

Stenographic Transcript
Before the
Subcommittee on Strategic Forces

COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON AIR FORCE AND
NAVY NUCLEAR PROGRAMS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF
NUCLEAR ENTERPRISE REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS IN
REVIEW OF THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION REQUEST FOR
FISCAL YEAR 2016 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE
PROGRAM

Wednesday, April 22, 2015

Washington, D.C.

ALDERSON REPORTING COMPANY
1155 CONNECTICUT AVE, N.W.
SUITE 200
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036
(202) 289-2260

1 HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON AIR FORCE AND NAVY NUCLEAR
2 PROGRAMS AND THE IMPLEMENTATION OF NUCLEAR ENTERPRISE REVIEW
3 RECOMMENDATIONS IN REVIEW OF THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
4 REQUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2016 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE
5 PROGRAM

6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

Wednesday, April 22, 2015

U.S. Senate
Subcommittee on Strategic
Forces
Committee on Armed Services
Washington, D.C.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 3:00 p.m.
in Room SR-222, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Jeff
Sessions, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

Committee Members Present: Senators Inhofe
[presiding], Sessions, Donnelly, King, and Heinrich.

1 OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOE DONNELLY, U.S. SENATOR
2 FROM INDIANA

3 Senator Donnelly [presiding]: I would like to thank
4 all the witnesses for being here, and you can take a seat.

5 Senator Sessions will be here in just a moment. He is
6 on his way over.

7 I will read my opening statement, and we will keep
8 rolling along until Senator Sessions gets here. Thank you
9 all very much.

10 I want to thank Senator Sessions for holding this
11 important hearing. Over a year ago, we had a failure in
12 ethics for both the Air Force and Navy nuclear missions.
13 For the Air Force, this involved cheating on ICBM
14 proficiency exams. For the Navy, it involved cheating on
15 naval reactors proficiency exams. While integrity of the
16 Air Force nuclear weapons was never compromised, it pointed
17 to a readiness and morale problem associated with the
18 demanding mission that Strategic Command requires and how
19 the DOD has paid a lesser amount of attention to its nuclear
20 mission.

21 One may have varying opinions of nuclear weapons, but
22 as long as they exist and other nations have them, it will
23 remain, as Secretary Carter termed, as the bedrock of our
24 defense posture. We cannot let this mission lapse.

25 I am gratified the Department has taken a head-on

1 approach to correcting these issues with the nuclear
2 mission, and we are anxious to help support the readiness of
3 our deterrence posture now and in the future.

4 Again, let me thank everyone for their attendance
5 today. I look forward to your testimony, and Senator
6 Sessions should be here with us in just a few minutes. And
7 we will go left to right. Ms. Creedon, thank you.

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF MADELYN CREEDON, DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR,
2 NATIONAL NUCLEAR SECURITY ADMINISTRATION

3 Ms. Creedon: Thank you, Senator.

4 I would also like to thank Chairman Sessions, obviously
5 when he gets here --

6 Senator Donnelly: He gets thanked more while he is not
7 here than when he is here.

8 [Laughter.]

9 Ms. Creedon: -- as well as the other members of the
10 subcommittee.

11 Thank you very much for the opportunity to discuss with
12 you today the report of the Department of Defense internal
13 nuclear enterprise review team. My co-chairs on the review
14 were Rear Admiral Peter Fanta, former Deputy for Resources
15 and Acquisition, Joint Chiefs of Staff; and Sergeant Major
16 Patrick Alston, the command's senior enlisted leader of the
17 U.S. Strategic Command.

18 Our internal review of the Department of Defense
19 nuclear enterprise started in February 2014 at the direction
20 of former Secretary of Defense Chuck Hagel. He started this
21 after a series of troubling events involving the Nation's
22 deterrent forces and their senior leadership when he
23 directed both an internal and an external review of the
24 health of the nuclear enterprise.

25 The external review was conducted by former Air Force

1 Chief of Staff and Commander of the Strategic Air Command,
2 General Larry Welch, and former Commander of Fleet Forces
3 Command, Admiral John Harvey. Their report, the Independent
4 Review of the Department of Defense Nuclear Enterprise, as
5 well as the report of the internal review team, were
6 provided to Congress this past November.

7 For the most part, the findings of both the internal
8 and the external reviews were very much in line. There
9 were, however, some differences in the recommendations. Our
10 internal team's report is a classified report. As such, I
11 have attached to my written statement an unclassified
12 summary describing the findings and the recommendations of
13 the internal review team's report. The fact sheet was also
14 provided to Congress in November, along with our report.

15 One of the key findings of our internal review team was
16 that in spite of the shortcomings in the enterprise -- and
17 there were many -- the men and women of the nuclear
18 enterprise are dedicated and committed to the mission and
19 the work. And they work exceedingly hard to ensure the
20 safety and the security of the U.S. deterrence forces. On
21 balance, the forces, including the civilians, were
22 understaffed, under-supported, under-appreciated, and in
23 many instances were working with out-of-date equipment, a
24 shortage of parts, and inadequate facilities.

25 We also found that some of the fixes of the past had

1 actually made things worse. As a result, we stressed in our
2 report that an approach that simply checks the box and moves
3 on is not the correct approach. This sort of approach will
4 fail to recognize the interconnected nature of many of the
5 problems and that many of the solutions are often long-term,
6 organizational, and cultural.

7 We had a fairly long list of key findings in our
8 report, which are summarized, as I mentioned, in my written
9 statement. But I wanted to take the opportunity to
10 highlight that the most important of our recommendations are
11 those that will help the people who work in the nuclear
12 enterprise every day get their job done. These men and
13 women are our most important asset in the nuclear
14 enterprise.

15 I want to close now by not only thanking the entire
16 internal review team for their work, but also former
17 Secretary Hagel for caring enough about the enterprise to
18 bring his personal attention and credibility to its
19 problems. He got the attention of the senior leaders in the
20 DOD and the services. Already, there are some good results
21 and some good efforts, and you will hear more about these
22 from my colleagues on the panel here today. The real
23 challenge, however, is to maintain that focus, energy, and
24 attention for the long term.

25 Thank you very much, and I look forward to your

1 questions.

2 [The prepared statement of Ms. Creedon follows:]

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Sessions [presiding]: Dr. Brumer?
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATEMENT OF DR. YISROEL E. BRUMER, DIRECTOR,
2 STRATEGIC, DEFENSIVE AND SPACE PROGRAMS, OFFICE OF THE
3 SECRETARY OF DEFENSE, COST ASSESSMENT AND PROGRAM EVALUATION

4 Dr. Brumer: Chairman Sessions, Ranking Member
5 Donnelly, and distinguished members of the committee, I am
6 honored to be here today. I appreciate the opportunity to
7 testify about how my team is executing tasks resulting from
8 these recent internal and external nuclear enterprise
9 reviews.

10 These reviews concluded that without intervention,
11 issues related to resourcing, personnel, organization, and
12 culture put the nuclear enterprise on a path to more
13 frequent and greater problems than we have previously
14 witnessed.

15 Former Secretary Hagel directed the Department to place
16 a renewed emphasis on the nuclear force. He specifically
17 charged the Director of Cost Assessment and Program
18 Evaluation to track, monitor, and independently assess the
19 implementation of the reviews' recommendations with
20 particular focus on assessing the health of the nuclear
21 enterprise. He also tasked us to provide monthly updates to
22 the Deputy Secretary of Defense and regular updates to the
23 Secretary.

24 Our eight-member team includes active duty ICBM and
25 ballistic missile submarine military officers, as well as

1 scientists and data experts to support technical
2 assessments. This team has shown unwavering dedication to
3 improving the enterprise by delivering the most honest and
4 objective analysis of data on assessment as possible.
5 Senior leadership has been keenly interested in
6 comprehensive and sustainable solutions rather than short-
7 term efforts that merely check boxes without placing the
8 enterprise on a more solid footing.

9 This charge has proven to be both the most important
10 and the most difficult aspect of our task. It is easy to
11 verify that an instruction has been modified to relieve the
12 force of an unnecessary burden or that needed equipment and
13 gear has been delivered. It is much more difficult to
14 measure changes in culture or personal attitudes towards the
15 mission. We believe this kind of analysis is important to
16 facilitate real change while also remaining vigilant to
17 identify unintended second- and third-order effects.

18 Our team has made significant strides in a short time.
19 Since September, we have distilled every possible
20 recommendation from the reviews. We have held meetings with
21 all the stakeholders and formulated problem statements
22 identifying the root causes of each issue. We have worked
23 with each responsible organization to develop detailed
24 approaches and milestones. Finally, to go beyond box
25 checking, we developed metrics to determine whether we are

1 achieving the desired intent to improve the overall health
2 of the enterprise. Additionally, we are visiting key
3 locations to become more familiar with the unique mission
4 and quality-of-life challenges, as well as hold non-
5 attributional discussions to gather empirical data on
6 knowing what issues are most pressing.

7 Assessing the overall health will prove challenging,
8 and we do recognize it will take years of dedicated efforts
9 to restore the risk margin that has been lost. We intend to
10 provide leadership with our best analysis and advice to help
11 them guide these efforts to completion. Our team has
12 embraced this challenge, and we are proud to have been
13 entrusted with the role of ensuring issues are addressed to
14 provide the Nation with a safe, secure, and effective
15 strategic deterrent that is so critical to our national
16 security.

17 I will continue to report our progress to this
18 committee on a regular basis. You have my assurance that we
19 will remain vigilant and we will maintain our honesty and
20 integrity for as long as the Secretary of Defense and this
21 committee deem our services worthy and necessary.

22 I thank you for your time, and I do welcome your
23 questions.

24 [The prepared statement of Dr. Brumer follows:]

25

1 Senator Sessions: Admiral Benedict?
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATEMENT OF VICE ADMIRAL TERRY J. BENEDICT, USN,
2 DIRECTOR, STRATEGIC SYSTEMS PROGRAMS

3 Admiral Benedict: Yes, sir. Chairman Sessions,
4 Ranking Member Donnelly, distinguished members of the
5 committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify before
6 the Subcommittee on Strategic Forces.

7 I represent the men and women of the Navy's Strategic
8 Systems Programs, or SSP.

9 Your continued support of our deterrence mission is
10 appreciated, and I thank you for that.

11 My mission as the Director of Strategic Systems
12 Programs is to design, develop, produce, support, and ensure
13 the safety and security of our Navy's sea-based strategic
14 deterrent capability, the Trident III (D5) strategic weapon
15 system.

16 My written statement, which I respectfully request be
17 submitted for the record, addresses all of my top
18 priorities. Due to time constraints, I would like to
19 briefly address three: nuclear weapons safety and security,
20 the Trident II (D5) life extension efforts, and the solid
21 rocket motor industry.

22 First, my top priority is the safety and security of
23 our Navy's nuclear weapons. Custody and accountability of
24 the nuclear assets entrusted to the Navy are the cornerstone
25 of this program. Our approach to the nuclear weapons

1 mission is to maintain a culture of excellence and self-
2 assessment that produces the highest standards of
3 performance and integrity.

4 Second, the Navy is proactively taking steps to address
5 aging and technology obsolescence. SSP is life-extending
6 the Trident II (D5) SWS strategic weapon system to match the
7 Ohio class submarine service life and to serve as the
8 initial baseline mission payload for the Ohio replacement
9 submarine platform. This is being accomplished through a
10 life extension program for all of the Trident II (D5)
11 subsystems, to include launcher, navigation, fire control,
12 guidance, missile, and reentry.

13 Finally, I remain concerned with the decline in demand
14 for the solid rocket motor industry. While the Navy is
15 maintaining a continuous production of solid rocket motors,
16 the demand for both NASA and the Air Force has declined.
17 This has put the entire specialized industry at risk. While
18 the efforts of our industry partners and others have created
19 short-term relief, a long-term support of the solid rocket
20 motor industry remains a national problem.

21 Thank you for the opportunity to testify today, and I
22 am pleased to answer any of your questions, sir.

23 [The prepared statement of Admiral Benedict follows:]

24
25

1 Senator Sessions: Thank you.
2 General Wilson?
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATEMENT OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL STEPHEN W. WILSON,
2 USAF, COMMANDER, AIR FORCE GLOBAL STRIKE COMMAND

3 General Wilson: Chairman Sessions, Ranking Member
4 Donnelly, distinguished members of the committee, thank you
5 for allowing me to appear before you and represent the men
6 and women of Air Force Global Strike Command.

7 Let me first say that the airmen are doing an
8 outstanding job every single day, providing a safe, secure,
9 and effective nuclear force for our Nation while ensuring
10 our conventional mission continues to excel.

11 The last time I testified before the committee, we had
12 just experienced our unignorable moment when we discovered
13 cheating at Mahlstrom Air Force Base. We have instituted
14 major changes based on feedback from our airmen doing the
15 mission and are constantly assessing whether and where we
16 still need to improve.

17 One of the most important changes we have instituted is
18 empowering our people, not micro-managing them. Through
19 their innovation, hard work, and shared commitment, they are
20 able to truly create their own future and to write their own
21 story.

22 These changes we are undertaking are completely in line
23 with both the internal and external nuclear enterprise
24 reviews. With the support of the senior leadership, we have
25 restored the nuclear focus and are starting to fund

1 essential modernization efforts.

2 Funding for the long-range strike bomber is critical to
3 extending our dominance against next generation
4 capabilities. The long-range standoff missile will improve
5 our ability to strike heavily at defended targets. The
6 ground-based strategic deterrent will provide the responsive
7 capability and the strategic stability on which this Nation
8 has come to rely. We are also continuing our efforts to
9 upgrade the NC3 systems that underpin our nuclear deterrent
10 to ensure we receive presidential orders. We are working
11 with our Navy partners to find areas of intelligent
12 commonality where appropriate.

13 Mr. Chairman, I want to thank you for the opportunity
14 to appear before the committee, and I look forward to your
15 questions.

16 [The prepared statement of General Wilson follows:]

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Sessions: General Harencak?
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATEMENT OF MAJOR GENERAL GARRETT HARENCAK, USAF,
2 ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF, STRATEGIC DETERRENCE AND NUCLEAR
3 INTEGRATION

4 General Harencak: Chairman Sessions, Ranking Member
5 Donnelly, thank you for the opportunity to appear before the
6 subcommittee today to discuss Air Force nuclear policies and
7 programs. I respectfully request my written statement be
8 entered into the record and look forward to your questions.

9 [The prepared statement of General Harencak follows:]

10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

1 STATEMENT OF HON. JEFF SESSIONS, U.S. SENATOR FROM
2 ALABAMA

3 Senator Sessions: We are sorry to have this program
4 interrupted, but I think it is time for us to go ahead and
5 move forward, as Senator King and Donnelly reminded me.

6 So we got a lot going on, and I would just say in terms
7 of an opening statement, I do believe the Department of
8 Defense, Ms. Creedon, and others has responded to this
9 problem. I think Secretary Hagel deserves credit for
10 insisting that we make an honest and very serious review,
11 which you have done and I thank you for. Some of the
12 findings are extremely troubling I thought, some of which is
13 classified, but I believe that you folks are on that.

14 Secretary Hagel said that the reviews found evidence of
15 systemic problems that if not addressed could undermine the
16 safety, security, and effectiveness of the elements of the
17 force in the future. Close quote. I think that is a
18 serious comment, and we need to address it.

19 Admiral Benedict, I know your naval submarine crews and
20 others are on constant stress and alert and acting. Ships
21 are moving things. Plans are being executed. It perhaps is
22 more difficult, I think, for the Air Force where you are at
23 bases and missiles are in silos and not as much is
24 happening. So I can understand the difficulties that we
25 might have in maintaining the kind of alertness and morale

1 that you need to have.

2 Previous briefings I have had so far on this subject
3 indicate that the Air Force is taking aggressive action to
4 create the kind of morale and attention and evaluation that
5 is necessary. But we will have, I am sure, other questions
6 that would be asked.

7 Also, from what I can see from Secretary Hagel's
8 announcement, we may be talking about a 10 percent increase.
9 That could be as much as \$8 billion, and you can buy a lot
10 with \$8 billion. So I think we need to ask the question can
11 we achieve the kind of improvements we need with less cost
12 than that.

13 On this vote, Senator King, you have not voted. Is
14 that right? Did it just get called?

15 Senator King: This is the next one.

16 Senator Sessions: Well, there should not be much time
17 left, is that not right, for us to vote? 5 minutes, okay.
18 We are in better shape than I thought.

19 Ms. Creedon, the review found that, quote, significant
20 changes are required to ensure the safety and security and
21 effectiveness of the force in the future. Can you give us
22 some examples of where safety and security and effectiveness
23 are at risk and some examples of recommendations that you
24 might make? And what is meant by cultural and structural
25 changes?

1 Ms. Creedon: Thank you, sir. So let me start probably
2 on the end of that.

3 On the cultural changes -- and I will just use a couple
4 of examples to illustrate some of these. On the cultural
5 side, we found that particularly in the Air Force, there was
6 not a good culture of strong self-assessments that could
7 provide up the chain of command no-kidding assessments of
8 what was going on in the forces. So we found that what was
9 happening was problems were not raised to the next level of
10 attention, and when problems were raised, they were not
11 treated with any significant degree of credibility. So what
12 we had was a situation where the senior leaders for the most
13 part did not even know how bad some of the situations were
14 at the working level because they were simply not putting in
15 place any sort of a good self-assessment regime or having
16 any good, candid opportunities for conversation within the
17 services.

18 On the organizational, again an illustrative example.
19 We found that particularly that the way the Air Force was
20 organized for maintenance of the ICBM's, that the Air Force
21 did not treat the entire universe of the ICBM as a single
22 weapon system. So you have the missile itself. You have
23 the silo that it is in, and the silos are covered by launch
24 control centers. And the launch control centers then talk
25 within their missile field. That whole missile field was

1 not considered as a weapon system. So as a result, you had
2 different pieces of the Air Force and different sources of
3 money responsible for the long-term maintenance of different
4 parts and pieces. So there was no holistic way to look at
5 that ICBM system as a system of systems. So you had some
6 parts of the Air Force taking care of other things, and then
7 you had the base commanders taking care of other things.
8 And particularly when the base commanders were using their
9 money, we found that the base commanders were forced with
10 choices of, say, plowing the snow or fixing blast doors on a
11 large control facility. So they were not organized
12 structurally to fix this.

13 On the safety and security, for the most part, what we
14 were worried about was the safety and security of the forces
15 as they were operating. So we found in many instances that
16 their equipment just was not adequate. So at the missile
17 fields, for instance, these missile fields are all in the
18 north. They have terrible winters. They have lots of snow,
19 lots of ice, and yet the security forces were driving around
20 in SUV's that were front-wheel drive. So it was as minor as
21 that that could fix some of these no-kidding safety of life
22 sorts of things.

23 Senator Sessions: And can you give an example of a
24 specific action such as the confused support system you just
25 described that have been done to improve that? Maybe,

1 General Wilson, you could comment on that. What steps do
2 you think that you have taken that would alleviate some of
3 the problems that Ms. Creedon just described?

4 General Wilson: Thank you, Chairman Sessions. Let me
5 give you three examples.

6 The first thing that she talked about is cultural. So
7 the big culture change that we have embarked upon is one of
8 empowerment, empowering our airmen. So we started a force
9 improvement program, and the force improvement was a
10 different look. So it is a bottom-up look and it was a
11 multi-diverse team of people who made up this individual --
12 so in operations, it would be operators from each of the
13 ICBM wings with submarine operators with airplane operators
14 to give a different perspective.

15 As part of the force improvement program, the ICBM
16 alone has brought forward over 350 recommendations from the
17 airmen doing the job on how to do it differently and better.

18 Senator Sessions: These recommendations were from the
19 ground up.

20 General Wilson: From the ground up, so from the people
21 doing the job. And I look at it as our job to remove the
22 barriers to their success. So as an example, as Secretary
23 Creedon just mentioned, the defenders out in the field did
24 not have the right uniforms and the right vehicles and the
25 right equipment. That has all been changed. Based on their

1 recommendations, we went out and said what is the best cold
2 weather gear and the best gear that we can get for the
3 environment that they are in. We have funded that. We have
4 delivered it to the field. It was no small task to do it.
5 Just for the defenders in the security force, it was over
6 250,000 individual line items that were delivered to the
7 field.

8 But in addition to the uniforms, we provided new
9 vehicles, new radios, and we greatly improved the training
10 of the security forces that they get. We do that at Camp
11 Guernsey in Wyoming.

12 So we are building a model defender program and the
13 model defender is not just the outer gear. It is the whole
14 human weapon system with the goal of making our airmen --
15 the place that everybody wants to go to for the mission
16 because they are doing a vitally important mission for our
17 Nation, and we are equipping them properly with the right
18 tools to do the mission.

19 Senator Sessions: Thank you, General Wilson.

20 Of course, this is a big deal. Errors cannot happen in
21 the area that you operate in. My impression, General
22 Wilson, is the Air Force has taken seriously the concerns
23 and have responded in a serious way. Without getting into
24 too many details, would you explain to us the role Secretary
25 of Defense Hagel had in moving this forward and what you can

1 tell us -- my time is already over. No. I guess I did my
2 opening statement in this.

3 But can you tell us what you have done that would
4 convey to the Congress and to the American people that you
5 have seriously evaluated the concerns in the report and from
6 top down, actions are being undertaken to fix it?

7 General Wilson: Yes, sir. If I were to describe it,
8 first of all, the change from the past. So what is
9 different today is we certainly have the attention and the
10 focus of the senior leadership, both of the Department, the
11 Secretary of the Air Force, and Chief of Staff of the Air
12 Force.

13 Senator Sessions: They have been personally engaged.

14 General Wilson: They have been personally engaged in
15 this.

16 As an example, the Secretary of the Air Force has
17 visited each of our missile wings three times in the last
18 year. She meets with our airmen. She gets their direct
19 feedback. The Chief of Staff has done the same. They have
20 been personally engaged. They both have talked about how do
21 we put our money where our mouth is. We have said this is
22 the most important mission. We need to put the resources
23 behind it to do that. We are on track to be able to provide
24 those resources now.

25 We do not disagree with anything in the reviews. Both

1 the internal and the external reviews we are in complete
2 agreement with. What we found is that our bottom-up reviews
3 and the top-down reviews overlapped about 95 percent.
4 Within that, we have got a multitude of areas that we are
5 addressing, everything from ICBM training, recruiting, how
6 do we evaluate, how do we instruct them from the security
7 forces, how do we provide the right supplies and the
8 maintenance. As Secretary Creedon talked about, how do we
9 define the ICBM weapon system that had not been done before?
10 There has been a multitude of efforts, but it is not just
11 the ICBM. We started with the ICBM.

12 The next place we went is to our bombers, and we did a
13 bomber force improvement program. And the bombers brought
14 over 215 recommendations forward on how to do things better
15 and more efficiently.

16 So we are looking at this as a continuous improvement
17 cycle, but it is not something that is one time and done.
18 We will go back out to the field. We have been going out to
19 the field regularly listening to our airmen and saying are
20 the things that we are doing helping. If not, how do we
21 readjust, and what do we need to be doing differently? So
22 we are taking this as a holistic, systemic view of the
23 enterprise with persistent attention and focus, and now it
24 is our job to make sure that we follow through with all the
25 things that we have got underway.

1 Senator Donnelly: General Harencak, have you given
2 your opening statement yet?

3 General Harencak: Yes, sir, I have.

4 Senator Donnelly: Very good.

5 Let me ask you this question, General Wilson, and that
6 would be like a "why," which is somewhat speculative but in
7 the reports as well. Why did these things happen? Is it
8 that the type of mission that we have, being in a missile
9 silo keeping an eye on things there, that it is not a
10 desirable mission? It is not challenging enough, that
11 members of the Air Force look at it as it was kind of a
12 sidetrack to their career? How does this happen?

13 General Wilson: That may be part of it. It may be
14 that we lost focus on the importance of what strategic
15 deterrence does for our Nation. We got engaged in places
16 around the world that took our eye off this. And we either
17 relayed in some form or fashion that what the airmen were
18 doing was not as important as other things.

19 I think we are seeing a change in that today. I will
20 give you an example. We recently met a captain at Mahlstrom
21 Air Force Base. He is an academy grad. He has a 3.8 GPA in
22 physics. He is finishing up his 4 years in the ICBM
23 community. He said I have noticed a change in the last
24 year. I have seen the differences in the empowerment and
25 what it can make, and I want to stay in this weapon system.

1 This is a once in a lifetime opportunity to be part of
2 something bigger and to make a difference. And so he is
3 staying in the ICBM community. That is not one person. You
4 will see broadly across the community now with this
5 increased focus and attention and people know the mission is
6 important, that the airmen value that. We just did not do a
7 very good job.

8 Senator Donnelly: My perception is that it will be
9 viewed as important as the leadership of the Air Force makes
10 it to be in the public messaging you have and in the way you
11 look at promotions there and ways of a career path there.

12 General Wilson: Yes, sir. Well, a couple of specific
13 examples the Air Force has done -- and you are well aware.
14 We have elevated this position for this command from a
15 three-star to a four-star. We have elevated the position of
16 the A-10 on the headquarters air staff from a two-star to a
17 three-star. Again, at all levels, we are seeing it. Before
18 we would see not a lot of -- from the different accession
19 sources who would volunteer to go to missiles, they were
20 seeing a complete difference. This year alone 29 first
21 choice and all 174 coming in, it was in the top six choices.
22 So it is making a difference.

23 Senator Donnelly: Admiral Benedict, as you know,
24 Indiana is home to the Naval Surface Warfare Center Crane.
25 It provides a lot of support to SSP. As you look at that,

1 one of the things that we have worked on at Crane that a lot
2 of folks have put time and effort into is trying to enhance
3 collaboration or commonality among the Navy and the Air
4 Force nuclear programs. And Crane has been involved in that
5 work to ensure lessons learned and best practices are shared
6 between the services. And I was wondering your view of how
7 we are doing at promoting collaboration and commonality on
8 these programs and how can we do better.

9 Admiral Benedict: Yes, sir. Thank you.

10 We are working, I think, better today in a more
11 collaborative manner on the topic of commonality than I
12 think we have ever been between the United States Navy and
13 the United States Air Force. I had the opportunity to host
14 Air Force flags. In fact, Major General Harencak visited me
15 when we were out there as part of the strategic forum
16 seminar that Crane hosted so generously for us. We showed
17 them all of our capability at Crane, and of course, Crane is
18 the single largest warfare center provider for strategic
19 systems in the United States Navy, and they do an
20 exceptional job and they have for many, many years.

21 I think we continue to progress in this area. We have
22 an official structure set up now where we are looking at
23 various areas, one of them in particular being rad hard
24 electronics, of which Crane is intimately familiar with the
25 way the Navy does business. We have identified that to the

1 Air Force for their consideration as they move forward.

2 Another example of collaboration and commonality is on
3 Monday of next week, I am flying to Omaha. I will join
4 Admiral Haney in Omaha. I am flying up with Admiral Haney
5 to be a part of the ICBM flag officers forum up at Cheyenne,
6 Wyoming with all the ICBM flags. And I have the opportunity
7 to pitch commonality in that forum to the Air Force
8 generals.

9 So I think we are making good progress in that area,
10 sir.

11 Senator Donnelly: Thank you.

12 Ms. Creedon, I know that the internal report on the DOD
13 nuclear mission was classified. But in this unclassified
14 forum that we have here, what was your biggest surprise when
15 you looked in determining how serious the issues were?

16 Ms. Creedon: There were probably two. One was that
17 although we knew going in that the Air Force had significant
18 problems because there were many years of reports that had
19 laid out a lot of these problems, the problems that we found
20 were worse and they were much more systemic.

21 With the Navy, again the surprise was that although the
22 strategic systems programs were good and the naval reactors
23 programs were good, what we found was the part in the middle
24 that neither Admiral Benedict nor Admiral Richardson had
25 really much authority over -- those were in worse shape than

1 we had expected. And what I mean by those, those are a lot
2 of the support facilities, particularly some of the
3 shipyards. They were pretty severely understaffed. There
4 was a pretty big bathtub in the mid-career sections, and the
5 facilities needed a lot of work.

6 And as a result of that, we understood why the
7 submariners were under as much stress as they were in their
8 operational capacities. So, for instance, a lot of the work
9 that in the past should have or would have been done by the
10 shipyard once a submarine was in port was being done by the
11 crew. So there were a lot of people and infrastructure
12 things that we were surprised to find in the Navy.

13 Senator Donnelly: Like how did we miss this or how did
14 we get in this spot in your opinion?

15 Ms. Creedon: That is probably one of those questions
16 that needs an hour or so to fully unpack.

17 Senator Donnelly: Actually I am on overtime right now,
18 but nobody else is here. So this is awesome.

19 [Laughter.]

20 Ms. Creedon: I will not take an hour.

21 But I would say it is a combination of things. I think
22 General Wilson touched on a few of them. I think over time
23 certainly at the Air Force, the mission had been sort of
24 pushed to the side. I do not think the leadership across
25 the board took much of the mission as seriously as possible,

1 although I want to caveat very quickly on this, that the
2 morale in the Navy was good where the morale in the Air
3 Force was not good. So for some complicated reasons, the
4 Navy had managed to keep the morale good.

5 There was just so much focus and attention over the
6 course of the various wars in Iraq and Afghanistan that that
7 is where you wanted to be. So from the Air Force
8 perspective, a lot of the folks found themselves -- and
9 these were their words. There are sort of two things that
10 have stuck with me. They felt trapped. And there was
11 another phrase that we ran into a lot, that they would say,
12 well, I have the nuclear stink on me, so I do not have much
13 of a future in the rest of the Air Force. So they did not
14 see themselves as having much of a career progression.

15 All of this happened gradually. It happened over time.
16 None of it was very quick. And so it will take a lot of
17 time to rectify all these things. But it was very
18 complicated, I think, how all these things happened, but a
19 lot of it was I just do not think there was a lot of
20 attention being paid at very senior levels to certain
21 aspects of this enterprise.

22 Senator Donnelly: General Wilson -- and this goes back
23 to what we were talking about before. You are seeing and
24 changing and making sure that there is no stigma to being
25 part of the nuclear program, I would assume.

1 General Wilson: Yes, sir. The goal is we want this to
2 be something that people aspire to. And I am heartened
3 today with some of our airmen, you know, what I see and the
4 ability -- we tell them you are going to be able to create
5 your own future here. You own this. You can make a
6 difference. Every airman's voice needs to be heard on how
7 do we make this better. And then we are trying to empower
8 them, and we are trying to clear the obstacles to their
9 success at all levels. And once they start seeing the
10 fruits of the success, they start believing it. And right
11 now, I think they are just starting to see we have said and
12 you are doing this. We have said this, you are doing this.
13 They believe it. We are on a journey here but I think we
14 are making some important progress.

15 Senator Donnelly: I think that Senator Sessions should
16 be back in just a minute or 2. I am going to run over and
17 vote very quickly, and then I will come back. And if he is
18 not back by then, you will be tortured by me again as I
19 return.

20 Thank you very much. We will put this in the hearing.
21 We will hold off until we get back from votes. Thank you
22 very much.

23 [Recess.]

24 Senator Heinrich [presiding]: Let me start out by
25 thanking all of you for your patience with our voting

1 schedule this afternoon. It has not been very conducive to
2 these hearings. But I sure appreciate the work that all of
3 you do.

4 I want to start out, General Harencak. It is great to
5 see you. It has been too long. As you know as well as
6 anyone, New Mexico is home to the Nuclear Weapons Center and
7 the thousands of airmen who work very hard every day to
8 ensure the safety and the reliability of our nuclear
9 enterprise.

10 The 2014 nuclear enterprise review noted that there
11 was, quote, a lack of promotion opportunities generally in
12 the nuclear career field and a lack of a defined,
13 sustainable career path for nuclear officers in the Air
14 Force and career constraints resulting from nuclear
15 specialization for both officers and enlisted personnel.
16 Unquote.

17 What steps are you taking to fix these personnel issues
18 to ensure that our airmen have increased opportunities and
19 incentives to enter and stay in this incredibly important
20 field? General Wilson, do you want to take that?

21 General Wilson: Yes, Senator, absolutely. We have
22 started for an ICBM operator a completely different model
23 than we have done before. We are calling it the 3 Plus 3
24 model. So we give them 3 years where they experience in a
25 missile field becoming a flight commander -- excuse me -- a

1 deputy and then an aircraft commander, missile crew
2 commander. At the 3-year point, we are going to PCS the
3 majority of them to another base where they are going to
4 become an instructor or a flight commander. And so we are
5 going to develop a bench of expertise that they did not have
6 before. So they are going to stay longer in their career
7 field.

8 We also have a bunch of educational opportunities as we
9 move forward, education with all the national labs. We are
10 spending a lot of time working on what I call the human
11 weapon system. What are the things we can do to improve the
12 deterrence thinking of the 21st century? Locally we are
13 starting a leadership development center where we will have
14 touch points for our officers, our enlisted, and our
15 civilians throughout their career where we provide them
16 leadership development opportunities.

17 In addition to that, we are working with our Air Force
18 partners at Air University to build a structure throughout
19 the Air Force where we increase our deterrence thinking more
20 broadly throughout the Air Force so that all airmen
21 understand the importance of nuclear deterrence.

22 At the strategic level in the air staff, we are doing
23 the same thing. So how do we get the Air Force into the
24 national policy debates? So General Harenchak and his team,
25 working with others at headquarters Air Force and STRATCOM,

1 our Navy partners to get into the debate at the national
2 level.

3 And lastly we are working with academia throughout the
4 world. We stood up something we call the Center for
5 Assurance Deterrence, Escalation and Nonproliferation
6 Science and Education, CADENCE. And what that is doing is
7 bringing in academia from around the world to help improve
8 how we do business, and they are doing some phenomenal
9 research but how do we take advantage of that at the Air
10 Force and more properly help our airmen.

11 So I think we have laid out a broader, deeper structure
12 for airmen. They can see a path. And we tell people with
13 the number of airmen today coming into the career field, we
14 have more that want to stay in than we have room for. As
15 they grow up, we are going to provide them leadership
16 development opportunities, and we have a number of
17 operational squadrons and ops officer positions and group
18 commander positions. There is a future that you have to be
19 an ICBM operator in the United States Air Force.

20 Senator Heinrich: Fantastic.

21 General Wilson: We got a bunch of efforts underway to
22 improve that.

23 And I will yield the remaining time to General Harencak
24 here.

25 General Harencak: The only thing I would add, Senator,

1 is the proof of this is truly in the pudding, and I am
2 absolutely confident that the leadership of the United
3 States Air Force is committed in the long term to the
4 purposeful development of nuclear officers and enlisted
5 airmen that all work in this field. So I believe that we
6 made structural and institutional changes to address your
7 concern, and already we are seeing the benefits of that in
8 just the last few months or a year.

9 Senator Heinrich: And CADENCE. Where is that being
10 stood up?

11 General Wilson: Shreveport, Louisiana.

12 Senator Heinrich: Fantastic.

13 And a related issue. As we know, nuclear missions
14 require perfection. However, the nuclear enterprise review
15 found that there is, quote, a blurring of lines between
16 accountability and perfection in the Air Force. I was
17 hoping you could explain what that means a little further.
18 Either of you. General Wilson?

19 General Wilson: What I am telling our airmen today is
20 that they own the future. We are not going to walk by any
21 problems. So when you see a problem, you need to identify
22 it, so this culture of self-assessment and being able to
23 have someone hear your voice and say this needs to be fixed,
24 we can do this better.

25 I recently had a conversation with a senior officer,

1 and he said --

2 Senator Heinrich: Basically you are saying
3 accountability and perfection were working against each
4 other in some cases.

5 General Wilson: We did. We had a culture that was
6 about passing the next inspection, and the culture of
7 inspections became the mission. Today we are telling our
8 airmen that is not it at all. We need to understand the
9 importance of our mission, but you are empowered to make a
10 difference.

11 A senior officer said to me, well, you do not really
12 believe a young airman has the wherewithal to -- they just
13 need to be told what to do. And I said, no, you are
14 completely missing the boat. An example is a young airman
15 at Barksdale Air Force Base who is 20 years old who works in
16 the medical group, and he is a high school programmer. He
17 was doing a job at that entry and realized I can do this
18 better. He made a difference. He wrote a program that is
19 now being used DOD-wide, and he is 20 years old. That is
20 the type of empowerment we are talking about, and it is
21 going on throughout our enterprise where the youngest airmen
22 and our NCO's and our young officers are speaking up because
23 they see a way to make it better, and we need to listen to
24 them and then let them do their job.

25 Senator Heinrich: Thank you.

1 Senator Sessions [presiding]: Senator King?

2 Senator King: Thank you.

3 Ms. Creedon, I go to a lot of hearings around here, and
4 I am starting to think that instead of the U.S. Congress, we
5 should call ourselves "Deficits are Us" because I keep
6 encountering deficits and this is another one. Can you give
7 me, very briefly, just in a few seconds, top line, what is
8 the size of the nuclear enterprise deficit and what is the
9 timeframe that we have to address it? Is it \$100 billion,
10 \$50 billion, \$20 billion? What is the number, and how much
11 time do we have to do this before national security is truly
12 jeopardized?

13 Ms. Creedon: So I think first we need to understand
14 exactly what our review did. So our review looked at the
15 people in DOD, the systems in DOD that we have now and that
16 we need to maintain until such time as we have replacement
17 systems.

18 Senator King: I understand that. I want a number.

19 Ms. Creedon: So our estimate was a range of between \$9
20 billion and \$25 billion. I do not know the time because how
21 those things get executed are up in the air. So we had said
22 possibly as many as 5 years, somewhere along those lines.

23 Senator King: That is the total number, though. \$9
24 billion to \$25 billion is the total number.

25 Ms. Creedon: That is what we came up with. Not

1 terribly scientific, but that is what we came up with, \$9
2 billion to \$25 billion. And it will take years to fix.

3 Senator King: Thank you.

4 Secondly, I am concerned about command and control in
5 this system and particularly in the world of cyber crimes.
6 How are we doing on that front?

7 Ms. Creedon: We are doing better. Obviously, a good
8 bit of this needs to be taken to a classified session on
9 this particular topic, but when we did our review, because
10 of some work that had been done previously, one of the main
11 areas of attention that we found that it had increased
12 attention was the nuclear command and control. So although
13 there is work to be done, it at least had, I think, started
14 to get better.

15 Senator King: It is being attended to.

16 Ms. Creedon: It is being attended to.

17 Senator King: General Wilson, the B-52 is reaching the
18 end of its life, and we are talking about the long-range
19 strike bomber, but that is still on the drawing boards. Is
20 there a capacity gap? Will the B-52 last until the long-
21 range strike fighter, bearing in mind that the last -- the
22 Defense Department average for new aircraft procurement is
23 23 years? That is the number that we saw in the full
24 committee. Can we get from here to there with the B-52?

25 General Wilson: We can. We are planning to fly the

1 B-52 for another 25 years. It has service life to go beyond
2 that.

3 Senator King: So you are confident in that platform
4 for that period of time.

5 General Wilson: I am. We need to do some upgrades to
6 it. But I am also confident that we need a new penetrating
7 bomber. The B-52's that we have on our ramp are 1960 and
8 1961 models. The B-2, our new bomber, is 25 years old. So
9 we absolutely need a new bomber. As technology improves
10 around the world, the ability to hold targets at risk
11 wherever they are on the planet is vitally important to our
12 Nation and certainly to the United States Air Force.

13 Senator King: I would like to follow up with you or
14 whoever is appropriate about the long-range strike bomber,
15 what the spec is, how it relates to the B-2 and the B-52.
16 So that is a discussion we can have.

17 General Wilson: We would be happy to have that with
18 you.

19 Senator King: If you could be in touch with my office
20 because I want to understand before we undertake a new --
21 before we get too far into a new vehicle, I want to have
22 that opportunity.

23 Another deficit is R&D. Are there sufficient funds in
24 the President's budget, if it were enacted as it is today,
25 to do the R&D that is necessary to keep pace in a field

1 which is essentially driven by technology? General Wilson,
2 do you want to tackle that? Or, Admiral, why do you not
3 give me a thought on that?

4 Admiral Benedict: Yes, sir. Well, I will address that
5 as it relates to the Ohio replacement program, our new
6 submarine. The answer is yes. As requested in the
7 President's budget, if that is fully funded, then we will
8 remain on track to do the design development and leading
9 into production of that vitally important platform.

10 Senator King: How about R&D generally in the nuclear
11 enterprise?

12 Admiral Benedict: I would say from my position as
13 Director of SSP, there are four areas that I think my
14 counterparts here in the Air Force would agree if we are not
15 investing in, no one is investing in, and those would be
16 reentry body science, rad hard electronics to the levels
17 that we have to, strategic propulsion, which is vital to
18 both us and the ICBM force, as well as the guidance systems
19 which are well beyond any commercial case.

20 Senator King: Could a current ICBM be used to put a
21 satellite in orbit, the same rocket?

22 Admiral Benedict: I will defer to the Air Force on
23 that, sir.

24 General Wilson: I would think the answer would be yes.
25 I would have to get with the pros to be able to do that.

1 But an ICBM is going to fly a significant distance, halfway
2 around the world and go up into the hundreds of miles high.
3 So the answer would be yes.

4 Senator King: Well, I am just interested because we
5 are talking about satellite overhead architecture and
6 vehicles, and I just want to be sure we are not having a
7 different vehicle for every trip to the store. And I would
8 like to follow up on that as well in terms of the
9 appropriateness of multiple use of some of these vehicles
10 that are being developed.

11 A final question. How is Russia doing in their
12 compliance with New START? Anybody? Answer quick. Nobody
13 answering makes me nervous.

14 Ms. Creedon: They are fine. Right now, the New START
15 -- they are full in compliance and we are full in
16 compliance.

17 Senator King: They are fully complying?

18 Ms. Creedon: They are. It is one of the few bright
19 spots in the relationship.

20 Senator King: Good.

21 That is all I have, Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

22 Senator Sessions: A good question.

23 Admiral Benedict, with regard to the study and the
24 Navy's response, are there things that impacted the Navy
25 that you have undertaken to make our arsenal more safe?

1 Admiral Benedict: Mr. Chairman, both studies
2 identified primarily two deficiencies within the United
3 States Navy's actions. We are already in process. And we
4 appreciate the confirmation that the two reviews gave us.
5 Those are the infrastructure and, as Ms. Creedon stated,
6 primarily in the shipyards. We were down in our shipyard
7 worker numbers as a result of the impacts of sequestration.
8 So those numbers were immediately authorized by Secretary
9 Work when he identified that. And so we are hiring
10 somewhere around 2,200 personnel for the shipyards and our
11 repair facilities. We are on track on that hiring process,
12 and that will certainly increase the throughput in our
13 shipyards.

14 The second piece, again as Ms. Creedon identified, was
15 the infrastructure. We are now on a 15-year
16 recapitalization plan of the naval shipyards, as well as a
17 25-year recapitalization program within the strategic
18 weapons facilities that I am accountable for. So, yes, sir,
19 we are on track.

20 Senator Sessions: Well, your answer to Senator King I
21 guess, Ms. Creedon, was \$9 billion to \$25 billion. Now,
22 this is in addition to what our current expected
23 expenditures are?

24 Ms. Creedon: Yes, sir. And it was to maintain the
25 current systems in DOD between now and whenever they are

1 replaced by the follow-on systems.

2 Senator Sessions: But you are not counting like the
3 Ohio class replacement or the new bomber?

4 Ms. Creedon: That is correct.

5 Senator Sessions: That is not being counted. What
6 does this money go for? I mean, we have been operating here
7 for a long time, and we obviously are not at the level of
8 safety and reliability we need to be. That is a huge sum of
9 money.

10 Ms. Creedon: And it is over a period of time. And I
11 would turn to my colleagues for their indications as to how
12 much each of them has begun to spend over the FYDP, but it
13 is a wide range of things. Some of it is facilities. There
14 are a lot of facilities that need to be replaced. Some of
15 it is new equipment. The Air Force needs new helicopters
16 for their missile fields. It is people. It is parts. It
17 is a whole range of things. It is a very large bill, but a
18 lot of it is facilities.

19 Senator Sessions: Well, \$25 billion would buy a lot, a
20 lot of helicopters, a lot of automobiles with heaters in
21 them. I am just telling you.

22 I would think we need a specific request. So how would
23 this reflect itself in future budget requests? You would
24 just ask for more or are you talking about taking money out
25 of existing programs?

1 Ms. Creedon: Well, at that point, sir, I think I would
2 like to turn it over to my DOD colleagues who are
3 implementing the recommendations.

4 Senator Sessions: Gentlemen, do you have thoughts
5 about that? I mean, this is not a blank check. I mean, we
6 have got to honor the taxpayers' money, and we are worried
7 about not being able to maintain sufficient force levels and
8 other matters too in this Defense Department.

9 Admiral Benedict: Sir, if I may, I will go first.

10 Our fiscal year 2016 increase was \$446 million. That
11 is in our budget within the Navy, and our FYDP increase
12 across the 5-year defense plan for the Navy totaled just
13 slightly over \$2 billion.

14 As Ms. Creedon said, the majority of that is personnel
15 in the shipyards, as I explained. We have self-funded --

16 Senator Sessions: How many do you have in a shipyard
17 now?

18 Admiral Benedict: Across all four shipyards, sir? I
19 would have to get you the specific number.

20 Senator Sessions: 2,000 sounds like a big number.

21 Admiral Benedict: Yes, sir. Remember, these are the
22 four naval nuclear shipyards. And so I do not have the
23 exact number of all four in total. The number that I gave
24 you, slightly over 2,200, is the increase to the existing
25 workforce in order to ensure that we can maintain the

1 throughput through that system. I do not have the total
2 number, sir.

3 Senator Sessions: General Wilson?

4 General Wilson: Mr. Chairman, we added \$5.6 billion
5 over the FYDP for the nuclear enterprise. That covers a
6 spectrum of things from both people. It covers milcon.

7 Senator Sessions: Well, is it not the rule of thumb
8 that you can do -- \$1 billion is equal to 10,000 uniformed
9 personnel?

10 General Wilson: I do not know the rule of thumb, Mr.
11 Chairman. We added 1,100 people to the nuclear enterprise
12 this last year to help us in every area from security forces
13 to our operators to supply specialists. 1,100 was the plus-
14 up that we got to the nuclear enterprise. Some of that is
15 for procurement going forward. We included the long-range
16 standoff weapon across this 5-year defense budget. We have
17 about \$700 million of milcon to start getting after the
18 weapons storage areas across all of our bases. So we added
19 \$5.6 billion on this FYDP to the nuclear enterprise.

20 Senator Sessions: Well, I think we should see that in
21 more detail. I think we should know more in detail about
22 that and exactly how many people and just to say \$5 billion
23 and we are talking about \$1 billion will produce about
24 10,000. So that is a lot of people.

25 Anyway, I think we have to look at this hard. We have

1 got to create safety and reliability. We know you have been
2 undercut and have not had sufficient funding for that, and
3 we are going to have to find some more money. But doing it
4 as smartly as possible would be good.

5 Senator Donnelly, I believe you are next. Has a vote
6 started again or do you know?

7 Senator Donnelly: Where we are at is there are a
8 number of voice votes taking place right now, so about 10 to
9 15 minutes before the final recorded vote. I already went
10 through questions, and so, Senator King or Senator Heinrich.

11 Senator Sessions: Please.

12 Senator Heinrich: One more round if we have got the
13 time.

14 And I would just make the point that, unfortunately,
15 nuclear weapons have never sort of conformed to the sort of
16 ratios between personnel, obviously, and hardware that we
17 see in other parts of the DOD budget.

18 But I want to get back to a couple of issues with
19 General Harencaak and also Admiral Benedict. And you guys
20 can decide who to answer first.

21 But the NNSA labs and plants through the current
22 refurbishment programs for the B61-12, the W88 Alt 370, and
23 the fuse for the W87 are leveraging rate, our technology
24 across these life extension programs now. And I wanted to
25 ask you is this sort of leverage beneficial to your

1 programs. Is it cost-effective? And is there a benefit for
2 the U.S. deterrent as the full-scale engineering and design
3 of these programs starts to level off over the next few
4 years for Air Force, Navy, and NNSA to think about some sort
5 of joint engineering programs to maintain the institutional
6 knowledge of the labs' workforce?

7 General Harencak: I will start, Senator. First off,
8 as you are well aware, the tremendous work that the labs in
9 New Mexico and Lawrence Livermore labs are doing in this
10 collaboration. The short answer to your question is a
11 resounding yes. We are leveraging. We are making
12 affordable smart decisions where we collaborate with the
13 United States Navy. And the B61 is a perfect example.
14 There are components -- we are just using Navy components in
15 them, which has been obviously tremendously helpful. We are
16 also collaborating on future ways that we could use joint
17 common and adaptable materials, not just in hardware but
18 also in our processes and using our people. We talked a
19 little bit earlier about Navy Crane. The Navy is also using
20 a facility in Heath, Ohio that the United States Air Force
21 runs through a contractor, and it has also been enormously
22 helpful.

23 I will say, though, I have been banging around this
24 particular aspect -- business for the last 6 continuous
25 years, and I can tell you I have never seen better

1 cooperation. Our B61 program at the NNSA is working with
2 us, and with collaboration from the Navy is on time, on
3 cost. And that is just one example of where this
4 collaboration and the great work between the Department of
5 Energy, the NNSA, the Navy, and the Air Force has occurred.

6 Senator Heinrich: That is exactly what I was hoping to
7 hear because I think as you heard from Senator Sessions, the
8 chairman, while we all recognize that this enterprise is not
9 cheap, we have to get the most bang for the buck possible in
10 this environment.

11 I want to move on real quick to KUMSC. General Wilson,
12 as I understand it, the Global Strike Command now owns the
13 Kirtland underground munitions and maintenance storage
14 complex. This is a unique and strategic national asset. Do
15 you have a long-term plan for its upkeep? And if you do,
16 can you share it with the committee?

17 General Wilson: Senator, I completely agree that KUMSC
18 is a national treasure. We have not taken control of
19 Kirtland KUMSC yet. We will on 1 October. As we have
20 talked in the past, though, in the Air Force corporate
21 structure, as we modernize our weapons storage facility,
22 KUMSC absolutely has to be part of that plan. And so we
23 will have that as part of the plan. I do not have it today,
24 but as we develop it, we will make sure we share it with
25 you.

1 Senator Heinrich: That was certainly the case when the
2 Nuclear Weapons Center was the lead, and we just need to
3 make sure that that does not fall by the wayside as we make
4 this incredibly important transition.

5 General Wilson: Absolutely.

6 Senator Heinrich: Thank you, General.

7 Senator Sessions: Senator King?

8 Senator King: I just want to take a moment to thank
9 all of you, Ms. Creedon especially and Dr. Brumer, for the
10 work on the report, on the review. I think so often we sort
11 of just keep going, and to every now and then to stop and
12 think and analyze and review and have some strategy about
13 where we are headed I think is very valuable. And I commend
14 former Secretary Hagel for initiating it and for your
15 carrying it out. And I can assure you that it is going to
16 help to guide our work and consideration. So just a thank
17 you for that important work.

18 Senator Donnelly: And I would just like to follow up
19 what Senator King said to say thank you as well and to also
20 let you know our goal is to simply make this all work the
21 best possible and to create the most confidence in the
22 people who work in this area, and that when we talk about
23 these things, it is not to try to pick out people or pick on
24 people. It is simply to say how can we do this better.
25 What are the things we missed on? Just like the next day in

1 practice, how can we run this better and make our team
2 better? And so to all of you, thank you and thank you for
3 your work on this effort.

4 Senator Sessions: Thank you, Senator Donnelly. And I
5 agree with those positive comments. I really believe that
6 the Defense Department took the challenge seriously. The
7 report is a serious report, and I believe that you are
8 determined to eliminate the dangers and problems that we
9 had. I truly believe that is so.

10 Admiral Benedict, General Harencak mentioned the joint
11 work that you have done. I understand there has been some
12 real savings of money in that. And do you see possibilities
13 in the future as we develop ICBM warheads and submarine-
14 launched warheads that we could also have interoperable
15 systems as the years go by?

16 Admiral Benedict: Yes, sir. And I think there is a
17 spectrum of commonality. It goes from the simple
18 constituents using the same materials in the weapon system
19 all the way up through -- you could envision at some point
20 at least a discussion about how common could we be. Could
21 we be a common missile? I am not certain we are at that far
22 right side of the spectrum. But I will tell you that we are
23 engaged at the engineering level, at the leadership level,
24 and as I mentioned earlier, I am actually briefing the Air
25 Force ICBM flags on Tuesday of next week with Admiral Haney

1 on this very subject up in Cheyenne, Wyoming. And they were
2 very generous to invite me up there to have the conversation
3 on commonality.

4 So I think the conversation is ongoing. The
5 recognition that the bill that you very well recognize that
6 is in front of the two services is something that we have to
7 think about differently, and I think there is a commitment
8 now within the leadership teams to ensure that we provide
9 you evidence that we have thought about it differently and
10 some different proposals than the past.

11 I will turn it over to my colleagues.

12 General Harencak: I would say, Senator, that it is not
13 a possibility. It is a certainty that we are going to do it
14 because we just cannot do it any other way. People ask me
15 all the time, well, how can we afford to do all this
16 recapitalization and modernization. Well, one way we are
17 going to afford to do it is we are going to do it in a new
18 way. We are not going to do it the same way we did it in
19 the 1960's and the 1970's and the 1980's and the 1990's. We
20 are going to do it in a smarter, better, faster way. And
21 that starts with making sure wherever we can leverage
22 another service or what the United States Navy has done or
23 vice versa, we are going to do it. So this is not a
24 possibility. This is a new way of doing things that we are
25 committed to, both our services. And it is probably the

1 only way we are actually going to be able to deliver the
2 needed systems for our Nation in an affordable manner.

3 Senator Sessions: Well, thank you. I think those are
4 encouraging comments.

5 Senator King?

6 Senator King: I was just going to say amen, General.
7 You got it right.

8 Senator Donnelly: I would third that and then also say
9 to General Wilson I understand you are moving to STRATCOM,
10 And we want to thank you on behalf of the committee for all
11 the help you have rendered to us and we hope to continue
12 that relationship as we look forward.

13 And, General Harencak, we understand there is a new
14 incoming A-10. During the ICBM cheating incident and
15 modernization of the Air Force's nuclear mission, you have
16 been proud to defend and advocate for the Air Force, and we
17 appreciate that very much and we wish you the very best in
18 your next position as well.

19 Senator Sessions: Dr. Brumer, this will be my final
20 question. Secretary Hagel talked about a 10 percent need
21 increase apparently. I believe Administrator Creedon has
22 used \$9 billion to \$25 billion. That depends on the years.
23 That might be even more.

24 First, does the 2016 request and the FYDP funding
25 profile reflect that increase? So let me ask you that.

1 Dr. Brumer: Yes. Thank you for that question,
2 Chairman.

3 Indeed, as part of the PB 2016 build, we did bring the
4 senior leadership detailed assessments of all of the budget
5 options and how they addressed the review recommendations.
6 The PB 2016 did add \$8 billion across the FYDP. Early on,
7 there were options to spend more money, but there were
8 executability problems and the ability to spend the money
9 efficiently. By the end of the FYDP, I believe it comes
10 close to the 10 percent number.

11 Senator Sessions: So that is a figure you can live
12 with?

13 Dr. Brumer: Sir, it is an outcome of trying to balance
14 a good faith effort to address the recommendations of the
15 reviews, as well as trying to ensure that there is good use
16 of Government resources to ensure that the money is well
17 spent. It is something that I am comfortable with today,
18 but we are very early on in the efforts to address the
19 issues. I believe that this is something that will require
20 years of sustained effort and sustained attention, and we
21 intend to comprehensively review those decisions and the
22 funding levels every year and if changes are needed in
23 future budget requests, we will recommend them.

24 Senator Sessions: Well, I think that is the kind of
25 answer you can give at this time and maybe no more than

1 that. But we would like to see the Government do a little
2 better than we normally do. We go for years under-investing
3 and then sometimes we over-invest. And if we can get on a
4 stable path that we can be confident would put us into a
5 safe, secure, and modernized system that is reliable, then
6 we want to do that. And we hope you will look for every way
7 possible to keep that cost as reasonable as you can.

8 Anything else, gentlemen?

9 Thank you all. We are adjourned.

10 [Whereupon, at 4:10 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25