

Stenographic Transcript
Before the

Subcommittee on
Readiness and Management Support

COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES

UNITED STATES SENATE

HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON
U.S. POLICY AND POSTURE IN SUPPORT OF ARCTIC
READINESS

Tuesday, March 3, 2020

Washington, D.C.

ALDERSON COURT REPORTING
1111 14TH STREET NW
SUITE 1050
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
(202) 289-2260
www.aldersonreporting.com

1 HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON
2 U.S. POLICY AND POSTURE IN SUPPORT OF ARCTIC READINESS

3
4 Tuesday, March 3, 2020

5
6 U.S. Senate
7 Subcommittee on Readiness and
8 Management Support
9 Committee on Armed Services
10 Washington, D.C.

11
12 The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 2:29 p.m.,
13 in Room SR-232A, Russell Senate Office Building, Hon. Dan
14 Sullivan, chairman of the subcommittee, presiding.

15 Members Present: Senators Sullivan [presiding],
16 Fischer, Ernst, Kaine, Shaheen, and King.

1 OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. DAN SULLIVAN, U.S. SENATOR
2 FROM ALASKA

3 Senator Sullivan: The hearing on the Subcommittee on
4 Readiness and Management Support will come to order.

5 The subcommittee meets today to hear testimony on U.S.
6 policy and posture in support of Arctic readiness, which is
7 a key topic.

8 We are pleased to have Under Secretary James Anderson
9 here from the Department of Defense and the NORTHCOM
10 Commander, General O'Shaughnessy.

11 This hearing is a long time coming. Five years ago
12 today, to the day, I asked Secretary of Defense Ash Carter
13 and then-Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, General
14 Martin Dempsey, about the previous administration's 2013 DOD
15 Arctic Strategy. Some of my colleagues will remember this
16 so-called strategy. It was 13 pages, half of which were
17 pictures, talked a lot about the environment, and it
18 mentioned Russia once, in a footnote. Not very much of a
19 DOD strategy. But, to his credit, during the hearing,
20 Secretary Carter stated, "The Arctic is going to be an area
21 of growing strategic importance." General Dempsey then
22 added that, "The Russians have just taken a decision to
23 activate six new brigades in the Arctic" -- four of them
24 were stationed there -- "and to develop a new Arctic
25 Command."

1 A lot has happened in the ensuing 5 years, but I
2 actually think we've come a long way on some important
3 issues. There is a lot at stake in America's Arctic, which
4 is also home to my State, the great State of Alaska. From
5 resource development and transportation routes, which are
6 opening up due to receding sea ice, to the region's
7 strategic location, keeping the environment protected, to
8 the Arctic's cold-weather hardened but very warmhearted
9 people, my constituents, some of America's most patriotic
10 citizens, the Arctic is growing in its global importance.

11 Since this day 5 years ago, and under the leadership of
12 my friend and mentor, Senator McCain -- the late Senator
13 McCain -- and now under Chairman Inhofe, Congress has
14 mandated two updates to the original DOD Arctic Strategy.
15 They are much more significant and serious documents. The
16 full Armed Services Committee has included over two dozen
17 Arctic-related provisions in the NDAA's in the last several
18 years, including, importantly, authorizing six polar
19 security cutters for the Coast Guard, creating the need for
20 a strategic Arctic port in the region, and requiring each
21 service to detail how they're implementing the 2019 DOD
22 Arctic Strategy.

23 In that same time, however, we've seen Russia's push
24 all-in on controlling the Arctic. Russia has opened 16
25 deepwater ports, 14 airfields, built Arctic military bases,

1 and even formed a new Northern Command. In fact, Vladimir
2 Putin has referred to the Northern Sea Route as the New Suez
3 Canal and has made major military investments to ensure this
4 route for Russia, and his government has even threatened to
5 sink foreign vessels that do not have a Russian pilot on
6 board or a Russian escort. The Russians also have built,
7 now, 54 icebreakers, many of which are weaponized, some of
8 which are nuclear. The United States, for our part, has
9 two, and one is broken.

10 Secretary of State Pompeo, in a speech before the
11 Arctic nations in Finland, stated, "These Russian
12 provocative actions are part of a pattern of aggressive
13 behavior in the Arctic."

14 Meanwhile, China has added themselves as a wannabe
15 player in the Arctic, as well. Currently, China has two
16 medium icebreakers. And, this December, they released plans
17 to build their first heavy-class icebreaker. In early 2018,
18 China released its own Arctic strategy -- the "Polar Silk
19 Road," it was entitled -- in which they describe themselves
20 a, quote, "near-Arctic state." They created this made-up
21 designation in spite of the fact that China is 900 miles
22 away from the Arctic Circle. As Secretary Pompeo stated in
23 his speech in Finland, "There are only Arctic states and
24 non-Arctic states. No third category exists. And claiming
25 otherwise entitles China to exactly nothing. In case our

1 Chinese Communist Party individuals who are watching, on
2 behalf of the U.S. and Alaska and other Arctic nations, let
3 me be clear on one thing. There is no such thing as a near-
4 Arctic state." And that's not going to -- and I just want
5 to repeat that again. No such thing.

6 Let me be clear about another thing, as well. Great-
7 power competition is outlined in our Nation's National
8 Security and National Defense Strategy, strategies that have
9 strong bipartisan support in the Senate. That great-power
10 competition is coming to the Arctic. Congress, in a
11 bipartisan way, understands this. Secretary Pompeo
12 certainly does. The media, as evidenced by headlines that I
13 will introduce for the record, over the last year on the
14 growing rivalry in the Arctic -- and I'm going to submit
15 this for the record, all these headlines, without objection
16 -- also is understanding this.

17 [The information referred to follows:]

18 [SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Sullivan: However, the one entity in
2 Washington, D.C., that has been slow to recognize the
3 challenges and threat in the Arctic is actually the
4 Department of Defense. So, today we are holding this
5 hearing focused on readiness in this important region of
6 America and our military's readiness to respond. Simply
7 put, we are not fully ready at all to conduct great-power
8 competition in the Arctic or other cold-weather
9 environments, like those found in most of the countries
10 where the National Security Strategy and National Defense
11 Strategy recognize there is going to be near-peer
12 competition, like Russia and China and also North Korea.
13 We're improving, but we've got a long way to go.

14 I want to thank both our witnesses again -- Secretary
15 Anderson, General O'Shaughnessy -- for being here today to
16 participate in this hearing.

17 I especially want to thank General O'Shaughnessy for
18 his steadfast leadership, advocacy on Arctic issues. He
19 certainly is not one of the people in the Department that
20 needs to be reminded of the importance of the Arctic. I
21 also want to thank General O'Shaughnessy for his decades of
22 exceptional service to our Nation. Your great service is
23 going to be missed, sir, and we thank you
24 so much for everything that you've done for our Nation.

25 With that, I'd like to turn it over to my friend and

1 colleague, Senator Kaine.

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 HON. TIM KAINE, U.S. SENATOR FROM
2 VIRGINIA

3 Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 And welcome, to the witnesses.

5 I'm very glad we're having this hearing. This is the
6 first hearing this year of the Readiness Subcommittee.
7 We'll be busy in the next couple of months. I had the
8 opportunity, over the last recess, to visit the shipyard in
9 Pearl Harbor. And, you know, so whether it's the Shipyard
10 Industrial Optimization Plan, whether it's workforce
11 training, I mean, these are the kinds of issues that we
12 grapple with, and I'm really glad that Senator Sullivan has
13 pulled this hearing together today, because I know many of
14 the committee members -- I know Senator King has done a lot
15 of work on Arctic issues. I haven't. So, I'm looking
16 forward to really climbing the learning curve.

17 When Secretary Seward helped purchase the Arctic from
18 Russia during the Lincoln administration, they called it
19 Seward's Folly. And it wasn't too long after that that they
20 realized what a genius move it was. And I think we're
21 realizing, every day, more reasons that it was a genius
22 move, and certainly the melting of the Arctic and the open
23 sea lanes is turning it into an area where -- thank God
24 we're an Arctic nation, but it only is a genius move if we
25 take advantage of it.

1 I was at Elmendorf Air Force Base in April with a CODEL
2 on our way to Korea and North Vietnam -- or Vietnam -- and
3 we had a lengthy discussion. They were really making the
4 case for Arctic investments. I'm not going to talk about
5 one of my pet issues today, just because it's probably not
6 that productive, and that's the -- we were getting strong
7 advice during that visit and during a subsequent visit to
8 INDOPACOM that, "Why doesn't the U.S. ratify the U.N.
9 Convention on Law of the Sea?" Because our allies, both
10 Arctic nations like Russia and those claiming to be near-
11 Arctic -- and, you're right, there's no such category --
12 they use their ratification of the treaty to assert claims
13 in the Arctic that we cannot assert, absent being a
14 signator, nor can we undertake defensive posture to
15 illegitimate claims that are asserted without being a
16 signator. We have to get other nations to, sort of, do it.
17 It would be better -- I think we'd be more successful if we
18 did that ourself. But, we'll save that for another hearing.

19 We have paid attention to the need for icebreakers, but
20 the posture and readiness is much more complicated, as
21 Senator Sullivan mentioned. How are we training our forces
22 to be able to fight and operate in the High North? How do
23 we make sure that there are not gaps between NORTHCOM,
24 EUCOM, and PACOM, each of which have critical
25 responsibilities? We want to make sure that the -- nothing

1 falls through the cracks there as they work together in
2 coordination. Planning for other capabilities, improved
3 communications, for example, that have some specific needs
4 in the Arctic zone. And then, how are we cooperating with
5 allies, Canada and other Nordic countries, who have been
6 good allies in a number of ways?

7 So, that's what we're hoping that we will address
8 today. I think it will be a good discussion. I look
9 forward to it.

10 And I thank the Chair for pulling this hearing
11 together.

12 Senator Sullivan: Great. Thank you, Senator Kaine.

13 And I want to, again, welcome our witnesses. And you
14 each will have 5 minutes for your opening statement. You
15 can submit a longer statement for the record.

16 Secretary Anderson, we will begin with you, sir.
17 You're recognized.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 STATEMENT OF JAMES H. ANDERSON, PERFORMING THE DUTIES
2 OF DEPUTY UNDER SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR POLICY

3 Dr. Anderson: Thank you, Chairman Sullivan, Ranking
4 Member Kaine, distinguished committee members. Thank you
5 for the opportunity to be part of a hearing on U.S. policy
6 and posture in support of Arctic readiness. It is a
7 privilege to be here, together with my colleague, and to
8 speak on behalf of the Office of Secretary of Defense.

9 The Department assesses long-term threats, risks, and
10 challenges within the global context of the National Defense
11 Strategy, the NDS. The NDS was released in 2018, and it is
12 the Department's guiding document, which articulates key
13 military-related challenges facing our Nation.

14 The NDS is clear that the primary challenge to the
15 United States security and prosperity is the reemergence of
16 long-term strategic competition with great powers. As the
17 Strategy makes clear, the threats posed by China and Russia
18 are immediate, pressing, and of an order of magnitude that
19 sets them apart from other challenges. We are seeing this
20 competition play out in varying levels of intensity in key
21 areas of the globe, including the Arctic.

22 The 2019 DOD Arctic Strategy is anchored in the
23 priorities of the NDS and frames the Arctic in a broad
24 geopolitical context. The Strategy recognizes that
25 competition in the Arctic is important and it is one

1 dimension of a broader global competition with China and
2 Russia.

3 We also acknowledge that the character of competition
4 varies between China and Russia, as they have vastly
5 different geography, interests, and capability related to
6 the Arctic region. Addressing competition in the Arctic
7 requires the Department to effectively implement the NDS, as
8 well as to take specific steps in the Arctic using a whole-
9 of-government approach, further supplemented and reinforced
10 by allies and partners.

11 The Department's end state for the Arctic is a secure
12 and stable region, where U.S. national interests are
13 safeguarded, the U.S. homeland is defended, and nations work
14 cooperatively to address shared challenges. This end state
15 recognizes the distinctive and historic characteristics of
16 the Arctic security environment. It also reflects the
17 deliberate decisions made by Arctic nations to generally
18 engage constructively on shared challenges in the region.

19 The immediate prospect of conflict in the Arctic
20 remains low, but the Department maintains a clear-eyed
21 approach to our competitors' activities and their
22 implications for U.S. interests and our military operations.
23 In making these assessments, we begin with the fundamental
24 difference between Russia and China: Russia is an Arctic
25 nation, China is not. Russia and China are both

1 increasingly active in the region, although in different
2 ways, for different reasons, and with different implications
3 for U.S. national security.

4 Russia's military investments in the Arctic contribute
5 to its territorial defense, but may result in greater
6 operational risk to forces that access the region. China
7 seeks a role in Arctic governance, despite it not having
8 territory claims in the region. There is the distinct risk
9 that China may repeat predatory economic behavior in the
10 Arctic that it has exhibited in other regions. Our focus is
11 on achieving defense objectives, rather than seeking to
12 duplicate the capabilities or approaches of our competitors.

13 The DOD Arctic Strategy establishes three defense
14 objectives, derived from the NDS, which guide the
15 Department's approach in addressing competition in the
16 Arctic: defend the homeland, compete when necessary, and
17 ensure common domains remain free and open. Our network of
18 allies and partners are the cornerstone of the Department's
19 approach to the region, and a clear strategic advantage for
20 the United States.

21 Six of the seven other Arctic nations are either NATO
22 allies or NATO-enhanced opportunity partners. Our allies
23 and partners share the United States interest in maintaining
24 a rules-based international order, including in the Arctic
25 region.

1 Although the Arctic presents unique challenges to the
2 Department, we believe we have the right strategic approach
3 and a strong network of allies and partners to navigate this
4 challenging and changing environment.

5 Thank you for the opportunity to testify. I look
6 forward to your questions.

7 [The prepared statement of Dr. Anderson follows:]

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Sullivan: Thank you, Secretary Anderson.
2 General O'Shaughnessy.

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 GENERAL TERRENCE J. O'SHAUGHNESSY, USAF,
2 COMMANDER, UNITED STATES NORTHERN COMMAND AND NORTH AMERICAN
3 AEROSPACE DEFENSE COMMAND

4 General O'Shaughnessy: Well, Chairman Sullivan and
5 Ranking Member Kaine, and distinguished members of the
6 committee, I'm truly honored to be here today as the
7 Commander of U.S. Northern Command and North American
8 Aerospace Defense Command. And I'm also pleased to testify
9 alongside Dr. Anderson, and congratulate him on the White
10 House's intent to nominate him as Under Secretary of Defense
11 for Policy.

12 And, Chairman Sullivan, thank you for allowing us to
13 submit our written statements for the record.

14 Senator Sullivan: Without objection.

15 General O'Shaughnessy: USNORTHCOM and NORAD are
16 charged with executing the National Defensive Strategy
17 number-one objective: defend the homeland. And our
18 adversaries have watched, they've learned, they've invested
19 to offset our strengths while exploiting our weaknesses.
20 They've demonstrated patterns of behavior that indicate
21 their capability, their capacity, and their intent to hold
22 our homeland at risk below the nuclear threshold. And the
23 changing security environment makes it clear that the Arctic
24 is no longer a fortress wall and the Arctic Ocean is no
25 longer a protective mode. They are now avenues of approach

1 to the homeland.

2 The increasing commercial and adversary presence in the
3 Arctic has created an immediate need to build Arctic
4 awareness, enhance Arctic operations, and strengthen the
5 rules-based order in the region. To meet this challenge, we
6 need to invest in a capable and persistent defense that can
7 deter adversaries, protect critical infrastructure, enable
8 power projection forward, and prevent homeland
9 vulnerabilities.

10 To deter, detect, and defeat the threats arrayed
11 against the homeland today, USNORTHCOM and NORAD are
12 transforming our commands and our way of thinking. We
13 cannot defend the Nation against 21st-century threats with
14 20th-century technology. We must be able to outpace our
15 adversaries using a layered defense infused with our latest
16 technology. The Strategic Homeland Integrated Ecosystem
17 Layered Defense, or what we're calling SHIELD, is the
18 architecture we need to defend our homeland against
19 adversary threats. And the Arctic, particularly Alaska, has
20 a critical role to play in SHIELD.

21 As such, our layered defense needs to establish
22 awareness in all domains, from below the Arctic Ocean to the
23 highest levels of space where we're at risk. We need a
24 layered sensing grid with sensors in all domains which can
25 detect and track threats from their point of origin long

1 before approaching our sovereign territory. In other words,
2 it requires the ability to identify and eliminate the
3 archers before the arrows are released.

4 We need an adaptable architecture for joint all-domain
5 command and control capable of fusing a myriad of sensors
6 across the globe into accurate, decision-quality threat
7 information and at the speed of relevance for effective
8 command and control. The DOD, in coordination with the
9 United States Air Force in the lead, is using the 2021
10 budget to further this capability of JADC2.

11 And lastly, we need the ability to deploy defeat
12 mechanisms capable of neutralizing advanced weapon systems
13 in order to defend our homeland.

14 We have put great effort into industry coordination
15 within these areas. However, more needs to be done to keep
16 pace with the advancing threats to our homeland. We need to
17 ensure we have complete awareness of what is happening in
18 and around the Arctic and our Nation, and have the ability
19 to defeat all relevant threats. A successful strategic
20 approach is enhanced by cooperation with allies and
21 partners. We are strengthening our Arctic alliances,
22 stretching from Finland to the far reaches of Nome,
23 including our indigenous partners, in order to compete when
24 necessary to maintain favorable regional balances of power
25 and ensure common domains remain free and open. Together,

1 we are stronger, as highlighted by our great binational
2 NORAD Command with Canada, and we are mindful of the gravity
3 of our mission and the trust that you have placed in us.
4 Aligned with the Department of Defense Arctic Strategy and
5 capturing our sense of urgency, we at USNORTHCOM and NORAD,
6 have declared 2020 as a year of homeland defense, and are
7 moving forward with the implementation of a layered defense
8 ecosystem called SHIELD, in which the Arctic plays an
9 absolutely critical role. You and the committee should have
10 the great faith in the men and women at USNORTHCOM and
11 NORAD, because, together, we have the watch.

12 Thank you for your support. And I look forward to your
13 questions.

14 [The prepared statement of General O'Shaughnessy
15 follows:]

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 Senator Sullivan: Well, thank you, to both our
2 witnesses.

3 I'm going to defer my first 5 minutes of questioning to
4 Senator King, who I know has another commitment but is also
5 -- had a strong interest in these Arctic issues, and I want
6 to make sure he and other members have opportunity to ask
7 questions. But, I appreciate him being here, very much.

8 Senator King.

9 Senator King: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate
10 your taking the initiative to move this issue forward, to
11 keep it in front of us, and to call this important hearing.

12 General, any evidence of China-Russia cooperating in
13 the Arctic?

14 General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, we certainly see areas
15 where China and Russia are cooperating at large, and we do
16 see some areas where China and Russia are cooperating
17 specifically in the Arctic. You look at the investment, for
18 example, that China has made with Russia in the Arctic. We
19 do have some concern of that, but we also have independent
20 concern with each of the activities that we see from China
21 --

22 Senator King: But, their primary motivations seem to
23 be separate. The Chinese are mostly economic, the Russians
24 are defensive and military?

25 General O'Shaughnessy: That's broadly correct,

1 Senator. The only thing I would add to that is, because of
2 -- 20 percent of the Russian GDP nominally comes from the
3 Arctic, that the Chinese investment will play a critical
4 role there, as well.

5 Senator King: By the way, I think, if we're going to
6 take a lesson from China declaring itself a near-Arctic
7 nation, I'm declaring Maine a near-Caribbean nation, just --

8 [Laughter.]

9 Senator King: You know, there's -- it works just as
10 well.

11 I'm worried about the operational seam that we've got
12 -- we've got three of our combatant commands that come
13 together, and I just want to be sure --

14 Senator Sullivan: We have a chart for that, if you
15 want to explain it --

16 Senator King: Yeah.

17 Senator Sullivan: -- a little bit more.

18 Senator King: Okay. Well, I don't want to steal your
19 -- but, it's a very serious concern. I just want to be sure
20 that the three combatant commands are absolutely seamlessly
21 working together so that, in time of some crisis or
22 difficult situation, we don't have a confusion of
23 leadership. Can you assure me on that?

24 General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, I will do two things.
25 First, I would acknowledge there -- the seam is the lines on

1 the map, but I will assure you that we are working closely
2 together. One of the things that does help that, as the
3 NORTHCOM designation as the advocate for capabilities within
4 the Arctic gives us a lead role to try to bring these teams
5 together. And I will say constant and regular
6 communication, especially between NORTHCOM and EUCOM, as we
7 look at the threats residing within the Arctic and through
8 the Arctic. And we actually exercise that muscle. When I
9 say that, I mean the transfer of forces back and forth, the
10 seamless ability to command and control those forces, as
11 well as just looking, not only with our allies and partners
12 and friends, but how that we actually integrate together. I
13 use an example: I went to the U.K. to go to the staff talks
14 with the U.K. as part of our tie-in with EUCOM forces, met
15 with Denmark leadership, and we also, operationally, are
16 back and forth with our exercises, et cetera. So, I should
17 give --

18 Senator King: That's what I was going to hope, that
19 there are exercises to clarify "what happens if" as to who's
20 in charge and who's calling the shots.

21 General O'Shaughnessy: Absolutely, Senator. And the
22 way we look at it is, although -- there is a line on the
23 map, of course, but that line does not actually exist there.
24 And so, we want to make sure that our forces, as they
25 operate, and not limited because of a line that we

1 arbitrarily put on the map.

2 Senator King: Now, you mentioned NORAD a couple of
3 times, and mentioned Canada. The bulk of the shoreline,
4 outside of Alaska, is Canada. Are they engaged? Are they
5 taking this seriously? Are they having hearings like this?

6 General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, absolutely. In fact,
7 I think, as the Trudeau administration has regained the --
8 post the election, regained power, one of their focus areas,
9 in fact, is the Arctic. And so, with the NORAD -- under the
10 NORAD construct, of course, we're fully engaged with our
11 Canadian partners, and see a resurgence in that partnership.

12 Senator King: Dr. Anderson, I met with the U.S.
13 Ambassador to Denmark recently. I think it's good news
14 we're opening a consulate in Greenland. I think that's a
15 positive development. Of course, Thule Air Force Base is an
16 important outpost up there.

17 Finally, I urge you to go to Iceland. Iceland may be
18 the second-most strategic place in the world. It's right in
19 the middle of --

20 Senator Sullivan: And what is the most strategic place
21 --

22 Senator King: I think it's -- it's one of those other
23 States that up in the --

24 Senator Sullivan: Okay, I'm just checking.

25 [Laughter.]

1 Senator King: It's the one Billy Mitchell designated.
2 Was that before or after his court-martial that he made
3 that?

4 Voice: It was before.

5 Senator King: I see, okay. This has been going on for
6 6 years.

7 [Laughter.]

8 Senator King: But, Iceland is a tremendously strategic
9 spot. It's an unsinkable aircraft carrier right in the
10 middle of the -- of that -- of the gap, Greenland to
11 England. And we, I think, mistakenly left it, left
12 Keflavik, in the early part of this century. And I just
13 hope that you'll keep Iceland in mind, keep the rotational
14 going, and perhaps think about a more permanent kind of
15 presence there because of its strategic position,
16 particularly with regard to Russian submarines.

17 Dr. Anderson: Oh, absolutely concur on the strategic
18 importance of that area, both Denmark, Greenland, and
19 Iceland, and the U.K., the -- the GIUK gap, not only for
20 subsurface submarine activity, but also for access to the
21 European theater and defense also, obviously, of the
22 homeland. So, certainly concur with your assessment.

23 Senator King: Thank you.

24 Thank you very much, gentlemen.

25 Again, Mr. Chairman, thank you for the courtesy. I do

1 have to go to another committee meeting. Thank you.

2 Senator Sullivan: Absolutely.

3 Senator Shaheen.

4 Senator Shaheen: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5 And thank you both for being here.

6 I want to make sure I understood you correctly, Dr.
7 Anderson. Did I understand you to say that the potential
8 for conflict in the Arctic is low? Or did I misunderstand
9 that?

10 Dr. Anderson: That is what I've said. Presently, our
11 assessment is that the potential for conflict, near term, is
12 low.

13 Senator Shaheen: There was an interesting piece on --
14 I think it may have been 60 Minutes within the last couple
15 of months, about Russia's activities in Norway and the
16 Arctic region, and the threat that they pose to NATO. And I
17 guess I'm puzzled by that comment, given everything that the
18 Chairman said, and given that piece and what else we have
19 learned about Russia's activities in the Arctic, why we're
20 comfortable that the potential for conflict is low. And I
21 don't know if you want to answer that, or General
22 O'Shaughnessy. Which of you -- maybe both of you could
23 answer that.

24 Dr. Anderson: Well, maybe I can expand a little bit.
25 We're certainly in a competition with the Russian

1 Federation. There is no question about that. And that
2 competition, you know, spans a spectrum of information and
3 diplomacy and economics, export controls, the Russian
4 espionage, and so forth, and so forth.

5 But, when I was saying the potential for conflict is
6 low, what I'm referring to there is actual no-kidding
7 kinetic conflict. And, in that sense, presently, we assess
8 that to be low. Now, we are very mindful of Russian
9 capabilities, Russian intent, and -- over the medium term
10 and the long term -- and we are very clear-eyed about what
11 we must do in order to deter Moscow from any thinking or any
12 -- any belief that they may have something to gain by
13 military activity.

14 Senator Shaheen: Good. Well, I'm glad we're clear-
15 eyed, because I would hope that we are not caught off guard
16 by what Russia is doing, as we were in Georgia and as we
17 were in Ukraine.

18 I want to go to what we're doing to prepare for cold-
19 weather activities. We have the U.S. Army Cold Regions
20 Research and Engineering Laboratory in Hanover, New
21 Hampshire, which I think does very good work. They are
22 trying to do everything possible to make sure that we can
23 operate in cold-weather climates. But, I wonder if you
24 could -- either of you could provide an update on what the
25 Army's doing in response to the DOD Arctic Strategy that was

1 published in June of 2019 to take advantage of CRREL, in
2 Hanover, and the other things we need to do to prepare.

3 Dr. Anderson: So, I can -- happy to start there. I
4 mean, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has a -- kind of a
5 research facility right outside of Fairbanks, where they
6 look at a variety of scientific and engineering challenges
7 that pertain not only to Alaska, but to the Nation as a
8 whole. So, that would be one example.

9 Clearly, the Army has forces, Active Duty and
10 reservists, in Alaska. They train, more generally, for
11 cold-weather environments. So, I think, you know, across
12 the board, as with the other services, they take the
13 potential challenges and the existing challenges of
14 operating in that harsh and demanding environment very
15 seriously.

16 General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, what I would add to
17 this is, what I have seen just over the last couple of years
18 is a relative rapid rise in each of the services'
19 participation in preparation to actually operate in the
20 Arctic. And that includes, of course, the Army as a key
21 force.

22 The examples that I would use is, as we find other
23 areas of the world you can deploy to with your current set
24 of equipment, with your -- with the normal training that you
25 would have, maybe, at home station, the Arctic is not like

1 that. You have to specifically train to be in the Arctic.
2 You have to have the right gear, just as you mentioned. You
3 have to -- and it's everything from your clothing to your
4 facilities to even, you know, the oil you use in your
5 machinery. And if you haven't been up there actually doing
6 it, actually training that way, you will not be prepared to
7 operate in the Arctic. So, I'm really pleased that I see an
8 increased activity in the Arctic training, not just within
9 -- certainly in Alaska, JPARC Range, as an example, a great
10 training opportunity for our force -- but even with our NATO
11 partners, as well. And we see more and more, for example,
12 Army deployments to our NATO partners to be able to operate
13 in that environment. We see the Navy sailing in areas that
14 they haven't sailed in decades. We see the Air Force
15 committed to continuing to operate in this. And we see the
16 Marines also preparing and participating. For example,
17 Arctic Edge, which we have just -- ongoing, just starting
18 right now, we see over 1500 personnel participating in that
19 Arctic-focused exercise.

20 Senator Shaheen: Thank you.

21 Mr. Chairman, can I ask one more question?

22 Senator Sullivan: Absolutely.

23 Senator Shaheen: So, global warming is obviously
24 having an impact on the Arctic. And it's an impact not just
25 on the sea lanes that will be open for longer periods of

1 time because of icemelt, but also on permafrost and what
2 that's doing to the infrastructure in the Arctic. Can you
3 talk about what we're planning to address that and with --
4 in terms of cost, and whether there are other -- there's
5 other potential for conflicts that may be happening because
6 we're going to see those sea lanes open for longer periods
7 of time, and the ability of some of our competitors to get
8 up there and present challenges to the United States and our
9 allies?

10 Dr. Anderson: So, I'm happy to start with that. I
11 mean, as has been mentioned, fortunately we're -- we do have
12 a icebreaker program underway. And, you know, it's -- we
13 have six, total -- three heavy, three medium -- that are in
14 the pipeline. That will help with some of the increased
15 hazards that -- resulting from warming trends. With respect
16 --

17 Senator Shaheen: Can I -- I'm sorry to interrupt, but
18 how many of those are operational now?

19 Dr. Anderson: So, right now we have one heavy that is
20 operational, the Polar Star. It -- there's another one, a
21 Polar Sea, but it is tied up at port and being cannibalized
22 to keep the Polar Star operational. Then we have one medium
23 one, the Healy. They both date back to commissionings back
24 in the 19- -- late 1970s. But, fortunately, we have some
25 new ones that are coming forth. So, there is that piece of

1 it. I would say, on the military installations and -- you
2 know, every military installation up in the High North, in
3 Alaska, you know, they have -- they are looking very closely
4 at the permafrost, the thawing, other environmental hazards.
5 Not related to climate change, but Alaska suffered an
6 earthquake in the fall of 2018. So, all these sort of
7 ecological/environmental implications are something that
8 commanders are dealing with.

9 I don't know if my colleague would like to expand a
10 little bit.

11 General O'Shaughnessy: Sure. First, let me mention
12 the Polar Security Cutter Program. That is incredibly
13 important, I think, to the Department of Defense, although,
14 obviously, it's our great Coast Guard brethren who will be
15 doing that. But, it's also worth noting, as we look at the
16 -- those coming online, that their first ones will -- first
17 one will go to the Antarctic. Right? And so, we have to
18 keep that in mind with respect to the timeline that we're
19 dealing with here, with respect to when they're actually
20 going to be relevant to the Arctic. And I think that's a
21 key part. \$551 million this year, though, from the
22 Department of Defense budget, supporting that program. So,
23 I'm very pleased that that continues to go forward, but I
24 can't emphasize enough how important it is to keep that on
25 timeline.

1 To your point about some of the effects that we are
2 seeing, whether it be from the diminishing sea ice, the
3 permafrost -- I'll use Barrow as an example, and one of my
4 trips up there. What I see when I -- when we go up there
5 is, it's -- there's a common set of challenges that we're
6 faced with. And when I go there and see -- it's not only
7 the military installations that are challenged now, it's the
8 local population, it's indigenous people, it's the local
9 infrastructure. And so, to me, this is something we can
10 work together, and we can find ways that -- for example, the
11 road going to our -- one of our key radar sites there is the
12 same road that the villages use. And so, how do we approach
13 this together? Because they're very real impacts. And so,
14 we have to ensure that we maintain our readiness, that we
15 maintain our ability to keep those military installations
16 operating, whilst at the same time I think we can partner
17 with our local people and communities to see how we can get
18 after this together.

19 But, to your point, it -- when you get out there and
20 see it, it is very real, the impacts that we're seeing, and
21 we have to make sure that's part of our cross-check, going
22 forward.

23 Senator Shaheen: Well, thank you.

24 Thank you for the additional time, Mr. Chairman. That
25 raises a whole bunch of other questions, but I'm already

1 over.

2 Senator Sullivan: Senator Kaine.

3 Senator Kaine: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

4 And I just want to follow up on some of the climate
5 questions. I was able to go with Senator Heinrich into the
6 Arctic National Wildlife Refuge a couple of summers ago, and
7 we were on Kaktovik, which Senator Sullivan knows well. And
8 the melting of sea ice has put polar bears ashore. And
9 also, the sea ice served as an anti-erosion buffer to --
10 just the erosion of tidal action; and now that sea ice has
11 melted, erosion -- moving the little airstrip. We were in
12 Arctic Village, which is an Athabascan village at the far
13 south part of the range, and they're talking about caribou
14 migration is so different than what it was that the
15 traditional hunting of the caribou nearby -- it's very hard
16 to get to the caribou in many years now.

17 So, I'm -- I guess I want to know this. What planning
18 assumptions do you put in as you're looking at this? You
19 know, the National Defense Strategy, the NDS, much of it, as
20 stated by -- has to be sort of an irreversible -- we're
21 going to be in great-power competition for a long time. And
22 If that's the case, we're not going to change quickly. You
23 have to make some planning assumptions about climate,
24 whether it's permafrost, sea icemelt, rising sea levels,
25 warming temperatures. What assumptions are you putting into

1 your planning documents about the effect of climate change
2 and then how it affects the environment in which you need to
3 operate?

4 Dr. Anderson: I think a big part of this has to do
5 with building in resilience to military installations, new
6 ones and refurbishing old ones.

7 Senator Kaine: But, what -- and I get that, but,
8 before I get to resilience, because we do resilience
9 planning at Norfolk, too -- you do resilience planning based
10 on an assumption. You know, there's going to be a 2-
11 percent rise in temperature in the next 30 years, or the,
12 you know, flooding will become more common in the streets.
13 So, you do resilience planning based upon assumptions. Is
14 there a document that you use, as you're making plans for
15 operations in and through the Arctic, where you are making
16 some assumptions sort of based on most reasonable-case
17 scenarios about climate effects?

18 General O'Shaughnessy: Yeah, Senator, I would say that
19 there's multiple inputs, if you will, to the planning
20 process, all the way from NOAA and what they're able to
21 provide us. What we're seeing clearly, working with the
22 Corps of Engineers very specifically, on what we're seeing
23 and what we can expect to see as that continues to -- those
24 effects continue to enhance --

25 Senator Kaine: If I wanted to get a document, read it,

1 and see the assumptions that you're making, what is that
2 document? Where could I get them?

3 General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, I think it's multiple
4 documents, and we can certainly provide those to you,
5 multiple sources that we're using to compile together the
6 effects that we're expecting.

7 Senator Kaine: I'll ask that one for the record,
8 because I'd like to take a look at that.

9 [The information referred to follows:]

10 Senator Kaine: General O'Shaughnessy, you stated that
11 your number-one unfunded requirement is a request for \$130
12 million to provide, quote, "an initial Arctic communication
13 capability." Tell us what that capability would give to
14 NORTHCOM that you don't have now.

15 General O'Shaughnessy: Thank you, Senator.

16 One of the things that we find -- very simple things
17 become hard, and one of those is communication, when you're
18 in the Arctic. If you're above about 65 degrees north, your
19 satellite communication starts to diminish, and above about
20 70 it becomes extremely limited, except for some of our more
21 exquisite capability -- for example, with submarines, et
22 cetera.

23 Senator Kaine: Right.

24 General O'Shaughnessy: And when we look at this, we
25 find that you could go about this with a -- say, a DOD

1 project to bring communication, but, what we find is, this
2 commercial world is getting after this with the
3 proliferation of LEO. And so, we find that a partnership
4 with the commercial world might bring us some capability
5 sooner, significantly sooner.

6 And, as we see, for example, the work that OneWeb and
7 Starlink are doing to proliferate LEO with satellites that
8 will provide literally the same connectivity that you get in
9 your home right today, broadband connectivity that would
10 then be available in the majority of the Arctic, we see that
11 as an amazing game-changing capability, all the way from,
12 just, our basic communication, but also, all of our sensors
13 right now have limited ability to connect in and are --
14 frankly, are not that resilient. And so, it gives us the
15 resiliency, it gives us ability to communicate. Think about
16 search and rescue, think about -- all the things that
17 normally would be easy become very hard in the Arctic. And
18 then there's a whole aspect that's on the civilian side, in
19 the impact to industry, the impact to the indigenous people,
20 of having that connectivity. So, we think, again, shared
21 challenges, shared solutions. We think a commercial
22 partnership would be key to this.

23 Senator Kaine: Well, I'm very encouraged, because I
24 don't think we need to build our own, sort of, exquisite
25 capacity when there's commercial opportunities that are

1 better. As long as we can protect, you know, the security
2 of information, I think that's very positive.

3 I want to ask you one more question, and then I know
4 Senator Sullivan has many, and I'll probably come back to
5 ask one further in a second round.

6 Talk to us about the -- we talked about the seams
7 between EUCOM, PACOM, and NORTHCOM -- talk about the
8 collaborative work that you do with the Coast Guard. So,
9 within the family, the Coast Guard search-and-rescue
10 capacity, the Coast Guard's ice cutters -- so, talk about
11 the relationship with the Coast Guard.

12 General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, first, I'd highlight
13 just the great coordination, not just within the Arctic, but
14 at large, between the Department of Defense and Department
15 of Homeland Security --

16 Senator Kaine: Yeah.

17 General O'Shaughnessy: -- across the board. In fact,
18 what I often tell is, I actually meet with the Secretary of
19 the Department of Homeland Security as or more often than I
20 meet with the Secretary of the Department of Defense. And I
21 meet with the Secretary of Defense quite often. So, it's a
22 great partner and collaboration, really, across the board.

23 But, specifically to our Coast Guard partners, Karl
24 Schultz and I -- it's an example of our great program -- we
25 went to Capstone together years ago. We were close friends

1 ever since. But, that brings a perspective of collaboration
2 from the start. And what we find is, we have -- again, it's
3 these shared challenges and shared work together. As we see
4 the diminishing-ice opportunities that are there, whether it
5 be because of civilian traffic or whether it be the northern
6 sea route and some of the challenges --

7 Senator Kaine: Right.

8 General O'Shaughnessy: -- we think we might face with
9 our adversaries, that partnership with the Coast Guard is
10 the key partnership in the Arctic. And I think as we
11 continue to let the polar security cutter -- it's called the
12 "polar security cutter" for a reason, and that middle part
13 of that's security, because it's part of our national
14 security. And whether it's Department of Defense or
15 Department of Homeland Security, that collaboration together
16 is going to be incredibly important. As we go forward and
17 finding those things that we can do together right from the
18 very beginning, we find an incredible synergy.

19 Senator Kaine: Just one comment, and then to, Senator
20 Sullivan, we have this quirky thing last year, when we had
21 the shutdown, where, you know -- you know, it did -- folks
22 in the military were getting paid, and folks in the Coast
23 Guard weren't, even though they're all part of our defense
24 mission. It just so happens the Coast Guard, because they
25 report up through DHS, were often on joint exercises with

1 Navy and other military, and they were the ones that were
2 not getting paid, which, you know, God willing, that never
3 happens again, because if it does, and it starts to be a
4 recruiting challenge, like, "Well, why would I want to go to
5 this side of the house if I'm going to be at risk, and I
6 would be less at risk on the DOD side." So, recruiting,
7 retention, our Coast Guard is really necessary to our
8 defense mission, and maybe more in the Arctic than anywhere
9 else.

10 Senator Sullivan: Right.

11 Senator Kaine: And there's inequities in there that we
12 have to be careful about, going forward.

13 General O'Shaughnessy: And, Senator, if I might make
14 one comment, if you'd indulge me. One example -- we have
15 many coastguardsmen on our staff.

16 Senator Kaine: Right.

17 General O'Shaughnessy: And they're key and critical to
18 that. I'd make a highlight. I have, actually, one right --
19 sitting right behind me, Ken Boda -- Captain Ken Boda.

20 Senator Kaine: I thought I noticed --

21 General O'Shaughnessy: Right?

22 Senator Kaine: -- a different color uniform in --

23 General O'Shaughnessy: Why is that important? They
24 bring a different perspective, but an equally important
25 perspective, as we go forward. Captain Boda was actually

1 the XO on the Polar Star. He served on the Polar Sea. He
2 was on the Healy. And so, having that on our staff to
3 inform us as we are the advocates for the Arctic is
4 priceless. I mean, literally priceless. And so, that
5 coordination that we have, and the collaboration, where Karl
6 Schultz is sending us his very best people to serve on our
7 staff, to make sure that we can, in fact, as we go forward,
8 looking at this together with our Coast Guard partners.

9 Senator Kaine: Excellent. Thank you.

10 Senator Sullivan: Well, as the Chair of the
11 subcommittee in charge of the Coast Guard, I'm also very
12 interested in these issues, as well. And we're actually
13 working on a Coast Guard bill, kind of pre-conferencing it
14 right now with the House, that has a pay-the-Coast-Guard
15 provision that I'm very, very adamant about, that that, what
16 you just mentioned, Senator Kaine, won't happen again.

17 Let me begin with a couple followup questions.

18 So, it is NORAD and NORTHCOM's number-one focus on the
19 unfunded priority list that Senator Kaine just mentioned,
20 which is the Arctic coms. And again, that deals with
21 homeland defense, these avenues of approach. Just so I'm
22 aware, General, is that part of, or different than, the
23 SHIELD layered defense that you're talking about?

24 General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, that's part of it.

25 Part of the attempt that we're trying to do is, rather than

1 buy individual systems that are stovepipe and try to solve
2 one problem, we're really approaching this, with SHIELD,
3 with this architecture that could come together that could
4 give us that domain awareness ability to command and control
5 and the defeat mechanisms across all the threats, from
6 ballistic missiles all the way to counter-UAS. And that
7 communication piece of that, so this unfunded priority we
8 have for communications in the Arctic, would be a key part,
9 and be -- insert into our ability to work SHIELD.

10 Senator Sullivan: And that, of course, protects the
11 avenues of approach to the entire homeland, not just an
12 Alaskan-focused issue, correct?

13 General O'Shaughnessy: Senator, you bring up a
14 incredibly important point. As we do talk about the Arctic,
15 we must remember, it's not just about the Arctic. It's
16 about our homeland, it's about United States of America and,
17 on the NORAD side, United States and Canada, and protecting
18 our sovereign territory, and having the means to operate in
19 battlespace that is now, as we see advancing adversaries,
20 they have the capability that -- and the intent to operate
21 there. We must have the same ability to operate if we're
22 going to be able to defend our Nation.

23 Senator Sullivan: And, look, I want to thank you.
24 You've done a great job, certainly in my State. I think the
25 very important constituents of mine, the Alaska Native

1 population, the Alaska Federation of Natives, have all
2 honored you, I think, even with your own Native name, which
3 is a rare and distinct honor.

4 But, on this Arctic coms piece, too, can you just
5 unpack, a little bit more, the potential that has for
6 coverage in some of the communities in my State, which, as
7 you know, General, it's not just a coms issue for the
8 military, a lot of the communities in Alaska don't have
9 nearly the Internet or telecoms coverage that the vast, vast
10 majority of the Lower 48 accept and take for granted. How
11 can this unfunded priority also help in that regard?

12 General O'Shaughnessy: Yeah, thank you for letting me
13 highlight that, Senator.

14 And I'd start -- I've actually had the incredible honor
15 to actually have four names --

16 Senator Sullivan: Wow.

17 General O'Shaughnessy: -- the indigenous --

18 Senator Sullivan: That's more than me.

19 General O'Shaughnessy: -- Alaska.

20 [Laughter.]

21 General O'Shaughnessy: And we've had great partnership
22 with AFN.

23 Senator Sullivan: Great.

24 General O'Shaughnessy: And part of that, I think, is
25 because we really see this as falling -- finding those areas

1 of common challenges that we can work together. And we
2 find, the more that we peel the onion back, and that the
3 more things we actually find, that we have these common
4 interests, and we can get after it together.

5 To your point about this communications that work and
6 -- we can look at this from a couple different aspects. One
7 is, just think about each of the individual villages that
8 are currently cut off, that could -- you know, the schools,
9 the health facilities, the first responders, if they had the
10 ability to actually communicate.

11 Senator Sullivan: Yeah.

12 General O'Shaughnessy: But, then, from a more selfish
13 interest of the Department of Defense, think about if we
14 could link all those together with search-and-rescue
15 capability, with the ability to tie in those villages to
16 part of our infrastructure, maybe looking at some of the
17 work that we've done with the -- on the Canadian side, with
18 the Canadian Ranger Program, and really taking full
19 advantage of that expertise, 10,000 years of understanding
20 the Arctic, and how do we leverage that into our capability,
21 capacity. So, again, I see the future. I see so much -- so
22 many opportunities specifically to the communications
23 package that we're looking to address. Part of it is, in
24 the end, it's a business. It's -- we're looking in -- to go
25 to the commercial. So, the more participants we can get

1 within that, the better business case we have. So, again,
2 we can look at it either from an altruistic standpoint, if
3 we want to work with our partners, or we can look at it,
4 even from our own self-interests in mind, having more people
5 part of this process actually makes a better business case.
6 And if you're OneWeb or you're Starlink, you're much more
7 interested if you have a bigger population. Same as the
8 reason why we're working with industry to try to get the
9 industry interested in this, as well, because then it's more
10 paying subscribers, if you will, that will really allow this
11 to take off. And I think we are on the verge of being able
12 to make this happen, and I think it'll be game-changing for
13 the military, I think it'll be game-changing for the local
14 populations. I think it would be game-changing for our
15 partners, like the Coast Guard, to be able to communicate,
16 and on and on and on. So, I really want to continue to
17 pursue this capability.

18 Senator Sullivan: Great. Well, I think you have done
19 -- in both your -- full committee and this committee, your
20 testimony has done a good job of highlighting the importance
21 of that. I certainly am going to make a press in the NDAA,
22 and I hope my colleagues will recognize the importance of
23 it. So, thank you for that. I think it's been very well
24 articulated, and I'm hopeful that we can get that number-one
25 unfunded priority for NORTHCOM actually funded by the DOD.

1 Mr. -- Secretary Anderson, I'm going to press a little
2 bit. I think your point on six of seven of the Arctic
3 nations are allies -- that's actually a really good point.
4 I've been a little bit frustrated, as you probably gathered
5 from my opening statement, with regard to the Pentagon's
6 approach to the Arctic. I think there's areas where the
7 Congress leads and the Pentagon follows, where the Pentagon
8 leads, the Congress follows. I think this is --
9 unfortunately, been the former. And I think we're starting
10 to see, with advocates like General O'Shaughnessy, a focus
11 in the Pentagon that's needed, because this is strategic
12 terrain that is becoming more and more important. That was
13 what former Secretary Mattis mentioned.

14 One thing that I wanted to mention to you. You know,
15 in the first serious DOD Arctic Strategy, they talked about
16 how we need to protect our sovereign territory, our sea
17 lanes, through Freedom of Navigation Operations, kind of
18 like what we do in the South China Sea. And actually, we do
19 FONOPs all over the world. I've asked, particularly, our
20 Navy leadership -- this is the goal, this is the stated
21 strategy, this is what DOD says it's going to do. However,
22 it appears to me, with the lack of icebreakers -- one heavy
23 -- that -- and even ice-hardened Navy shipping -- that the
24 ability to do FONOPs in this key part of the world to
25 protect America's strategic interests are quite limited.

1 You know, I like to brag about the fact that I had five
2 uncles and great uncles who served and fought in World War
3 II. One of my great uncles was a lieutenant in the Navy,
4 did three Murmansk runs. It was a very dangerous Navy duty
5 during World War II. And that was all Arctic operations
6 with the U.S. Navy. I'm not sure the U.S. Navy can pull
7 that off again right now.

8 What is your sense of the ability -- now, granted,
9 we're starting to build icebreakers, but we don't even have
10 ships that can plow through ice, or ice-hardened ships. The
11 Department of Defense has said we're going to do Freedom of
12 Navigation Operations. Putin has said that the Arctic is
13 the new Suez Canal that he's going to control. He has 54
14 icebreakers. He's got all the cards. What are we doing to
15 push back on that situation, when our Strategy clearly
16 states that we should have the ability to do FONOPs?

17 And, by the way, in one of the hearings that we had
18 with the CNO of the Navy, he said, "Well, Senator, we --
19 we're up there a lot, the Navy is." I'm like, "Really?
20 How? Where?" "With subs." Well, I think it's great that
21 we've got subs up there, but a sub is not a FONOP. You
22 can't see a sub. The whole point of a FONOP is to
23 demonstrate presence. So, how do we address that, Mr.
24 Secretary? Because I think we're sorely lacking in that
25 realm, as of now, even though it is part of the Strategy.

1 Dr. Anderson: So, the -- I mean, exercising Freedom of
2 Navigation Operations is certainly something that's central
3 to the Department and to the Nation. And we do this around
4 the globe, in some areas certainly more than others, as your
5 question suggests. I cannot, you know, telegraph when we're
6 going to do FONOPs in the Arctic, but I will --

7 Senator Sullivan: Yeah, well, my question is, Can we
8 do FONOPs in the Arctic?

9 Dr. Anderson: Yes, sir.

10 Senator Sullivan: Very different question.

11 Dr. Anderson: Understood. So, I do -- depending on --

12 Senator Sullivan: What's the answer?

13 Dr. Anderson: The Arctic, as, sir, the map behind you
14 suggests, is actually a quite large area, and I think we --
15 the Navy does have the capability, in, sort of, ice-free
16 areas, to do FONOPs in a very limited capacity, or more
17 limited capacity, in those that might be congested with ice.
18 We've already talked about, you know, the limitations there.

19 But, it's something that -- of course, as a matter of
20 principle, we take issue with any excessive maritime claim.
21 We submit to Congress every year an annual report of those
22 nations that are claiming excessively. And we do quite a
23 number of FONOPs around the world. But, I take your point,
24 and certainly acknowledge that we do have limitations in the
25 Arctic right now.

1 Senator Sullivan: And are we focused on trying to
2 address those?

3 Dr. Anderson: I think the Cutter Security Program with
4 the Coast Guard, the development of those icebreakers is
5 certainly a large part of that.

6 Senator Sullivan: How about ice-hardened Navy ships?

7 Dr. Anderson: So, my understanding is that the Navy
8 has looked at this, and they have assessed that, to exercise
9 their Arctic Strategy, they do not have a requirement for
10 ice-hardened ships.

11 Senator Sullivan: Do you think that is even remotely
12 logical?

13 Dr. Anderson: Again, looking at the -- at certain
14 places in the Arctic, we can certainly -- and we do operate
15 both in the surface and the subsurface and above the air, to
16 demonstrate our overflight rights and our maritime freedom
17 of the seas. But, there are limitations.

18 Senator Sullivan: Yeah, I don't think that's logical.
19 I think the days of the Murmansk runs, which is a proud
20 history of the U.S. Navy that I'm proud that my family
21 participated in, couldn't do them right now. And that's --
22 we're going to wake up one of these days and recognize that
23 that's a severe limitation. And we've been beating the drum
24 here, but I think we've got a lot more work to do.

25 Senator Kaine.

1 Senator Kaine: A couple more items. So, I want to
2 pick up on this "six of seven" comment, Dr. Anderson, in
3 your testimony. I thought that was interesting. Six of the
4 seven other Arctic nations are either NATO allies or NATO-
5 enhanced opportunities partners. The Arctic Council
6 excludes military and security issues from its mandate. We
7 do other work there. But, talk a -- I hadn't really thought
8 about the fact that the Arctic nations are generally NATO
9 allies or security partners. So, what is the current
10 status? And this question is actually for either of you,
11 about just, you know, the mil-to-mil cooperation between us
12 and those NATO allies and partners on Arctic issues. Are
13 they taking it seriously? Are they making the investments?
14 Do we do wargaming and other exercises to the extent that we
15 should?

16 Dr. Anderson: So, I would say absolutely yes, with the
17 case of our NATO allies and those enhanced partners. To
18 cite a -- kind of a current example, right now Norway is
19 leading the charge up to a major exercise that's going to
20 run from 12 to 20 March, entitled Exercise Cold Response.
21 There'll be some 15,000 allies and partners, including some
22 U.S. forces, involved in that exercise. Norway is -- you
23 know, it brings some strong capabilities to the table. They
24 are going ahead with the F-35. We have a very strong
25 bilateral relationship with Denmark, with our access to

1 Greenland, as mentioned earlier, with Thule. With --
2 Iceland also provides certain other contributions with some
3 non-NATO partners, with the Fins and the Swedes. Very
4 strong relationships there. And a strong relationship
5 between them and NATO itself. This manifests itself in a
6 wide variety of sort of bilateral efforts and also key
7 leader engagements.

8 So, I would say, in short, it's -- we need them, and we
9 exercise them -- with them in a robust way. And this
10 provides us a distinct and clear advantage over the Russian
11 Federation in the competition space regarding the Arctic.

12 Senator Kaine: I mean, that is something that we need
13 to always remember, that we have these networks of
14 alliances. And Russia and China just -- that's not the way
15 they do things. They can purchase friendships through
16 transactions, but they don't have the real networks of
17 alliances that we have. And that's strong.

18 I am worried, though, about Russia. There's an awful
19 lot of a northern route around Russia. And so, what are we
20 thinking about when Putin says, "Hey, look, this is the new
21 Suez Canal, the route from the Pacific over to the North
22 Atlantic. You know, if you don't either have, you know, a
23 Russian ship or you're not escorted by a Russian, we're
24 going to cause you trouble, we're going to pay -- you're
25 going to have to pay a big toll to us to do it"? Is that

1 something that we just have to accept, or what are -- what
2 are the thoughts of the U.S. and our allies in the Arctic
3 nations about how we would maintain open sea, you know, that
4 is essential adjacent to the northern border of Russia?

5 Dr. Anderson: I would -- I'd say, broadly, that, you
6 know, those type of Russian claims, you know, where they
7 demand to have escorts on ships or they insist on putting
8 pilots on ships, I mean, that is completely unacceptable,
9 and, you know, our State Department has the -- kind of, the
10 diplomatic lead on that to take issue in the appropriate
11 forum. So, that is not something that we accept as the
12 status quo.

13 Senator Kaine: Okay.

14 General O'Shaughnessy: And, Senator, I --

15 Senator Kaine: General O'Shaughnessy?

16 General O'Shaughnessy: -- I would just add to that.
17 It's -- and I think it does start, as the Secretary
18 mentioned, as, you know -- look, watching Secretary Pompeo,
19 in May at Finland, where he very clearly articulated that.
20 I think that's where it starts. But, then we have to
21 continue to show -- because our lack of presence is a
22 statement unto itself. And so, continuing to work with our
23 allies and partners with respect to continuing to enhance
24 our ability to operate there and actually operate there.
25 For example, our tie-in with Denmark is an example where

1 their Arctic Command has partnered with us at NORTHCOM,
2 which defies the seams mentioned earlier, with respect to
3 COCOMs, but -- and we're, you know, sharing information back
4 and forth, we're doing exercises together. And so, those
5 things are the start of it. But, also, we're doing
6 roundtable -- for example, the Arctic Council, of course, is
7 not military, by design --

8 Senator Kaine: Right.

9 General O'Shaughnessy: -- but we're able to use, kind
10 of, the Arctic Security Council to go and talk through those
11 security issues, to actually have that dialogue with our
12 allies and partners with respect to the very challenges that
13 you mentioned, Senator.

14 Senator Kaine: Great. Thank you.

15 That's all my questions.

16 Senator Sullivan: Thank you. And I'll probably go for
17 5 to 10 minutes.

18 Senator Kaine: Yeah. That's cool. Yeah. That's
19 fine.

20 Senator Sullivan: Well, let me close out with a few
21 more questions. This has been a very informative hearing.

22 You know, gentlemen, we're talking FONOPs, which is
23 really, in essence, power projection, which is what our
24 military is, in many ways, all about. But, as you know,
25 power projection also relates to infrastructure and the

1 ability to have ports and other infrastructure that can
2 support military assets.

3 General O'Shaughnessy, you know the challenge in
4 Alaska. The closest strategic port that could actually
5 handle, say, a Arleigh Burke-class Navy ship or a polar-
6 class icebreaker, is about 1500 nautical miles from the
7 Arctic Circle. So, that would be about the equivalent of
8 having, you know, Fort Lauderdale cover the entire eastern
9 seaboard up to Boston, in terms of port capability. We
10 wouldn't accept that. But, somehow we accept that in the
11 Arctic. So, it's the Port of Anchorage or Dutch Harbor that
12 could handle ships that are the size that can project power.
13 And I'm not even talking an aircraft carrier. I'm talking
14 just destroyers and icebreakers.

15 So, previous Secretary of the Navy Richard Spencer,
16 former Secretary Richard Spencer, had been to Alaska twice
17 with the Commandant of the Coast Guard. He clearly has
18 advocated for and said we need a strategic Arctic port.
19 This committee, two different times, has passed legislation
20 highlighting the need for a strategic Arctic port that can,
21 essentially, provide a base where a Navy ship or a
22 significant-size national security cutter or polar security
23 cutter can pull up, resupply, refuel. And we don't have any
24 of that along the entire Arctic area of responsibility on
25 the west coast of Alaska, and yet, as we've already

1 discussed, Russia has probably close to a dozen or two dozen
2 of these kind of ports. What's your assessment and your
3 personal opinion, as the advocate for the Arctic, on the
4 need for strategic Arctic ports, whether it would be Nome or
5 Port Clarence, these places that you've become familiar
6 with, or reopening -- which the former Secretary of the Navy
7 was also interested -- Adak, which is a very strategic
8 location, the gateway to the Arctic, a critical potential
9 base with a deepwater port with regard to our Asia-Pacific
10 interests -- can I get your assessment -- actually both of
11 your -- gentlemen -- on the need for a strategic Arctic
12 port, which this committee and the NDAA have twice said is
13 something that is important?

14 Dr. Anderson: So, I'll start on that. As -- we are
15 working on Section 1754 -- or 1752, which is in the NDAA
16 provision, to look and assess for the need of strategic
17 ports. So, that report is -- we're starting on that. We're
18 going to deliver that by June. You know, I'd certainly
19 grant, in a matter of principle, ports are important, but
20 I'm going to reserve judgment until I see the results of
21 that analysis.

22 What's also going on is a particular study that the
23 Army Corps of Engineers, as you know, is doing on Nome.
24 They have a draft report, which has been issued, I think, in
25 December. And we're awaiting, kind of, the final report

1 there to see what are the options, the cost benefits of
2 deepening that existing port so that it could accommodate
3 larger vessels.

4 Senator Sullivan: So, Mr. Secretary, just -- and then
5 I'd like to hear from General O'Shaughnessy -- your personal
6 military judgment. Doesn't necessarily have to follow the
7 Secretary's. But, I will say, this is kind of round two of
8 this. This is a classic example where the Pentagon has come
9 back to us, saying, "Aw, you don't really need anything." I
10 mean, no kidding? I think that's fundamentally ridiculous.
11 Of course you need some kind of port infrastructure capacity
12 that can handle the very ships that we need to protect our
13 sovereignty. We can't even do FONOPs in the region. We
14 need a place to be able to -- I'm not asking for a Navy base
15 or any -- I'm just saying a place to park ships. Fifteen-
16 hundred nautical miles away from where the action is, and we
17 find that acceptable. I certainly hope -- I certainly hope
18 the Pentagon is not going to come back, after studying this
19 again, saying, "There's no need." I had breakfast with the
20 Secretary of Defense today. I don't think that's his view.
21 So, you guys might want to run that up the food chain before
22 you come back to this committee again and say, "Eh,
23 infrastructure looks fine." The infrastructure is not fine.
24 It doesn't exist. And we need it to exist.

25 General, what's your view on this?

1 General O'Shaughnessy: Well, first, Senator, when I
2 think -- the infrastructure part you mentioned is not just
3 the port, but the broader -- I mean, this is a microcosm of
4 the broader challenge with the infrastructure that we have
5 to work in the Arctic. That said, specific to your
6 questions on the port, I would say, one, I look forward to
7 working on the response with our colleagues, due in June,
8 and then the following report, 90 days thereafter. And so,
9 that is a great opportunity for us to really expand on this.

10 I will say, we have a stated requirement for fuel north
11 of Dutch Harbor. And where that becomes important, as you
12 mentioned, not only Anchorage, but Dutch Harbor, not -- does
13 give you some capability, but it's --

14 Senator Sullivan: Dutch Harbor is quite, quite, quite
15 a ways from --

16 General O'Shaughnessy: It's, what, 1,000 miles --

17 Senator Sullivan: -- Bering Strait.

18 General O'Shaughnessy: -- from Barrow, as an example.

19 Senator Sullivan: Yeah.

20 General O'Shaughnessy: Right? So, that's -- and part
21 of the -- one thing we have to look at is, it's not just
22 getting a ship to Barrow, it's its ability to continue to
23 operate once it gets there, and not just have to turn around
24 and go get gas.

25 As I mentioned, I have Ken on my staff, and he's been

1 very helpful as we look at some of the challenges, because
2 we do have capability now, for example, at Nome, where we're
3 able to get gas part of the year, but we use barges, and we
4 go back and forth. And so, that's --

5 Senator Sullivan: Again, that's not the same as the
6 ability --

7 General O'Shaughnessy: No, and --

8 Senator Sullivan: -- to pull a ship up, that we expect
9 in I don't know how many eastern seaboard ports along
10 America's eastern seaboard, where you can do that with a
11 Navy ship or a Coast Guard cutter. Right now, you can't do
12 it anywhere in the entire U.S. Arctic. You can't pull a
13 ship up --

14 General O'Shaughnessy: Sure.

15 Senator Sullivan: -- to resupply or get fueled without
16 barging. So, I think we really need to look at this,
17 gentlemen, and take it seriously.

18 General O'Shaughnessy: And the challenges you submit
19 there are quite real. And when you look at -- for example,
20 about a third of the time that the port is actually open in
21 Nome, for example, when we're doing these barge ops, you
22 can't do it because of the weather, and the winds over 10
23 knots, and the sea states, and whatnot. So, we just -- we
24 have to look at the detail --

25 Senator Sullivan: Well, you would be able to do that,

1 obviously, if you had a port.

2 General O'Shaughnessy: Exactly. And so, one of the
3 things we've done, just to preserve options as we do go
4 forward, is, we work with the Corps of Engineers. And, as
5 we do look at the Nome study -- and we're not saying Nome is
6 an answer, or if there is an answer, but when we look at
7 that study, we ensured that they kept the 40-foot draft as
8 part of that proposal. To your point about the 40-foot
9 draft would allow us to work DDGs, the polar security
10 cutter, et cetera, as we go forward here, at least so we
11 have the numbers, we have the understanding, so we can
12 continue the work we're doing.

13 But, then, as we look at, also, the common challenges
14 we have, this is yet another example of -- we have, both
15 from the military standpoint, certainly with the use -- with
16 a facility such as that, we look at the commercial side that
17 would have uses such that. And so, we see this -- this is a
18 shared effort, going forward. And that's the way I think we
19 should look as -- both within the Department of Defense and
20 the broader Federal Government, and then the local
21 government, as we make these analysis about the necessity
22 for a port and what that would look like, I think we have to
23 look broader than just the pure DOD military application.
24 And, sir, I thank you and Senator Murkowski for the work
25 that you've done with the Civil Work Act and the bill that

1 you put on -- there that allows to look at those with a
2 national security lens as we go forward.

3 So, I look forward to continuing to work this issue.
4 This is an important issue. And I think you've hit some of
5 the key parts that we know we need to work on infrastructure
6 at large, and clearly this is part of it. I've had the
7 great opportunity to talk to the harbormaster, example, Joy,
8 talk to her just to really understand the details so I can
9 inform OSD and advocate for what we really need, not just to
10 be able to get there, but then to be able to operate once
11 we're there.

12 Senator Sullivan: Well, I think that's a really
13 insightful answer. And I do want to mention -- and I think
14 the Corps has been working well with this -- just the way in
15 which this study's being done. As you know -- and you know,
16 Mr. Secretary -- it's actually being partially funded by the
17 Corps and partially funded by the City of Nome. So, they're
18 all-in to even help the DOD actually do the study. And my
19 view, long held, as you have on the East Coast, I think it's
20 a series of ports that we should be looking at to protect
21 our -- America's strategic sovereign interests along western
22 Alaska, whether it's Nome or Port Clarence or Kotzebue or
23 even up in Barrow, that can handle these kind of ships,
24 which, again, is something that I believe is kind of
25 expected, accepted, just a given on the East Coast, and even

1 most of the West Coast, but not in America's Arctic. And I
2 think we need to start working to change that.

3 Related to that, as we look to -- the Coast Guard has
4 announced that the first two polar security cutters will be
5 based in Seattle, where the one that's functioning, the one
6 that is broken, are currently homeported. Beyond that, my
7 own view -- and maybe this is more of a Coast Guard view --
8 or Coast Guard issue, where, as I mentioned, I chair the
9 subcommittee in charge of the Coast Guard -- but, I think it
10 would make sense, beyond that, to have these other Coast
11 Guard security cutters based in a place that needs them.
12 You mentioned the Antarctica mission. To me, that's not the
13 priority for America. The priority for America is defend
14 our own sovereignty. Do you have any views on that,
15 General, in terms of going forward -- granted, this is a
16 little bit further out -- but to have Coast Guard assets,
17 particularly the polar security cutters, based in the
18 Arctic, that can respond to the needs and missions there?

19 General O'Shaughnessy: Well, Senator, I certainly
20 wouldn't tell the Coast Guard, you know, where to base their
21 force, but what I would say is --

22 Senator Sullivan: But, you are the advocate for the
23 Arctic.

24 General O'Shaughnessy: For the Arctic. And, as such,
25 and with our partnership with the Coast Guard, what I would

1 advocate for is the presence. Right? And so, whether that
2 means that they base it in Alaska or they just make the
3 presence available in Alaska, clearly some work to be done
4 there. But, what we have to make sure we have is that the
5 time that it's actually available to do missions needs to be
6 part of that calculation.

7 Senator Sullivan: Good. Thank you.

8 I have one final question. And it relates to this
9 previous posterboard we had, dealing with the gaps in the
10 different COCOMs. There has been some discussion -- and I
11 think it's at fairly senior levels within the Department of
12 Defense -- that, if you look at the significant Alaska
13 military-based forces -- Alaska-based military forces -- as
14 you know, they're operationally -- they're OPCON to PACOM.
15 And yet, right now we have, for example, the 1st Stryker
16 Brigade that's in Iraq. And, as you know, we're getting two
17 squadrons of F-35s here, starting in a couple of months.
18 And to address this issue of seams within COCOMs, what's
19 your sense on whether or not the specific Alaska-based
20 forces that are in NORTHCOM, OPCON to PACOM, biggest threat
21 from EUROM, and critical role, given Alaska's role in
22 missile defense, to STRATCOM, what's your sense about a more
23 service-focused orientation on operational control of these
24 forces as a way to make them much more of a global force
25 ready for deployment, given their strategic location and

1 their ability to deploy in several different theaters, not
2 just PACOM? Do you have a sense on that? I know it's a
3 topic that's being discussed at the senior levels of the
4 Pentagon.

5 General O'Shaughnessy: Right. I would just say,
6 broadly, that, as we look at this, I think we have to look
7 at it from a new lens. Right? I think the current
8 alignment --

9 Senator Sullivan: From what? I'm sorry.

10 General O'Shaughnessy: A new lens. The current
11 alignment was in a different security environment. And so,
12 I think, as we look at the security environment we find
13 ourself today, as articulated by the NDS, very clearly talks
14 about the changing nature of our adversaries that can hold
15 us at risk. And, as we look at that, our ability to respond
16 to that, I think we have to look at the UCP at large --
17 Unified Command Plan at large -- and then the assignment of
18 forces within there.

19 Senator Sullivan: Do you have a personal opinion on
20 this?

21 General O'Shaughnessy: My personal opinion, and which
22 I've shared with the senior DOD leadership, is, I do believe
23 that those forces that are currently within my AOR, but then
24 assigned to a different COCOM, ought to be service-retained.
25 And, by that, I'm not saying we need to own them in

1 NORTHCOM. I'm just saying we give the Secretary of Defense
2 the flexibility by retaining them in the services, and then
3 they can be assigned -- allocated as they need to, based on
4 the current --

5 Senator Sullivan: Mr. Secretary, do you have a view on
6 that? I know it's a kind of a complicated topic that does
7 relate to the almost unique aspects of the strategic
8 location of the Alaskan forces. They can get anywhere in
9 the northern hemisphere in about 7 hours. But, also, the
10 seams that I talked about with regard to the different
11 COCOMs, and how that plays out with the ability to use them
12 for global force protection and global force deployment.

13 Dr. Anderson: So, I would say, generally, I'm -- you
14 know, I'm aware that the UCP is reviewed every couple of
15 years, and this is exactly the type of seam issue that is
16 deserving of attention. I would also say, generally, that,
17 you know, there's an emphasis within the building to sort of
18 make sure that we have the appropriate-size -- right-size
19 immediate-response force and contingency response force.
20 So, in that context, I tend to align my thinking, in a --
21 kind of a preliminary sense, with what the General just
22 articulated, in terms of having those forces assigned to the
23 service.

24 Senator Sullivan: Final question. And I asked this
25 today, at the broader hearing, from the Secretary of the Air

1 Force and Chief of Staff of the Air Force on the -- in the
2 full committee. And this goes to the question we were just
3 talking about. But, given the strategic location of Alaska,
4 the Air Force is looking at its OCONUS bed-down decision of
5 the KC-46. The Secretary of Defense has testified that if
6 you colocated KC-46s that are at the seams -- PACOM, EUCOM,
7 NORTHCOM, STRATCOM -- colocated with over 100 fifth-
8 generation fighters, which we will be having in Alaska,
9 here, in the next 2 years, you would have a message of
10 extreme strategic reach to our potential adversaries on what
11 they see in Alaska -- KC-46s colocated with 100 fifth-gen
12 fighters. Do either of you have a view on that? The other
13 locations the Air Force is looking at are purely in the
14 PACOM region. And again, it kind of cabins the ability for
15 strategic reach when you put an asset like KC-46s solely in
16 one AOR, when, as you know, your colleague, the TRANSCOM
17 Commander, recently said that the KC-46 refueling capability
18 was their most stressed asset that they have for their
19 global force-protection capabilities. Do you have a view of
20 that, General? Personal opinion?

21 General O'Shaughnessy: Yeah, Senator, what I would say
22 is -- I'll leave the basing decision to the Air Force, as
23 there's a lot that would go into that, but what I will
24 absolutely agree with you on is the strategic value of
25 having access to them from Alaska. And, as you mentioned,

1 you tie it to that fifth-gen, it does make a powerful
2 statement. And one of the things I was really shocked at
3 when I was in PACAF, that I didn't realize -- as we were
4 looking at deployments, it was actually quicker to go from
5 Alaska to a regional right in EUCOM than it was to go, say,
6 to the South China Sea. And so, that really -- it was kind
7 of eye-opening to me to really understand the -- you know,
8 we you look at a traditional map a lot, and it doesn't
9 convey the strategic value of Alaska, as articulated by Bill
10 Mitchell in 1935, as you mentioned, first point.

11 And then, the second point, I think, as you mentioned,
12 is the leveraging, not only the ability to deploy, but also
13 the ability to train. And you look at the JPAR and the
14 ability to operate there. One of the continuous challenges
15 we have is the ability to get tanker support for those
16 operations that are happening at JPARC Range. And as we
17 see, hopefully, an -- a steady increase in our use of the
18 JPARC Range, not only for the fifth-gen Center of
19 Excellence, but I would start thinking about, as a Arctic
20 Center of Excellence --

21 Senator Sullivan: Yeah.

22 General O'Shaughnessy: -- of using that there. I see
23 the value of having that tanking capability there, as well.

24 Senator Sullivan: Great. Thank you,

25 Mr. Secretary, do you have a view on that -- Under

1 Secretary Rood -- you know, this is an Air Force decision.
2 He was in Alaska about 2 months ago, and, I think, saw the
3 strategic rationale of that colocation that the Secretary of
4 Defense testified would show our adversaries extreme
5 strategic reach. Do you have a view on that yet, sir?

6 Dr. Anderson: I would certainly concur with the
7 Secretary of Defense and his assessment there. The Chairman
8 also testified, in so many words, so he sent a powerful
9 message, that, indeed, if they were colocated, that they
10 would have that reach, and it would be powerful message.

11 Senator Sullivan: Great.

12 Well, gentlemen, thank you very much.

13 I want to thank Senator Kaine for his patience on this
14 hearing. It's a lot of questions from me, but I think it's
15 very informative.

16 For both of you, really appreciate all the work.

17 If members have additional questions in the next 2
18 weeks, they will submit them for the record. If you can,
19 respectfully, answer those as quickly as you can, that would
20 be much appreciated.

21 Otherwise, very informative. Again, General
22 O'Shaughnessy, I can't thank you enough for your great
23 service to our Nation, my State, the people of Alaska, but
24 the people of America, and, of course, the people -- men and
25 women of the Air Force.

1 This hearing is adjourned.

2 [Whereupon, at 3:46 p.m., the hearing was adjourned.]

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25