

STATEMENT OF SECRETARY OF DEFENSE ROBERT M. GATES
SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE - DEFENSE
JUNE 15, 2011

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee.

I appreciate the opportunity to discuss the President's budget request for Fiscal Year 2012 – my last budget testimony before this, or any other, congressional committee.

The budget request for the Department of Defense being presented today includes a base budget request of \$553 billion and an Overseas Contingency Operations request for \$117.8 billion. These budget decisions took place in the context of a nearly two year effort by this Department to reduce overhead, cull troubled and excess programs, and rein in personnel and contractor costs – all for the purpose of preserving the fighting strength of America's military at a time of fiscal stress for our country. The goal was not only to generate savings that could be applied to new capabilities and programs, but for our defense institutions to become more agile and effective organizations as a result.

In all, these budget requests, if enacted by the Congress, will:

- Continue our efforts to reform the way the department does business;
- Fund modernization programs needed to prepare for future conflicts;
- Reaffirm and strengthen the nation's commitment to care for the all-volunteer force; and
- Ensure that our troops and commanders on the front lines have the resources and support they need to accomplish their mission.

Reform – Efficiencies

The FY 12 budget decisions took place in the context of a nearly two year effort by the Department of Defense to reform the way the Pentagon does business – to change how and what we buy, to replace a culture of endless money with one of savings and restraint. To not only make every defense dollar count, but also become a more agile and effective organization in the process. This process culminated in my announcement in January that summarized the impact of these reforms on the FY 12 budget.

The military services conducted a thorough scrub of their bureaucratic structures, business practices, modernization programs, civilian and military personnel levels, and associated overhead costs. They identified potential savings that totaled approximately \$100 billion over five years. More than \$70 billion is being reinvested in high priority needs and capabilities, while about \$28 billion is going to higher than expected operating costs – “must pay” bills that would otherwise be paid from investment accounts.

We then looked at reducing costs and deriving savings across the department as a whole – with special attention to the substantial headquarters and support bureaucracies outside the four military services – savings that added up to \$78 billion over five years.

\$10 billion of that total came from restructuring the Joint Strike Fighter program and reducing Army and Marine Corps end strength starting in FY 2015.

The rest of the DoD-wide savings came primarily from shedding excess overhead, improving business practices, and reducing personnel costs. Key examples include:

- \$13 billion from holding the civilian workforce at FY 10 levels for three years, with limited exceptions such as growth in the acquisition workforce;
- \$12 billion through the government-wide freeze on civilian salaries;
- \$8 billion by reforming military health programs to maintain high quality care while slowing cost growth;
- \$11 billion from re-setting missions, priorities, functions for the defense agencies and the Office of the Secretary of Defense.
- \$6 billion by reducing staff augmentation and service support contracts by 10 percent annually for three years;
- \$2.3 billion by disestablishing Joint Forces Command and the Business Transformation Agency;
- \$1 billion by eliminating unnecessary studies and internal reports;
- \$4 billion in changed economic assumptions, such as a lower than expected inflation rate;
- \$100 million by reducing more than 100 flag officer and about 200 civilian senior executive positions; and
- \$11 billion in a variety of smaller initiatives across the department.

To better track how and where taxpayer dollars are spent, the department is also reforming its financial management systems and practices – with the goal of having auditable financial statements by the congressionally mandated date of 2017. We are pursuing a streamlined approach that focuses first on the information we most use to manage the department.

Choices Ahead

I believe there are more savings possible by culling more overhead and better accounting for, and thus better managing, the funds and people we have. But one thing is quite clear. These efficiencies efforts will not come close to meeting the budget targets laid out by the president, much less other, higher targets being bandied about.

Nonetheless, meeting this savings target will require real cuts – given the escalating costs of so many parts of the defense budget – and, as a result, real choices. That is why I launched a comprehensive review last month to ensure that future spending decisions are focused on priorities, strategy and risks, and are not simply a math and accounting exercise. In the end, this process must be about identifying options for the President and the Congress, to ensure that the nation consciously acknowledges and accepts additional risk in exchange for reduced investment in its military.

As we embark on this debate about the future size and composition of the American military, it would be well to remember that we still live in a very dangerous and often unstable world. Our military must remain strong and agile enough to face a diverse range of threats – from non-state actors attempting to acquire and use weapons of mass destruction and sophisticated missiles, to the more traditional threats of other states both building up their conventional forces and developing new capabilities that target our traditional strengths.

FY 2012 Base Budget Request

The President's request for the base defense budget is for \$553 billion, which represents about 3.5 percent real growth over the FY 2011 defense bill enacted by Congress this year. The four major components are:

- \$207.1 billion for operations, maintenance, logistics and training;
- \$142.8 billion for military pay and benefits;
- \$188.3 billion for modernization; and
- \$14.8 billion for military construction and family housing.

Modernization

In all, the FY 12 budget request includes \$188.3 billion for modernization in the form of Procurement, Research, Development, Testing and Evaluation. Key modernization initiatives include:

- \$4.8 billion to enhance ISR capabilities and buy more high demand assets, including the MC-12 surveillance aircraft, Predator, Reaper and Global Hawk UAVs – with the aim of achieving 65 Predator-class Combat Air Patrols by the end of FY 2013;
- More than \$10 billion to modernize our heavily used rotary wing fleet;
- \$3.9 billion to upgrade the Army's combat vehicles and communications systems;
- \$4.8 billion to buy new equipment for the reserves;
- \$14.9 billion to buy new fighters and ground attack aircraft;
- \$24.6 billion to support a realistic, executable shipbuilding and investment portfolio that buys 11 ships in FY 12 and modernizes existing fleet assets;
- \$10.5 billion to advance the modernization portion of the Administration's approach to ballistic missile defense – including \$8.4 billion for the Missile Defense Agency; and
- \$2.3 billion to improve the military's cyber capabilities.

Questions have been raised about whether we are too focused on current conflicts and are devoting too few resources to future possible high-end conflicts. This budget should put those questions to rest. The FY 2012 base request provides for significant investments at the high end of the conflict spectrum, including:

- \$1 billion (\$4.5 billion over the Future Years Defense Program) for a tactical air modernization program that would ensure that the F-22 will continue to be the world's preeminent air-to-air fighter. This effort will leverage radar and electronic protection technologies from the JSF program;
- \$204 million (\$1.6 billion over the FYDP) to modernize the radars of F-15s to keep this key fighter viable well into the future;
- \$30 million (\$491 million over the FYDP) for a follow-on to the AMRAAM, the medium range air-to-air weapon, that would provide greater range, lethality and protection against electronic jamming;
- \$200 million (\$800 million over the FYDP) to invest in technologies to disrupt an opponent's ability to attack our surface ships;
- \$1.1 billion (\$2.2 billion over the FYDP) to buy more EA-18 Growlers than originally planned, plus \$1.6 billion over the FYDP to develop a new jamming system, expanding our electronic warfare capabilities;

- \$2.1 billion (\$14 billion over the FYDP) to fund Aegis-equipped ships to further defend the fleet from aircraft and missile attack and provide theater-wide tactical ballistic missile defense; and
- To improve anti-submarine capabilities, \$2.4 billion for P-8 Poseidon aircraft (\$19.6 billion over the FYDP) and \$4.8 billion for procurement of Virginia-class attack submarines (\$27.6 billion over the FYDP).

The FY 2012 budget also supports a long-range strike family of systems, which must be a high priority for future defense investment given the anti-access challenges our military faces. A key component of this joint portfolio will be a new long-range, nuclear-capable, penetrating Air Force bomber, designed and developed using proven technologies and with an option for remote piloting. It is important that we begin this project now to ensure that a new bomber can be ready before the current aging fleet goes out of service.

The budget request includes \$10.6 billion to maintain U.S. supremacy in space, in keeping with the recently released National Security Space Strategy. This new strategy will help bring order to the congested space domain, strengthen international partnerships, increase resiliency so our troops can fight in a degraded space environment, and improve our acquisition processes and reform export controls to energize the space industrial base.

As the military services were digging deep for excess overhead, they were also taking a hard look at their modernization portfolio for weapons that were having major development problems, unsustainable cost growth, or had grown less relevant to real world needs.

The Joint Strike Fighter program received special scrutiny given its substantial cost and its central place in ensuring that we have a large inventory of the most advanced fifth generation stealth fighters to sustain U.S. air superiority well into the future. The FY 12 budget reflects the proposed restructuring of the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter program to stabilize its schedule and cost. The department has adjusted F-35 procurement quantities based on new data on costs, on likely orders from our foreign nation partners, and on realigned development and test schedules.

The proposed restructuring adds over \$4 billion for additional testing through 2016. It holds F-35 procurement in FY 12 at 32 aircraft and reduces buys by 124 aircraft compared with last year's plans. Even after these changes, procurement ramps up sharply to 108 aircraft by FY 2016. This is the fastest that future procurement can prudently be increased.

The F-35 restructuring places the Marine's STOVL variant on the equivalent of a two year probation. If we cannot fix this variant during this time frame and get it back on track in terms of performance, cost and schedule, then I believe it should be canceled. To compensate for any delays in F-35 deliveries, we propose buying 41 more F/A-18s between FY 2012 to 2014.

I also want to reiterate the President's and my firm opposition to buying an extra engine for the F-35 – a position echoed by the Air Force, Navy and Marine Corps leadership. We consider it an unnecessary and extravagant expense, particularly during this period of fiscal contraction.

This budget proposes cancelling the Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle and reallocating funds to existing Marine ground combat requirements, a decision based on the recommendation of the Secretary of the Navy and the Commandant of the Marine Corps.

Ultimately, the Navy and Marine Corps leadership based their recommendations on two main principles: affordability and balance. The EFV, a program originally conceived in the 1980s, has already consumed more than \$3 billion to develop and will cost another \$12 billion to build. The EFV as designed would have cost many times more than the system it would replace,

with much higher maintenance and service costs. If continued over the next two decades, the EFV program would consume fully half of all Marine Corps procurement dollars while swallowing virtually the Corps' entire ground vehicle budget – procurement, operations, and maintenance – with all the risk to readiness that entails.

To be sure, the EFV would, if pursued to completion without regard to time or cost, be an enormously capable vehicle. But as with several other high end programs completed or cancelled in recent years – the F-22, the Army Future Combat Systems, or the Navy's DDG-1000 destroyer – the mounting cost of acquiring this specialized capability must be judged against other priorities and needs.

Let there be no doubt – we are committed to sustaining the Marine Corps amphibious mission. This FY 2012 request proposes that the \$2.8 billion previously budgeted to the EFV for the next five years instead be re-invested towards an integrated new vehicle program for the Marine Corps, including:

- New armor, weaponry and engines, plus a life-extension program for the existing amphibious assault vehicles;
- The development of a new, more affordable, sustainable and survivable amphibious vehicle;
- Accelerated procurement of new personnel carriers; and
- Enhancement of existing Marine vehicles such as the Abrams tank and Light Armored Vehicle.

Throughout this process, we will harness the lessons learned – in terms of engineering, design, and testing – from the development of the EFV.

Personnel

The FY 12 budget request includes \$142.8 billion for military pay and benefits and continues our strong support for troops and their families. This includes funding for wounded, ill and injured care, enhancing the military health care system and supporting military families under stress. Examples in this request include:

- \$2.3 billion to provide care for our Wounded Warriors and their families; and
- \$8.3 billion for supporting families, including child care and school programs.

While the department continues to insist on and pay for the highest quality health care, we are also mindful of sharply rising health costs – which have risen over the last decade from \$19 billion in 2001 to \$52.5 billion in this budget request. The department has taken a comprehensive look at all facets of the military health care model – emphasizing the need to balance the number one priority of continuing to provide the highest care and service, while ensuring fiscally responsible management.

One area we have identified are benefits provided to working-age retirees under the TRICARE program. Many of these beneficiaries are employed full time while receiving full pensions, often forgoing their employer's health plan to remain with TRICARE. This should come as no surprise, given that the current TRICARE enrollment fee was set in 1995 at \$460 a year for the basic family plan and has not been raised since. By comparison, the fees for a comparable health insurance program for federal workers total roughly \$5,000 per year.

Accordingly, we propose a modest increase to TRICARE Prime enrollment fees for working age retirees: \$2.50 per month for individuals and \$5.00 per month for families in FY 2012, and then indexed to increases in national health expenditures in future years.

We are proposing other health care initiatives such as efficiencies in pharmacy co-pays designed to provide incentives to make greater use of generic prescriptions and those ordered by mail. We also seek to phase out, over several years, special subsidies offered to a small group of hospitals that treat military families and retirees. Additionally, we are proposing providing TRICARE-for-Life to all Medicare-eligible retirees aged 65 and over, including future enrollees in the Uniformed Services Family Health Plan. It is important to note that none of these changes would affect health care benefits for active-duty personnel.

Security Assistance Reform

The FY 12 request includes funding and authorization for a key step forward in a critical policy area: helping other countries to protect and defend themselves. The Pentagon and the State Department have agreed to a three-year pilot pooled fund - called the Global Security Contingency Fund - that will be used to build partner capacity, prevent conflicts, and prepare for emerging threats. The proposed fund would incentivize interagency collaboration through a new business model. It would provide a more agile and cost effective way to reduce the risk of future conflicts by allowing our government to respond to unforeseen needs and take advantage of emerging opportunities to help partners secure their own territories and regions.

The request is modest, an initial \$50 million State Department appropriation, along with a request for authority to transfer an additional \$450 million into the fund from either department if needed. The Department of Defense intends to make significant contributions from its own resources into this pooled fund. We will be requesting in parallel an authorization for this initiative in the FY 12 NDAA.

Overseas Contingency Operations

Finally, this budget request includes \$117.8 billion in FY 2012 to support Overseas Contingency Operations, primarily in Afghanistan, and to wind down our operations in Iraq – this is a significant reduction from the \$159 billion enacted for OCO in FY 2011. The request, which fully funds our wartime requirements, includes:

- \$86.4 billion for wartime operations and related costs;
- \$425 million for the Commander's Emergency Response Fund;
- \$475 million for the Afghan Infrastructure Fund;
- \$2.6 billion to support counter-IED efforts;
- \$3.2 billion for MRAP vehicles, including the MRAP All Terrain Vehicles developed for Afghanistan; and
- \$11.9 billion to replace and restore worn, damaged or destroyed equipment.
- \$12.8 billion for training and equipping of the Afghan security forces.

Office of Security Cooperation – Iraq

I also want to mention a request in FY 2012 for \$524 million for the Office of Security Cooperation – Iraq (OSC-I). The OSC-I, which will be jointly funded with the State Department, will execute our Foreign Military Sales program in Iraq. OSC-I will help ensure the continuation of military-to-military relationships that advise, train, and assist Iraq's security forces.

Conclusion

In conclusion, I want to thank this committee for all you have done to support our troops as well as their families. From my earliest days as Secretary of Defense, I have made a point of reminding officers – from cadets to admirals and generals – that Congress is a co-equal branch of government that under the Constitution raises armies and provides for navies and air forces. Members of both parties serving in Congress have long been strong supporters of our military and are owed honesty and candor from the military and from the Department.

It has been the greatest privilege of my life to lead this great military for the past four-and-a-half years. Every day, I've considered it my responsibility to get our troops everything they need to be successful in their mission and to come home safely. In my visits to the combat theaters, in military hospitals, and in bases and posts at home and around the world, I continue to be amazed by their decency, resilience, and courage.

Finally, I want to thank this committee once again for all you have done to support our troops as well as their families. In visits to the combat theaters, in military hospitals, and in bases and posts at home and around the world, I continue to be amazed by their decency, resilience, and courage. Through the support of the Congress and our nation, these young men and women will prevail in the current conflicts and be prepared to confront the threats that they, their children, and our nation may face in the future.

Thank you Mr. Chairman.

#