And I'm glad you are, by the way. I think that's the prudent and the appropriate thing to do.

I will say for the record, you're the first person from the administration -- the administration's budget doesn't presume that in most other areas. I mean, they assume that sequester disappears.

I've had this discussion on other subcommittees with civilian counterparts and expressed my concern that they were -- while I hope they were right, you know, my concern was you better not plan that way.

So am I correct in thinking that you are planning as if this -- I mean, I'm sure you're hoping for something different and better, we are too. But are you planning as if the sequester would extend forward?

MABUS:

The budget that we put in assumed that sequester would not happen. The Strategic Management Choices Group (ph) that's ongoing at the Pentagon is looking at the -- the possible budget futures, including sequestration continuing, what would that do to -- to all the services, maybe Marine Corps included.

So we're doing both.

COLE:

Well, I just want to commend you for doing both. Again, I hope that we're not in that situation. I know this committee certainly doesn't. But I think you're being exceptionally prudent and wise and just thank you for -- for doing so.

(CROSSTALK)

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Echo Mr. Cole's comment. We hate the sequester. We don't like the continuing resolution, but at least we were able, and you would acknowledge it, to put in there -- give the flexibility to you. Maybe not enough flexibility.

Mr. Womack?

WOMACK:

One final question for the secretary, our role in cyber -- in CYBERCOM?

MABUS:

We stood up 10th Fleet (ph), which is our cyber- capability that supports CYBERCOM. We are growing cyber-capability, both inside the Navy and in conjunction with CYBERCOM, both in terms of number of people and in terms of capability.

The Marine Corps, even though it's coming down in overall people, are increasing the number of Marines involved in cyber because it is such an important area for the future.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Mr. Womack?

WOMACK:

Thank you. Good.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Lastly, the number of ships matter. I'm concerned -- I know last year when I asked the question, people rushed to my office to show me a lot of numbers. We've never had over in the last 20 years, have we, Admiral, more than 300 ships?

GREENERT:

We've never had more than 300?

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Three hundred. Yeah. What's the -- when's the -- in terms of our -- we have the stated requirement now of 306 ships.

GREENERT:

That's correct.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

But when's the last time we've had over 300 ships?

GREENERT:

Well, in 2001, we had 303.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Did we have 300?

GREENERT:

Yes, sir.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

OK.

And the mix of ships, could you comment on that?

GREENERT:

That's a...

(CROSSTALK)

FRELINGHUYSEN:

I mean, I know we're counting numbers here, but in reality, it appears we have less in the way of combat-related ships and more -- more numbers that relate to support.

GREENERT:

Well, actually, that -- when you look at -- if you look at the 306 study, we need 86 -- 88, excuse me, 88 large service combatant, cruisers and destroyers. We're very close to that. We have 83-84 now. We'll grow to that number quickly.

We have the right number of carriers under -- under construction. We have the right number of submarines. This will dip in 2024. And we -- and we have the right auxiliary ships.

And so, if there's an area that I am most confident about, it's the -- it's the combat ships.

Where we're short is in small surface combatants and some of our supporting ships that we -- that we need...

(CROSSTALK)

FRELINGHUYSEN:

So we have the ability to pivot to the Pacific?

GREENERT:

We have the ability...

(CROSSTALK)

FRELINGHUYSEN:

We have the ability?

GREENERT:

Yes, sir, we do.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

Tyranny of distance and all that nature. We have the ability to do that?

GREENERT:

Under the current defense strategic guidance, what we're required to do, yes, sir, we do.

We -- what's important is, we've got to develop those places that we would operate those ships out of.

FRELINGHUYSEN:

The committee, Mr. Young wants to extend his thanks, as do all of us, for -- Mr. Secretary, for your being here. Admiral Greenert, General Amos, and to all the men and women that -- that you represent, the best of America, we want to thank you for your testimony here this morning -- I should say this morning and this afternoon.

The subcommittee is adjourned until 1 p.m. tomorrow when we will -- we will host Secretary John McHugh and General Ray Odierno to discuss the Department of Army and their needs.

The meeting stands adjourned.

Again, gentlemen, thank you.