

Stenographic Transcript  
Before the

COMMITTEE ON  
ARMED SERVICES

## **UNITED STATES SENATE**

HEARING TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATION OF  
ERIC K. FANNING TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Thursday, January 21, 2016

Washington, D.C.

ALDERSON COURT REPORTING  
1155 CONNECTICUT AVENUE, N.W.  
SUITE 200  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036  
(202) 289-2260  
[www.aldersonreporting.com](http://www.aldersonreporting.com)

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

HEARING TO CONSIDER THE NOMINATION OF  
ERIC K. FANNING TO BE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Thursday, January 21, 2016

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

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:34 a.m. in Room SD-G50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. John McCain, chairman of the committee, presiding.

Committee Members Present: Senators McCain [presiding], Inhofe, Ayotte, Fischer, Cotton, Rounds, Ernst, Tillis, Sullivan, Lee, Graham, Reed, McCaskill, Manchin, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, and Heinrich.

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

3           Chairman McCain: Good morning. Before I begin my  
4 statement, I would like to note it has been reported that  
5 the White House has authorized the Department of Defense to  
6 target ISIL in Afghanistan, the first such authorization  
7 beyond Iraq and Syria. Many of us may be interested to know  
8 that we confined our attacks on ISIL to Iraq and Syria. Now  
9 the administration seems to be waking up to the fact that  
10 more than a year into the U.S. military campaign, ISIL's  
11 reach is global and growing.

12           We can only hope it will not take so long for the  
13 administration to realize the conditions on the ground in  
14 Afghanistan simply do not warrant a dangerous calendar-  
15 driven withdrawal of U.S. forces.

16           The Senate Armed Services Committee meets this morning  
17 to consider the nomination of Eric Fanning to be Secretary  
18 of the Army. We understand that your mother, Cathy, is  
19 joining us this morning. As is our tradition, Mr. Fanning,  
20 we hope you will take the opportunity to introduce her and  
21 any other family and friends joining you today.

22           The United States Army is at war. Tested by 15 years  
23 of war, the Army is confronting growing threats and  
24 increasing operational demands with shrinking and less ready  
25 forces and aging equipment.

1           By the end of the next fiscal year, the Army will be  
2 cut down to 450,000 Active Duty personnel, soldiers down  
3 from a wartime peak of 570,000. These budget-driven force  
4 reductions were decided before the rise of ISIL or Russia's  
5 invasion of Ukraine. If mindless sequestration cuts are  
6 allowed to return, the Army will shrink to 420,000 troops,  
7 increasing the risk that, in a crisis, we will have too few  
8 soldiers who could enter a fight without proper training or  
9 equipment.

10           Readiness must be the first priority of the Army. As  
11 global instability increases, the Army must be able to  
12 maintain an uncommitted force and readiness to respond to  
13 unforeseen contingencies.

14           As our Army shrinks, readiness suffers. Just over one-  
15 third of the Army's brigade combat teams -- just over one  
16 third of the Army's brigade combat teams -- are ready for  
17 deployment and decisive operations.

18           Meanwhile, the Army is woefully behind on  
19 modernization. The Army must modernize for the harsh  
20 realities of 21st-century warfare. Our soldiers must be  
21 trained and equipped for an increasingly diverse and complex  
22 range of threats. They must be able to win against peers in  
23 highly lethal combined arms maneuvers, near-peers in hybrid  
24 warfare conditions, and determined unconventional  
25 insurgents.

1           Yet our Army is essentially organized and equipped as  
2 it was in the 1980s. The main difference is that it is  
3 smaller. In fact, many key enabling forces like artillery,  
4 armored cavalry, and engineers have been reduced to levels  
5 that compromise the Army's ability to field campaign-quality  
6 forces. Part of that is the legacy of the Army's  
7 acquisition record, which Secretary McHugh has said is "too  
8 often a tale of failure, too many underperforming or  
9 canceled programs, too few successful fieldings of  
10 developmental designs, and far too many taxpayer dollars  
11 wasted." That is from your predecessor, Mr. Fanning,  
12 Secretary McHugh.

13           The Army must learn the lessons of the failed  
14 acquisitions program of recent years. Together with the  
15 experience of more than a decade of war, these lessons must  
16 guide critical acquisition programs, including the joint  
17 light tactical vehicle and the armored multipurpose vehicle.

18           New acquisition authorities passed into law in the  
19 National Defense Authorization Act for fiscal year 2016 open  
20 opportunities for both the Secretary and Chief of Staff to  
21 lead positive change. It will not be easy, but it has been  
22 done before.

23           Army leaders like General Abrams transformed the Army  
24 before. They restored the discipline and morale of the  
25 force in the aftermath of the Vietnam War. They

1 transitioned the Army to an all-volunteer force while  
2 revolutionizing training doctrine, and they built an Army  
3 that won the Cold War and removed Saddam Hussein from  
4 Kuwait.

5         We need this kind of transformation again today. I am  
6 deeply concerned about the dangerous choice we are forcing  
7 upon our Army. The increasing velocity of instability  
8 combined with continued reduction in defense spending will  
9 inevitably lead to depleted readiness, chronic modernization  
10 problems, and deteriorating morale.

11         These are just some of the major challenges the United  
12 States Army faces. One Army Secretary will not tackle them  
13 alone.

14         Mr. Fanning, if confirmed, you will take office with  
15 less than a year remaining in this administration. Some may  
16 question what you can realistically hope to achieve. But as  
17 you have been patient, waiting for this day to testify on  
18 your nomination, I challenge you to be impatient, if  
19 confirmed as Secretary. Our Nation's soldiers do not need a  
20 Secretary to mark time. They need a strong Secretary that  
21 recognizes there is much to be done and not a minute to be  
22 wasted.

23         Senator Reed?

24

25

1           STATEMENT OF HON. JACK REED, U.S. SENATOR FROM RHODE  
2 ISLAND

3           Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I  
4 join you in welcoming Mr. Fanning. I thank you for holding  
5 this hearing to fill the critical position of Secretary of  
6 the Army.

7           I also would like to thank Mr. Fanning for his  
8 willingness to serve in this position of great  
9 responsibility. It is my understanding, as the chairman has  
10 indicated, that your mother, Cathy, is in the audience this  
11 morning, and I welcome her to the hearing also.

12          Mr. Fanning has a wealth of experience, having served  
13 in senior-level positions throughout the Department of  
14 Defense. His previous positions include serving as the  
15 acting Under Secretary of Army, where he was responsible for  
16 issues related to the daily management and operation of the  
17 Army.

18          Prior to that position, Mr. Fanning was confirmed as  
19 the Under Secretary of the Air Force, and he oversaw the Air  
20 Force's annual budget and served as the chief management  
21 officer.

22          Finally, Mr. Fanning has served as the Deputy Under  
23 Secretary of the Navy and played an integral role in the  
24 Navy business transformation efforts.

25          Mr. Fanning, if you are confirmed as the next Secretary

1 of the Army, your experience during your tenure in the  
2 department will be critical in order to lead the Army during  
3 a very critical time when it faces a multitude of  
4 challenges. As you know, the Army continues to draw down  
5 its end-strength with the final goal of 450,000 in the  
6 Active Army, 335,000 in the Army National Guard, and 195,000  
7 in the Army Reserve.

8 In addition, I would welcome your comments and your  
9 testimony on whether the U.S. can continue to meet  
10 commitments overseas with this smaller Army.

11 At the same time, the Army must also contend with how  
12 to modernize the force and increase readiness levels. As  
13 you are aware, the Army modernization program has been  
14 challenged. Many programs have been truncated or canceled.

15 And, Mr. Fanning, I look forward to hearing your  
16 thoughts on how the Army can make targeted investments in  
17 modernization as well as your views on how the Army can  
18 improve its acquisition process.

19 Finally, I welcome Secretary Carter's decision to open  
20 all military positions to service by women. With respect to  
21 the Army, it is my understanding that neither General Milley  
22 nor Secretary McHugh requested an exception to policy to  
23 keep any position within the Army closed.

24 As General Milley testified last July during his  
25 confirmation hearing, there is no doubt that women can



1 engage in ground combat with the enemies of our Nation  
2 because they have been doing it for 10 years. I strongly  
3 agree with those comments.

4 Since that hearing, three women have graduated from the  
5 United States Army Ranger School, which is the premier  
6 training school for Army combat armed soldiers and officers.

7 According to Army statistics, between fiscal year 2010  
8 and fiscal year 2014, the graduation rate at Ranger school  
9 was only 42 percent, so this is another example of the  
10 significance of this accomplishment. And all of those  
11 people, prior to these individuals, were men.

12 These three women represent the Army of today and the  
13 Army of the future, and I look forward to full integration  
14 of women into all of the roles in the United States Army.

15 Again, Mr. Fanning, we look forward to your proposals,  
16 your plans, your ideas to continue to lead and serve the  
17 Army.

18 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19 Chairman McCain: Mr. Fanning, it is the custom of the  
20 committee to ask several standard questions, so I will begin  
21 them now, and we appreciate your answers.

22 In order to exercise legislative and oversight  
23 responsibilities important to this committee and other  
24 appropriate committees of the Congress, we are able to  
25 receive testimony, briefings, and other communications of

1 information. Have you adhered to applicable laws and  
2 regulations governing conflicts of interest?

3 Mr. Fanning: I have.

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

7 Mr. Fanning: No, Mr. Chairman. I was appointed acting  
8 Secretary, but after you notified the President that you  
9 thought that was in violation of the law, I did resign the  
10 position.

11 Chairman McCain: Thank you.

12 For the record, on November 30, 2015, I notified  
13 President Obama by letter that Mr. Fanning's appointment as  
14 the acting Secretary of the Army violated the Federal  
15 Vacancies Reform Act of 1998. Without objection, a copy of  
16 that letter will be included in the record of this hearing.

17 [The information referred to follows:]

18 [COMMITTEE INSERT]

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Chairman McCain: I further note for the record that  
2 the Senate and this committee takes with the utmost  
3 seriousness the Senate's constitutional responsibility to  
4 provide advice and consent on presidential nominations.  
5 That important constitutional requirement is fundamental to  
6 the separation of powers between the executive and  
7 legislative branches.

8 I have often said that elections have consequences, and  
9 Presidents are entitled to considerations of their  
10 nominations. However, until the Senate gives its advice and  
11 consent, and until the nomination is confirmed by the full  
12 Senate, no President and nominee may conduct themselves in a  
13 way that would presume confirmation.

14 Each administration issues guidance to nominees on the  
15 actions they must avoid to presume confirmation. Following  
16 that guidance allows nominees to prepare for the important  
17 duties and responsibilities that they will undertake, if  
18 confirmed by the Senate. Nominees disregard that guidance  
19 at the peril of presuming confirmation.

20 Senator Reed, do you have any comment on that?

21 Senator Reed: I do not, sir.

22 Chairman McCain: Thank you.

23 As Mr. Fanning indicated, he has now resigned from his  
24 position and is no longer serving in the acting capacity.  
25 In my opinion, his resignation has cured the President's

1 violation of the law. Therefore, I believe this committee  
2 is prepared to continue consideration of his nomination.

3 Will you ensure that your staff complies with deadlines  
4 established for requested communications, including  
5 questions for the record in hearings?

6 Mr. Fanning: I will.

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

10 Mr. Fanning: I will.

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

13 Mr. Fanning: They will.

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

16 Mr. Fanning: I do.

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

22 Mr. Fanning: I do.

23 Chairman McCain: Thank you.

24 Please proceed.

25

1           STATEMENT OF HON. ERIC K. FANNING TO BE SECRETARY OF  
2 THE ARMY

3           Mr. Fanning: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Reed,  
4 members of the committee. It is an honor to appear before  
5 you today.

6           I would like to thank President Obama for nominating me  
7 and the Secretary of Defense for supporting this opportunity  
8 to serve. If confirmed, I look forward to working with them  
9 and with Congress.

10          My mother, Cathy Fanning, is here today from Florida.  
11 She was unable to attend my previous confirmation hearing 3  
12 years ago, but not even the threat of record-breaking snow  
13 was going to stop her this time.

14          Chairman McCain: We welcome Ms. Fanning, and I hope,  
15 like my mother who is 104 years old, you will provide  
16 Secretary Fanning with the same advice and counsel that I  
17 receive from my mother.

18          [Laughter.]

19          Mr. Fanning: There is certainly no shortage of advice  
20 and counsel.

21          [Laughter.]

22          Mr. Fanning: I see also that my goddaughter, Caroline  
23 Kassir, and her mother, Allison, have joined us as well.

24          Chairman McCain: Welcome.

25          Mr. Fanning: Nobody gets the opportunity to serve in

1 positions like this without the help of many people over a  
2 very long period of time. This is particularly true for me.  
3 I am fortunate to have many in this room with me today, and  
4 I will always be grateful for their support.

5 I come from a family with a long history of service in  
6 uniform. Two uncles graduated from West Point and made a  
7 career of the Army. A third uncle served a career in the  
8 Air Force. A cousin flew helicopters for the Marine Corps.  
9 And another cousin was an Army Ranger. I learned from an  
10 early age the importance of service and developed a deep  
11 respect and admiration for the sacrifices of those in  
12 uniform and their families.

13 I have now had the privilege to work in all three  
14 military departments with all four services, as well as in  
15 the Office of the Secretary of Defense over the course of  
16 two administrations, all after starting my career 25 years  
17 ago as a research assistant on the House Armed Services  
18 Committee. I have seen the Army from every seat at the  
19 table, including the Army's.

20 I was deputy chief management officer of the Navy  
21 Department and chief management officer of the Air Force and  
22 the Army. I worked on efficiencies and transformation in  
23 every part of the Department of Defense and look forward, if  
24 confirmed, to working with this committee as it explores the  
25 next round of defense reforms.

1           The Army as a force is viewed by too many as just a  
2 number, its end-strength. Few understand the complexity of  
3 ground warfare like this committee does, or how long it  
4 takes to build an army with the overmatch necessary to win  
5 decisively and with as few casualties as possible.

6           It takes a generation to build an army. It is not just  
7 the privates but the senior enlisted who lead them.

8           Few understand the many missions of the Army. In  
9 addition to fighting and winning wars, the Army deters  
10 enemies, ensures allies, builds partner capacity, enables  
11 the joint fight through foundational capabilities, and  
12 responds to national emergencies like we see today with  
13 flooding and severe weather.

14           The Army's greatest strength is, of course, its  
15 soldiers, over 1 million of them in the Active, Guard, and  
16 Reserve. There are more than 140,000 of them currently  
17 serving in over 140 countries outside the United States.

18           Today, they are exercising with allies in Eastern  
19 Europe to deter Russian aggression; training, enabling and  
20 fighting against ISIS and other terrorists around the world;  
21 building partnership capacity across the Pacific. If  
22 confirmed, these soldiers will be my highest priority,  
23 specifically making sure they are ready, which means  
24 ensuring they are resilient, fully trained, and properly  
25 equipped.

1           To do that, we must create an environment where  
2 everyone can flourish, rid of the scourge of sexual assault  
3 and suicide. While soldiers are deployed, they must have  
4 confidence we will take care of their families. They must  
5 also know that we will take care of them when they come home  
6 and ease their transition should they choose to leave the  
7 Army.

8           We must make the same commitment to the future force by  
9 investing now so that we have the right capabilities for  
10 them when they are needed.

11           I have been immensely proud during my first 6 years in  
12 this administration to work alongside the men and women of  
13 the Navy, Marine Corps, and Air Force. If confirmed, I very  
14 much look forward to becoming part of the Army family.

15           It would be my honor to play a role in making sure that  
16 the best men and women our country has to offer get all the  
17 support they need in undertaking the mission of defending  
18 our country, a mission for which they freely volunteer.

19           We ask them to do extraordinary things. We owe them no  
20 less.

21           Thank you again for considering my nomination. Thank  
22 you for your service. And I look forward to your questions.

23           [The prepared statement of Mr. Fanning follows:]

24

25



1 Chairman McCain: Thank you, Mr. Fanning.

2 We will pause a moment for business. Since a quorum is  
3 now present, I ask the committee to consider a list of 3,178  
4 pending military nominations. All of these nominations have  
5 been before the committee the required length of time.

6 Is there a motion to favorably report these 3,178  
7 military nominations to the Senate?

8 Senator Reed: So moved.

9 Chairman McCain: Is there a second?

10 Senator Kaine: Second.

11 Chairman McCain: All in favor, say aye.

12 Mr. Fanning, roughly how many Army and other personnel  
13 are now in Iraq serving there?

14 Mr. Fanning: I understand the number to be about  
15 4,500.

16 Chairman McCain: About 4,500. Is there a status of  
17 forces agreement with Iraq on the presence of those troops,  
18 that you know of?

19 Mr. Fanning: Not that I know of, Mr. Chairman.

20 Chairman McCain: Certainly not one that has been  
21 through the parliament of Iraq.

22 So ostensibly, you were in administration at the time,  
23 the reason why we could not leave a sustaining force behind  
24 in Iraq at the time of the withdrawal was because we did not  
25 have a status of forces agreement so, therefore, it would be

1 impossible for us to leave a force behind. Yet somehow we  
2 have now 4,500 uniform members of the military, and no one  
3 seems to be confirmed about the fact we do not have a status  
4 of forces agreement with the Iraqis. I find that curious.

5 Let me ask you a fundamental question. In Iraq and  
6 Syria in the battle against ISIS, which is now  
7 metastasizing, at least to the degree where we are going to  
8 have to attack ISIS in Afghanistan among other places, are  
9 we winning?

10 Mr. Fanning: Mr. Chairman, I think it is too early to  
11 tell. We clearly are putting a lot of pressure on ISIS, but  
12 they are also showing they can put pressure on us and they  
13 are not contained. But I do think we are making process  
14 recently. There is open source reporting of 6,400 ISIS  
15 fighters killed in the last 3 months. We have disrupted the  
16 supply route between Mosul and Raqqa, taking back Sinjar and  
17 Ramadi.

18 But a great deal of work needs to be done. I do  
19 believe it is a long fight.

20 Chairman McCain: Do you think we have any plan to take  
21 Raqqa?

22 Mr. Fanning: I do not know the specifics of any plan,  
23 but we are moving in that direction, applying pressure both  
24 outside Raqqa and outside Mosul.

25 Chairman McCain: But you do not know of any specific

1 plan?

2 Mr. Fanning: I do not, sir, but I do not think I  
3 would, in my current capacity.

4 Chairman McCain: You work directly for Secretary  
5 Carter?

6 Mr. Fanning: I do.

7 Chairman McCain: And you did not know of any strategy  
8 to retake Raqqa there?

9 Mr. Fanning: Since I have returned to his office, I am  
10 in a different capacity than I was before when I was chief  
11 of staff. I am assigned special projects, and he has been  
12 generous enough to let me focus on this hearing today.

13 So no, I have not been involved with him on any  
14 discussions about a plan for Raqqa.

15 Chairman McCain: So, therefore, you would not have any  
16 estimate as to how long it would take before we could retake  
17 Mosul?

18 Mr. Fanning: No, Mr. Chairman, I do not.

19 Chairman McCain: In the defense bill we just passed,  
20 which I know you are very well aware of, it requires a  
21 reduction of headquarters staff by 25 percent, cost savings  
22 from overall administrative support by \$10 billion over a 5-  
23 year period.

24 Committee testimony, obviously, is that staffs are too  
25 large and redundant, some going so far to say that the

1 secretarial staff and the military staff should be  
2 consolidated into a single service staff.

3 First of all, what do you think about the reductions?  
4 Second of all, what do you think about such a fundamental  
5 change?

6 Mr. Fanning: I think first on the reductions, I have  
7 seen this now in all parts of the Department of Defense. I  
8 have been particularly impressed with how the Army went  
9 about it, because they really did try to delayer the  
10 organization, increase the span of control for supervisors.

11 I think this is something you never stop working on.  
12 Headquarters grow back, if you are not applying pressure in  
13 the opposite direction. So I think the 25 percent reduction  
14 was a good start. I would like to see how we rationalize  
15 that reduction where we go further.

16 As to the second part, the question about collapsing  
17 the staffs inside the military departments, I think there is  
18 a great deal of potential there. Fundamental guiding  
19 principles need to be, one, protecting civilian control of  
20 the military; but two, also making sure the Chiefs have the  
21 support and resources they need to give independent military  
22 advice.

23 But I think if we keep cutting the headquarters in the  
24 form that they currently exist in, we are just going to have  
25 weaker product delivered later. I think we need to have

1 some reform as the next round, and I think there is enormous  
2 potential there, not just in the military departments but  
3 between military departments and OSD, within OSD, and then  
4 further out in the headquarters in the field.

5 Chairman McCain: Well, I thank you for that. You are  
6 uniquely situated now to play a key role. I agree with you  
7 that just flat-out reductions are just the first steps. It  
8 is a little bit like sequestration in that it is a meat ax  
9 when we need a scalpel.

10 So I would look forward to having you play a role  
11 there, given your unique background.

12 Finally, a source of great frustration to this  
13 committee, all of us members, are continued cost overruns on  
14 weapons systems. We made some reforms. We are getting the  
15 service chiefs more involved, you are aware. But it still  
16 seems to go on. Every time we really need something, we use  
17 that expedited process, which we used for the MRAP and we  
18 used for others.

19 So I hope that you will make that one of your top  
20 priorities. We cannot justify eliminating sequestration and  
21 increasing defense spending, which the majority of members  
22 of this committee on both sides feel is necessary given the  
23 nature of the events in the world today, but it is hard for  
24 us to go back to our constituents when we have a \$2 billion  
25 cost overrun on an aircraft carrier. And numerous Army

1 programs that spent billions, and then never became  
2 realities, going all the way back to the future combat  
3 systems, to the presidential helicopter. You are very aware  
4 of them.

5 We have to stop it. If we are going to have  
6 credibility with the American people, we cannot have these  
7 horror stories. I am sure you appreciate it.

8 Mr. Fanning: I do. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9 If confirmed, one of the things I would want to do in  
10 the Army is initiate a rapid capabilities office like I  
11 worked with very closely in the Air Force. I found it to be  
12 a very effective way for large programs as well, the bombers  
13 inside the RCO, the Rapid Capabilities Office in the Air  
14 Force.

15 I think that the acquisition reforms in the NDAA will  
16 help with this as well. That is injecting the military  
17 departments, the Chiefs, in the requirements process,  
18 especially as it overlaps with the acquisition process, to  
19 help keep costs under control.

20 That is different than dumping requirements when you  
21 already have cost overruns because you cannot afford them.  
22 It is making wise decisions at the proper times, when you  
23 have more information to make those trade-offs.

24 So I look forward to implementing those reforms and  
25 think it will help us greatly field things faster and avoid

1 the cost overruns that we saw in the past.

2 Chairman McCain: Senator Reed?

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

4 Again, Mr. Fanning, thank you for your service to date  
5 and your willingness to continue to serve.

6 Given your perspectives in both the Navy and Air Force,  
7 can you just outline what you think are the most significant  
8 priorities you would bring to the Secretary of Army's  
9 Office?

10 Mr. Fanning: First, I think for the Army, readiness  
11 has to be the priority. It is what General Milley said is  
12 his priority, and I would agree with him, if confirmed, 100  
13 percent that we need to make sure the soldiers we are  
14 sending into harm's way, into combat, are ready, fully  
15 trained, fully equipped. So that would be the first  
16 priority.

17 The second, as a part of these efficiencies, is the end  
18 result has to be maximizing the combat power of the force  
19 structure that we have. So I think that is a continual  
20 culling process to make sure that you are looking across all  
21 of your force structure and keeping that tail-to-tooth ratio  
22 as strong in the tooth direction as you possibly can.

23 Third, something that I took very seriously and spent a  
24 lot of time on in the Air Force, is maximizing the idea of  
25 one Army, a total force, Active, Guard, and Reserve. We

1 talk a lot about the Army going from 490,000 to 450,000.  
2 That is just the Active component. We cannot do what we are  
3 asked to do, the Army cannot do what it is asked to do, if  
4 we just think in terms of an Active component. We have to  
5 think more creatively going forward about how we operate as  
6 a total force.

7 Then fourth, as I mentioned earlier, I would really  
8 want to focus on acquisition reform, specifically the  
9 standup of a rapid capabilities office. The Army has some  
10 capabilities where we are seeing, based on what is going on  
11 on the ground in Ukraine in Syria and so forth, that our  
12 overmatch is not as great as it should be, as it needs to  
13 be, particularly if we do not change course. I think  
14 specifically about position navigation and timing,  
15 electronic warfare and cyber, and then survivability of our  
16 platforms, particularly aviation. I see these as three  
17 great problem sets that we could launch in a new rapid  
18 capabilities office.

19 Senator Reed: As part of your development of a one  
20 Army concept, I would presume that you are going to take an  
21 active role in an engaging the TAGs?

22 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely. Already, I spent a lot of  
23 time with General Grass in both jobs. And whenever I travel  
24 to a State, I always ask if the TAG is available to meet. I  
25 took the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army out with me -- I



1 believe it was in December; it may have been in November --  
2 to me with all the TAGs when they were gathered in Colorado.

3 So I bring a number of relationships with me from the  
4 Air Force and plan on increasing that while in the Army,  
5 working very closely with the TAGs and the Council of  
6 Governors.

7 Senator Reed: One of the issues, and the chairman made  
8 reference to this quite explicitly, is the new legislation  
9 which he guided through last year with respect to the  
10 services' role in acquisition. I presume that would be one  
11 of your significant priorities in getting the Army fully  
12 engaged with their new responsibilities in acquisition.

13 Can you give us some perspective on that?

14 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely. There are many great  
15 dedicated professionals in OSD but my experience in having  
16 worked in all three military departments in OSD, even though  
17 we are in the same building, one of the reasons I prefer  
18 working in the military department is I feel those who do  
19 are much closer to the troops. I think that is very  
20 important in terms of setting monitoring requirements.

21 What I would say about these new reforms, and I do  
22 think putting more responsibility in the military department  
23 is the right direction to move, is it is easy for people to  
24 conflate the acquisition process and the requirements  
25 process. They are fundamentally linked. They overlap. But

1 where I think there is the most potential is that  
2 requirements process, getting the requirements right to  
3 start and then at various points in the acquisition process  
4 being able to make those trade-offs.

5 We learn more as we do, particularly if the technology  
6 is not mature. And a good program manager should have the  
7 opportunity to come back to the Chief of Staff, the service  
8 Secretary, and say, "I can get this to you a year faster, if  
9 you can cut 5 percent the requirement you thought you set.  
10 I can meet that requirement in a different way. I can save  
11 money if we do not chase this."

12 Also, that there are smart decisions rather than  
13 reactions to when all the green vectors have turned red.

14 Senator Reed: I think one of the other aspects that  
15 you suggest in your comments is holding those program  
16 officers accountable. One of the things I think we all  
17 noticed is that accountability has been so diffuse that  
18 these systems take on a life of their own and no one is  
19 really responsible, et cetera.

20 I would assume that in your development of the new  
21 approach that you would have accountability at the forefront  
22 in terms of the program managers and others that are under  
23 your command. Is that fair?

24 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely. One of the things that is  
25 most intriguing about these changes, it is hard to hold

1 program managers accountable now, based on the process, how  
2 long they serve, how long the process is. This gives us an  
3 opportunity to iterate through the process in ways where we  
4 can design more fundamentally transparent metrics that we  
5 can hold people accountable to.

6 Senator Reed: Thank you very much.

7 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8 Chairman McCain: Senator Ayotte?

9 Senator Ayotte: Thank you, Mr. Fanning. I want to  
10 thank you for your service, and it is great to have your mom  
11 here.

12 I wanted to ask you about the size of the Army and what  
13 your viewpoint is on that. As you know, we are drawing down  
14 the end-strength of the Army to 450,000 by 2018. As a  
15 result of that, we are actually seeing a huge number of  
16 involuntary separations of people who have served multiple  
17 deployments, who have served the country admirably, which,  
18 to me, to get a pink slip after you come home and served our  
19 country is pretty appalling.

20 But I want to ask you two questions.

21 Number one, do you think that we have the right size  
22 Army? And what about the reduction down to 450,000.

23 Then, secondly, when General Milley was before our  
24 committee in July, he said that only about 30 percent of our  
25 Army brigades are at acceptable levels of combat readiness,

1 and he noted that that number should be between 60 percent  
2 and 70 percent. So what do you view to be the biggest  
3 readiness problem? Has it improved since July? And where  
4 are we?

5 Mr. Fanning: I will start with readiness. It has not  
6 improved markedly since July. It is still about a third of  
7 our BCTs that are ready, that the Army would define as  
8 decisive action, ready for a big, large land fight that we  
9 might face against Russia, North Korea, or what have you.  
10 The Army has a plan, ways to get there, but there are many  
11 impediments in place.

12 The demand on the force the size that it is makes it  
13 difficult to keep it trained, to keep it going through those  
14 training rotations.

15 Senator Ayotte: When you shrink the Army, you get the  
16 dwell-to-deploy ratio that is very difficult to meet.

17 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely, because the demand is not  
18 shrinking at the same rate.

19 Senator Ayotte: So should we be pushing for more  
20 resources for a larger Army, given the threats that we face?  
21 Is that something that you would advocate for?

22 Mr. Fanning: I do worry about the size of the Army  
23 today. When we were directed to go down to 450,000 in the  
24 Active component by the QDR, General Odierno testified that  
25 this was with risk. I know he said this quite a bit. I was

1 sitting across the table in the Air Force seat. General  
2 Milley has recently testified that we can meet the combatant  
3 commanders' requirements at 450,000, but the risk is  
4 increasing. I do not see that vector changing.

5 Two years ago, when we targeted 450,000, we did not  
6 have ISIL, we did not have Russia as provocative as it is.  
7 So I am concerned. It is preventing us from doing a number  
8 of things we want to do to the Army to make it readier and  
9 to keep it whole.

10 By the way, I know that you directed the Chairman of  
11 the Joint Chiefs to do a force assessment on the Army  
12 specifically by the end of next month, which I think will be  
13 very telling.

14 Senator Ayotte: Yes. Good. I look forward to  
15 receiving that, especially as we look at this readiness  
16 issue, which is fundamental to the strength of our force and  
17 obviously how we treat our men and women in uniform. I  
18 think this needs to be a priority for you in this position.

19 I also wanted to follow up on an issue that we have  
20 seen in New Hampshire with our Guard, and that is military  
21 construction. In fact, in New Hampshire, the condition of  
22 our readiness centers in New Hampshire is unacceptable.  
23 According to the Army National Guard Readiness Center  
24 transformation master plan, if you look at where we are, we  
25 are ranked 51 out of 54 States and territories evaluated

1 nationwide with our infrastructure. In total, the New  
2 Hampshire Army National Guard, if you look at our readiness  
3 centers, all except one are rated poor or failing.

4 So in fact, if you look at our Manchester Readiness  
5 Center, it was constructed from 1938 to 1940. It does not  
6 comply with building codes, life, health, safety, or any  
7 antiterrorism force protection standards.

8 So I would ask you, in the upcoming budget request, I  
9 hope the Army does not continue to postpone its requests for  
10 funding for the New Hampshire Army National Guard vehicle  
11 maintenance shops in Hooksett and Rochester, as well as our  
12 readiness centers in Pembroke and Concord, because we are  
13 just in a very deplorable situation, if you think about our  
14 being 51 out of 54.

15 And I hope, if confirmed, that you will commit to  
16 examining the allocation of military construction dollars  
17 not only between the Active and Reserve component, but also  
18 the allocation among the State Army National Guards to  
19 ensure that the Army is prioritizing what our Guard needs as  
20 well. As we know, this is a total force situation. We  
21 could not have fought in Afghanistan, Iraq, or what we are  
22 doing against ISIS without the Guard.

23 Mr. Fanning: I absolutely will, and I think we need to  
24 take a fundamental look at the total number of dollars as  
25 well. This is a place where, across all the military

1 departments where I work, we take the greatest risks --  
2 milcon, facility sustainment -- to the point -- because that  
3 includes ranges, testing facilities -- that it has become in  
4 and of itself a readiness issue.

5 Senator Ayotte: Thank you very much.

6 Chairman McCain: Senator Manchin?

7 Senator Manchin: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

8 Thank you, Mr. Fanning, and your family and all the  
9 support you have.

10 You have quite a resume, sir, and all the experience  
11 you have, which I think would be a tremendous asset for the  
12 Army, and what you can bring to it, organizational skills.  
13 The thing I would like to ask and everybody is talking about  
14 is our force. And I agree with you. I am concerned as you  
15 are about reduction of forces.

16 Give me the ratio of forces versus contractors. If  
17 adjustments can be made, because I would tell you this,  
18 there is not a West Virginian I know that would not  
19 sacrifice so we have the military we have to defend our  
20 country. Not one. But they want to make sure we are using  
21 their money right. They do not think that we do it as  
22 efficiently as we could, as far as procurement. They  
23 believe that we are sometimes top-heavy, as far as  
24 contractors versus reduction in force. And every time  
25 somebody comes before us wanting more money, they tell us

1 how they reduced the forces. And when we check everything  
2 else, your command centers are high, all the administration  
3 is high, contractors are high. But the people that we  
4 actually want to do the fighting for us, they are the ones  
5 that are in critical need.

6 There has to be an adjustment. Give me your take on  
7 this.

8 Mr. Fanning: First, I would say that there are  
9 tremendous individuals and product that comes out of the  
10 contract workforces as an integral part of how we fight and  
11 how we mobilize, train, and equip.

12 That said, we lean on the contractor workforce to surge  
13 when we need to. I do not think we do a good enough job of  
14 then rationalizing and culling afterward. It is much like  
15 efficiencies. I think that the contractor workforce is  
16 something we need to be analyzing continually.

17 Senator Manchin: Can I interrupt you? I am so sorry,  
18 sir.

19 But being a former Governor, and there are a few of us  
20 here, we know that we were in charge. We were commanders in  
21 chief of our National Guard. It was our responsibility to  
22 do the things that needed to be done. And we had the  
23 support of the Governor and the Legislature. But we are the  
24 ones who led that charge.

25 With that being said, we think there is so much more



1 our Guard could be doing in the role that we are paying  
2 high-priced contractors to do. We just think it is  
3 ridiculous, the redundancy. We are paying contractors but  
4 we already have a Guard in waiting that is trained and ready  
5 to do the job and go to the frontline and do whatever.

6 We do not see that correlation or that commitment to  
7 using what resources we already have.

8 Mr. Fanning: I think certainly General Milley has  
9 talked about the total force and using the Guard more. If  
10 confirmed, as I said, that will be a priority of mine. I  
11 spent 2 years working that pretty hard in the Air Force.

12 Not only do we need to do it, as we draw down, it is  
13 the right thing to do to make sure that we are utilizing all  
14 the components properly.

15 We are in an interesting position now where we are  
16 almost due the national commission's report on the structure  
17 of the Army. I am optimistic we will get some interesting  
18 ideas out of that that will help push us forward in thinking  
19 more about total force and using the Guard more  
20 productively.

21 But going back to the contractor workforce, that is  
22 something that we need to rationalize all the time. When I  
23 was in the Navy Department, we started something called  
24 contractors court where every echelon has to justify its  
25 contracts to the next echelon up. It does an interesting

1 thing, because you would see each echelon cancel a certain  
2 percentage of the contracts because they knew they could not  
3 justify it to the boss. So by the time it got all the way  
4 up to the top of the pyramid, you had rationalized that  
5 pretty well.

6 We did it in the Air Force to great success. The Army  
7 has something similar. But if confirmed, it would be  
8 something that I personally would oversee.

9 Senator Manchin: Have you gotten a handle on how many  
10 contractors we actually have? I cannot get anybody to give  
11 me an accurate count.

12 Mr. Fanning: That is the first thing and the most  
13 difficult thing, to know how many contracts you have. And,  
14 of course, we contract for services, so we do not always  
15 know how many people are behind those contracts.

16 Senator Manchin: And the amount of money we are  
17 paying.

18 Mr. Fanning: It is amazingly difficult to figure out  
19 what that number is. It is very frustrating.

20 Senator Manchin: And as far as procurement, that seems  
21 to be your strong point. What would you do? I mean, the  
22 bottom line is, every time somebody asks you if we have  
23 enough money or enough in force, you always are going to say  
24 you need more.

25 But on the other hand, if you only have X amount to

1 work with, what can we do here that allows you to be more  
2 effective and to use that in a more prudent way? Can we  
3 untie your hands?

4 Mr. Fanning: In my experience, bureaucracies are  
5 additive, and processes are created to prevent the last bad  
6 thing from happening.

7 Senator Manchin: What would you change in procurement  
8 right now?

9 Mr. Fanning: I would give more flexibility to the  
10 program managers, those people who you are holding  
11 accountable, and then hold those people accountable. That  
12 includes whoever it is in the leadership positions, but then  
13 us inside of the organization so that we can develop --  
14 program managers spend the vast majority of their time  
15 putting briefing slides together and briefing people, as  
16 opposed to actually running their programs. We are not  
17 nearly as agile as an institution as our adversaries are  
18 now, or even private sector companies that do not want to  
19 work with us because of all the barriers we put up for them  
20 to do so.

21 So I would look for ways we can strip out some of these  
22 requirements that slow us down, allow us to be more agile,  
23 better tap into innovation, both in terms of technology but  
24 also processes, so we can iterate more rapidly than we are  
25 now.

1           Senator Manchin: Let me just say, my time is running  
2 out, but I think you are uniquely qualified, because you are  
3 seeing three branches of government. Very few people have  
4 come to this position having the background that you have  
5 had and the administrative skills that you have. I hope you  
6 put them to good use. And I hope we give you the ability to  
7 do that, sir. And I hope you use the forces that we have,  
8 make sure that our frontline forces are strong and we have  
9 the right number of people to do the job, and make sure that  
10 we do not have an abundance of contractors that we do not  
11 need, overpriced, using our Guard more effectively, and  
12 building the force that we need to protect our country. We  
13 will be behind you 1,000 percent.

14           Mr. Fanning: Thank you, Senator.

15           Senator Manchin: Thank you.

16           Chairman McCain: Senator Donnelly?

17           Senator Donnelly: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18           Thank you, Mr. Fanning, for your service and your  
19 continued willingness to serve.

20           I have a number of questions, so hopefully you can  
21 answer these succinctly. Yes or no will suffice on some of  
22 these.

23           You and I have talked a lot about what is going on with  
24 regard to Russia, the massive Russian buildup in the Arctic,  
25 as well as Russia's other numerous provocations over the

1 past few years.

2 As you know, Senator Dunford and General Milley  
3 testified that they saw Russia as the biggest threat to the  
4 U.S. Secretary Carter here also testified that he saw  
5 significant strategic importance to the Arctic and how we  
6 late to the game. Admiral Zukunft, the Coast Guard  
7 Commandant, said we are not even in the game relative to  
8 Russia's massive buildup in the Arctic.

9 Do you agree with that, what Secretary Carter and the  
10 Coast Guard admiral said?

11 Mr. Fanning: I do think that we are not nearly enough  
12 in the game in the Arctic as we should be.

13 Senator Donnelly: Admiral Harris testified here that  
14 he saw one of the greatest threats in the Pacific as North  
15 Korea. Do you agree with that?

16 Mr. Fanning: I do.

17 Senator Donnelly: We have been supportive in a  
18 bipartisan way of the President's rebalance or pivot to the  
19 Asia-Pacific. Are you supportive of that strategy?

20 Mr. Fanning: Yes.

21 Senator Donnelly: So as you know, last year, the Army  
22 decided to get rid of the 425 base, the Joint Base Elmendorf  
23 Richardson, 5,000 airborne infantry troops, strategic asset  
24 for the country, kick-in-the-door capability, 7 to 8 hours  
25 can be anywhere in the northern hemisphere given the

1 strategic lift that we also have at JBER.

2 To General Milley's credit, he has put this decision on  
3 hold, reevaluating it, thinking it may have been a strategic  
4 mistake.

5 Does the U.S. Army have any other airborne brigade that  
6 is trained, equipped, and ready to fight and win in subzero  
7 mountain climates like those in the Arctic or those in North  
8 Korea?

9 Mr. Fanning: No, not like those we have in Alaska.

10 Senator Donnelly: And the 425 is part of the strategic  
11 Reserve right now with regard to a contingency in Korea.  
12 General Scaparrotti called it the over the hill cavalry that  
13 could be there in 7 hours.

14 Do you think removing these forces emboldens the  
15 already unstable leader of North Korea or Putin, in terms of  
16 his buildup in the Arctic, when we are removing literally  
17 the only airborne BCT-trained soldiers in that part of the  
18 world?

19 Mr. Fanning: If confirmed, Senator, I would look for  
20 ways to reverse as many of the combat cuts that the Army  
21 made last year as possible, to include Alaska.

22 Senator Donnelly: Let me talk about, just very  
23 quickly, we have been supportive of the President's  
24 rebalance. As a matter fact, in the NDAA, we had language  
25 supporting it, talking about how we should not be cutting

1 forces in the Asia-Pacific.

2 How does cutting the only airborne brigade combat team  
3 in the Asia-Pacific support the President's rebalance to the  
4 Asia-Pacific?

5 Mr. Fanning: That is one element of the Army's  
6 rebalance to the Pacific. The Army created a four-star  
7 leader there and has increased the number of soldiers and  
8 civilians overall that are dedicated to the Pacific. I  
9 think the number is 77,000 to over 100,000 today since 2007.

10 Senator Donnelly: Let me just say if the Army retained  
11 the 425 at its full strength, as you and I have talked  
12 about, would it not send a strong message, a strategic  
13 message to North Korea, to Russia, and our allies about  
14 America's commitment to defend our strategic interests on  
15 the Korean Peninsula, in the Arctic, and support our allies?  
16 Do you think that would be a strong message?

17 Mr. Fanning: I think it would send a strong message.  
18 The Army last year had to balance the cuts that it needed to  
19 make across all of the requirements and priorities that it  
20 has.

21 Senator Donnelly: Let me get to the 450,000 number. I  
22 believe, and I think a lot of members of this committee  
23 think it is low. I think it is way too low, strategically  
24 risky for the country.

25 Do you agree with that?

1 Mr. Fanning: I do believe it is a risk, yes. That has  
2 been testified to by many others as well.

3 Senator Donnelly: To his credit, again -- and you  
4 already touched on it and I appreciate you mentioning it --  
5 General Milley is working hard to balance the tooth-to-tail  
6 ratio, as you said earlier, making sure we have much more in  
7 the teeth category than the tail.

8 Of the 450,000, how many currently have musician MOS?

9 Mr. Fanning: In the 450,000, I believe that number is  
10 about 1,500.

11 Senator Donnelly: How many prisoners are at Fort  
12 Leavenworth of the 450,000?

13 Mr. Fanning: Of the 450,000, 1,100 of them are counted  
14 as prisoners.

15 Senator Donnelly: How many soldiers of the 450,000 are  
16 right now out-processing?

17 Mr. Fanning: Combined total of just over 15,000.

18 Senator Donnelly: So when we talk about the 450,000,  
19 there are literally thousands, tens of thousands, who are  
20 not deployable, not capable of fighting. Correct?

21 Mr. Fanning: That is correct.

22 Senator Donnelly: Does it make sense that the Army is  
23 proposing cutting thousands of healthy, deployable airborne  
24 infantry soldiers to make room for tens of thousands of  
25 nondeployables and noneffective soldiers that are counted as



1 part of the 450,000?

2 Mr. Fanning: It would be nice not to count them  
3 against the 450,000. I do not think people realize what  
4 percentage of the 450,000 Active component is not deployable  
5 for reasons even greater than you have mentioned. They have  
6 medical profiles or for other legitimate reasons. They are  
7 part of the generating force. They are training now. They  
8 are already deployed.

9 So when we say we are heading toward a 450,000 Active  
10 component in the Army, that is not 450,000 people ready to  
11 be deployed.

12 Senator Donnelly: My time is expired here, but let me  
13 get one final commitment, Mr. Fanning. We have had a lot of  
14 discussions, but, if confirmed, I need your 110 percent  
15 commitment to ensure that the very last soldiers that we are  
16 cutting are the combat-effective, tip-of-the-spear,  
17 strategically located infantry soldiers who can fight  
18 tonight if they need to, as opposed to so many of the other  
19 soldiers that we are talking about.

20 In other words, that you and General Milley would  
21 commit to cut the trigger-pullers strategically located like  
22 the 425 absolutely, positively last relative to any other  
23 soldiers you are looking at cutting. Can I get that  
24 commitment from you?

25 Mr. Fanning: You absolutely have that commitment,

1 Senator.

2 Senator Donnelly: Thank you.

3 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4 Chairman McCain: Senator Sullivan?

5 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6 Mr. Fanning, thank you for being here. And to your  
7 mom, thank you. To the Kassir family, it is wonderful to  
8 have you here, your dear friends.

9 Mr. Fanning, one of the things that we have seen is  
10 again in the third quarter a big spike in suicides,  
11 especially among Guard members. What are your plans to  
12 improve mental health services and to make that number go  
13 down in the United States Army?

14 Mr. Fanning: We have seen a spike. With the sheer  
15 size of the Army, the number in absolute terms is large and  
16 it is too large. I think the Army has made some impressive  
17 progress, increasing access to health care by embedding it  
18 at the brigade level so that it is more readily accessible.

19 In terms of care across-the-board, sexual assault  
20 prevention, behavioral health, suicide, I think that is a  
21 key component of making access to care as easy as possible  
22 for our soldiers. So that is one thing.

23 But I think also a lot more work has to be done  
24 fighting the stigma against seeking behavioral health care.

25 Senator Sullivan: One of the other things that has

1 been done in the Israeli Defense Forces is they have pushed  
2 down to the platoon level that the soldier in charge keeps  
3 an eye out for the other members and reports, "Hey, Tim is  
4 getting a little sideways," or, "Cathy is getting a little  
5 sideways."

6 Are you looking at anyways to push the decisionmaking  
7 down a little bit lower as to enabling them to have the  
8 ability to say, look, maybe we need to help this person?

9 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely. I think we need to have it  
10 down as low as possible. The Army is actually already  
11 looking at this, from my understanding, and has a number of  
12 other programs like that. The senior master sergeant of the  
13 Army has started something called Not In My Squad to cover a  
14 whole range of issues. Part of that is training people to  
15 look for indicators that they should act on and report.

16 Senator Sullivan: It really helped reduced the numbers  
17 in the IDF.

18 Another area, you said before that the Army recognizes  
19 the tactical importance of the Humvee fleet and the enduring  
20 requirement to maintain a relevant and capable fleet. Do  
21 you expect the Army will continue to rely on a large Humvee  
22 fleet even after the JLTV has been fully fielded?

23 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely. As I recall, the ultimate  
24 end-state after they rationalize the requirements for the  
25 ground fleet was to maintain about 50,000 Humvees, which

1 also allows them to cull out the newest and best maintained  
2 of what they have. So it will end up being a relatively  
3 young and well-maintained fleet, and a sizable one still.

4 Senator Sullivan: Looking in the Middle East, one of  
5 the things that has struck me is we have seen refugees all  
6 throughout the world at the same time that we will not put  
7 in a no-fly zone or safe zone, right in the same country  
8 where those refugees are coming from.

9 Do you support putting in place a no-fly zone or a safe  
10 zone?

11 Mr. Fanning: I actually have not studied either of  
12 those proposals enough to give you an opinion on them. I am  
13 happy to come back and talk to you. I do think we have not  
14 done enough collectively to prevent the crisis and now deal  
15 with the crisis, which is unlike any refugee crisis that I  
16 have seen.

17 Senator Sullivan: Well, you are going to be working  
18 with the Department of defense, you are going to be working  
19 with the Secretary of Defense, and this is a critical issue  
20 to all of us. And we need you to provide the unvarnished  
21 truth of your opinion to him.

22 I am wondering if you are going to look into this and  
23 start to put this information together and come to some  
24 conclusions on this?

25 Mr. Fanning: I will, Senator. As you know, it is the

1 service Secretary's responsibility to make sure that we have  
2 the forces that are ready and trained for whatever they are  
3 asked to do, including if it is a no-fly zone or a safe  
4 zone.

5 Senator Sullivan: I do. But I am also hopeful that if  
6 Secretary Carter asks you, that you say: Look, here is why  
7 I think it makes sense, or why it does not make sense. Here  
8 is a mission that is critical and important to the success  
9 of our Nation's future and where this goes.

10 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely. I commit to you that I,  
11 certainly, will give my unvarnished opinion to Secretary  
12 Carter whenever asked.

13 Senator Sullivan: On occasion, if not asked, if you  
14 see something a little sideways, will you take him aside  
15 privately and say to him, "Look, here is my view of this"?

16 Mr. Fanning: Yes.

17 Senator Sullivan: Okay.

18 Mr. Fanning, you have served this Nation well and with  
19 distinction. We appreciate everything you have done for our  
20 country. Thank you for being here today.

21 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22 Mr. Fanning: Thank you, Senator.

23 Chairman McCain: Senator Fischer?

24 Senator Fischer: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25 Welcome, Mr. Fanning. I would like to begin by

1     thanking Senator Sullivan for bringing to your attention  
2     some questions and comments that he has about our concern  
3     that we have with Russia, especially in the Arctic. I think  
4     many times we do not focus on that because of the truly  
5     large challenges that we see all around this world. But I  
6     do appreciate his comments and I do share the concerns that  
7     he has about the 425. So I thank you for your commitments  
8     that you made to him.

9             I know one of your main challenges is going to be to  
10    balance that investment made against future threats  
11    alongside the demands that we now face with readiness and  
12    modernization and force structure. You have said that your  
13    top priority is readiness. You noted to me when we met last  
14    month the need for more investment in facility sustainment.

15            How do you plan to prioritize all those remaining  
16    demands, if we are going to be able to address needs in the  
17    future and be able to balance those? I want to see what  
18    your thought process is on that.

19            Mr. Fanning: Sure, Senator. I think we take risks in  
20    all parts of our budget right now. What I look at, having  
21    seen this happen incrementally, and part of it is just the  
22    uncertain fiscal environment that we have been planning in,  
23    is looking -- sometimes we lose sight of the aggregate  
24    risks. That is really what I am trying to get at now and,  
25    if confirmed, would do so in the Army.

1           One of those places that is not unique to the Army,  
2 where we have taken an aggregate risk that I think a lot of  
3 people have not fully realized yet is in milcon and facility  
4 sustainment.

5           So it really is becoming, in my view, a fundamental  
6 readiness issue for all of the services. As I said earlier,  
7 ranges are a part of that. We need to make sure that we are  
8 not mortgaging our future with the decisions we are making  
9 now.

10           But all that means is we would be moving risk to  
11 another part of the budget. But we have taken year after  
12 year after year of layered risk in facility sustainment, and  
13 it concerns me greatly.

14           The first visit I made in the Army was to Fort Bragg.  
15 That is a critical, very busy base. And from the minute  
16 that I landed, I could tell that this base looks tired. So  
17 we have to look into that very seriously.

18           Senator Fischer: As members of this committee, we are  
19 hearing a number of predictions and ideas about what the  
20 future is going to look like. Do you see any kind of major  
21 shift on the horizon for the Army, and what the Army will  
22 do, how it will operate, what it will need in the future?

23           Mr. Fanning: Secretary Gates always said, "We have a  
24 perfect record of predicting the future. We get it wrong  
25 every time." I think he was talking about the future kind

1 of war we will have.

2 What I try to do, and, if confirmed, will try to do in  
3 the Army, is less predict what that future is than take  
4 advantage of some of the reforms we are talking about to  
5 make the Army more agile at getting new capabilities out to  
6 the field. I think we are losing the competitive edge we  
7 have at iterating against our adversaries, either in how to  
8 use technology, which is a big part of it -- we have to  
9 empower soldiers in the field with the tools that we already  
10 have, and how to use them differently -- but how to  
11 incorporate new ideas and new technology faster into what we  
12 do produce and what we do field.

13 Senator Fischer: Are there resources or specific  
14 equipment that the Army now has that you believe is outdated  
15 and should be replaced? Do you have a list of what needs to  
16 be ended in order to move forward in the future for what you  
17 are really going to need?

18 Mr. Fanning: I do not know, in the current state,  
19 there are a lot of things that I say we could end, because  
20 we are reliant on them all. A lot of the platforms are old  
21 but have lots of new technology and capability on them.

22 I think of three phases to procurement, which is  
23 modernizing what you have now, recapitalizing the next  
24 generation, and then your science and technology to keep  
25 investing in what comes after that.



1           The Army, last year, before I went over as acting  
2 Under, just because of the budget pressures, decided to  
3 invest more in modernizing the platforms they have and  
4 keeping the science and technology for the long-term  
5 investment going, and taking risks in developing the next  
6 generation platforms.

7           That is a concern to me. If confirmed, that is an area  
8 I would be looking at very closely. Where have we taken too  
9 much risk in platforms that we are going to try to hold on  
10 too long?

11           Senator Fischer: Thank you.

12           Chairman McCain: Senator King?

13           Senator King: Mr. Fanning, I, certainly, appreciate  
14 you being here today. I have to say you are one of the most  
15 refreshingly candid witnesses I can recall being before this  
16 committee. I want to join Senator Donnelly and really  
17 encourage you to carry that quality into your work. You  
18 have a great deal of experience, a great deal of knowledge,  
19 and, I have learned today, a great deal of wisdom on these  
20 issues. Share it. Do not be hesitant, even if it might  
21 cause some friction. That is your value to the United  
22 States.

23           I hope you will maximize the input that you have,  
24 because I believe you have a lot to contribute.

25           Mr. Fanning: Thank you.

1           Senator King: There has been a theme in our  
2 discussions today, and what bothers me is that what we are  
3 talking about is turning one of those expensive aircraft  
4 carriers. And we make strategic decisions that have long-  
5 term implications and even long-term implementation based  
6 upon assumptions that turn out to not be very good.

7           I was in Iceland recently. And if there is a strategic  
8 spot on this planet, it is Iceland in the North Atlantic.  
9 Yet because we thought the Cold War was over, we closed the  
10 airbase at Keflavik. I think that was a tremendous  
11 strategic mistake in retrospect, because the world has  
12 changed and now suddenly we are in competition with Russia  
13 again, and I use the word "competition" advisedly.

14           The Army size that we have been talking about today,  
15 the assumptions upon which that decision was made were valid  
16 when they were made, but they are no longer valid. I share  
17 my colleagues' concern that we are facing a new round of  
18 challenges around the world and we really have to revisit  
19 that decision.

20           I am not so convinced as some of my colleagues about  
21 the danger of contractors. Because of the cost of training  
22 and high level of training that our Army and our tooth, if  
23 you will, we ought to be using contractors for everything  
24 but fighting. We should not have somebody who costs \$1  
25 million or \$500,000 to train to do work that contractors can

1 do. So I think that is something that has to be constantly  
2 evaluated.

3 Do you agree with that assessment?

4 Mr. Fanning: I do. I think the contract workforce is  
5 an important, integral part of the workforce, the civilian  
6 workforce and the uniformed workforce. The challenge is  
7 getting the balance right. In my view, the contract  
8 workforce provides invaluable services to the Department of  
9 Defense and is a place you can go to when you need to surge.

10 Senator King: And it makes sense to do that rather  
11 than use trained Army personnel, our uniformed force, to do  
12 things that are not warfare.

13 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely. The challenge is, and it is  
14 something that we have to keep on all the time, making sure  
15 we have those three components properly balanced.

16 The one that grows the fastest if not properly overseen  
17 can be the contractor workforce because of how many  
18 different ways it can grow.

19 Senator King: That is a management challenge.

20 Mr. Fanning: It is a management challenge. But I  
21 would never suggest, and I hope that I have not, that they  
22 are not a very valued and important part of how we get  
23 things done. Some things are best done in the contract  
24 workforce because it is an expertise that you do not need  
25 organically and want to pay for, or it is a surge

1 capability. Some things you want in your civilian  
2 workforce, and others you want a uniformed person to do.

3 Senator King: I do think that we need to talk about  
4 the Army, the end-strength, and have a review of that. I  
5 hope that is something that you will initiate.

6 The third area where we are talking about having made  
7 strategic decisions that now appear imprudent because of  
8 changed assumptions is the Arctic, as Senator Sullivan has  
9 emphasized. Huge activity by the Russians, in terms of  
10 their military buildup, and the idea of depopulating or  
11 diminishing our force availability in that region seems to  
12 me, given again changed assumptions -- it may have made good  
13 sense 2 years, 5 years ago. I am not sure it makes sense  
14 today.

15 We have to continue to reassess these decisions and be  
16 flexible in responding to the current realities.

17 The final one that the chairman talked about is  
18 Afghanistan. We have to assess what is going on on the  
19 ground as opposed to saying we are going to make certain  
20 decisions based upon the calendar or 2-year-old assumptions.

21 I think all of those are examples of this importance of  
22 flexibility and constant reassessment of what the realities  
23 on the ground are.

24 Do you share that sort of overall concern?

25 Mr. Fanning: Absolutely, Senator. We like to say we

1 are a learning organization. That does not mean much if we  
2 are not willing to make changes based on what we have  
3 learned.

4 In regard to the Arctic and Alaska, in particular, when  
5 I became acting Secretary of the Air Force about 2 years  
6 ago, one of the first things I did was reverse an Air Force  
7 decision to move a squadron of aggressors, fighter jets, out  
8 of Alaska because of the strategic importance there, because  
9 of the range space we had there, because of the proximity  
10 not just to adversaries or potential adversaries in the  
11 Pacific, but the proximity to our partners in terms of  
12 training and so forth.

13 So I have had a particular interest in that region for  
14 a long time.

15 Senator King: Finally, I noted in your testimony  
16 several times you used the words "agile" and "mobile." You  
17 remind me of my high school football coach used to say he  
18 wanted us to be agile, mobile, and hostile.

19 [Laughter.]

20 Senator King: I appreciate your testimony, Mr.  
21 Fanning, and I appreciate your service to this country.  
22 Thank you.

23 Mr. Fanning: Thank you, Senator.

24 Chairman McCain: That is no longer possible for the  
25 Senator.

1 Senator Ernst?

2 Senator Ernst: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3 Thank you, Mr. Fanning, for being here today and for  
4 your service in so many different capacities throughout our  
5 various departments.

6 I want to thank your mother for joining us today as  
7 well today. Thank you, Cathy, for being here.

8 As you know, Mr. Fanning, last month, Secretary Carter  
9 announced that all military occupational specialties will be  
10 open to women. I do support providing women with various  
11 opportunities to serve in any capacity as long as we are not  
12 lowering standards to allow participation, and that we are  
13 not decreasing our combat effectiveness.

14 So in order to ensure that women are fully integrated  
15 into these previously closed positions, I believe the  
16 implementation strategy must be thoroughly and fully  
17 developed to include having an understanding of those  
18 secondary and tertiary effects, so that we are not setting  
19 our women or our men up for failure.

20 Over the past few weeks, I have had the opportunity to  
21 visit with a number of soldiers and Marines. I visited Fort  
22 Bragg, North Carolina, as well as Marine Base Quantico in  
23 Virginia. During my trip to Fort Bragg, I was able to sit  
24 down with the number of special operators and airborne  
25 paratroopers from the 82nd to discuss the gender

1 integration. I did the same at Quantico.

2 Both of these groups were mostly senior-level NCOs,  
3 more junior noncommissioned officers, and, of course, some  
4 junior officers, both men and women. We really talked about  
5 gender integration.

6 Have you had the opportunity to go out and talk through  
7 gender integration with soldiers? Are you committed to  
8 doing that, if you have not?

9 Mr. Fanning: I have. I have been to Fort Benning,  
10 Fort Bragg, Fort Hood. I spent a lot of time at Benning, in  
11 particular, discussing this issue down at the Ranger school.

12 If confirmed, it would be a dialogue I would continue  
13 to have because I share your view that we need to get this  
14 right. It is critical that we get this right.

15 Senator Ernst: Absolutely. And I think we have to,  
16 again, make sure that we are planning wisely and that we are  
17 understanding what any follow-on effects will be, whether it  
18 is positive or whether it is negative as well.

19 One of the top concerns that I heard about the  
20 implementation is that it should not be done haphazardly.  
21 We have seen this recently with short turns of getting plans  
22 turned in, and short turnarounds for implementation. I am  
23 directing those comments at the Marines.

24 But we want to make sure that the Army does it right.  
25 We want to make sure that everybody does it right. Do you

1 think that having such a quick turnaround of 15 days for a  
2 plan, to work that out, do you think that is enough time to  
3 get it right.

4 Mr. Fanning: I have not seen the Marine Corps plan or  
5 any guidance they have been given. I will say that I think  
6 getting this right means doing it methodically and  
7 deliberately, in however much time it takes to get it right.

8 The Army plan, as I saw it before I left, is just that.  
9 It is a long-term plan that I think is carefully thought  
10 through, starting with validated requirements for  
11 infantrymen, for example. What requirements do you need to  
12 meet to do a job of an infantryman? If you can meet the  
13 requirements, then we start from there.

14 But I do not believe, in the Army plan -- and all the  
15 plans are with the Secretary of Defense for review -- you  
16 are going to see anything that looks like a rush to  
17 judgment.

18 Senator Ernst: I am very hopeful of that.

19 Mr. Fanning: That would set us back, set back  
20 opportunities for women and take us more time, in the end.

21 Senator Ernst: Yes. I agree with that. We do have to  
22 be very methodical and talk about the implications of the  
23 standards and what that might do to orders of merit lists  
24 and promotion opportunities. Are we setting our women back  
25 or moving them forward? We do not know what those



1 implications are yet.

2 So I appreciate your thoughtful approach to that.

3 Also, do you believe that women, now that we have  
4 opened up those areas of combat, do you believe that women  
5 should be required to register for the selective service?

6 Mr. Fanning: Senator, I think that is something the  
7 administration has taken up and is looking for a  
8 recommendation from Secretary Carter. I cannot get out in  
9 front of him.

10 I would say, if we are focused on equal opportunity, I  
11 think a part of that is equal responsibility.

12 Senator Ernst: Thank you. I do appreciate your  
13 thoughtful manner as we work with our soldiers in the Army.

14 I also want to echo -- I know Senator Sullivan had  
15 spoken earlier about the 425. We want to make sure that we  
16 are protecting our assets in the Pacific Northwest. That is  
17 of great concern. Many of us have talked that through. So  
18 I would appreciate your consideration with that as well.

19 Thank you, Ranking Member Reed.

20 And thank you, Mr. Fanning.

21 Senator Reed: [Presiding.] Thank you, Senator.

22 On behalf of Chairman McCain, let me recognize Senator  
23 Heinrich.

24 Senator Heinrich: I want to thank the ranking member.

25 And thank you, Mr. Fanning. Welcome back. And I want

1 to say, I really appreciate your willingness to serve. You  
2 have served this country in many different roles. In  
3 particular, I want to thank you for the work that we did  
4 together on operationally responsive space.

5 Senator King was talking about the ability to  
6 reevaluate information and change directions. That is a  
7 skill that is often lost on people in this town. I think  
8 you have it, and I appreciate that very deeply.

9 In last year's NDAA, this committee expressed its  
10 concern about the lack of investment and sustainment of  
11 major range and test facility bases. The committee noted  
12 that some test ranges, and I know I have mentioned the White  
13 Sands Missile Range but there are others, have not received  
14 a milcon project in direct support of tests and evaluation  
15 in over a decade now.

16 The committee, therefore, urged the department to  
17 complete its comprehensive assessment of test range only  
18 milcon needs and investments.

19 I wanted to ask you if you know what the status of this  
20 comprehensive assessment is at this time.

21 Mr. Fanning: If I understand correctly, I think the  
22 draft assessment is done and it is now in coordination. I  
23 have not seen anything yet.

24 But I share your concern on that. I saw it acutely in  
25 the Air Force. That is why I mentioned it as readiness

1 issue. Not investing in the ranges and testing facilities  
2 means that we cannot replicate real-world scenarios.  
3 Ineffective training, ineffective testing, does not tell us  
4 much.

5 Senator Heinrich: Do you have thoughts on what metrics  
6 you will use, if confirmed, to assess the quality and  
7 capability of the Army's test and evaluation infrastructure,  
8 in particular?

9 Mr. Fanning: I think two fundamental metrics -- first,  
10 I would probably start with the end user to see what they  
11 got from the range, what they did not get from the range or  
12 the facility.

13 But I think, if we are focused on investments in the  
14 facilities, a series of metrics would be how often the  
15 facilities are actually available when we need them to be.

16 Senator Heinrich: Switching gears a little bit, Mr.  
17 Fanning, morale, welfare, and recreation programs are a key  
18 component to soldier retention and quality-of-life. As you  
19 noted in your advanced policy questions, it is important to  
20 continue providing high-quality MWR programs and to sustain  
21 them for the future. I would say that is even more acutely  
22 important in remote and isolated installations.

23 If confirmed, how do you intend to address those  
24 challenges in sustaining Army MWR programs, particularly  
25 given the current fiscal environment, and, in particular, at

1 those remote and isolated installations?

2 Mr. Fanning: I share your commitment to the remote and  
3 isolated installations and facilities. I think one of the  
4 most important things to do with MWR is to constantly assess  
5 what is of value to the soldiers and their families. We lay  
6 on a lot of programs, and we do not ever rationalize them  
7 and pull money out of ones that are not effective to put  
8 back into ones that are. And people cannot access them,  
9 because we are not investing enough.

10 And be on the lookout for how things evolve, how  
11 families are evolving, how needs are evolving, to look for  
12 new ways that we can provide services in that area.

13 Senator Heinrich: I think that is particularly  
14 important, because those needs change, and we need to meet  
15 people where they are, especially if we are going to  
16 continue to be able to have the kind of people that we want  
17 serving at those remote and isolated installations.

18 As a former engineer, I was pleased to see your  
19 commitment to expanding, in particular, outreach programs  
20 that foster STEM professionals. We really need to make sure  
21 that we are getting the best and brightest within the Army  
22 and all the services, with regard to the next generation of  
23 scientists and engineers.

24 Can you talk a little bit about how you are going to  
25 approach that issue at the Army, in particular, and how we

1 make sure that we have a constant structure in place to  
2 engage those scientists and engineers early so that we can  
3 get them into the services and doing that kind of work?

4 Mr. Fanning: First, I would say that I think we need  
5 to start by explaining what the civilian workforce is and  
6 what it is not. It gets kind of bandied about in the  
7 political process. I think a lot of people assume it is  
8 just a large collection of bureaucrats.

9 Our engineers and scientists are national treasures. I  
10 think that hit me the most, and probably a lot of other  
11 people, a few years back when we were furloughing civilians  
12 -- what was happening to our laboratories, what was  
13 happening to our test ranges. Now these are people who can  
14 make a lot more money doing things outside of government,  
15 but who are committed to the mission.

16 So I think that is where we can do the most in  
17 capturing people earlier, which is finding ways to expose  
18 them to the mission and the problem sets that we are on and  
19 get them excited about that.

20 But these workforces, as we decrease the civilian  
21 workforce, increase the civilian workforce, convert from  
22 contractor to civilian, we need to make sure that we are  
23 keeping this talent organically that is very hard to recruit  
24 and very hard to replace if we lose it.

25 Senator Heinrich: Thank you very much.

1 Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Senator Heinrich.

2 I have been informed that my colleagues might return  
3 from the vote, Mr. Secretary, which gives me the great  
4 opportunity to initiate a second round.

5 Let me ask, you bring to this job extraordinary  
6 experience in management in the Department of Defense, in  
7 both the Department of Navy and Department of Air Force.  
8 One of the persistent criticisms of the Defense Department  
9 is that it has not been able to successfully pass an audit.

10 Can you give us some insight as to how you in the Army,  
11 but hopefully the Department of Defense across-the-board,  
12 can get DOD on the track to a successful audit?

13 Mr. Fanning: I think, first of all, for success to  
14 take place in this area, it needs constant senior  
15 leadership. We got a tremendous shot in the arm from  
16 Secretary Panetta, who understood this better, probably,  
17 than most. So that is the first thing. It is just a  
18 commitment, if confirmed, that I will make to this process.

19 I think in regard to the Army, there are probably two  
20 things. I have seen it now in each of the military  
21 departments, and it is different in each service, what the  
22 strengths and weaknesses are, and what the ways forward are.  
23 I have long been a proponent of learning from doing. We had  
24 gotten to a point across all of the military services, I  
25 think, where we had prepped enough and it was time to start

1 testing what we had done. We are actually learning a lot  
2 from that. In 2014, just now 2015, the Army had an auditor  
3 that put down its pen, so we did not complete the audit.  
4 The Army did not complete the audit or get a favorable  
5 opinion at the end. But we are learning two things. We are  
6 not only learning where we have weaknesses that we need to  
7 put more emphasis. We are learning where we have made  
8 enough improvements that we can pull resources off of that,  
9 so finding the resources to put in the areas where we have  
10 problems.

11 So in the Army, the first thing is creating a series of  
12 work schedules based on those problems and sticking to it  
13 and holding people accountable.

14 The second, and this applies to all the military  
15 departments, but maybe even more so to the Army, the Army is  
16 fortunate in that some of its ERP systems are actually more  
17 robust and are fielded, and is making sure that you shut  
18 down the legacy systems when you are supposed to, because  
19 those legacy systems are not audit-compliant. So you need  
20 to force the service, the workforce, into the new systems  
21 that are compliant.

22 So those would be the two areas I think I would  
23 probably focus on the most.

24 Senator Reed: Thank you very much, Mr. Secretary.

25 I notice that my colleague, Senator Graham, has

1 arrived. Let me forgo further questioning in the second  
2 round so that he may have a first opportunity.

3 Senator Graham?

4 Senator Graham: Thank you, Senator Reed. Thank you  
5 very much.

6 Have you been following the media reports that there  
7 may be consideration at the Pentagon to take a star away  
8 from General Petraeus?

9 Mr. Fanning: I have.

10 Senator Graham: What is your view of that?

11 Mr. Fanning: I shared Secretary McHugh's view that no  
12 further action was necessary regarding General Petraeus. I  
13 was his acting Under when he was the Secretary of the Army.

14 Senator Graham: I just want to say for the record,  
15 Senator Reed, that I hope there is bipartisanship for this  
16 approach.

17 Number one, that is a great answer. I think General  
18 Petraeus, like everyone else who has been fighting this war,  
19 only God knows how many years he was deployed since 9/11.  
20 He made a mistake. He took responsibility for it. His  
21 military record I think stands as one of the greatest in  
22 recent memory. And I would just urge the Secretary of  
23 Defense to follow your recommendation and not go down this  
24 path.

25 As to the Army itself, I know you have been asked force



1 structure. What does it mean to have 490,000 members of the  
2 Army versus 420,000, in terms of things you can do? What is  
3 the difference? I know you have 70,000 more people, but  
4 what does it mean in terms of engagement?

5 Mr. Fanning: I think when you look at 490,000 down to  
6 450,000 in the current construct, down to 420,000 as a  
7 possible number in sequestration, General Odierno testified  
8 when the Army was first targeted on the 450,000 number that  
9 there would be great risk. General Milley has testified the  
10 same thing. The risk has increased. The number has not  
11 changed for our end-strength, but the risk has increased.

12 Going down to 420,000 in a sequester environment I  
13 think would require a whole new set of assumptions and  
14 guidance on what the Army is supposed to do and what its  
15 priorities should be.

16 Everyone has testified, and I will do it here today,  
17 that we could not do even as a total force, not just the  
18 Active component, what we are being asked to do if we went  
19 down to what sequestration would force us to do.

20 Senator Graham: President Obama in the State of the  
21 Union address called for the Congress to give him an  
22 authorization to use military force against ISIL. I think  
23 that is an absolutely reasonable request. Do you agree that  
24 it would be good, if Congress would do it?

25 Mr. Fanning: I do.

1           Senator Graham: You are about to Secretary of the  
2 Army. I think you are well-qualified.

3           From an Army perspective, would you like to see  
4 limitations on time when it comes to fighting ISIL?

5           Mr. Fanning: I think my preference would be not to  
6 have a limitation.

7           Senator Graham: Okay, I think that makes perfect  
8 sense. If I am in the Army, I do not want to tell the  
9 enemy, after 3 years, we are going to have to stop and start  
10 all over again.

11           So one, that makes sense to me that from an Army  
12 perspective, I think from a national perspective, we should  
13 not have a limitation on time.

14           What about geography? Should we limit it to geography?

15           Mr. Fanning: I think we should fight them wherever  
16 they are.

17           Senator Graham: They are in Afghanistan today. I want  
18 to applaud the administration for allowing our military to  
19 go after ISIL as if they were al Qaeda. I think that is a  
20 responsible deal.

21           Means. Are there any means you want to take off the  
22 table?

23           Mr. Fanning: No.

24           Senator Graham: Thank you. I look forward to voting  
25 for you as Secretary of the Army.

1           Mr. Fanning: Thank you, Senator.

2           Senator Reed: I do not think I can top that so let me  
3 just say the staff has indicated that there are no more of  
4 my colleagues that are returning.

5           Let me thank you, Mr. Fanning, for your service to the  
6 Nation.

7           On behalf of Chairman McCain, the hearing is adjourned.

8           [Whereupon, at 10:54 a.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25