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

Chairman McCain: Well, good morning.

The Senate Armed Services Committee meets this morning to receive testimony on the posture of the United States Army in review of the defense authorization request for fiscal year 2017 and the future years defense program.

I am pleased to welcome Acting Secretary, much too young, Patrick Murphy, and Army Chief of Staff, General Mark Milley. I thank you both for your years of distinguished service and your continued leadership of our Army.

15 years of war have tested our Army, but time and time again, our soldiers have met that test and proved their commitment, courage, and determination. It is the duty of this committee and this Congress to do our utmost to provide them the support they need and deserve. That starts by recognizing that our Army is still at war. At this moment, 186,000 soldiers are deployed in 140 locations around the globe. They are fighting terrorists and training our partners in Afghanistan and supporting the fight against ISIL, all the while defending South Korea and reassuring our allies in Eastern Europe. The demands on our soldiers only continue to increase as the threats to our Nation grow more diverse, more complex, and more severe.

But despite the stark and urgent realities of the
threats to our Nation and the risk they pose to our soldiers, the President continues to ask the Army to do more with less. And he has done so once again with his defense budget request. The President should have requested a defense budget that reflects the scale and scope of the national security threats we face and the growing demands they impose on our soldiers. Instead, he chose to request the lowest level of defense spending authorized by last year’s budget agreement and submit a defense budget that is actually less in real dollars than last year, a budget that will force our Army to confront growing threats and increasing operational demands with shrinking and less-ready forces and aging equipment.

By the end of the next fiscal year, the Army will be cut down to 450,000 active duty soldiers, down from a wartime peak of 570,000. These budget-driven -- I repeat budget-driven -- force reductions were decided before the rise of ISIL or the Russians’ invasions of Ukraine. Ignoring these strategic facts on the ground, the budget request continues down the path to an Army of 450,000 soldiers, an Army that General H.R. McMaster, an individual known to all of us as one of the wisest soldiers, testified earlier this week, quote, the risk of being too small risks being too small to secure the Nation.

We should be very clear that when we minimize our Army,
we maximize the risk to our soldiers, the risk that in a crisis they will be forced to enter a fight too few in number and without the training and equipment they need to win. That risk will only grow worse if mindless sequestration cuts are allowed to return and the Army shrinks further to 420,000 soldiers.

As our Army shrinks, readiness suffers. Just over one-third of the Army’s brigade combat teams are ready for deployment and decisive operations. Indeed, just two -- just two -- of the Army’s 60 brigade combat teams are at full combat readiness. And the Army has no plan to return to full spectrum readiness until 2021 at the very earliest.

As the National Commission on the Future of the United States Army made clear in its recently published report, both the mission and the force are at risk.

Meanwhile, the Army is woefully behind on modernization, and as a result, America’s capability advantage in ground and airborne combat weapon systems is not nearly as great as it once was. Decades of under-investment and acquisition malpractice have left us with an Army that is not in balance, an Army that lacks both the adequate capacity and the key capabilities to win decisively.

As Vice Chief of Staff of the Army General Daniel Allyn recently testified, the Army can no longer afford the most
modern equipment and we risk falling behind near peers in critical capabilities. Indeed, the Army currently has no major ground combat vehicle development program underway and will continue to rely on the increasingly obsolete Bradley fighting vehicle and Abrams tanks for most of the rest of this century.

As General McMaster phrased it earlier this week, the Army is, quote, outranged and outgunned by many potential adversaries.

Confronted with the most diverse and complex national array of national security threats since the end of World War II, the Army urgently needs to restore readiness, halt misguided end strength reductions, and invest in modernization. Instead, this budget request is another empty promise to buy readiness today by reducing end strength and modernization for tomorrow. Mortgaging the future of our Army places an unnecessary and dangerous burden on our soldiers, and I believe it is the urgent task of this committee to do all we can to chart a better course.

I look forward to the testimony of our witnesses today and their recommendations as to how we build the Army the Nation needs and provide our soldiers with the support they deserve.

I would like now to call on a former Army person for his remarks.
STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR FROM RHODE ISLAND

Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for calling this important hearing.

Let me welcome Secretary Murphy and General Milley. Thank you for your distinguished service to the Nation.

And as the chairman indicated, we are reviewing the Army’s proposals for the fiscal year 2017 budget request, and they are absolutely critical. We are facing extraordinary challenges, and the chairman has outlined them very eloquently and very precisely. We have to rebuild readiness. We have to modernize the force. And also in this light, I think another message is, with all respect to Secretary Murphy, getting not an “acting” Secretary but a permanent Secretary. And I hope we could move Mr. Fanning’s nomination as quickly as possible.

The President’s fiscal year 2017 budget submission for the Department of the Army includes $148.1 billion in total funding, of which $125.1 billion is the base budget and $23 billion for overseas operations in the OCO account.

While the budget request complies with the funding levels included in the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, the Army’s top line is essentially flat as compared to the fiscal year 2016 enacted levels. As the committee considers the Army’s funding request, we must always be mindful of the
risks facing our country and our national security challenges. In fact, it is highly unlikely that demand for Army forces will diminish any time in the near future. Currently, as the chairman indicated, 190,000 soldiers across the active and reserve components and active forces are serving in 140 countries. And while we continue to field the most capable fighting force in the world, 15 years of sustained military operations focused almost exclusively on counterterrorism and counterinsurgency has taken a toll on the readiness of our soldiers. Today less than one-quarter of our Nation’s Army is ready to perform their core wartime missions and some critical combat enabling units are in far worse shape. In addition, the evolving threat facing our Nation impacts readiness as the Army needs to train and fight a near peer competitor in a full spectrum environment.

Unfortunately, while additional funding is important, it is not the sole solution to restoring readiness levels. It will take both time to rebuild strategic depth and relief from high operational tempo.

I applaud the Army for making readiness their number one priority in this year’s budget request. General Milley, I look forward to your thoughts on the Army’s progress in rebuilding readiness within the timelines the Army has set and what additional resources may be needed.

While readiness is vital, we cannot neglect investments
in the modernization of military platforms and equipment. Building and maintaining readiness levels requires that our forces have access to equipment that is properly sustained and upgraded. The Army’s fiscal year 2017 budget request -- $22.6 billion for modernization efforts that includes $15 billion for procurement and $7.5 billion for research, development, test and evaluation -- is a start. I would like to know if our witnesses feel confident that this funding for modernization is adequate and will not adversely impact the future readiness of our aviation units particularly or add substantial cost.

Related to the Army’s acquisition processes, this committee made important changes in acquisition and procurement policies in the fiscal year 2016 National Defense Authorization Act, including giving the service chiefs significant responsibilities. And I would appreciate the Chief’s and the Secretary’s comments on how these procedures are being worked into the system.

The men and women in uniform in our military and also our civilian workforce remain a priority for our committee. We need to ensure the pay and benefits remain competitive in order to attract and retain the very best for military and government service. The committee also understands, however, that military and civilian personnel costs comprise nearly one-half of the Department’s budget. And again, your
insights as to how we can control those costs would be very much appreciated.

Finally, as I have stated and as the chairman emphatically stated, the Budget Control Act is ineffective and shortsighted. And I believe, in a bipartisan fashion, that we have to repeal the BCA, establish a more reasonable limit on discretionary spending in an equitable manner that meets our domestic and defense needs, and then move forward.

Again, I would like to thank the witnesses and the chairman.

Chairman McCain: Thank you.

Secretary Murphy?
STATEMENT OF HON. PATRICK J. MURPHY, ACTING SECRETARY
OF THE ARMY

Mr. Murphy: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Senator Reed and members of this committee, for allowing me to be here to talk about your Army.

It is my 12th week on the job as Acting Secretary of the Army. It is truly an honor to be back on the Army team. I have traveled to see our soldiers, our civilians and their families in Kentucky, Missouri, Texas, and Kansas and also to Iraq and Afghanistan. And the selfless service and dedication of our team should inspire us all. We are tasked with the solemn responsibility to fight and win our Nation’s wars and to keep our families safe here at home.

Our Army must produce ready units today to deter and to defeat our Nation’s enemies, defend the homeland, project power, and win decisively. And by “ready,” we mean units that are fully manned, trained for combat, fully equipped according to the designed structure, and led by competent leaders.

We must also be ready for our future fights by investing in modernization and research and development. We do not want our soldiers to have a fair fight. They must have the technical and tactical advantage over our enemies.

With our $125.1 billion base budget request, our Army will focus its efforts on rebuilding readiness for large-
scale, high-end ground combat today. We do so because ignoring readiness shortfalls puts our Nation at greatest risk for the following reasons.

First, readiness wins wars. Our Army has never been the largest in the world, and at times we have not been the best equipped. But since World War II, we have recognized that ready soldiers properly manned, trained, equipped, and led can beat larger or more determined forces. Whether confronting the barbaric acts of ISIS or the desperation of North Korea, our Army must be prepared to execute and to win. We train like we fight and our Army must be ready to fight tonight.

Next, readiness deters our most dangerous threats and assures our allies. We are reminded with alarming frequency that great power conflicts are not dead. Today they manifest themselves on a regional basis. Both Russia and China are challenging America’s willingness and ability to enforce international standards of conduct. A ready Army provides America the strength to deter such actions and reassure our partners throughout the world.

Readiness also makes future training less costly. Continuous operations since 2001 have left our force proficient in stability and counterterrorism operations. But our future command sergeants major and brigade commanders have not had the critical combat training
experiences as junior leaders trained for high-end ground combat. Investing in readiness today builds the foundation necessary for long-term readiness.

And finally, readiness prepares our force for potential future conflicts. We cannot fight the last fight. Our Army must be prepared to face the high-end and advanced combat power of an aggressive Russia or, more likely, Russian aggression employed by surrogate actors.

This budget dedicates resources to develop solutions for this, to allow our force to develop new concepts informed by the recommendations of the National Commission on the Future of the Army. Our formations must first be ready to execute against current and emerging threats.

The choice, though, to invest in near-term readiness does come with risk. Smaller modernization investments risk our ability to fight and win in the future. We have no new modernization programs this decade. Smaller investments in end strength risk our ability to conduct multiple operations for sustained periods of time. In short, we are mortgaging our future readiness because we have to ensure in today’s success against emerging threats. That is why initiatives like BRAC in 2019 are needed to be implemented now. Let us manage your investment, and this will result in $500 million a year in savings and a return on your investment within 5 years.
Lastly, while we thank Congress for the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, which does provide short-term relief and 2 years of predictable funding, we request your support for the enactment of our budget as proposed. We request your support for continued funding at levels that are calibrated toward national threats and our interests. And we request your continued support for our soldiers, civilians, and their families so that our military and our Army will continue to be the most capable fighting force in the world and will win in decisive battles and keep our families safe here at home.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Mr. Murphy and General Milley follows:]
Chairman McCain: General Milley?
STATEMENT OF GENERAL MARK A. MILLEY, USA, CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY

General Milley: Thank you, Chairman McCain and Ranking Member Reed and other distinguished members of the committee for the opportunity to appear before you today to discuss our Army. And thank you for your consistent support and commitment to our soldiers, our civilians, and our families.

The United States Army, as I mentioned 6 months ago when I took this job, must remain the most capable, versatile, and lethal ground force valued by our friends and most importantly feared by our enemies.

This mission in my view has one common thread, and that thread is readiness. A ready Army is manned, trained, equipped, and well led as the foundation of the joint force in order to conduct missions to deter and if deterrence fails, to defeat a wide range of state and non-state actors today, tomorrow, and into the future.

As mentioned by the chairman, 15 years of continuous counterinsurgency operations, combined with recent reduced and unpredictable budgets, has created a gap in our proficiency to conduct combined arms operations against enemy conventional or hybrid forces resulting in an Army today that is less than ready to fight and win against emerging threats. America is a global power, and our Army must be capable of meeting a wide variety of threats under
varying conditions anywhere on earth. Our challenge today is to sustain the counterterrorism/counterinsurgency capabilities that we have developed to a high degree of proficiency over the last 15 years while simultaneously rebuilding the capability to win in ground combat against higher-end threats such as Russia, China, North Korea, and Iran. We can wish away these cases, but we would be very foolish as a Nation to do so.

This budget prioritizes readiness because the global security environment is increasingly uncertain and complex. Today in the Middle East, South Asia, and Africa, we see radical terrorism and the malign influence of Iran threatening the regional order. Destroying ISIS is the top operational priority of the President of the United States. And the Army conventional and special operations forces are both playing a key part in that effort.

In Europe, a revanchist Russia has modernized its military, invaded several sovereign countries since 2008, and continues to act aggressively towards its neighbors using multiple means of Russian national power. The Army will play an increasing role in deterring or, if necessary, defeating an aggressive Russia.

In Asia and the Pacific, there are complex systemic challenges with a rising China that is increasingly assertive militarily, especially in the South China Sea, and
a very provocative North Korea. Both situations are creating conditions for potential conflict. Again, the United States Army is key to assuring our allies in Asia and deterring conflict or defeating the enemy if conflict occurs.

While none of us in this room or anywhere else can forecast precisely when and where the next contingency will arise, it is my professional military view that if any contingency happens, it will likely require a significant commitment of Army ground forces because war is ultimately an act of politics requiring one side to impose its political will on the other. While wars often start from the air or the sea, wars ultimately end when political will is imposed on the ground. If one or more possible unforeseen contingencies happen, then the United States Army currently risks not having ready forces available to provide flexible options to our national leadership, and if committed, we risk not being able to accomplish the strategic tasks at hand in an acceptable amount of time. And most importantly, we risk incurring significantly increased U.S. casualties.

In sum, we risk the ability to conduct ground operations of sufficient scale and ample duration to achieve strategic objectives or win decisively at an acceptable cost against the highly lethal hybrid threat or near peer
adversary in the unforgiving environment of ground combat.

The Army is currently committed to winning our fight
against radical terrorists and deterring conflict in other
parts of the globe. Right now as we speak, the Army
provides 46 percent of all of the combatant commanders’
demands around the globe and 64 percent of all emerging
combatant commander demand. And as pointed out by both the
ranking member and the chairman, almost 190,000 American
soldiers are currently deployed in over 140 countries
globally.

To sustain current operations and to mitigate the risks
of deploying an unready force into the future, the Army will
continue to prioritize and fully fund readiness over end
strength, modernization, and infrastructure. This is not an
easy choice, and we recognize the risk to the future. While
the Army prefers our investment for both current and future
readiness, the security environment of today and the near
future drive investment into current readiness for global
operations and potential contingencies.

Specifically, we ask your support to fully man and
equip our combat formations and conduct realistic combined
arms combat training at both home station and our combat
training centers. We ask your support for our modernization
in five key limited areas: aviation, command and control
network, integrated air missile defense, combat vehicles,
and the emerging threats programs. And finally, we ask and appreciate your continued support for our soldiers and their families to recruit and retain high quality soldiers of character and competence.

We request your support for the fiscal year 2017 budget and we thank you for the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2015, which did provide some short-term relief and 2 years of predictable funding.

With your support, we will fund readiness at sufficient levels to meet our current demand, and we will build readiness for contingencies for the future.

Thank you for your continued support, and I look forward to your questions.

Chairman McCain: Well, thank you, General.

I have read yours and Secretary Murphy’s written testimony, which I think is excellent. It is not often that I quote from it, but in reference to the Budget Control Act, you state this continued fiscal unpredictability beyond fiscal year 2017 is one of the Army’s single greatest challenges and inhibits our ability to generate readiness. I think that is pretty straightforward.

And then it goes on to say this will force the Army to continue to reduce end strength and delay modernization, decreasing Army capability and capacity, a risk our Nation should not accept. Those are pretty strong words. And I
thank you for them.

And I am often a critic of the administration's policies, but that sentence can be laid at the doorstep of the Congress of the United States of America and our failure to stop this mindless meat axe reduction in our capabilities to defend this Nation. I thank you for the straightforward comments on that issue. If -- God forbid -- a crisis arises, part of the responsibility for our inability to act as efficiently and rapidly as possible will lay at the doorstep of the Congress of the United States of America which, by the way, is a majority of my party.

General Milley, in your statement, you made it very clear, but let me just -- are we at high military risk?

General Milley: Senator, yes. And I wrote a formal risk assessment, which you know is classified, through the Chairman and to the Secretary of Defense. And I characterized this at this current state at high military risk.

Chairman McCain: High military risk is a very strong statement, and I am sure you thought long and hard before you made it.

Could we not substantiate that high military risk by pointing out that two of the brigade combat teams are at category 1 -- the BCTs -- and approximately -- is it one-third that category 1 or 2? Is that correct? So two-thirds
of our BCTs would require some additional training, equipment, whatever before they would be ready to fight? Is that the correct interpretation of that classification?

General Milley: Yes, Senator. In short, yes. I would say even those that are -- the couple that are at the highest level -- we could deploy them immediately. In fact, one of them is forward deployed already. The others, even the ones on the second, third, and all the rest of them -- they are going to require something in terms of training to get them ready. But roughly speaking, one-third across the board of our combat formations, our combat support, and our combat service support are in a readiness status that is ready to go.

Chairman McCain: So it would require, depending on the unit, some length of time to make them ready to get into category 1 or 2.

General Milley: That is correct.

Chairman McCain: So two-thirds are not ready to defend this Nation immediately in time of crisis.

General Milley: That is correct. They would require some amount of time to bring them up to a satisfactory readiness status to deploy into combat.

Chairman McCain: You pointed out at the beginning -- and so did I -- the 186,000 soldiers in 140 locations around the globe. Can we maintain that if we continue to reduce
the end strength of the Army down to 420,000, taking into
consideration we are an all-volunteer force?

General Milley: To my knowledge, 420,000 is only under
sequestration. This budget takes it to 450,000. But even
at 450,000 for the active force -- and some of those forces
deployed overseas are National Guard and Reserve. So a
980,000 total Army is stretched to execute the global
commitments. The real issue is if a contingency arises, and
then some really tough choices are going to have to get
made.

Chairman McCain: And any sane observer of what is
going on in the world would surmise, as we incrementally
increase our particularly Army special forces deployments,
that the requirements, at least in the short term or short
and medium term, is going to require more deployments, more
training, more equipment in order to counter the rising
threats that we see that Secretary Murphy outlined in this
opening statement. Is that true?

General Milley: I think that is a correct assessment.

Yes, Senator.

Chairman McCain: Which is why you have come to the
conclusion that we are at, quote, high military risk.

General Milley: That is correct. On the high military
risk, to be clear, we have sufficient capacity and
capability and readiness to fight counterinsurgency and
counterterrorism. High military risk refers specifically to what I see as emerging threats and potential for great power conflict, and I am specifically talking about the time it takes to execute the tasks. High risk would say we would not be able to accomplish all the tasks in the time necessary and the cost in terms of casualties. And combined, that equals my risk assessment.

Chairman McCain: Well, I thank both you and Secretary Murphy for your very forthright testimony before the committee today. I think it is extremely helpful.

Senator Manchin?

Senator Manchin: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I thank both of you for your service and appreciate you being here.

In the past few days, General Milley, I have had a chance to talk with some of your general officers and came away with two big concerns: the reduction of the size of our Army and budget predictability -- more so than I have ever been. I have been shaking my head at sequestration for years now. It is a foolish way to set budgets. It was a penalty that we put on ourselves because we never thought we would ever go there, that we would ever be dysfunctional or become in political discord the way we are and could not come together to prevent that from happening. But it did and we have got to move on.
So, General Milley, what I would ask -- could you walk me through specifically how the sequestration has forced the Army to reduce its size to the most critical level that I think we have ever faced right now with all the threats that we are facing?

General Milley: I think there are a couple of points to be made. One is the unpredictability, the year-to-year budgeting. And in reality because we go with continuing resolutions, it really ends up being about a 9-month cycle vice 12-month. So the unpredictability, the short-term nature of it does not allow for longer-term planning projection and some certainty for equipment, for example, with industry or for training plans for units and so and so. So that is a big deal, is the uncertainty.

The second piece of it is just the magnitude of the cuts. Since 2008, the Army has had about a 74 percent or 75 percent cut in the modernization account at large and about a 50 percent cut in R&D at large. You know, less than 10 years. That is a significant cut.

So if we think 10 years ahead and look 10 years behind, if that trend continues, that is not good. What we are focusing on is today’s readiness. So a 20- and 21- and 22-year-olds, et cetera that are in the Army today -- we are focusing on them being ready to deploy and to conduct combat operations because that is necessary. But if you are 10
1 years old today, I am worried about the 10-year-old who is
2 going to be the soldier 10 years from now. That is a bigger
3 risk that we are taking, but we are compelled into that risk
4 based on the top line that we are given.
5
6 Senator Manchin: We are time-limited right now, but we
7 are going to 980,000, I guess, troop strength.
8
9 General Milley: That is correct.
10
11 Senator Manchin: For everything I heard from all of
12 your front-line generals basically is there is no way that
13 we can meet the imminent threat that we have around the
14 world with 980,000 people.
15
16 General Milley: It is high risk.
17
18 Senator Manchin: So if you confirm that at high risk,
19 what would it take for us not to be at high risk? These are
20 artificial caps and all this other bull crap that we are
21 dealing with.
22
23 General Milley: I have got a series of studies that
24 are ongoing. If we operate under the current National
25 Security Strategy, the current Defense Planning Guidance, in
26 order to reduce to significant risk or moderate risk, it
27 would take, roughly speaking, about a 1.2 million person --
28
29 Senator Manchin: So we are over 200,000 troops short.
30
31 General Milley: Right. And at $1 billion for every
32 10,000 soldiers, that money is not there. So we are going
33 to make the most efficient and effective use of the Army
that we have.

Senator Manchin: Secretary Murphy, if I may. I have a lot of concerns regarding the level of contract support. We have talked about that and I have never gotten a good handle on it. And I think I have always heard it has been two for one. For every one soldier we have in uniform, we have two people backing that person up, roughly.

My question to you, are the long-term savings that some of your bean counters tell us that by having a contractor, there is long-term savings that provide substantial -- or is the number of contractors driven by the arbitrary troop force caps that prevent us from deploying the soldiers to do these jobs? So are they telling us it is long-term savings here, and with these caps here, the only way you are getting around the caps is by having more contractors on the back end to do jobs that soldiers in uniform should be doing?

Mr. Murphy: Senator Manchin, after 9/11, when I deployed a couple months later, we went from our gate guards and our security forces at our compound in Tuzla, Bosnia from our soldiers to private contractors.

Senator Manchin: Because of the caps?

Mr. Murphy: I am not trying to be disrespectful. They were not at the level of readiness. But that is what we have been doing for 15 years, Senator. Again, I am not saying that is right. I have the numbers. We have cut
civilians 46,000, 16 percent civilians and contractors, 16 percent. That is 46,000 of them. So I am looking at this.

The most lethal --

Senator Manchin: How many troops have we cut over the same period of time?

Mr. Murphy: Well, we cut 150,000. 13 percent in soldiers, 16 percent in civilians and contractors. So I am trying to balance this, Senator. You know, we talked about the cuts.

Senator Manchin: Are you making decisions based on the caps that we have? Somebody has put caps in there for some reason because we did not want people in uniform, for whatever reason, which I cannot understand and cannot explain to the good people of West Virginia why you do not want people in uniform who we count on and are trained properly to do the job.

Mr. Murphy: When I was where you were 5 years ago in Congress on the Armed Services Committee, we did not even know how many contractors we had. I have my arms around it now. We are getting after it, and we are making sure that it makes the most fiscal sense but sense mostly for national security.

Senator Manchin: Very quickly. My time is running out.

If I could say this, if we go to the 1.2 million, if
somehow we had the resolve to do what we need to do here to
meet the imminent threats we have, do we have proportionally
contractors -- we have to go up also in contractors. Will
that 1.2 million be able to do some of the jobs that
collectors are doing now?

Mr. Murphy: I would say that some of our soldiers will
do more of the jobs, but our soldiers are geared for brigade
combat teams to win.

Senator Manchin: Thank you. My time is up.

Chairman McCain: Mr. Secretary, we eagerly look
forward to the day when you can tell us how many contractors
are employed in the Department of Defense, and it will be
one of the most wonderful days of my political career.

Senator Fischer?

Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General, this committee has held a number of hearings
about the future of warfare and what new technologies are
going to be required. This is something that the Secretary
and the Deputy Secretary have discussed at length as well.
We have heard some very bold predictions about incorporating
robotic systems on the battlefield as soon as the next 10
years. Do you think we are going to see a real revolution
in the role of unmanned systems on the battlefield in the
next 10 years? And do you think that is a goal that we
should be working towards in the view of other near-term
requirements that you are facing?

General Milley: Thank you, Senator.

I think “revolution” might be too strong a word. But I do see a very, very significant increased use of robotic, both manually controlled and autonomous, in ground warfare over the coming years. I do not see some sort of revolution like we are going to go from the horse to the tank or the musket to the rifle. But I do see the introduction at about the 10-year mark or so of really widespread use of robotics in ground warfare. We are already seeing it in air platforms and we are seeing it in naval platforms. The ground warfare is a much complex environment, dirty environment, but I do anticipate that we are going to refine the use of robots significantly and there will be a large use of them in ground combat by -- call it -- 2030.

Senator Fischer: And as service secretary, what role do you have in the third offset initiative? We have heard that we will be exploring some new operational concepts and capabilities for ground combat. And is that something that the Army is leading on?

Mr. Murphy: Senator, I would say with the third offset, we need to lead from the front. And we are talking about leap-ahead technologies. So when you look back at the second offset, we are talking about precision munitions. We are talking about GPS. When I was in Iraq, we did most of
our operations at night because we had night vision goggles.
Again, this is the technology. When I say we do not want a
fair fight, we want our soldiers at a technical and tactical
advantage. When you talk about the leap-ahead technology,
the third offset, I do think it is robotics. I think
robotics, cyber, electronic warfare -- the gains that we
need to make there because, by the way, ma’am, our peer
competitors are investing in those things too, and we cannot
be outmanned and outgunned. We need to make sure that we
have the technical and tactical advantage. So I am
definitely part of that within the Army and within the
Department of Defense.

General Milley: May I make a comment, ma’am?
Senator Fischer: Yes, certainly.

General Milley: I think for the next 5 to 10 years,
for ground warfare you will see evolutions and you will see
acceleration of some of these technologies brought in, but
they will be episodic. I think 10 years and beyond, though,
I do see a very significant transformation of ground
warfare, the character of war, not the nature of war. That
would include robotics, cyber, lasers, railguns, very
advanced information technologies, miniaturization, 3D
printing. All of these technologies that are emerging in
the commercial world I think will end up having military
application just past a decade from now. And I think we,
the Army, going back to risking the future, need to invest
in the R&D and the modernization of that or we are going to
find the qualitative overmatch gap between the United States
and adversaries closed. And we are already seeing that gap
closing today.

Senator Fischer: When we talk about the third offset,
many times we focus on the stuff. We focus on the new
technologies that are out there, and we hear about the
robotics. We hear about the lasers. I would like to know
how much input both of you would have when it comes to
setting goals and missions and then trying to figure out
what technologies are out there or what needs to be designed
in order to meet those goals instead of reacting to the
technology that is there. How do you view that?

General Milley: I mean, it is an iterative,
interactive process, number one. But number two, say 25,
30, 40 years ago, much innovation was done by the Department
of Defense in terms of technology. Today most technological
innovation is actually being done by the commercial world.
So it is important that we have linkages into the commercial
sector, Silicon Valley, 128 up in Boston, the Triangle, and
down in Texas. So it is all these innovative centers. We
need to keep in touch with them closely, and we do have a
lot of input not just personally but also through the
organization of the Army. So we do have a lot of input into
it. There is a lot of technological advances out there.

There are a couple of challenges. One is what does the year 2025, 2030, 2040, 2050 look like demographically, politically, economically, socially, et cetera but also technologically. Those are some big questions. Once we can figure that out -- and we are working hard at that -- then we can drive the ways in which we desire to fight. Once you figure that out, then you can figure out the equipment, the organizations, the training plans, et cetera to create that organization. But we first have to define what exactly is that world going to look like, at least as best we can. We will not get it exactly right, but we want to get it more right than the enemy.

Senator Fischer: Thank you, General. I wish you good luck in trying to figure that out and meet those goals for the future. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Reed?

Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you for your testimony again.

You have put the focus on readiness, which I think is appropriate. If additional resources could be freed up in this process, General Milley, where would you focus in terms of more emphasis on readiness?

General Milley: A couple of key places, Senator.
Thank you. One would be aviation flight hours. I think that is important. We dropped aviation flight hours from about 14, 15, which is really a requirement per month, down to about 10. We bumped it back up to 12, but we probably need some more. That would be one area.

Secondly and very importantly is home station training. So we all of the units, all the brigade combat teams to go either the joint readiness training center, the national training center, or the training center in Germany. So key to success at one of those big ticket training centers is the home station preparatory training prior to going, all the gunneries, the field training exercise, et cetera. That has been underfunded over the past years. If we can get home station training up to a level, then the units will come out of the CTCs at a much higher level in combined arms training.

So I would put it probably in aviation flight hours and in the home station training.

And lastly, the third to last would be if we did have additional monies, I would probably put it towards additional CTC training for the National Guard. The National Guard is going to be very, very important because of the capacity issue of the regular Army to deal with the current day-to-day but also the contingency operation. So we need to increase -- in short order, we need to increase
the readiness of the Army National Guard’s combat formations.

Senator Reed: This year, I believe you have two scheduled rotations to the training centers for National Guard brigades.

General Milley: That is correct, Senator. We are trying to increase it to four.

Senator Reed: A related issue in terms of the emphasis on flying hours and readiness, et cetera, particularly in Army aviation, the procurement and the acquisition process -- are you at a point now where you could jeopardize long-term aviation programs, or do you still have a little bit of head space?

General Milley: I think we are approaching the margin. It is very tight right now. So what we have done is we have had to stretch out aviation modernization in order to reach some of that for readiness. Aviation is about, roughly speaking, 20 percent or so -- 25 percent of the operating budget. So we have stretched out aviation modernization to take those monies and put it into readiness.

Senator Reed: One of the points I think that you have made in your comments is that the emphasis on training at home station, which means the units have to be at home essentially. It is the time element. It is the dwell element rather than the deploy element.
General Milley: That is correct.

Senator Reed: So if we were to, not in terms of a major contingency, but in terms of the current situation, begin to increase our footprint in places around the world, the dilemma would be that would rob you of the time and the available troops to get ready for the next big battle. Is that a fair statement?

General Milley: Sort of, Senator, in that some of these overseas exercises actually improve your readiness.

Senator Reed: I am not talking about exercises. I am talking about a commitment in terms of a kinetic situation.

General Milley: An operational commitment? Yes, that would consume readiness. That is correct.

Senator Reed: And that is the dilemma because we always have to be prepared to do that, and if it happens, then we will do it. But we have to understand the cost not only short term but long term is that we fall further behind in the readiness.

General Milley: That is correct.

Senator Reed: The point that has been made very, very powerfully by the chairman and myself is that sequestration has to be eliminated because this year might be manageable. Next year, if sequestration is imposed, it becomes frankly impossible and you would have to come up here and tell us that you probably could not perform your mission. Is that
fair?

General Milley: I think if sequestration were imposed and went to those levels, that we could not perform the missions assigned to us under the current strategy. And most important to me, as a commissioned officer, and I think important to this committee is we would risk American lives if we were committed into combat.

Senator Reed: Well, again, thank you, sir, for your service. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, for your service. And thank you, Mr. Chairman, for this hearing.

Chairman McCain: Senator Cotton?

Senator Cotton: Thank you.

Thank you, gentlemen, for appearing before us.

General Milley, I would like to return to the priorities you just laid out for Senator Reed. If I heard them right, it was more aviation hours and more home station training for regular Army units and, finally, more CTC training time for National Guard.

General Milley: Those would be three of the areas. There are other areas, but those would be three. That is correct.

Senator Cotton: Those are the priorities you would spend if you got the first extra dollar in your budget, or are those limited just to your priorities for more readiness?
General Milley: Those are readiness dollars.

Senator Cotton: You had mentioned earlier about the soldiers we are sending to fight today and your priority for readiness, which you have said repeatedly during your tenure as the Chief. So America’s moms and dads, whose soldiers are serving in your Army, at 25 is an E-5 or a 1st lieutenant, can be assured that you would never send one of their sons or daughters into combat unready to fight.

General Milley: That is correct.

Senator Cotton: But that has a cost in modernization. So moms and dads around America, whose 15-year-old son and daughter aspire to be in the Army one day, have to be more concerned about the qualitative overmatch and capabilities of the future Army. Is that correct?

General Milley: I think that is also correct, Senator.

Senator Cotton: There is some discussion within the Congress about mandating a certain end strength of the Army at a higher level than 450,000. I think that would be a good idea. I would like to see it much higher than that. Could you talk about the consequences if this Congress does, in fact, mandate a certain end strength without increasing your budget numbers?

General Milley: I think if we were mandated to go to a higher size, more soldiers, bigger end strength, and we did not have the dollars, I personally think that would be
disastrous for both the Nation and the Army in that we would have to, at the end of the day, mortgage more modernization of the future. We would have to take down installations, quality of life programs. There are all kinds of things that would have to happen. And at the end of the day, I think we would risk literally having a hollow Army. We do not have a hollow Army today, but many on this committee remember the days when we did and when people did not train and units were not filled up at appropriate levels of manning strength and there were no spare parts. All of those things would start happening if we increased the size of the force without the appropriate amount of money to maintain its readiness.

Senator Cotton: Because a mandatory end strength without a budget to match would mean they do not have the money to train, to be equipped, go to CTCs, and so forth. However, you also mentioned the greater risk for modernization. I assume that is because if the Army mandated a certain end strength because of your bedrock commitment to send our sons and daughters overseas fully equipped, fully trained, fully manned, you would take even more money out of modernization.

General Milley: That is exactly right. The three levels are end strength, readiness, and modernization accounts. So we would have to take down -- if end strength
went up, then the first one out the door is modernization, and I certainly do not recommend that. So if there were a mandated increase in the size of the Army, for whatever reason, then I would strongly urge that that happen with the money appropriate for the pay and compensation, for the readiness, et cetera. Absent that, I think it would be a big mistake.

Senator Cotton: Thank you. I certainly support a much higher end strength than we are on the path to have. I also think it would be deeply inadvisable not to match that with a concomitant budget increase.

Turning to modernization, because of the risk we are facing there, you were speaking with Senator Fischer about some of the commercial technology that we have seen. Could you talk a little bit about your new acquisition authorities and your desire to use more commercial, off-the-shelf technology. You famously said in the Army’s handgun program, that if you had -- was it $34 million -- you could go to Cabela’s and buy 17,000 handguns for the Army or something like that? You see it across other domains as well with the global response force desire for enhanced mobility or DCGS versus commercial technology.

General Milley: I think the proposals that are out there now on the acquisition reform are absolutely moving in the right direction. I welcome that. I embrace it. I do
not claim that I know everything there is to know about
acquisition by a long shot. But I think empowering the
chiefs to really take greater responsibility and with that,
of course, comes accountability -- and I welcome that as
well. We should get into it. Roll our sleeves up, get
after it and get the right equipment to the warfighters in a
faster amount of time at a reasonable cost to the taxpayer.
The pistol was just one example, but I am bumping into these
things all over the place in a wide variety of programs.

So there have been an awful lot of sessions going on in
the Army over the last, I guess, 6-8 weeks now. I am
probably not on a lot of people’s Christmas card list, but
that is all okay. Our desire is to make sure our soldiers
are taken care of.

Senator Cotton: I cannot imagine that. Maybe they
just want to bring you home for Thanksgiving.

General Milley: That must be it.

Senator Cotton: Well, I imagine you will continue to
bump up against that unlike some of your counterparts who
cannot go to Cabela’s and buy a next generation fighter or
bomber or a ballistic missile submarine. There are, of
course, a lot of modernization opportunities in the Army
that use commercial technology, and I know you are committed
to that. Thank you.

My time has expired.
General Milley: Thank you, Senator.

Chairman McCain: Fortunately, members of this committee are without controversy.

Senator Shaheen?

Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

Thank you both for being here this morning and for your service.

And I want to begin by adding my support to those on the committee who believe that we need to deal with sequestration and that it poses an imminent threat to our national security and to a lot of other things with respect to our future.

But I want to follow up on the conversation you were having with Senator Fischer, General Milley, talking about the importance of innovation, technological innovation, to our future. When we were having hearings on the future of our military, one of the things we heard is that as you pointed out, there has been a dramatic decrease in support for R&D on the part of the Department of Defense, and that the one program that has consistently provided the kind of innovation that DOD needs is the Small Business Innovation Research program. And I wonder if you could just speak to the importance of that for providing the new technologies that the Army is looking for.

General Milley: I think it is a great program and I
fully support it. I think small business -- not in all
cases, but oftentimes small entrepreneurs are the most
innovative partly because of survival techniques, I guess,
in business. But they tend to be very adaptive, agile, and
innovative. So supporting those initiatives in order to
take advantage and leverage emerging technologies is
something that I fully support.

Senator Shaheen: Great. Well, hopefully we can get
this reauthorized for next year without the kind of
challenges we had the last time we tried to get it
reauthorized.

I had the opportunity recently to meet in Brussels with
officials from Europe and from particularly Eastern Europe
and the Baltics. And they were very pleased to see our
proposal to increase the European Reassurance Initiative
fourfold. You both mentioned in your testimony the threat
from Russia.

One concern that they asked me about that I could not
answer was why the decision seems to have been made to
preposition the equipment, to do the rotational more in
Western Europe than in Eastern Europe on the front lines.
And so how do we explain the decision to do that?

General Milley: First of all, I would defer an
authoritative, definitive answer to General Breedlove
because he is the one who determines where that equipment
goes and so on and so forth.

But there are a couple of issues here, not the least of which are political negotiations with foreign governments as to where it goes, where you base it, and building the infrastructure to support it and so on and so forth.

What we are going to do is the initial tranche -- the unit will bring its equipment. So the rotational units will bring their equipment rather than have it prepositioned initially. And then you will see in 2017 and 2018 we will have a prepositioned divisional set of equipment in Europe.

There are advantages and disadvantages to prepositioning and/or bringing it with you. Both are valued.

The advantage of deploying with your equipment is to exercise the strategic deployment systems of the Navy and the Air Force, along with the Army, in order to long haul heavy equipment for heavy brigades. The prepositioned equipment -- obviously, the big advantage there is the speed. And so a combination of both actually is what would be required in time of crisis.

But the positioning of that equipment physically inside Europe, I would like to defer that logic and rationale to General Breedlove, if that is okay.

Senator Shaheen: It is. And I have had the opportunity to ask him about it. But it sounded to me like
you are saying that the locations are based not just on their military effectiveness but politics have also been part of those decisions.

General Milley: I mean, sure. There are political negotiations, you know, diplomatic negotiations between countries that have to occur before we get that locked in.

Senator Shaheen: One of the things that, obviously, our continued readiness depends on is the effectiveness of our Guard and Reserve. I was pleased to see that this budget included two military construction projects in New Hampshire that are very important. Right now, we rank 51st out of 54 in terms of the condition of our facilities and armories. So can you -- I do not know. Maybe this is appropriate for you, Secretary Murphy -- talk about how we ensure that the National Guard has the resources that it needs to be ready whenever we expect them to deploy?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, Senator. The National Guard -- we are a total force. So we are not three different forces. We are one Army, one team.

Senator Shaheen: Sorry to interrupt, but sometimes the resources do not always seem like we are a total force and one team.

Mr. Murphy: Ma'am, all I can tell you is that when you look at MILCON to the $1 billion budget, 10 percent went to -- again, the MILCON, which is part of the budget -- it has
been the lowest it has been in 24 years. But when you dive down in the numbers like I have, you know, Hooksett, $11 million; Rochester, $8.9 million because we are one team. And there is a different leadership because we were asking a whole heck of a lot like we have the last 15 years and the next 10 years. So there are not two different teams. We are one team. So we are getting after it and we are giving them the resources they need to make sure that they do not have a fair fight and they have the resources in MILCON.

But my other comment, ma’am. I mean, we have mortgaged modernization. And I know time has run out, but I can expand on it later if you would like me to.

Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Wicker?

Senator Wicker: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Milley, earlier this week, Lieutenant General McMaster testified before the Airland Subcommittee. Our chairman has already alluded to this in his opening statement. But his quote is exactly as follows. We are outranged and outgunned by many potential adversaries. He also said our Army in the future risks being too small to secure the Nation.

Now, do you agree with his statement in whole or in part?
General Milley: In part. And H.R. is one -- I love him like a brother.

To say “many” is probably an overstatement. But to say that the gap is closing, the capability gap is closing between major great power adversaries and the United States in terms of ground forces, absolutely true. And I think that was the intent of what he was trying to say.

In terms of size of the force, yes, I agree with his comment on size of the force. But outranged, outgunned on the ground, I think it is a mixed bag.

Senator Wicker: Are we outranged by any potential adversary at this point?

General Milley: Yes.

Senator Wicker: And which ones would that be?

General Milley: I would have to say the ones in Europe, Russia on the ground.

Senator Wicker: And would you tell the committee what it means to be outranged by Russia?

General Milley: Well, with either direct or indirect fire systems, the ground-based systems, tanks, artillery, those sorts of things. I would have to get you the actual range of all these weapons. So it is not overly dramatic, but it is the combination of systems. We do not like it. We do not want it. But, yes, technically outranged, outgunned on the ground, I think that is factually correct.
Senator Wicker: So outranged and outgunned would have the same definition as far as you are concerned. And we are outranged and outgunned by Russia to some extent at this point.

General Milley: That is correct.

Senator Wicker: Now, what does that mean for our Nation’s security?

General Milley: Well, again, it depends on what we want to do relative to -- in Europe, for example. So the fundamental task there is to deter, maintain cohesion of the alliance, assure our allies, and deter further Russian aggression. If we got into a conflict with Russia, then I think that it would place U.S. soldiers’ lives at significant risk.

Senator Wicker: What specifically should we do? What steps should this committee and this Congress take to reverse these trends and maintain the Army’s supremacy over our adversaries?

General Milley: I think there are a couple of things. One, I think in terms of the capability of the force, a subset and the most important one is what is emphasized in this budget is readiness. That has to be sustained.

So what is readiness? It is manning, making sure that we have got enough people to man the organizations at appropriate levels of strength.
Senator Wicker: We are okay there.

General Milley: It depends on the unit. We have a lot of non-availables in the force, for example, right now. So it depends on the given unit. Right now, ideally you would want a unit to be well above 90 percent before you sent them off to combat. That is not necessarily the truth. And then when you get the availability of the force, you start peeling this back unit by unit, you will find that the foxhole strength, the number of troops that a given battalion or brigade that deploy to, say, NTC or JRTC is not necessarily what you might have expected just from the paper numbers. So manning is an important piece. That is the end strength.

The equipping piece is critical, things like spare parts. First of all, do they have the right and most modern equipment? And secondly, does the equipment work? And that is a work in progress.

More or less, manning and equipping is not too bad. Training is the long pole in the tent. And then there is more to it. It is leadership, cohesion, and good order and discipline and trust of the force. All of those in combination equal readiness. So I would say that the number one thing, at least near term, would be readiness.

But then in addition to that, because we have to look past lunchtime here, in addition to readiness, we have got
to reinvest in our modernization and R&D over time. And
that is what H.R. was getting at. If we continue to attrit
that, as we have over the last 8 years -- 8 to 10 years or
so -- if we continue to attrit that, then that will result
in a bad outcome 5-10 years from now. And I think those are
the two things I would offer to you, Senator.

Senator Wicker: Thank you very much. And perhaps you
can elaborate on that.

I do need to ask you about the light utility
helicopter. You recently published an unfunded requirement
for 17 Lakotas in fiscal year 2017. Of course, I was
relieved to hear that. But can you elaborate on how these
17 Lakotas in your EUFR would be utilized and what risk
would occur if you do not receive those 17 Lakotas?

General Milley: Yes. Those 17 are specifically tied
to the National Commission’s recommendation, which we owe
you a response to their recommendations. They have got 63
recommendations. A lot of them have to do with aviation.

So the 17 Lakotas are specifically tied to their
recommendations, and they would be utilized at Fort Rucker
to free up Apaches to go to the Guard. And they would
specifically be utilized to train new helicopter pilots. As
you know, the Lakota is not a combat aircraft. We have
divested it, stopped procuring it. It does have great
utility for things like training areas, using them as op
forward to simulate enemy aircraft, using them as a medevac aircraft, use it to train pilots, and so on and so forth. But it is a not a combat aircraft. So we have chosen to divest ourselves of it. But the 17 are in there specifically to use as training aircraft at Fort Rucker, and it is linked directly to the National Commission’s recommendations.

   Senator Wicker: And they will free up combat --

   General Milley: They will free up combat aircraft that we could then transfer to the National Guard to execute the other parts of the commission’s recommendation.

   Senator Wicker: Thank you, sir.

   Chairman McCain: General, would you add retention to that list?

   General Milley: Yes. Retention, recruiting talent. I mentioned the modernization piece, but the readiness piece is the most important piece. But absolutely to the list is retention.

   Chairman McCain: Senator King?

   Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

   First, I want to associate myself with your comments in the opening statement and perhaps put a bit of context. We had a meeting in the Budget Committee yesterday talking about overall budget issues. I think what a lot of people do not realize is that the expenditures for defense and non-
defense discretionary as a percentage of GDP have fallen dramatically in the last 50 years and dramatically in the last 25 years to the point where defense as a percentage of GDP is now the lowest it has been in 70 years, 3.3 percent. In 1965, it was about 9 percent. It has fallen almost by two-thirds. We always focus on the numbers, which are very big, but as a percentage of our economy we are, as I say, at one of the lowest levels since World War II.

Secondly, the budget numbers that we are now working with were established in 2011 before Syria, ISIS, Ukraine, Russia’s militarization of the Arctic, China’s race to military modernization, North Korea’s nuclear capacity, cyber, encryption, and of course, on the domestic side, something like what we have seen in the last few years in the heroin epidemic.

In other words, we have locked ourselves into a straightjacket of financing that does not allow us to deal with current realities. It is absolutely beyond comprehension that we should do this, particularly given the sacred responsibility in the preamble to the Constitution to provide for the common defense. That is the most fundamental responsibility of any government to keep its people safe. And we are knowingly just blindly going through this process of trying to continually meet these new challenges that were established since these numbers were
set up as the limits and fit the response of this country
into a continually shrinking package. It is irresponsible
and we have to start talking about the larger picture.

To move beyond budgets, during the break, I spent some
time in Poland and Ukraine. They are talking about a new
kind of war, and I want to ask you, General Milley, about a
new strategy and a new doctrine. They are talking about
hybrid war, what happened in Ukraine, not a frontal attack,
not sending in the Russian army, not sending tanks across
the border, but using some indigenous Russian language
speakers, some troops but not in uniform necessarily, a new
kind of incursion, which clearly is a possibility in the
Baltics, which are NATO allies.

General Milley, what is your thinking? We need to have
a new strategy to deal with this. This is probably what the
next conflict might look like.

General Milley: Well, it is clear that in the Russian
case, they are using a new doctrine that was developed, I
guess it was, 2005, 2006, 2007, 2008 time frame by General
Gerasimov and others. They have various names for it,
indirect war, hybrid war, et cetera.

What they are trying to do, I think, is to advance
their interests at levels below direct armed conflict with
the United States.

Senator King: And how do we respond?
General Milley: So I think one thing is the indigenous peoples of that region, the frontline states, if you will. The Baltics is an example. They want to be able to defend themselves and we should take actions and authorities and appropriate resources and help them to defend themselves because they are NATO Article 5 members. So that is I think fundamental.

Secondly, I think a lot of training exercises. And I think what is embedded in the ERI relative to the Army piece -- this is very, very important. We need to send a very strong message to the Russians. I think we are doing that by prepositioning equipment, rotating heavy forces, in this case an armored brigade, and conducting well over 40 exercises in Europe to let our allies know we are there and to let our enemies know that we are there.

Senator King: I was surprised to learn over there that one of the ways we are really getting hammered is by a very effective propaganda and disinformation campaign on behalf of the Russians.

General Milley: Correct.

Senator King: And it drives me crazy that the country that invented Hollywood and Facebook is losing the information war. We have got to do that better. They are laying the groundwork for this kind of hybrid war by a disinformation and propaganda campaign that is creating the
rich soil in which a hybrid war can take place.

General Milley: They are using all means of national power. They are using information. They are using the cyber domain. They are using space capabilities, as well as ground special operations, naval, et cetera. So they are acting very aggressively relative to their neighbors and they are using all of those techniques, many of which are not necessarily new. There are new systems to deliver those techniques.

Senator King: But we put the USIA out of business in 1997. We have got to get back into the business of communications, it seems to me.

General Milley: That is right. That is correct, Senator.

Senator King: I am out of time, but I want to commend you for the comments you made about procurement. We have got to start talking about 80 percent solutions, not perfect weapons and commercial, off-the-shelf. I think quite often -- I mean, the old saying is the best is the enemy of the good. We need more timely and more affordable development of systems that use commercial, already available, already developed, already R&D’d equipment to the maximum extent feasible. We cannot keep going for these very perfect weapon systems that everybody has a piece of. And I think your role as a chief in this process is very important.
Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

General Milley: Thank you, Senator.

Chairman McCain: Senator Sullivan?

Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank both you gentlemen for a couple things. As the chairman mentioned, General Milley, your forthright testimony -- it is very much appreciated on these what are clearly difficult issues.

And Secretary Murphy and General Milley, you know, the commitments you had made earlier about coming up, taking a look at some of the issues in Alaska, and kept you word on that, made an independent judgment after a very thorough review -- I appreciate that as well.

And I also want to let you know that I think it is safe to say on this committee we are working -- not that you are not doing a great job there, Secretary Murphy, but we are also recognizing the importance and quality of Mr. Fanning in terms of what he represents for the Army. And I think a number of us are committed to working on that issue.

General Milley, I want to go back to your statement in your testimony, which I think is a really big deal. It is kind of a warning bell. But when a service chief of the most important ground force for the most important military in the world talks about high military risk, that is a pretty remarkable statement. And I certainly hope that
Members of Congress will recognize what a remarkable statement it is.

At what point does that become unacceptable risk?

There was a subcommittee hearing recently with a number of the senior members of the military. And whose call is that? Is that our call as oversight and policymakers? Is that your call? Is that Secretary Carter’s call, the chairman’s, the President’s? But, you know, we use “high risk,” but at what point is that unacceptable for where we are? Are we looking at another Task Force Smith situation that I know the Army and many other historians look at with a lot of trepidation.

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.

My job is to provide my best military estimate of what the risk is. It is our civilian leadership to determine whether that risk is acceptable to the Nation or not.

Senator Sullivan: Just for the record, I believe when you are saying high military risk, which not many service chiefs in my recollection make that statement, it is a pretty important and significant statement. I certainly believe it is unacceptable risk for the country and, as you mentioned, for our troops.

General Milley: Again, it is up to this body here, the United States Congress. It is up to the President. It is up to my civilian leadership to determine whether it is
acceptable to the Nation. I think it is high military risk.

Senator Sullivan: Well, thank you again for your forthright testimony on that. I know that is not an easy statement to make.

I want to go back to Senator Manchin’s question, which I thought was a very good one. He asked you, well, then at what level forces would we need to actually bring that risk down to something that is medium or low risk. He talked in terms of the overall number. I want to actually ask the question more specifically with regard to the active force.

Just so I am clear, the high risk assessment is that our number of 450,000 active duty soldiers -- is that correct?

General Milley: The high risk assessment is based on the total Army not just the active. So I based it off the 980,000 because -- and again, it is based on the contingencies of these higher end threats. So the National Guard and the United States Army Reserve are going to play a fundamental role if in fact one of those contingencies were to happen. So I based my risk on the total Army, not just the regular Army.

Senator Sullivan: Have you looked at the 450,000 number and what will we need to get to a number on the active force that would bring down that risk? I think again a number of us on this committee, bipartisan, believe the
450,000 number is too small.

General Milley: Well, I did. You know, we have got a variety of studies that we did to determine the size of the force relative to the National Military Strategy and the Defense Planning Guidance. So that answers the question of, you know, for what, what do you need the Army for. Well, you need it to do these tasks. So we did that. We did the mission analysis. We did the associated force structure requirements. And it is my estimate about a 1.2 million-man total Army would be required. Again, the money is not there.

Senator Sullivan: Do you have that broken down?

General Milley: We do. We have broken down with active, Guard, and Reserve. The active piece of that comes out at just a little more than 500K or so.

But it is not just numbers, of course. And I know you know this, but it is not just numbers. It is the readiness of that force. It is the technological capability of that force. It is how that force plays into the joint force. It is how we fight. It is the doctrine. It is the sum total of all of those things.

We tend to laser-focus on size. I think that is critical, capacity, size. I think that is fundamental to the whole piece. But there are other factors to calculate beyond just the numbers of troops, and I think it is
important to consider that.

Senator Sullivan: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Heinrich?

Senator Heinrich: Secretary Murphy and General Milley, I think from the hearing today, it is clear that we all agree you are rightly prioritizing the readiness of our men and women in uniform. But it is also very clear that because of the budget box that we have put the Army in, that we are not modernizing at a level necessary to stay ahead of our adversaries the way that we have in the past.

I am a big believer in directed energy. It is where I started my career. I have seen not only what is possible but what is capable today. And I believe it should be a fundamental piece of the Department’s third offset strategy.

If we are trying to truly develop a future weapon system that changes the nature of warfare as we the in the past, just like, Secretary, you talked about with the advantages of night vision goggles, GPS, we have to invest in the technologies that will give us a qualitative technological advantage to ensure that we have an unfair fight with the enemy.

Unfortunately, this committee was informed that none of the funding provided last year by Congress for the tech offset initiative is going towards directed energy despite a
clear direction from Congress to do so. I will just give
one example. The Army’s high energy laser mobile
demonstrator, LMD, has already proven capable of destroying
90 incoming mortar rounds and UAVs with its 10 kilowatt
laser, and there is a lot more to come.

So I want to ask you why there is not more emphasis on
directed energy and what is the Army’s plan to deliver an
operational directed energy system in an environment where I
think it is always too easy to invest in more R&D and the
next big, fancy thing that is perfect, like Senator King
mentioned, when we could be developing and fielding programs
today.

Mr. Murphy: Senator, part of the acquisition -- and if
I could just make one mention about White Sands real
quickly, if that is okay.

Senator Heinrich: Absolutely. That was kind of my
next question.

Mr. Murphy: So it is not directed energy because I
just want to make sure. It is on the top of my head.

You all have the largest solar field in America in the
Army, and that gives us a savings of $2 million. But when
you talk about modernization, you talk about directed
energy, et cetera, and modernization programs, when we talk
about science, technology, and modernization, you have to
follow the money. When I left Congress 6 years ago, the
budget of the Army was $243 billion. We have had a 39 percent cut. So we are asking -- including OCO then and now, what we are asking is the 125 base and 148, including OCO. But when you talk about modernization, we are asking for $25 billion in this budget. It was $46 billion 6 years ago, fiscal year 2011. So again, you have to make these -- Senator Heinrich: Mr. Secretary, I think we all recognize the stresses that you are under. I think more specifically what I am saying is given the money that was directed by this committee last year to look at third offset and to utilize those specific funds to look at the future of warfighting and how we maintain that qualitative edge, why not more emphasis on directed energy within that specifically?

General Milley: Let me pile on here. Again, hard choices. So we have chosen to take the R&D type monies and put them into some other areas. We are putting money into directed energy, by the way. But I think you are talking about in terms of scale and proportion that is less than some of the other areas.

One of the reasons is because some of our sister services -- we operate as a joint force -- are doing a lot of work on directed energy. So we do not want to duplicate their work. We want to let them pump their money into it and see what comes out of directed energy weapon systems.
And then we will modify that research for application in ground warfare. So we can leverage the work of some of our other services, Senator.

Senator Heinrich: I want to thank both of you for your leadership in strengthening the Army’s integrated air missile defense and certainly in announcing an air defense detachment at White Sands. We are all very excited about that. The increasing proliferation of missile systems by our adversaries means that we have to enhance our training and our expertise to better protect men and women deployed around the world, as well as our homeland.

Can you just talk a little bit about the sophisticated missile threats that are emerging, what the Army is facing today, and what steps are being taken to counter that threat?

General Milley: The countries that I mentioned in my opening statement, specifically Russia, China, North Korea, and Iran, all have increasingly -- very sophisticated now and increasingly more sophisticated tiered integrated air defense systems that are very complex, very lethal, and very robust, to the point where U.S. fixed wing air from the U.S. Air Force or Navy assets or rotary wing air from Army and Marine helicopters are at risk. And these are terrestrial-based integrated air defense systems in combination with the adversaries’ fixed wing air defense systems. So it is a
growing, increasingly growing capability. You have heard about, I believe, from the Air Force and Navy many times about the anti-access/area denial threats. Those are real and they are in place today, and they are growing in capability.

Senator Heinrich: Thank you, Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Lee?

Senator Lee: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks to both of you for being here. Thanks to your sacrifice and your commitment on behalf of our Nation’s security.

The National Commission on the Future of the Army recommended in its report earlier this year that the Army maintain four battalions of age 64 Apache helicopters in the Army National Guard under the aviation restructuring initiative. I would just like to know from either or both of you what has been the Army’s assessment of this recommendation and how does the Army plan to react to it, respond to it?

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.

Under the direction of the Acting Secretary of the Army, what we have done is a very rigorous study of the 63 recommendations. Right now, more or less about 50 or so we think are achievable at relatively little or no cost or we have already started doing them. There is one that we
absolutely disagree with. We recommend no. And then there are about nine -- I think it is nine others or 10 others -- that do incur some or significant cost in terms of dollars, and we are analyzing that. The one you mentioned is one of those. So we are analyzing that.

What we promised the Secretary of Defense is we would give him a written report on our recommendations on which ones we think are good to do, and of those, how would we pay for them, how would we execute, implement those recommendations. The Congress commissioned the commissioners, and that report will come to you after, of course, we submit it to the Secretary of Defense. So we expect to do that to the Secretary of Defense on the 15th of April. So I guess whatever that is -- next week. And that report also will be not only signed by the Secretary and I it will be signed by Frank Grass. It will be signed by Tim Kadavy and it will be signed by Jeff Talley, the heads of our National Guard and Reserve. So a lot of meetings with all the stakeholders involved so we can come to what we think is our consolidated position.

Thanks for that question. It is a really important priority that we are doing right now, is working through that commission.

Senator Lee: Well, thank you. And I look forward to reviewing that when we get it hopefully sometime next week.
Can you tell me -- if the Army does decide to maintain Apache capability within the National Guard, can you tell me how the Army would determine where these units would be assigned and what metrics might be used to review the current Apache battalions within the National Guard?

General Milley: It would be Tim Kadavy and Frank Grass would analyze needs of the Guard units, look at how they are involved in various war plans or operational plans, and where they stack in the deck of readiness and responsiveness to the speed at which that unit has to respond, and then what active unit they might integrated into once mobilized. All those factors would be at play. Lieutenant General Kadavy, who is the head of the Guard Bureau -- he would make that recommendation to the Secretary and I and Frank Grass, and then we would approve or disapprove or modify that recommendation.

Senator Lee: Thank you.

Following the Chattanooga attacks last year, my office received a lot of calls, emails, letters, and communications of every sort from constituents having connections to all of the branches of the military. These constituents were expressing concerns about force protection at domestic bases and at international bases, especially for their families at soft targets outside the bases.

Tell me what has the Army done to improve force
protection in the United States and at bases in Europe and the Middle East where they are sort of targets for attacks, and what other options are being considered, including the possibility of allowing soldiers to carry personal firearms on the base in order to protect themselves.

General Milley: I will defer to the Secretary on the policy pieces of that, but I have been involved in that issue for quite some time.

With respect to posts, camps, and stations that are small, isolated, they are outside/inside communities such as recruiting stations, such as Chattanooga, the assessments are done by the local commanders. The Secretary -- actually it was previous Secretary McHugh authorized the commanders to go ahead and conduct their assessment and make a determination whether it was appropriate or not appropriate to arm them. So he delegated the authority in the assessment to the commanders, which is appropriate. Commanders should make those decisions because one size will not fit all. It will depend on locality, risk, and so on.

But some of the constraints on it: people have to be trained. It must be a government-owned weapon. You cannot carry privately owned weapons, et cetera. So that is out there.

Secondly is on the larger camps and installations, for example, Fort Hood or Fort Bragg or Fort Lewis, for example, in terms
of carrying privately owned weapons on military bases, concealed privately owned weapons, that is not authorized. That is a DOD policy. I do not recommend that it be changed. We have adequate law enforcement on those bases to respond. If you take the Fort Hood incident number two, the one where I was the commander of 3rd Corps, those police responded within 8 minutes, and that guy was dead. So that is pretty quick. And a lot of people died in the process of that, but that was a very fast evolving event, and I am not convinced from what I know that carrying privately owned weapons would have stopped that individual. I have been around guns all my life. I know how to use them. And arming our people on our military bases and allowing them to carry concealed privately owned weapons -- I do not recommend that as a course of action.

Senator Lee: Thank you, General.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Donnelly?

Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Murphy, General Milley, thanks for your service and for your leadership.

I was in Iraq last week to meet with General McFarland, to visit Al Assad out in Anbar province where we are training Iraqi security forces. I met with a number of our soldiers deployed in the fight. And as you well know, they
are a tremendous credit to our country and to the Army.

I also want to note that it is my understanding that the Army is the first service to meet the annual mental health assessment requirement set out by the Jacob Sexton Act across every component, and we thank you for leading the way in this effort.

Recently there is a report issued by Indiana University. Researchers at IU have been able to use certain blood biomarkers, in combination with at-base questionnaires, to predict suicidal ideation with 82 percent accuracy and suicide-related hospitalization with 78 percent accuracy. If you would, I would like you, Mr. Secretary, to take a look at this report and let me know how we can be applying research like this to better identify soldiers who might be at risk. Can you take the time to do that, sir?

Mr. Murphy: Yes, Senator. You have my commitment.

Senator Donnelly: Thank you very much.

And in testimony today, you stated that the Army only has about 1,800 of the 2,100 behavioral health providers necessary for adequate care. Two things. I think one is better education incentives can enable us to fund more care providers, will help boost recruitment and retention. The other is utilizing non-physician provider types, nurse practitioners, physician assistants, licensed mental health counselors to help fill the gap.
Do you support these tools, and do you have any other plans to address that gap that you have between 1,800 and 2,100?

Mr. Murphy: I do, Senator. We appreciate your leadership on this. And there is no doubt we have to get after it.

I would say -- I did not mention it -- but the embedded behavioral health teams -- they have been a great success in that. It is members of their own team in a brigade area where they are out there. There are 60 teams right now. But that really has been a game-changer, Senator, when you talk about getting rid of the stigma of mental health because it is a readiness issue.

But in regards to when you look at other things -- you know, when I was in Fort Hood, they could not hire certain folks because they did not have the certain licensing. So we are looking at that, and there is potential that if they have their masters degree but not a license that maybe they can be supplemented to break that because if they do not have a license, what I found, those same people go to TRICARE and we farm out to TRICARE and TRICARE can have those people, but we cannot hire those people.

So again, those things, you know, when I travel and I ask those tough questions to make sure that we could get these numbers up because, as you know, last year was 301
suicides. I write condolence notes every week to fallen soldiers, including the ones that are committed, and to their families and to their children. My first week in this job, 3 months, you know, we had lost 10 folks in my first week. So it is something that weighs on all of us as leaders, but I think the Army is really leading the way and getting after it. But there is much more we can do, and I look forward to looking at that Indiana University report and looking at some of the criteria and certifications.

Senator Donnelly: This is to both of you, whoever wants to answer.

In my home State of Indiana, Crane Army Ammo -- and this is in regards to demil technology. They partnered with researchers at Purdue to try to improve the technology that is used for demil. As they have done this kind of thing, I am interested to know if you have ideas on how we can boost the efficiency of our demil operations. For example, we are spending a significant sum transporting munitions from storage to demil locations. Can we take a look at maximizing proximity of demil operations to demil asset storage locations? I know that is a little bit technical, but are those the kind of things that we can be doing to help look at saving money as we move forward?

General Milley: Right now, Senator, we mostly store, as you know, which comes in at -- I forget what the exact
numbers are, but I think it is something like $2 million versus $20 million to demil.

From a technical standpoint, I will have to get back with the team and get some detail and get back to you and I will provide that to the Secretary so he can get back to you.

Senator Donnelly: Thank you.

And I am running out of time. So, General, I just wanted to ask you, while I was in Iraq, it seems we are moving ISIS out of town after town at the present time. Things are moving in the right direction. And the big action that is going to be taking place, as we look ahead, is Mosul. I was wondering in your conversations with General McFarland, with other people in the theater there, how you think that is shaping up as we look forward.

General Milley: I took this job in August. I have served multiple tours over there. Went over in September, did an assessment. In September, I thought we were losing. I was absolutely convinced of it. The enemy had strategic momentum September of last year.

Went back in December, and in between I have read the reports and have been in frequent contact and meetings and so on and so forth with the commanders.

You are correct. Things are moving in the right direction. There is progress, but progress is not yet
winning. So no one should think that this thing is over. It is not. There is a lot of work to be done. It is true the Iraqis have taken Ramadi, and they are currently engaged in the battle of Hit and conditions are being set for the assault on Mosul. There are also significant efforts being done up in the northern areas, and the lines of communication have been cut between Mosul and Raqqa. And our basic strategy shifted in October, and we are seeing the results of that today with significant losses in enemy personnel, key leaders, increased pressure on their finances and loss of territory, and they are under a lot of pressure. And we are doing that intentionally, multiple dilemmas, multiple problems, all simultaneous, and we are hitting them in a lot of ways.

All that is to the good, but that is not exactly winning yet. The caliphate has to be destroyed. ISIS has to be destroyed, and they have also chosen to displace some of their forces into Libya and elsewhere and they have counterattacked into Europe. This is a tough fight and it is by no means over yet, and no one should be dancing in the end zone yet. There is a long way to go here.

Senator Donnelly: I met with a number of the Sunni tribal leaders, and one of the things they said was if I saw you, to thank you for the cooperation and the assistance of the U.S. Army. So thank you, sir.
General Milley: Thank you, Senator.

Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Tillis?

Senator Tillis: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

General Milley, my colleague here, Senator Sullivan, and I were talking about how much we appreciate your candor and giving us the information we need to be instructed in the job that we have to do.

I want to go back to acquisition reform, either for you, Mr. Secretary, or General Milley. You know, we made several recommendations in the fiscal year 2016 NDAA that was focused on improving cost, schedule execution, and performance.

One question I would have is did you agree with or do you think that some of the things in the NDAA have actually been helpful, if some have and some have not, and then give me some specific examples of how it is changing your execution. And, General Milley, we will start with you.

General Milley: Thus far, Senator, I think it has been helpful. Number one, it changed the tone. That is important. It changes people’s views and attitudes, and I think that is not unimportant to clearly and unambiguously insert and pin the rose on someone’s chest and hold them accountable, that being the Chief of Staff of the respective service. That also alerts a lot of people as to there are
some new rules in town sort of thing.

Secondly, I think for the Army, we have instituted a new process, really a revitalized process of the Army Requirements Oversight Council. So it is unambiguous within the Army itself that the Vice Chief of the Army Dan Allyn or myself will be personally approving and are approving the requirements for every single program that the United States Army puts money against.

In addition to that, we have made that a commander-centric program because the United States military operates off commanders. It is not staff-centric. It is commander-centric, and commanders will be held accountable. So it is the commanders that are going to generate requirements and commanders that approve requirements.

And then I think one key thing I think that was in the legislation that is important is the role of the Chief of Staff in milestone B authorities. I think that was really good and we appreciate that.

We have made some other recommendations in writing. I would ask you to take those into consideration for enactment.

Thank you.

Mr. Murphy: And, Senator, I would say that there is no doubt that we are getting after it with acquisition reform, which is critically important. And it is making our system
more leaner and more responsive and decreasing the amount of
time it takes to put these weapons or these systems back
into the warfighters’ hands. I think the frequency from
when you start from one milestone to the next and the next,
the next has improved about 33 percent, but it needs to
improve much more greatly than that.

Senator Tillis: And, General Milley, some of the key
acquisition programs, the joint light tactical vehicle, the
Stryker lethality upgrades, and the distributed common
ground system -- do you consider them to be some of the key
programs that we have to focus on for modernization, and can
you explain why?

General Milley: Yes, they are. The JLTV, the joint
light tactical vehicle, mobility piece is very important
because once light forces are on the ground and they have
been moved strategically by air or sea, for example, what we
want to make sure is that they have increased mobility to
move around the tactical battlefield. So that is a key
system for that.

And as you know, the HUMVEE fleet has been around for a
while. So our wheeled ground mobility is going to be split
about 50/50, about 50,000 HUMVEEs, about 50,000 JLTVs over
time. So that is an important system.

The Stryker lethality. When H.R. McMaster -- and I am
sorry Senator Wicker is not here, but when H.R. McMaster
talked about being outgunned and outranged, in direct fire
weapons, for example, the Stryker just cannot match a tank
no matter which way you cut it. It is a good vehicle. It
is a great vehicle, but it is not going to go toe to toe
with any tank. So that is what General Breedlove has. He
has a Stryker regiment over there and a paratroop regiment.
So he has got light infantry, foot infantry, and Strykers
and very little else over there. That is why we are
rotating in an armored brigade. So Stryker lethality is
going to up-gun that particular weapon systems and that is
critical and it is important to deterrence.

On the DCGS, I am taking a hard look at DCGS, and I am
keenly aware of all the various controversies. My rough
assessment is that DCGS is performing reasonably well -- the
increment two is going to be online here in a couple years
-- performing reasonably well at kind echelons above
brigade. But when we get into the tactical level, we have
to move it around and jump it from place to place, an ease
of use for young soldiers, that there is a very high density
of training requirement, et cetera.

So there may be some other options out there. I am not
sure, but taking a hard look at that whole piece on the
DCGS. And I have got personal experience with it. A very,
very good system. At the strategic level, operational
level, your ability to pull down national intel assets, et
cetera. But when it gets down to the tactical level, more
difficult to work with, not quite as fast, and difficult to
jump from location to location on a mobile battlefield. So
we are taking a look at that. But those are important
systems, yes.

Senator Tillis: Thank you.

Actually just in a final comment, I share Senator
Sullivan’s concerns about -- well, first, we appreciate your
being clear on what the risk is and what we need to be
mindful of. What I think we also need to do -- and this
comes from a CODEL that I was on in the Middle East. On the
way back, we met with a group of marines who in an almost
matter-of-fact way said that this capability that we have to
cover threats in the region may be cut in half next year
because of other competing priorities. In a matter-of-fact
way like they had to do it because of the pressures that
they are having on budget and limited resources.

I think that we need to understand this particular
case. I am going to follow up in a private setting. We
need to do a better job -- I told them give us that ghost of
Christmas future. Give us a real meaningful idea of what
your risk is going to look like if we are not successful.
And I know the chairman hopes to be successful with ending
sequestration, but we also need to recognize that it is a
high threat that we may have to deal with. And if we do,
what does that look like? If we are already concerned with where we are, where do we go from here?

And with the chair’s indulgence, Secretary, you can --

Mr. Murphy: If I could just real quick, Senator. I would say we know what the numbers are going to be if sequestration, which is grave -- we are already testifying today that this is minimally adequate right now, but if you would go back to sequestration, if the Congress of the United States does this, we are down on the active duty side at 420,000, and that is not acceptable.

Chairman McCain: Senator Hirono?

Senator Hirono: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Milley, as the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific takes shape, while we do not stop training for the types of environments that we face in Iraq and Afghanistan, we also look to enhance our soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines to perform in the Asia-Pacific. And one of these environments that must be -- that we have to be able to handle is the jungle environment. And our last official schools to perform jungle training were closed decades ago, there is an opportunity for our troops and our allies to learn how to perform in this environment, and this would be at the jungle operations training course at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii.

Can you talk a bit about the importance of this kind of
training for our soldiers’ readiness, as well as the ability
to train members of other branches of our armed services as
well as those of our allies?

General Milley: Thank you, Senator.

Environmental training is very important. As I
mentioned in my opening statement, the United States Army
has to be prepared to deploy anywhere on earth. And there
are many, many places that have jungles or heavily forested
areas.

We did close our jungle school years ago, and General
Flynn, Commander of the 25th Division, and General Fuller,
the previous Commander, set up the jungle school out in
Hawaii out in the Kiukas. It is a good school. It is a
great school in fact, but it is mostly locally used right
now. But I think we can expand the usage of that to other
forces so they can get some environmental training.

We do winter warfare training in Alaska. We do
urbanized training at the training centers, and we do rural
training at most installations, and we do jungle training in
Hawaii. So it is a critical thing. Environmental training
is important to keep soldiers up to speed so we can operate
in any particular environment.

Senator Hirono: So is there any effort or any move to
expand or strengthen the jungle training school’s
facilities?
General Milley: He is operating the jungle school right now out of his own budget. I am taking a look at it. I did ask them -- it is funny you asked because I asked him about, I guess it was, a month or 2 ago. I said send me the full POI. I want to see the program of instruction. I want to see the program of instruction that you are using out there because I am considering anointing it as an official Army school as opposed to just a local 25th Division school. And there are some things that come with that for soldiers, and you get awarded a little certificate and so on and so forth. So it is all good.

But baseline premise of what you are saying, though, is absolutely accurate. It is environmental training to be able to operate in any part of the world, and we support that. And I am looking actually at expanding that.

Senator Hirono: Thank you.

Also, General, turning to the utilization of our National Guard, they are an important aspect of our total force. And I am pleased to see your confidence in their abilities and support for the associate units pilot program happening this summer, of which the 3rd and 2nd Brigades of the 25th Infantry Division at Schofield Barracks in Hawaii will be a part.

This pilot program will match one Reserve unit with an active duty counterpart unit which could lead to more formal
training, coordination, improved readiness, guidance, and
closer coordination.

Can you comment on this pilot program and discuss the
attributes of this kind of coordination and work with the
National Guard?

General Milley: Thanks, Senator.

The purpose is to increase readiness and increase the
cohesion and the bonding of the total Army. Just saying
"total Army," just saying we are all one team, et cetera is
only so many words unless we walk the walk. So we used to
have a round out program years ago. It is sort of a revised
version of that.

The benefits of it are that the Guard is exposed to the
regular Army. Equally important is the regular Army is
exposed to the Guard. And we break down whatever barriers
there may be, internal Army cultural barriers. And then
secondly is that each leverages the other’s skills to
improve the readiness of the force. Those are the
fundamental big benefits of doing this.

But importantly from a national strategic standpoint,
if that regular Army unit goes and if we succeed in the
pilot program and we get it all wired in the next couple
years, if there is a contingency, then those Guard units --
it would be my intent anyway that those Guard units would be
alerted, marshaled, and mobilized and they would deploy with
those active units. So we would in fact have one Army not only in training but in deployment.

Senator Hirono: I commend you for those efforts because we can talk about one Army and all of that, but you actually have to provide those opportunities for them to interact and to work together in the kind of cohesive way that you are talking about.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Senator Ernst?

Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Secretary Murphy and General Milley, I want to thank you for being a very active and cohesive team, and you are really making strides. And I will follow up with what Senator Hirono said. I appreciate your efforts with the National Guard, of course, and I think that we have a great relationship there, one team, one fight. So thank you very much for that.

General Milley, I am going to follow up on some concerns that Senator Tillis gave about the vehicle program for our infantry fighters and the rotation that you mentioned for the armored BCTs through Europe.

I am concerned about rotating those units through Europe instead of permanently standing one up in that region. I am just not certain that that will show the commitment that we need to have for our allies in that
region, as well as projecting that strength to Russia as well. So I am just very concerned about that.

And as you know, the National Commission on the Future of the Army included forward-stationing an armored BCT in Europe. That was one of the recommendations, and I agree with that recommendation.

General Milley, do you believe that rotating an armored brigade in Europe is the optimum course of action to reassure our allies and defeat Russian aggression rather than having one permanently positioned?

General Milley: There are advantages and disadvantages to both, Senator. I personally actually favor rotation, and here is why.

When we permanently station -- first of all, the infrastructure has been torn down over the years. But it would be pretty costly to rebuild some of that stuff for families and PXs and commissaries and schools and all that stuff to permanently station a forward force.

But also important is that when a unit rotates, they have a sole focus, which is to train and be prepared to close with and destroy the enemy. There are no families. Your family is not with you. So you are focused. You are mission-focused. So I think that in terms of readiness and your ability to deter, assure, and if necessary defeat, I actually think rotation is a better way of doing it.
And then in terms of strategic effect to deter, the idea of permanent presence is that the armored brigade would be permanent. The plan is to go heel to toe. So the effect of permanency is being achieved without the costs of permanency. So we are going to deploy an armored brigade for 9 months, and right on their heel comes the next armored brigade and then the next armored brigade and then the next armored brigade. There is never a gap between that armored brigade in this rotation cycle that we have set up.

So the effect of a permanent armored brigade for General Breedlove will be achieved, and the disadvantages of forward-stationing, costs, et cetera are not going to be incurred. And the advantages of rotation, battle focus, mission focus -- that does get achieved. I personally think the advantages of rotation outweigh the disadvantages.

Senator Ernst: That is a great explanation and I appreciate that feedback.

I am going to go back to something we have discussed many times over and that is the modular handgun program. I would love to have you visit a little bit more about this. It really has turned into quite a boondoggle. And just to work on this issue has turned into something more than it really should be. And I do appreciate your high level of motivation and attention to the issue.

We just want to make sure that we are getting the
program right and that we are streamlining this so that we
can get a better pistol in the hands of our soldiers. If
that is what is needed, that is what we need to do.

Can you give me an update on your efforts and where we
stand in this process right now?

General Milley: I think you got a little bit of an
update or some members of the committee got a little update
the other day from General Murray, General Anderson, General
McMaster, et cetera, and they described the various levels
of pain that folks have been going through.

But it is all good and we are going to deliver. Then
we are going to make it right for the soldiers and the
taxpayer and make sure that we get a new handgun. I do
believe there is a requirement for a new handgun. I think
the 9 millimeter Beretta has run its course, and it is more
expensive to replace it or to buy new ones or to repair it
than it is actually to purchase a new weapon.

I do think the system has been very frustrating in the
sense of lots of paperwork, lots of bureaucracy, ridiculous
amounts of time, 2 years of testing, $17 million to do a
test and so on and so forth.

So we are ripping all that apart. We are just ripping
all that apart, and we are going to make it better. So in
short order here, I think pretty soon, measured in weeks not
years, we will have some decisions. We will be moving
forward, and we will be able to provide the joint force, all
the services -- we are the lead for the handgun. We will be
able to provide the joint force with an acceptable quality
handgun that will work and it will do what we need it to do
in combat.

Senator Ernst: Thank you. Thank you both very much
for your service and attention. I appreciate your candor,
General Milley. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman McCain: Senator Blumenthal?
Senator Blumenthal: Thanks, Mr. Chairman.
And I want to thank Senator Kaine for yielding to me.
Just a couple of questions pursuing the line of inquiry
that Senator Donnelly began on mental health, the 1,700 of
2,000, roughly, that are needed in terms of psychiatric
personnel. Is there a plan to fill those positions, and
what is being done to do so?

Mr. Murphy: Senator, we are getting after it on this
issue, and we need to as an Army because it is all about our
people and our soldiers. And it is our soldiers, civilians,
and their families as well. So when I gave you the number,
as I did earlier, that there were 301 suicides, that is the
total force. That is our whole family.

And we are looking at things like levels of
certification. Do you really need a masters degree? Could
you have different things that otherwise -- because we got
to fill the ranks. And we are not just competing out there
in the market within the Army. It is other sources of
government. It is private industry that are making these
investments as well and trying to get these recruiters. So
we are trying to help make this push that we need these
young Americans to go out there, get their degrees, get
their certifications, get this profession so we could use
them and bring them within our ranks.

But as I said earlier, there is no doubt that a game-
changer for the Army has been our embedded behavioral health
teams. We have 60 of these teams where it is breaking down
the stigma that these professional mental health providers
are in the brigade areas.

Senator Blumenthal: I understand that and I commend
you on it. As you know, the VA has a very active
recruitment effort using scholarship assistance and loan
repayment incentives. And I wonder whether the Army is
doing the same.

Mr. Murphy: We are looking at everything, Senator, and
we will continue to work with you and your office to do just
that.

Senator Blumenthal: I think what is necessary is a
plan with specifics, and I understand that great progress
has been made. But I think you would agree that more has to
be done. So I would welcome your working with us and thank you very much.

General, have you received complaints about the EOTech sight? It was a subject of a recent report in the “Washington Post.” I am wondering whether any of the men and women under your command have raised questions or concerns about it.

General Milley: Senator, I am going to have to dig into that. Obviously, there is something out there or you would not be asking. So, no, personally I have not. That is not ringing a bell, but I will dig into that.

Senator Blumenthal: I would appreciate your doing that and getting back to us.

General Milley: And you called that complaints at the Equal Opportunity --

Senator Blumenthal: No. It is a sight used on rifles.

General Milley: Oh, rifle sights.

Senator Blumenthal: Made by a company named EOTech.

General Milley: No, I am not aware of that. I thought you were talking about something else. I am not aware of that.

Senator Blumenthal: Sorry to confuse you.

General Milley: Yes, weapon sights. Now you are talking guns, so I am good. No, I have not, but I will look into it and get back to you. I will find out about the
EOTech sight. I got it.

Senator Blumenthal: I would appreciate it. And you can look for reference to the "Washington Post" of I believe this week. There was a story on the front page about the discrepancies and issues that have arisen with respect to this.

General Milley: I will do that. I just made a note.

Senator Blumenthal: Affecting primarily the Army and the Marine Corps.

General Milley: Yes, sir. Got it. We will do that.

Senator Blumenthal: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: I take it, Secretary Murphy, that you are taking great effort to implement the Clay Hunt Suicide Prevention Act.

Mr. Murphy: No doubt. Yes, Senator.

Chairman McCain: And I hope that is an outline for -- I hope that members of this committee are aware that we passed unanimously the Suicide Prevention Act, which calls for most of the things that we are concerned about. It is not perfect, but I am sure that many of those provisions agreed to unanimously are being implemented.

Mr. Murphy: That is correct, Chairman, and we are getting after it. We have made great strides in personnel over doubling these teams.

Chairman McCain: Maybe you could tell some of the
members of the committee, if questioned, when you get a chance to talk about giving them a report on the progress that has been made. Maybe you could just send a letter to all of us so we can know what measures are being taken. Thank you.

    Senator Kaine?

    Senator Blumenthal: That would be very helpful. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

    Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you to the witnesses. I want to also associate myself with the comments of the chair with respect to the effects of sequestration and the need for us to find a better solution.

A compliment and a question. So the compliment. Earlier this week, the Army made a decision. There had been an earlier temporary decision, but earlier this week -- I actually think it might have been Thursday or Friday of last -- a decision to allow an Army captain, Paul Singh, who is a Sikh, to wear both the beard and the turban that is a foundational part of his religion as he serves. He is a combat veteran with an Afghanistan tour. This is something that Senator Gillibrand and I have been writing letters to DOD about for a couple of years. And I wanted to just commend you on that.

    I am very passionate about this issue. Maybe just
being Virginia biased, the statute of religious freedom that Thomas Jefferson authored that became the basis for the First Amendment that basically says in our country, you can worship or not and you will not be preferred or punished for how you worship and you can freely exercise your faith was one of only two ideas that was unique to the American Constitution. The rest of it was a great borrowing job, but freedom of religious exercise and interestingly enough that war should be started by Congress, not the President were the only two things that were unique to our Constitution. And so it is very foundational.

And I know that there are issues of how you balance people’s religious practices with you can wear a helmet or a gas mask, and you want people to be who they are without proselytizing. Those are all challenging questions. But particularly in the world we are living in today and in the war of today, sadly in the future, this is becoming more and more important.

All over the world, we see violence and even war that is driven by sectarian tensions whether it is Hindus and Muslims in Myanmar, whether it is ISIL’s atrocities against religious minorities like Yazidis or Christians or other groups they do not agree with, whether it is -- I said Buddhists and Muslims in Myanmar -- Hindus and Muslims in areas of India and elsewhere.
You also see, even when there is not war, rifts within armed services. You know, one of the reasons that the Iraq military many cited as having been very ineffective against the initial wave of attacks by ISIL was because of deep sectarian tensions between Sunnis and Shias within the Iraqi military that renders it less effective.

And one of the virtues that the United States plays generally and in our military is demonstrating that people can live and work and go to school together with different religious faiths and we can make it work.

I was on a CODEL that Senator Gillibrand led in early January in Israel and Turkey. And it was interesting. In both nations, leaders said to us, wow, what is with the anti-Muslim rhetoric that we are seeing in your political space right now. And as we dug into it a little bit, what they sort of disclosed is, hey, we live in a neighborhood of the world that has a lot of sectarian tensions, but we do not always want to be that way. But for us to get better, we have to have an example. And the U.S. has been our example of a place where people of different faiths could freely be who they are, but we could make it work together.

And so the decision to allow one Sikh for the first time in history of the Army to wear a turban and beard might seem like a small thing, but it is actually about a deeply critical American value that sadly is really wanting and
needed in the world today.

And so I certainly would encourage the Army and the DOD generally to look at this policy. The defense minister of one of our greatest allies, Canada, is a vet who has been deployed multiple times in Afghanistan. He is a Sikh who has been able to wear his beard and turban in the service. We have got a lot of Sikhs who are in and a lot of Sikhs who would want to be in the military. And I would hope that we would recognize that as not only true to our values but also as something where we could hold up an example in the world in a way that is really needed right now.

The question that I have is about the European Reassurance Initiative, and it is a little bit about sequester politics and the readiness issues. The tug of war is in putting the budget together.

We have got all these readiness gaps, and at the same time, the proposal is to quadruple the investment in the European Reassurance Initiative and to take it up to $3.4 billion. I just would be curious as you talk about hard choices, how do you trade off the need to do this dramatic increase in the ERI with the fact that we are still short in some of the readiness investments that we need to make.

General Milley: Senator, the ERI is really important, and it trades off what tradeoffs DOD made to make that happen in other accounts. You know, those are priorities
set by the Secretary of Defense.

But I can tell you that the ERI is really important because the deterrence of Russia from further aggression is a critical national security priority. They have been aggressive since 2008. That behavior needs to change. This is only one of many other initiatives that are being done and actions that are being done by the U.S. Government across all domains and by a whole of government approach. But this is important.

Deterrence happens because an aggressor perceives that the cost of further aggression is going to exceed the benefit of aggression. By putting a division’s worth of equipment and rotating an armored brigade there, it will be clear, we think, that cost of further aggression, especially into NATO allies like the Baltics or Poland, will come with a very high cost relative to the United States of America.

Senator Kaine: Thank you very much.

Thanks, Mr. Chair.

Senator Reed: On behalf of the chairman, Senator McCaskill please.

Senator McCaskill: Thank you.

Secretary Murphy, as you are aware, the Army has been investigating concerns regarding the Guard recruiting and assistance program for years. In 2012, a preliminary report of the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial
Management found that all expenditures made through the RAP program, a total of almost $400 million, violated ADA, the Anti-Deficiency Act. At the time, the Army anticipated that a final report on the matter would be released by October 2014.

In late December, trying to be patient, I penned a letter to your predecessor, Secretary McHugh, and asked for a status update on this report.

I need a date, Secretary Murphy. I cannot understand. There is no way this report is not finished. And I cannot understand what this stall is about. All it does is just incredibly irritate me that we are this non-responsive in how we fix problems if we are not willing to be forthcoming when we find problems, dealing with the way that our military has spent almost $400 million.

Mr. Murphy: Senator, I have been straight with you since the beginning that I will always be honest and straightforward with you. I will get you an answer within a week on where it is. I have been here for 12 weeks as Acting Secretary of the Army. I have said what is going with that, and it is said it is coming, it is coming. I will get you an exact date.

Senator McCaskill: I do not want you to camp out. But it is coming, it is coming. It has been since October of 2014 that it was supposed to be here. So I need that report
or I need a date when that report is going to be produced.

Mr. Murphy: And you will have that date within a week.

Senator McCaskill: Thank you.

Mr. Murphy: Just for the record, I have also taken responsibility on the enterprise marketing and that program. So mistakes like that will never happen again.

Senator McCaskill: Thank you.

Mr. Murphy: You are welcome.

Senator McCaskill: General Milley, I had the pleasure of a briefing from Colonel Eichoff, the Command for U.S. Air Defense in Europe, last week. And I believe she is the first woman to hold that position. And I was very impressed and proud and just wanted to convey that.

I was taken aback when she talked about some of the European Reassurance components that are in the budget, that they are all in OCO. You know, there are not very many members left here, but this is like one of these embarrassing things that we are doing. Is there any rational reason why our strength of equipment and troops in Europe would not belong in the regular budget of the military? Have we gone past the Rubicon? Is there now everything we can stick in OCO, we stick in OCO because of the unwillingness of Congress to step up to its responsibility as it relates to sequestration?

General Milley: Senator, I will not comment. I do not
even know the techniques of whether it is right or wrong or indifferent. What I care about as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as the Chief of Staff of the United States Army and provide best military advice is to deter Russia from further aggression. Where that money comes from, whether it is OCO or base budget, is frankly somewhat less concerning to me.

What is important to me is that we get a division’s worth of equipment and other capabilities over there to help Colonel Eichoff, General Breedlove, General Hodges, to deter aggression from Russia.

Senator McCaskill: You and I could not agree more on that. And I think most Members of Congress would agree on that. I just think this artifice we are using, this ruse that we are performing on the American public that somehow if we put it in OCO, it does not count as us spending money is damaging long term for the military. We ought to step up. You all step up to our responsibility every day. We ought to step up to our responsibility and fund our military in a way that is forthright, transparent. That sends an important message to the world. Us playing this game that pretending that because it is in this fund, we do not have to pay for it is I think beneath the honor and respect that we should show the military. And I just wanted to get that on the record.
General Milley: I would second your motion, Senator.

Senator McCaskill: First, I want to thank both of you before I ask this question about your trips to Fort Leonard Wood. I know, General Milley, you went, and I know, Secretary Murphy, you were just recently there. I am sorry I could not be there at the same time. I do not need to convince either of you of the importance of that institution as it relates to the generating force, say nothing of the other capabilities, engineering capabilities and military police capabilities and the other joint operations that are so important at Fort Leonard Wood.

But I know as we try to get women into our military in all roles, women in the generating force are very important because they are in fact very visible to women that might be considering a career in the armed services.

And so I wanted to ask is there any plan in place to get the proper leadership at these training facilities as it relates to gender as we try to encourage more women to say please take me, I am willing to give my life for my country?

General Milley: Yes. We try to encourage that throughout the force. As you know, we have got -- the infantry and armor have been recently opened up. So one principle of that program that we are going to implement, one of the first principles is to put leaders, female infantry leaders in those units first.
So not specific to Leonard Wood, but we are going to
graduate now coming up in the May-June time frame from both
West Point and ROTC -- I think it is 44 women have
volunteered to be infantry lieutenants. And if they meet
all the appropriate standards, then they will go through the
various infantry schools, BOLIC, the basic officer
leadership course, at Fort Benning. Then they will graduate
in the fall. Then they will do their follow-on training
that is normal for infantry such as Ranger school. And if
they continue to meet all those standards, then they will be
assigned to infantry units sometime about this time next
year. January, February, March, April time frame, you will
start seeing infantry female, infantry in armor, officers,
noncommissioned officers and junior soldiers in those combat
units.

So the idea of starting with leaders is a fundamental
first principle, and there is no doubt in my mind that we
want to take advantage of 50 percent of the world’s
population or the American population and maximize their
talent to increase our readiness.

Senator McCaskill: Thank you so much. Thank you both
for your service and the hard work you are doing. Very
appreciated.

Mr. Murphy: Senator, can I just mention real quick?
When I was at the Sapper school graduation, we had three
females of the 33 that graduated. Secondly, Army Lieutenant
Colonel Lynn Ray, first battalion commander, combat engineer
commander. So that is — again, as the Chief mentioned, we
have instructed and initiated a leaders first program at
these units where you have two women per company at the
leadership level before we send the lower ranks.

Senator McCaskill: And you all know how tough Sapper
is, and the fact that we have been putting women through
Sapper for a number of years — we can learn a lot about how
to prepare women for some of the toughest jobs in the
military by what they have done with Sapper. So thank you
for that, Secretary Murphy.

Senator Reed: On behalf of the chairman, let me
recognize Senator Gillibrand.

Senator Gillibrand: Thank you.

I am going to continue with the line of questioning of
Senator McCaskill.

Before he retired, then-SOUTHCOM Commander General John
Kelly raised concerns that lowering standards was the only
way to ensure that women became infantry SEALs and Rangers
in real numbers. That position has been vehemently
contested by you and your fellow service chiefs, as well as
the Commander of SOCOM until recently General Votel. Yet,
General Kelly’s comments represent prevalent views in combat
units.
Do you plan to allow the lowering of standards and how do you both plan to deal with these views from the leadership in junior personnel levels?

General Milley: Absolutely not. Standards are standards. And those standards are developed through years upon years of blood-soaked lessons learned from combat. They are neither male nor female. They are combat standards, and they are related to combat. And if you meet the standard for combat, then you pass go, collect $200, and move on your way. If you do not, then you do something else in life. So those standards are inviolable. They are based on combat, and we would place unit discipline, cohesion, and ultimately effectiveness at risk if we compromise those standards. We must guard against that. All of us, Members of Congress, members of the executive branch, members of the uniformed military, et cetera must guard against the lowering of standards.

General Kelly and General Votel, their comments exactly right in the sense of raising the flag, a warning flag, that this initiative in the infantry and armored and special forces has the potential to lower standards. And the rest of us must be the guardians of those standards. We must not allow the lowering of standards. Those are related to combat. If we do that, we are actually putting at risk the unit and the women that would go into those services and
potentially putting at risk the lives of their teammates as well. So standards are inviolable. They must not and will not be lowered.

Senator Gillibrand: And so how do you deal with the views of personnel that you are lowering standards, that the mission of all these women -- clearly you have lowered standards? How do you reinforce that these women are properly trained, are ready and have met everything and will do a great job?

General Milley: I think there are a couple of things. One is, first, do not lower the standard and then ensure that you educate people that they understand the standards have never been lowered. You know, Ranger school. I have heard a lot of comments about Ranger school, you know, the three women, one of whom was a mother of two, that graduated Ranger school. The standards were lowered. I said really. I said why do you not rock up and start walking 12 miles with 35 pounds on your back? Why do you not climb the hills of Dahlonega? Why do you not run the swamps of Florida?

Those standards have not changed. Those swamps have not changed. Those hills have not changed. 12 miles is still 12 miles. It is still a 5-mile and 40-minute run. Those standards have not been changed. And they met those standards.

So part of it is education and leadership, making sure
that we have everyone understand the standards. But the key
principle of do not lower those standards, that is
inviolable. We cannot allow that.

Mr. Murphy: Senator, I would just agree that it is a
leadership for our Army, that we could not be more clear
that we -- first of all, women do not want those standards
to be lowered. When they went to Ranger school, they were
not asking for it to be lowered. They know they could meet
the standard. They met the standard, and that is why they
are Rangers. So we are a standards-based Army. We could
not be more clear from the top, and it is emanating
throughout the force.

Senator Gillibrand: But I just hope you have their
back when they do pass through these requirements because if
they are getting feedback that they are still not good
enough, that is problematic, especially since you did not
lower the standards. Right?

General Milley: I have huge confidence, male or
female, if they meet the standard, they will be mutually
respected by their fellow peers and soldiers. I have no
doubt in my mind.

Senator Gillibrand: I do have a doubt in mind that
they will not be respected. So what I am asking you to do
is to be vigilant that these women who do pass and do meet
the standards are then respected for meeting the standards
because you did not lower the standards. And I just cannot
tolerate this notion that after these women have been
through hell and proven their mettle, that they are still
discharged when given their mission.

    General Milley: There will not be.

    Senator Gillibrand: Okay.

    General Milley: If they meet the standard, they will
not be discounted.

    Senator Gillibrand: Good luck. I give you many
blessings on that.

I would like to shift to cyber. Last year, the Army
National Guard announced the establishment of 10 cyber
protection teams, including one in New York and New Jersey
National Guards. This was a huge step forward for our
national security, and these teams, each located
deliberately within nine of the country’s 10 FEMA regions,
can serve both Federal and State purposes, including
bolstering civilian authorities in case of domestic response
to cyber attack. New York has already experienced the
hacking of a small dam, and we are constantly alerted to the
threats of cyber attacks to America’s financial hub.

    And yet, absolutely no funding in the Army’s fiscal
year 2017 budget request was set aside for these new units,
and months after the announcement, we are still left
wondering how they will be supported. I am concerned these
teams have not been given a mission by the Army. Unlike the Air Guard CPTs, they are not designated to the cyber mission forces. The Army has not funded them, and it is not clear when they might get trained.

General Milley, since becoming Chief of the Army, you have made it a priority to talk about one Army and to look for ways to take advantage of the benefits of the different components. How do you envision we can we use the National Guard CPTs to address cyber threats, and do you know why there is no money allocated for these CPTs in the budget? And can you tell us when we might expect to see Army Guard’s cyber protection teams fully operational?

General Milley: There are 41, I think it is -- 21 and 10 -- for the regular Army, split up with offensive and defensive capabilities, and then there are 10 in the Guard, as you noted, and I think there are 10 or 11 in the United States Army Reserve.

They are coming online at various paces. By 2018, all of these teams across the total Army should be trained. I will not say it is super-long, but there is a process that we have to go through of vetting or identifying and selecting and vetting because of the higher-order skills involved in cyber war. So that goes up front to recruit them and then organize and train and equip these teams.

So I will go back and double check, but I think by 2018
all of these teams are online and at least have initial
operating capability. I will get you a better answer with a
definitive date, if you do not mind, but I think it is 2018.

[The information follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]
Senator Gillibrand: Thank you both for your service.

Chairman McCain: I am afraid that General Sullivan has another question.

Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just a few to follow up.

Very quickly on lowering the standards, General, just to be clear, that is a joint responsibility. Right?

Senator Gillibrand’s questions are about the military leadership, but you also do not want Congress to mandate lower standards. Correct?

General Milley: I do not want anybody to lower standards, regardless of where they are.

Senator Sullivan: You know, General, you have been very focused on this issue of the tooth-to-tail ratio in the Army. This committee has been looking at that. I know you have been looking at that. Are we there yet? Are we at a satisfactory point in terms of what you believe is the proper balance between combat forces and tail forces? And whose responsibility is that? Is that something that you can work out through your authorities as the Chief, or is that something you need additional support from the Congress on? Because I think it is a critical issue, and I commend you for focusing on it so much.

General Milley: Senator, you are always looking at tooth-to-tail to make sure you got the right balance in the
force structure, et cetera.

I think we have some room to improve particularly in headquarters. I think our headquarters -- they played a very important function, and today is different than it was, say, 50 or 60 years ago, advances in technology and information, et cetera, et cetera. But my own observation is I think our headquarters remain still a little bit bigger than what needs to be for combat.

For example, if you were to deploy a brigade or a division, say, the on-the-ground footprint of that headquarters is very large. In today’s environment and in tomorrow’s environment, increasingly in tomorrow’s environment, if you have a large footprint, you are emanating a variety of electronic signals from radios and all these computers and everything else that we have. Given the electronic warfare capabilities, the acquisition and the capabilities of some of our adversaries -- Russia, for example -- we have seen in the Ukraine they can acquire the electronic signal very quickly. They will fly unmanned aerial vehicles over there, acquire the target, and they will amass artillery on you. So you will be dead.

So what do we have to do? We need to pare down our headquarters -- this is just one example -- to very small, nimble, mobile capabilities that can, in fact, survive what we think is the lethal environment that we would see in the
future. That could mean increases in reach-back, for example, where much of your headquarters footprint and the processing of intelligence information, the processing of friendly unit situations is done at home station at a garrison or at a base here in the United States. Given today’s technologies and the electronic pipes that are out there today, we can push a lot of that information forward rather than put an 800- or 1,000-man headquarters on some tactical battlefield in the future with nothing but a big target.

So we are taking a hard look at that. There is definitely some streamlining that needs to be done to reduce the tooth-to-tail because in my professional opinion, especially in the potential future contingencies we are looking at, large tails are going to result in significant amounts of casualties and potentially battlefield losses or loss of a battle, a campaign, or even a war.

Senator Sullivan: Well, I think you have the support of this committee on your focus on that, and please let us know if there is statutory authority that you need additionally to what was in the NDAA last year that the chairman led on the issue of headquarters.

Let me ask one final question. You know, there is a lot of discussion on the end strength. You know, when the Chairman and Secretary Carter were testifying, and in your
testimony there is this focus on the conventional
challenges, Russia, North Korea, Iran, China, ISIS, other
terrorist groups. I think there is this notion -- and I
would like you to talk about it a little bit -- that a lot
of what we can defend ourselves with, because there are
certainly capable forces, is our special forces. They get a
lot of press. They do a lot. They are all over the world.
They are incredibly capable.

But I think it is also very important to recognize that
on certain of these threats, in fact, almost all the ones
that are listed right here, it is the conventional forces
that are what we need the most.

Can you talk a little bit about the difference in their
capabilities and how important it is to have airborne
brigade combat teams that can drop out of the sky 5,000
soldiers, in addition to the special forces? Because I
think sometimes there is so much focus on the SF forces,
that we lose the focus on how important our conventional
forces are.

General Milley: Senator, I think there are several
myths of war, so to speak, that are prevalent in various
communities. One of those key myths I think is that you can
win wars from afar, from standoff distances, et cetera.
Another key myth is that special forces can do it all. As a
proud member of special forces, special forces cannot do it
It depends on what you are trying to do. If you are involved in a war, if you are using the language of war and you are defining yourself as at war, then you need to apply all of the synergistic effects of the entire joint force in time and space to impose your political will. That is a lot more than special forces. That is everything from all the domains of space, cyber, naval, air, marines, special operations forces, and conventional ground forces, all of that converging in time and space to rip the shreds out of an enemy if you are at war.

You can do lots of other things. You may not define yourself at war, but you just want to impose cost or you want to attrit or you want to deter or you want to punish. Those things can be done in a variety of ways. You can do that from just standoff weapon systems or perhaps just special forces.

But the idea that special forces can do it all is not true, and the professionals in special forces will be the first to tell you.

One of the fundamental roles of conventional ground forces, whether Army or Marine, is to seize and control territory and deny that same territory to enemy forces. Special forces does not seize and control territory. They never were designed to do that. But if you want to impose
your will on an enemy, that is one of the key tasks that is
likely going to have to get done if you define yourself in a
state of war.

So thanks for the question, but it is a myth out there.
It is very prevalent. Special forces has huge talents, love
it to death, and they can do a lot of things. But winning
wars in and of themselves, not capable.

Senator Sullivan: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: Some of us think that that myth has
been adopted into a Pentagon strategy to defeat ISIS.

General, we will be doing more on this tooth-to-tail
issue because it is not only the size of the staffs and
bureaucracies but in many cases, it is absolute duplication
of effort. Different branches of the Defense Department
have staffs that are all doing the same thing, and that is
one of the aspects of reform that we will be acting on in
this year’s NDAA.

Secretary Murphy, to each member of the committee, if
you would send a letter describing what actions are being
taken on this whole issue of mental health, suicide, I would
appreciate it. Obviously, from what you have heard today,
there is significant interest in the issue, as there is
amongst the American people. We have to work on this
suicide rate not only of active duty personnel, but we also
know that 8,000 veterans a year are committing suicide as well. And that has to be one of our highest priorities. So we thank you for your very forthright testimony. I think this has been a very beneficial hearing, and I thank you.

Senator Reed?

Senator Reed: I just second those comments, Mr. Chairman, and thank the witnesses for their service and their testimony. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman McCain: And you are still too young, Mr. Murphy.

[Laughter.]

The Chairman: The committee stands adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 11:56 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]