AUTHENTICATED
U.S. GOVERNMENT
INFORMATION
GPO

[H.A.S.C. No. 119–27]

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY FISCAL YEAR 2026 POSTURE

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

FIRST SESSION

HEARING HELD
JUNE 4, 2025



U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE
64–589 WASHINGTON : 2026

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED NINETEENTH CONGRESS

MIKE ROGERS, Alabama, *Chairman*

JOE WILSON, South Carolina
MICHAEL R. TURNER, Ohio
ROBERT J. WITTMAN, Virginia, *Vice Chair*
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia
SAM GRAVES, Missouri
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee
TRENT KELLY, Mississippi
DON BACON, Nebraska
JACK BERGMAN, Michigan
RONNY JACKSON, Texas
PAT FALLON, Texas
CARLOS A. GIMENEZ, Florida
NANCY MACE, South Carolina
BRAD FINSTAD, Minnesota
MORGAN LUTTRELL, Texas
JENNIFER A. KIGGANS, Virginia
JAMES C. MOYLAN, Guam
CORY MILLS, Florida
RICHARD MCCORMICK, Georgia
LANCE GOODEN, Texas
CLAY HIGGINS, Louisiana
DERRICK VAN ORDEN, Wisconsin
JOHN J. MCGUIRE III, Virginia
PAT HARRIGAN, North Carolina
MARK B. MESSMER, Indiana
DEREK SCHMIDT, Kansas
JEFF CRANK, Colorado
ABRAHAM J. HAMADEH, Arizona

ADAM SMITH, Washington
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
JOHN GARAMENDI, California
DONALD NORCROSS, New Jersey
SETH MOULTON, Massachusetts
SALUD O. CARBAJAL, California
RO KHANNA, California
WILLIAM R. KEATING, Massachusetts
CHRISSY HOULAHAN, Pennsylvania
JASON CROW, Colorado
MIKIE SHERRILL, New Jersey
JARED F. GOLDEN, Maine
SARA JACOBS, California
MARILYN STRICKLAND, Washington
PATRICK RYAN, New York
GABE VASQUEZ, New Mexico
CHRISTOPHER R. DELUZIO, Pennsylvania
JILL N. TOKUDA, Hawaii
DONALD G. DAVIS, North Carolina
GILBERT RAY CISNEROS JR., California
ERIC SORENSEN, Illinois
MAGGIE GOODLANDER, New Hampshire
SARAH ELFRETH, Maryland
GEORGE WHITESIDES, California
DEREK TRAN, California
EUGENE SIMON VINDMAN, Virginia
WESLEY BELL, Missouri

CHRIS VIESON, *Staff Director*
MICHAEL KIRLIN, *Professional Staff Member*
JAY VALLARIO, *Professional Staff Member*
ANDREW SMITH, *Research Assistant*

CONTENTS

Page

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Rogers, Hon. Mike, a Representative from Alabama, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services 1
Smith, Hon. Adam, a Representative from Washington, Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services 2

WITNESSES

Driscoll, Daniel P., Secretary of the Army 3
George, GEN Randy A., USA, Chief of Staff of the Army 5

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS:
Joint Statement of Secretary Driscoll and General George 85

DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:
[There were no Documents submitted.]

WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:
Mr. Carbajal 97
Dr. DesJarlais 97
Mr. Crow 98
Dr. Jackson 98
Ms. Strickland 98
Mr. Vasquez 99
Mr. Luttrell 99
Mr. Moylan 100
Ms. Elfreth 100
Mr. Van Orden 101
Mr. McGuire 101
Mr. Vindman 102

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:
Mr. Wilson 105
Mr. Garamendi 105
Mr. Wittman 106
Mr. Norcross 107
Mr. Scott 107
Mr. Moulton 118
Ms. Stefanik 120
Ms. Houlahan 121
Mr. Crow 121
Mr. Bergman 123
Ms. Sherrill 125
Dr. Jackson 127
Ms. Mace 130
Mr. Ryan 131
Ms. Tokuda 132
Mr. Moylan 134
Mr. Davis 135
Mr. McGuire 137
Mr. Crank 137
Mr. Hamadeh 138

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY FISCAL YEAR 2026 POSTURE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, Wednesday, June 4, 2025.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in Room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Mike Rogers [Chairman of the Committee] presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. MIKE ROGERS, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM ALABAMA, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The CHAIRMAN. The Committee will come to order. I want to welcome our witnesses and thank them both for their service to our great nation. Today we kick off our review of the administration's FY [fiscal year] 2026 budget request for the Department of Defense with the United States Army. Unfortunately, we still have not received any real information about that budget request, nor have we received any detailed information on the Army's Transformation Initiative, or ATI the Secretary and the Chief announced over a month ago.

I believe I speak for most of the members of the Committee when I say that we share your goal of developing a more modern, agile, and well-equipped Army. And the broad structure of the ATI sounds encouraging, rapidly delivering modern warfare capabilities, organizing force structure, and eliminating waste and obsolete programs, but we need to see your homework.

An overhaul this significant should be based on thorough assessment of requirements, and it should include a detailed blueprint of the specific changes being proposed, and how the Army plans to implement them. We need those assessments and blueprints. We also need you to provide us a timeline for implementing ATI. These details will help Congress understand, evaluate, and ultimately fund your transformation efforts.

The Marine Corps did well with Force Design 2030, and the Army should follow that model. At the end of the day, we want to make sure this overhaul is being driven by battlefield requirements, and not by artificial budget constraints. I am pleased to hear both of you are committed to fundamental reform of the Army acquisition processes, you will find this Committee a willing partner in that effort.

The battlefield is rapidly changing, but the capabilities we deliver to our war fighters are not keeping pace. Next week we will introduce a piece of bipartisan legislation that will overhaul the acquisition process, and refocus it around rapidly equipping our war

fighters with modern capabilities. I look forward to working with both of you on this legislation, and I also understand you both hope to use ATI to build a force more relevant to a conflict in the Pacific.

While I have long supported the pivot to Asia, I urge you not to lose sight of Europe. The U.S. [United States] Army is the backbone of our presence there, and that presence matters. Thanks to President Trump's leadership, our NATO [North Atlantic Treaty Organization] allies are finally investing more in their own defense, but Europe's rearmament won't happen overnight. Withdrawing U.S. brigades too soon would risk inviting further Russian aggression and leave our European NATO allies especially vulnerable.

We cannot let that happen. Ultimately, to maintain readiness and achieve peace through strength, we must adequately fund the Army. I look forward to working with you both to build the ready, capable, and lethal fighting force America needs to deter its adversaries.

And with that, I yield to my friend and colleague, the Ranking Member Mr. Smith.

STATEMENT OF HON. RANKING MEMBER, ADAM SMITH, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM WASHINGTON, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thanks to our witness for being here today, and for your service, and I substantially agree with pretty much everything the chairman just said. Obviously, Army transformation is the headline, and right off the bat, I have spoken with both of you about this, but I want to applaud both of you publicly for diving in to that very difficult subject, it needs to be done.

Now, the chairman is right, the details need to be worked out, but there is no question that the nature of warfare is changing dramatically. How do we adjust our force to meet those challenges? Certainly, we've seen what happened with Ukraine and Russia, just in the last several days has gotten our attention about the vulnerabilities of existing systems, and the capabilities of drones and new systems.

How does that inform the way we want to build our national defense structure? So, your efforts in that are broadly supported by this Committee, the devil is in the details, but you are headed in the right direction, and we look forward to working with you to make some of those changes. And I agree with the chairman on the budget, the budget is a major problem, I think in two respects.

One, it is not consistently given, this is the latest in my memory that a budget has ever come before Congress, well it is not here yet, so latest and continuing that record here as we go. But even before that, as well documented, we have been passing CRs [continuing resolutions], we haven't been doing consistent budgeting, and that adds an element of uncertainty to the challenges that we have outlined.

We need a more consistent budget process. I guess the only minor quibble I would have with the chairman's comments, when he said artificial budget constraints. I think the budget constraints are real, and frankly one of the things that I would like to see

within the Department of Defense, and frankly throughout government, is a recognition of those budget constraints.

We don't have an unlimited amount of money as we are 36 trillion dollars in debt, we are apparently about to pass a budget reconciliation bill that is going to add another 2, 3, or 4 trillion dollars to that. We have very real budget constraints, and one of my worries across DOD [Department of Defense], not just with the Army, is we are just sort of keeping doing a whole lot. We don't think we have enough ships, we don't have enough nuclear weapons, we don't have enough planes.

And so, we have got all these plans to fill that that cannot possibly be met by the budget constraints that we face. So, again, I applaud the Army for taking a little bit more of a realistic look at that, and I hope we can build off of that and move forward. One other really important issue obviously is recruitment and quality of life. This Committee did a ton of work last cycle to try to make sure that we support our service members and their families, who we continue to recruit and retain, the best forces we have.

Also interested in your thoughts about what that force looks like in the modern battlefield. Certainly, we will always need war fighters, infantry, all of that. But technology is becoming so much more important, how does that change who we want to recruit, and how we do our outreach to make sure that we have the people that we need serving in the Army and throughout the military.

And lastly, I want to agree with the final point the chairman made about Europe specifically, but more broadly I have never been a big fan of the whole pivot to Asia idea. The idea that China is our primary challenge I agree with, but that challenge is global, it is not just in Asia. What happens in Ukraine is going to have a profound impact on how we deal with China, as they are now partnering with Russia, and North Korea, and Iran.

And also, China is active everywhere in the world. This is a global competition, so I don't think we can afford to ignore the rest of the world, and thinking that if we focus on Asia, that will focus on the challenges that we meet. It needs to be a more comprehensive approach. With that, I thank the chairman for this hearing, and I look forward to the testimony and the questions.

Thank you, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the ranking member. I would like to now introduce our witnesses. The Honorable Dan Driscoll, Secretary of the Army, welcome. General Randy George, Chief of Staff of the Army, welcome.

Secretary Driscoll, we will start with you, you are recognized for five minutes.

STATEMENT OF THE HONORABLE DANIEL P. DRISCOLL, SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

Mr. DRISCOLL. Chairman Rogers, Ranking Member Smith, distinguished members of this Committee, it is a privilege to address you today. I want to express my sincere gratitude for your unwavering support of our soldiers and their families. I would like to start off this hearing with some good news. Yesterday, the United States Army met its fiscal year 2025 recruiting goal four months early, welcoming more than sixty-one thousand new recruits.

These men and women are stepping up during a time of global uncertainty and complex threats, and those threats are real. When I went through my confirmation hearings, I pledged to be the soldier's Secretary of the Army. That commitment has guided every single step of our approach so far. The Army Transformation Initiative has been conceived with the soldier in mind, and your partnership is absolutely critical as General George and I begin implementing this transformation, which is now more urgent than ever.

This week, we witnessed a stark illustration of modern warfare in Ukraine and Russia. Reports indicated a coordinated strike against Russia's strategic bomber force using a swarm of over 100 inexpensive drones. At a cost of a mere tens of thousands of dollars, Ukraine inflicted billions in damage, potentially setting back Russia's bomber capabilities for years.

The world saw in near real time how readily available technology can disrupt established power dynamics, and drones are but one example of a broader shift. The Army needs to keep pace. In my first three months as secretary, General George and I have been immersed in understanding why the Army has been slow to innovate. Our soldiers are not the problem. I have met with them in the Middle East, Europe, along our southern border, and at installations across the United States.

Their strength, dedication, and unwavering commitment to this nation are inspiring. We ask a great deal of them, and they consistently deliver. Nor is the ingenuity of American industry at fault. Our tech sector continues to thrive, driven by innovation, entrepreneurship, and a willingness to embrace risk. So, where does the problem lie? As secretary I have found that the Army has become calcified, having suffered from years of inefficiency, slow moving processes, and wasteful spending.

Program lobbyists and bureaucrats have overtaken the Army's ability to prioritize soldiers and war fighting. We must all work together to ensure the Army is ready to fight and win. The Army Transformation Initiative will make us into an Army that is lean, agile, and relentlessly focused on empowering its soldiers. An Army that embraces innovation, collaborates effectively with the private sector, and prioritizes war fighting readiness above all else.

To achieve this vision, we must streamline our acquisitions process, reclaim our right to repair, and cultivate a culture that rewards innovation and calculative risk taking. We must also empower those closest to the fight to actually make the decisions. The Army Transformation Initiative is our first step to achieve this vision, but this transformation hinges on your support.

We are asking this Committee to empower us to make these changes while providing your constitutionally mandated oversight. We are asking for the flexibility to make decisions that keep pace with the rapid advancements in technology, and the evolving nature of warfare. We are asking for this Committee to work with us to maximize the value of every dollar appropriated to best support our soldiers.

I ask this because it is my duty both as Secretary of the Army, and as an American citizen to ensure that every dollar the Army receives contributes to defending this great nation of ours. I know we are all committed to our soldiers, to their success, and to pro-

viding them with the overwhelming advantage they deserve. Thank you, and I welcome your questions.

[The prepared joint statement of Secretary Driscoll and General George can be found in the Appendix on page 85.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

General George, you are recognized.

STATEMENT OF GENERAL RANDY A. GEORGE, CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY

General GEORGE. Chairman Rogers, Ranking Member Smith, distinguished members of the Committee, thanks for the opportunity to be here with you today. I want to start off by saying just how proud I am of our Army. I am proud of our troops in the Indo-Pacific, on the southern border, in the Middle East, in Europe, and of everything our Army has done over the past year to respond to wildfires, floods, and even a bridge collapse.

We have formations all around the world conducting missions, and exercises, and innovating with our partners and allies. When not deployed, our units are conducting tough, realistic training at their home stations, and our combat training centers. Our Army is a professional team that remains focused on its warfighting mission, and young Americans want to be a part of it, and this is evidenced by our strong recruiting numbers this year.

And as the secretary mentioned, we have already met our recruiting mission for the year, and we still have our most productive months ahead of us. And while I am proud of our Army, I also know we have work to do. We know the world is changing, commercial technology is rapidly evolving, especially AI [artificial intelligence] and autonomous systems, and this is impacting the character of war.

We understand that we must transform to stay ahead of our adversaries, and we need to get better by 2026, and 2027, not by 2030. Over the last year, using existing FY [fiscal year] 24 funding, some of our units transformed in contact, which means they experimented with changing how we train, fight, man, and equip while they were deployed or in training environments. This was a great proof of concept, it confirmed that our formations are capable of rapidly improving their lethality.

One Transformation in Contact brigade in Europe was three hundred percent more effective in lethal targeting in training. Transformation in Contact taught us some valuable lessons about what our Army should be buying, and how we should be buying it, and we are just getting started.

We are going to make the changes we can at our level so that we can continue to dominate the modern battlefield. For instance, we will cancel programs that are obsolete, or not what our war fighters need, develop and adapt war winning capabilities by modular, open architecture designs that can be iteratively updated, cut and consolidate headquarters. For instance, we are going to reduce GO structure, cut one thousand positions from the headquarters Department of the Army staff, and add modern business systems that we know will make us more effective.

And finally, we will power down authorities and funding so that commanders in our fighting formations have what they need to make their teams and their communities successful. What I have learned from being in this seat is that it is our job to do as leaders what we can with the budget that we have. I have been talking about the need for agile funding, for UAS [unmanned aircraft systems], counter-UAS, and EW [electronic warfare], and we need more flexibility in those areas.

Technology is changing too rapidly, we have got to be able to buy capabilities rather than specific programs so that we can always get our war fighters the best available tech and equipment for the fight. This is where we could use your help. We are quickly approaching our Army's two hundred and fiftieth birthday. "This We'll Defend," has been our motto for two hundred and fifty years, and I'm looking forward to celebrating our long legacy of duty.

More importantly, our soldiers are ready today to defend our country, and we will do our part to ensure they have what they need to be successful in that enduring mission. We appreciate all of your support, and we are looking forward to your questions.

[The prepared joint statement of General George and Secretary Driscoll can be found in the Appendix on page 85.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you both. I now recognize myself for the first set of questions. As I mentioned in my statement, the Committee is willing to work with you on ATI [Army Transformation Initiative], but we need to see your math. When can we expect the full details of exactly what you are proposing?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The way that we envision ATI, and how we have described it throughout the formations, is this will be an iterative process. And so, there will be no one date where everything with our first batch of ATI will be completed. We will be hopefully doing what the best companies in America do, and learning as we go. The very first batch of cuts that General George has referenced, where we are pushing our soldiers back out to the formations, those are in process.

When we are looking at the assets that we have, and what we are buying, and where we don't want it, we have started to work with those companies who are providing things to empower them with the information about what we do want, so a lot of that is in process. When we are looking at our depots, and where we are manufacturing things in our organic industrial base, we have just started that process of putting together the plans for what could be the right solution.

But our commitment is that we will share it as soon as we have reasonable drafts for this Committee, to take your feedback to help make it stronger and better.

The CHAIRMAN. So, will it be reflected in the President's FY 26 budget?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Many of the cuts, and the lack of requests for obsolete equipment will be reflected in that budget.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay. Do you expect to cancel any programs for which the money was in the FY 25 CR?

General GEORGE. We are not doing that right now, Congressman. We had been in the process of gong back through with businesses, things that we are doing right now. But as the secretary men-

tioned, looking forward, there are several examples, and I know we have been over, and we are happy to come over and brief everyone on what we are doing with the transformation initiative in detail.

But these are systems that I think we have long talked about that we know we don't need in our formation, and are not going to help us win on the battlefield, and we can go down those in detail.

The CHAIRMAN. But those aren't in the FY 2025 CR, are they? The things that you are thinking about.

General GEORGE. To my knowledge, Chairman, there is nothing that is in there. I mean, we just had a conversation, everything that we keep--I will give you one example, we don't want to buy Humvees, we haven't asked to buy Humvees, but that was in our budget, and we are obviously continuing with FY 25 because that is what we were directed to do with our budget.

The CHAIRMAN. The only reason I ask these questions, I just worry about you being locked in. If whatever you are wanting to do is not in the FY 26 budget, then you may have some constraints that are unnecessary. Yes, sir?

Mr. DRISCOLL. And we worked with, in this budget creation process, we have included the entire Pentagon leadership in this, and so it should be reflected in the 26 budget.

The CHAIRMAN. I know you did mention the desire to have the right to repair, we want to be helpful with you on that, so do know that you need to be getting with us about exactly how you see that being constructed statutorily, and we will be helpful. As you know, the acquisition system that we have now is just antiquated, and needs to be modified. And the ranking member and I are making acquisition reform the number one priority in this year's NDAA [National Defense Authorization Act]. What specific authorities, or support, do you need from Congress to fix it?

General GEORGE. I agree with you, Chairman. One of the things that we are looking at, there is a lot of, and how we are going to look at restructuring as well, is there is a lot of commercial off the shelf stuff that we should be adopting. And so, we should be able to be structured so that we are adopting certain equipment that we know the commercial sector is moving very fast.

Other stuff we are going to have to modify, we talk about the Infantry Squad Vehicle is one example of that, we just modify that a little, but it is largely a commercial program. And then there is obviously develop. I think where we need the most help is in agile funding. We know that on drones, autonomous systems, EW, and specifically to the incident in Russia that the Secretary highlighted, counter-UAS.

We need to not buy one program or record, I think program or record is kind of an old term, and we need agile funding to be able to buy those, as the technology changes, buy the best available thing that is on the market.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, I agree, and we need to make those things history, and it is going to be difficult, it is going to require culture change in the Department. We are wanting to impose that culture change, but we are going to need you to want to do it too to make this system viable in the future.

With that I will yield to the ranking member.

Mr. SMITH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I completely agree on the agile funding piece, and within the budget process it is going to be really important to have close coordination between whatever it is that the President's budget winds up being, and then how Congress deals with that to reflect those priorities, and try to give you that agile funding. But Mr. Secretary, on the Army Transformation Plan, if you could sort of just quickly explain that?

What programs are you getting rid of, what programs are you adding? I mean, we can all sort of get the idea that drones are a problem, survivability is a problem, but how does that translate into what we are going to put money into, and what we are not going to put money into going forward?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am happy to answer. So, basically Army Transformation Initiative does four things, there are four buckets of actions, and then I will circle back to the buckets to answer your specific question. The first bucket of actions is United States Army, as General George has mentioned, has not wanted to buy a number of programs and products for the last couple of decades in some instances, and they keep getting them.

And so, it was basically working with the Pentagon leadership under Secretary of Defense Hegseth and President Trump to say hey, let us do what is right for soldiers, we don't need to buy these assets, and resources are limited, let's stop.

Mr. SMITH. I think just a couple of examples, Humvee obviously is one.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Humvee is one, JLTV [Joint Tactical Light Vehicle] is one, the Booker Tank is an example of kind of a sunk cost fallacy in action. We wanted to design a light tank, we ended up with something that was medium, no one really liked it, the manufacturer wasn't particularly happy with it, we weren't happy with it. What would have historically occurred there is we would have kept buying it.

And what we said, we went to the leadership and we said look, we got this one wrong, we the Army have to own this, the wrong answer is not to keep buying it, it is instead to stop the spending, and go buy the things we want.

Mr. SMITH. Exactly. So, what are the things you want?

Mr. DRISCOLL. So, the things we want are drones, light, attritable, commercially off the shelf. We want counter-drone technology, we want our soldiers to have a data layer. So, the very basic function of war will require our people to be able to communicate over the horizon with each other, with our sensors, and our things near instantaneously. When we read about things like generative AI, that cannot work in warfare until we have a very good data layer.

And so, we are very optimistic that there are commercial solutions available, and we are working to do that. So, that would be the second bucket. The third bucket would be right to repair. As the chairman mentioned, the Army, one of the visits we went on, it was horrifying to me that the soldiers were showing us this exquisite equipment that had been off the line for nearly a year, and they knew how to 3D [three-dimensional] print a part to it, and the part cost two dollars.

And for one year they couldn't use this equipment, and it is at scale, and we the Army have been a bad customer to ourself, and so there are some corrections along that. And then another thing General George mentioned in his intro, is we have done a lot of these things to ourselves. We have too many people up in headquarters not wearing helmets, not out in the formations, not doing what they signed up to want to do. And so, we are going to push those soldiers back out to the formations.

Mr. SMITH. Just one thing on that maintenance question. Are you using AI for predictive maintenance to help with that piece of it as well?

Mr. DRISCOLL. So, we want to. We are running some experiments, so very specifically I don't know if anyone has seen the Meta Ray-Ban glasses that are available, they are four or five hundred dollars. We have requested, we are purchasing some of those, we are going to have our Humvee mechanics wear them, and collect one thousand hours of repair footage.

And what we believe may happen is we can train a generative model, so that one year wearing those glasses, you may not actually be a Humvee mechanic, but you may be able to do ninety percent of the repair requirements. And so, we are trying to run experiments as quickly as possible to do that.

Mr. SMITH. And your fourth bucket?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Our fourth bucket is the pushing soldiers back out, getting rid of the bureaucracy in our own formation that we caused.

Mr. SMITH. Okay. How does long range fires fit into this? I know this is something that the Army has been working on, focusing on for a while, obviously the further you are from a target the less vulnerable you are. Drones are an example of sort of a long range fire in its own way. Is it just going to be drones, or are there other systems that you think are going to be necessary to be able to deliver from distance?

General GEORGE. Sir, I was going to add, there is a couple of other things that we are looking at on the reductions. AH-64D is another one, it is twice as expensive, we know we are moving towards autonomy. We had an RCV [Robotic Combat Vehicle], which is a big, heavy autonomous system, and again, we should be looking to commercial industry to help us with that. It was way too expensive, so there is a lot of things that are on that list.

We are looking at long range fires, and I will tell you, this is another thing where I think we have to get industry involved. We are getting ready to do some tests this summer with long range missiles that are a tenth of the price. And when you start talking about magazine depth, and this is back to your initial comments on understanding that you have a budget, I think we have all learned that we have to live within a budget.

We can get things, invest in things that are much more cost effective, and I think that is where we need the flexibility to do that.

Mr. SMITH. Absolutely. And just as I am out of time here, I want to make a point, there are a lot of smaller companies that are developing drones, hypersonic missiles that are so much cheaper than what a lot of the programs of record that we have been working on for a while, it is just independent people who have gone out

there and developed the technology, and now they have got a really cheap thing to offer.

We need to really access those things if we are going to be able to deal with our budget constraints and get to where we need to be.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the ranking member.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina, Mr. Wilson.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, Chairman Mike Rogers for your leadership, and thank both of you for your service to our country, which is so appreciated. We are in a cold war that we didn't choose between dictators with rule of gun invading democracies with rule of law. War criminal Putin began this with the invasion of Ukraine, and the Chinese Communist Party continues to build itself up, and expand, and modernize with capabilities, and rapidly expand, while we are actually reacting to the changes in the battle space.

This is as Iran is developing a nuclear weapon capability to achieve death to Israel, death to America. And we have seen change this weekend, and the change this weekend was indeed a victory by the people of Ukraine, eliminating Soviet bombers that have been built for the purpose in the Cold War, the first Cold War, to vaporize the people of America and Europe.

And now those bombers are gone, what an extraordinary achievement. So, we need to adapt, and you are going to find bipartisanship here, this is remarkable, I agree with Adam Smith that we need to be working together on less expensive but effective drones, and they might even be produced in Ukraine. But wherever they came from, or then they can license them here, whatever it takes.

Secretary Driscoll, recently the President signed an executive order assigning the Army as the lead for deploying advanced nuclear reactors at military installations by 2028, and I see America benefits from President Trump's vision and leadership in this development. And South Carolina, with the Savannah River Site, that I have the opportunity to represent, and I amt he only member of Congress who has ever worked at Savannah River Site, nuclear capability is very important.

With that in mind, how is the Army prioritizing micro nuclear reactors as a national security imperative to ensure resilient, uninterrupted power for critical defense infrastructure? And over and over again, we can see that small modular reactors, micro reactors will be an important opportunity, what is the status of development?

Mr. DRISCOLL. We couldn't agree more. So, contested logistics is going to be, when you look at what just happened in Russia this past weekend, and the ability of these cheap drones to contest logistics lines, the Army owns that, and has historically owned that. And what we will need to do is for a lot of the new tools that are coming out, directed energy, they have incredible energy requirements.

You are going to have to have spikes of energy comes through the lines that just are not—the current technology is not sufficient for it, and we are standing up groups to run the same experiments

we were talking about, we were trying to do on small nuclear, and the micro nuclear reactions.

Mr. WILSON. I wish you well on that, and indeed, I know a perfect 310 square mile site on the east coast, the largest secure site on the east coast, and it is not actually in Alabama, it is in South Carolina, and so production could do very well there. And additionally, Mr. Secretary, to better understand, and I am really grateful as a former Army Guard member myself, to understand the impact of the Army Transformation Initiative on the National Guard.

In particular the Army National Guard has four AH-64 Apache battalions including the 151st Aviation Regiment in South Carolina. What do you see as occurring about the eliminating of said squadrons, what about the divestment of the AH-64Ds, and elimination of the squadron? And maybe the general should be answering.

General GEORGE. Yeah, I was going to jump in on that one, Congressman.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you.

General GEORGE. So, I mentioned previously when Ranking Member Smith asked the question, we are getting rid of the AH-64Ds, expensive. What we are going to do, we are getting rid of those battalions as well, divesting of those battalions inside the active component. The National Guard will stay with four Apache battalions, what you will notice is you will get the newest AH-64E aircraft.

So, part of this has been making sure that we divest ourselves of the old, more expensive aircraft, and we are going to upgrade our fleet. And this is across all of them, same thing, the Guard is going to see Mike models replacing Lima and Victor models on the UH-60s, and so that is what we are looking at doing.

Mr. WILSON. And as you divest yourself of the Apaches, a great ally of America, Jordan, would be happy to accept them, and this would actually back up another remarkable achievement, and that is the removal of the dictator Bashar Al-Assad in Syria to be replaced by a government that is working in every way to have a relationship with Israel, possibly Abraham Accords, to provide stability. And one way to do that is for Jordan to be even more enhanced.

I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. I appreciate the gentleman from South Carolina raising the issue of nuclear power production. You may recall that last week President Trump and Secretary Hegseth talked about not only President Trump's initiative to get more nuclear energy production in the United States, but particularly Secretary Hegseth to do some reforms in the Defense Department to help deal with our need to get off the grid.

I have asked Representative Harrigan to lead the language in this year's NDAA to put some pilot programs where we use SMRs [small modular reactors] on some of our bases, and depots as a proof of concept. I would ask you to work with him on fashioning that legislation to make it as broad as possible, because we really would like to see this concept proved. I know it is something the Department of Energy embraces as well.

With that I will now turn to the gentleman from California, Mr. Garamendi, you are recognized.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and Ranking Member Smith. You laid out the challenge that we have in working with the Army in its transformation, and we simply don't have the information that we need, and we look forward to getting that information. We will be doing an NDAA in the next month and a half to two months, so are you prepared to prepare us? I will let that hang out there.

A couple things that I want to go into, on the Readiness Subcommittee, we are always concerned about logistics, and I want to raise the issue of logistics particularly in Europe as well as in the Pacific. How does your Army Transformation Initiative deal with the sustainment of material supplies in the Indo-Pacific? Specifically, the APSs [Army prepositioned stocks], are they going to continue? What is the plan? If you don't have it, then we must continue to find out what is it going to be.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think from a high level, absolutely, ATI, the intent of it in the bucket two of what we need to buy, we know that we have got to spread out our prepositioned stocks. So, it is no longer going to be sufficient to have big warehouses with a lot of American equipment sitting as a target, those will be incredibly targetable by the enemy. And what we need to do is continue to invest in, and explore drone technology that can do a lot of these micro movements for us, and spread out our stocks.

And so, I think as it specifically relates to the APS, we are trying to think about different ways to have our equipment prepositioned around the globe, and the tools that we can create with micro movements to get them into the hands of soldiers.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I would assume that micro movement, if it happens to be in the Pacific would require the Army's maritime vessels, which seem to be continually declining in their availability, so would that be a piece of it, or are you going to give up those ships?

General GEORGE. We are looking at that, Congressman. To your previous question, I wanted to go back, there is a lot of things. One is autonomy is going to do a lot of things, there is autonomous systems right now that are unloading vessels, and moving very large things, and I think that we should look at that, some of the most dangerous things that I did in Iraq and Afghanistan were resupply operations.

So, whatever we can do to make sure that we are reducing that. We are looking at hybrid electric when we were out just seeing the ISV [Infantry Squad Vehicle], and we had an ISV heavy that actually could, the GM [General Motors] Defense makes it, it could actually power our TOCs [Tactical Operations Centers] for five or six days, and then you are not bringing fuel forward. That will work anywhere in the world, it certainly will work in the Pacific.

We were down in Austin, and I think some others in here saw there are systems right now that are being built, autonomous systems, the same that are going to be much less expensive, that can still deliver wherever you are at in the world, in the maritime environment, land, or air, and I think that is where we need to be investing. Again, that takes agile funding to make sure that we don't

lock ourselves into a program, and continue to buy things that maybe we won't need in a couple years.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Speaking of agile funding, one of the things that the Army brought to our attention in the last three years was the support necessary to upgrade the barracks here within the United States, and in other places, Europe, as well as the Pacific. I note that about a billion dollars of that money that we put together for upgrading the barracks has been agilely funded away from the barracks to be used on the border. So, what about the barracks, have you forgotten about them, or are they not important anymore?

General GEORGE. I would say our barracks, and again, having grown up in those environments, are very important to us. One of the things that we were working with Congress, I think that right now we are probably overpaying for some of our barracks, and we have passed that onto the MILCON [Military Construction] committees, and kind of detailed what we are doing. When we are talking about agile funding for drones and everything else, it is not colorless money.

We want to be very specific that hey, this is for drones, this is for EW, and this is for counter-UAS, and that is where we want to make sure that that money is focused.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Final seven seconds, a thought on my side is that yes, we want to support you and your initiative, very, very important to do that. At the same time, there are ongoing programs that are extremely important for the maintenance of the troops, barracks being but one of them—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time is expired.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Wittman.

Mr. WITTMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Driscoll, General George, thanks again for joining us, appreciate your leadership. I do want to focus on the Army Transformation Initiative, appreciate you all doing that, well past time, this dynamic movement is absolutely needed. The challenge for us though is to make sure that there is certainty going forward when this does involve people's lives.

When it involves uniformed service members and the civilian staff, they deserve to know what is going on, and when they don't it creates a high level of anxiety. I have TRADOC [United States Army Training and Doctrine Command] Headquarters in my district, it is part of the Transformation Initiative, along with Army Futures Command, I can tell you that the rumor mill there is running wild, there is chaos there at Fort Eustis because there is lack of certainty.

We owe it to our constituents, and the folks that are in our districts to give them certainty, even if it is saying it is still continuing to be under consideration. I understand what you all went through in the Transformation in Contact efforts there to figure out how are you going to organize brigades, I understand that, that is a good portion of what needs to happen in the Transformation of the Army.

So, first of all I want to understand what have you learned from that that you are going to translate to the ATI? Second of all, as you are going through the Transform in Contact 2.0, which is ongo-

ing, is it fair to characterize that, that that is going to be at least a foundational aspect of what happens with ATI? And are certain ATI decisions still under analysis?

Because we kind of get a couple of different stories. General George, I talked with you, and you said hey, it is definitive, it is one commanding general position, a certain number of other positions. And then we hear wild speculation about all these other things that are out there, and then on the backside we are being told it is still under analysis. We have just got to get the story straight.

So anyway, I wanted to get your perspective on where we are going with ATI, how is Transforming in Contact 2.0 going to inform that? What are we doing as far as creating some certainty as to what this is going to be or what it is going to look like? I would rather hold it back and say we are still analyzing it, than putting stuff out there and saying this is what it is going to be about.

Mr. DRISCOLL. So, Transformation in Contact, I think at its highest level is taking a practice that a lot of companies in America have done that has made us an amazing nation, but particularly companies that are venture backed, it is part of their model. And it is this idea of doing a minimum viable product, getting it into the hand of your customer as quickly as humanly possible at a very small scale, and then learning from them.

So, what Transformation in Contact has done for us is it gave us lessons from the actual soldiers using the equipment that we thought might work, some of it did, some of it didn't. We learned lessons when we sent equipment up to Alaska, and it is negative forty-five degrees, that equipment just didn't work, we wouldn't have known that without getting it into the hands of soldiers.

So, almost all of Army Transformation Initiative has been informed by what soldiers have told us, and we expect that iterative cycle to continue, ideally long past our time in these roles. Because what had happened historically to contrast with that is long procurement documents were created with hundreds and hundreds of requirements, that then by the time the document was signed it was already outdated technology.

And then by the time it was actually fielded, it was even worse, and just what we are seeing on the battlefield, that will no longer work. And then just to your question, ATI we hope has many iterations. Within the buckets that I described earlier to your colleague, many and most of those we have gotten buy in from Secretary of Defense Hegseth and the President's team to execute on those.

No longer purchasing obsolete equipment, buying the new things that we need, to the merging of a lot of the things that we are going to have, and pushing people out from headquarters back to the formations, that planning, we have given the order to start to make the plans, it is currently ongoing. And the moment we have it clear enough to share, we intend to.

Mr. WITTMAN. Yeah, I just think it is critically important to communicate that in a way. I don't have any issue with making the transformation that is necessary, but these are people's lives, these are people's families, so don't forget that these are people's lives

that are impacted by this, both the civilian force, and the uniformed services force.

They are incredible individuals that want to do everything they can for the nation, but putting them through this period of uncertainty is not really fair to them. So, General George, I don't know if you had anything you wanted to comment on.

General GEORGE. I just was going to add, Congressman, we always talk about lessons, to really learn you change how you train and operate, you change how you are organized, you change how you buy things. We have talked a lot about how we buy things, how we are organized is something that we have learned. You mentioned our mobile brigade combat teams. What we also noticed all the way up is that we had redundancy in what we were doing, and how we were bringing things to the war fighter.

That was a problem with the Army Futures Command, and TRADOC, and challenge in how we are training our people moving forward, how quickly can you train FPV [First-Person View] drone operators, what do you need? The other thing that we are looking at is our business systems, we are collapsing business systems probably by fifty percent, and we are going to be much more effective—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time is expired.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. Moulton.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. Secretary Driscoll, thank you for being here. You have a bipartisan reputation for competence, and lack of criminality, which is remarkably rare in this administration, so I hope you survive, and I thank you for your service. General George, thank you for your continued service as well. I want to associate myself with the chairman's opening comments.

Namely our bipartisan support for modernization, and for using the Marine Corps' Force Design 2030 as a model. General George, you and I last year had an extended conversation in the SCIF [Sensitive Compartmented Information Facility] where you argued that the Army didn't need to fundamentally change in response to modern threats. I cited examples of where the Marine Corps has reduced its reliance on tanks, since we have seen 10 million dollar tanks killed by three thousand dollar drones, and replacing traditional artillery with rockets and missiles.

But you argued against this, maintaining that you need everything you have, both at the geo-strategic level and the operational level. And now you are saying that you want to make these changes, so what has changed over the last twelve months?

General GEORGE. I am remembering back to that conversation, and I think that was very specific to tanks. And one of the things, I do think we still need tanks on the battlefield, Congressman. I do think we need to update our tanks to make sure that they are basically software defined, I have talked to a lot of people around the world that know that we are going to need that.

That is not a capability that the Marines can provide, but that is a capability that the Army will likely need to be able to provide if we are in that kind of situation, so—

Mr. MOULTON. Do you still think you need exactly the same number of tanks that you always had?

General GEORGE. Well, on ATI, and what came out of our announcement, is we actually are reducing by three ABCTs [Armored Brigade Combat Teams], and actually converting those units. Again, that is in the Guard, to mobile brigade combat teams, and we want to do that very quickly, same with Styiker Brigade Combat Teams. But I do think we are going to need armored, mobile protection. What we are going through, and again, we want to do this quick, this isn't about 2030, this is doing this rapidly, and making sure that we can change our formations.

I think since that conversation we also have been investing in drones, putting them in our formations, investing in autonomous systems that can do breaching. I think we are still going to have to do all of those things, we are seeing all of that on the modern battlefield right now.

Mr. MOULTON. How does the Army's needs in the Pacific differ from those in Europe? What role will tanks play in the Pacific?

General GEORGE. Well, I can tell you that I know that the PLA [People's Liberation Army] has tanks, people have tanks around the world, I think we need to be prepared with it. Again, we always talk about that the Army—

Mr. MOULTON. It is great that the enemy has tanks, I would like to kill them with our drones.

General GEORGE. Army is a global army, and I think that was brought up here earlier, we need to be ready to go wherever the President directs—

Mr. MOULTON. The pacing threat is in the Pacific, right, General George?

General GEORGE. Excuse me?

Mr. MOULTON. The pacing threat is in the Pacific?

General GEORGE. No argument on the pacing threat.

Mr. MOULTON. Okay, then let us make sure our forces are designed to aim for the pacing threat, and not continue to be calibrated to an old threat in Europe. It is great that the PLA has a lot of stuff that we don't have. I would love to kill million dollar tanks from the PLA with thousand dollar drones from the United States. Fundamentally, why is the Army five years behind the Marine Corps in this Transformation, Secretary Driscoll?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think one of the first things General George and I did is we went to the west coast, we went to JBLM [Joint Base Lewis-McChord], went to Seattle, talked to Microsoft, went to Silicon Valley, and hit Open AI, Google—

Mr. MOULTON. I am just asking why are you so far behind the Marine Corps?

Mr. DRISCOLL. So, what we saw on that visit was I think that the United States Army had done—it had a lot of bureaucracy that got in the way of doing the right thing, and I think what we have tried to do is take the best practices from the Marine Corps' transition, and try to implement those as quickly as possible.

Mr. MOULTON. I appreciate that. General George, onto the birthday parade where you are going to have twenty-four main battle tanks, and forty-eight armored vehicles rolling down Pennsylvania Avenue as if it were North Korea, Russia, or China. What is the

total cost to the unit at Fort Cavazos of moving these vehicles to and from D.C. [Washington, District of Columbia] for the parade?

General GEORGE. Congressman, I don't know the specific cost of that one movement, I think right now—

Mr. MOULTON. Well, I guess the total cost is about 35 million, so would it be safe to say about 10 million dollars just for that movement?

General GEORGE. I would hesitate to give you an exact number of what that movement cost, I mean we have, I think been very public in what it is that we expect the parade to cost overall. We are looking forward to our Army birthday next year—

Mr. MOULTON. Have you included damage to D.C. roads in that estimate?

General GEORGE. We have put out an estimate of what we think everything will cost, Congressman.

Mr. MOULTON. Secretary Driscoll, you said in your opening statement that it is your responsibility to ensure that every dollar the Army receives contributes to defending this nation, and for us all. How does the parade contribute to defending the nation?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congressman, we think it is an incredible, once in a lifetime opportunity to expand our recruiting pool, and tell the amazing story of the United States Army, and the impact that it has had on the lives of American—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time is expired.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Scott.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Gentlemen, welcome. General George, you have heard me talk about this before, Army Special Operations Recruiting, the 18X program, I am concerned about a couple of specific instances where D1 [Division one] athletes that I know were not allowed to participate in the 18X program because they had, in one example it was a piece of plastic in an ankle.

I mean, when we are talking about athletes that are playing D1 sports, more oftentimes than not, they are going to have some type of injury, and just want to encourage that we have flexibility in that 18X program, so that these people that have been able to perform at these high levels are allowed in, and that we don't have this—they call it GENESIS, I call it Exodus program, kicking the very people out that we need going into our special operations forces.

General GEORGE. Just one comment, I think yesterday, Congressman, we got an update on recruiting, and again we can look at this on our dashboard, I think we are over ninety-nine percent for 18X for this year, so again, we expect to get, it is a very important population for us, it is one of the sixteen that the secretary and I track in detail. So, every time we get a recruiting update, I wouldn't argue.

One of the conversations we also just had is how are we—we can look back into people's pasts much further, to your comment on making sure that people that have been athletes, we have the waiver process, and we got that, so we are definitely looking at that.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And Congressman, I would just say what we have tried to do is, and this is back to the Booker remark, we are trying

to hold a mirror up, and when we are inadequate, we want to say it, and we want to fix it, our GENESIS program is inadequate, our waiver program is inadequate, and we are trying to fix it.

Mr. SCOTT. And of all of the comments that you have made, it was refreshing to hear somebody say hey, Army made a mistake in buying this system, and we don't need it, and we are going to cancel it. Because what I have seen over the last several years that I have been in Congress is we are going to spend whatever it takes to make a system work that in many cases we don't need.

And I think if you look at the bureaucracy that surrounded the purchase of a nine millimeter pistol, where it took ten years to pick a pistol, which is a fine pistol, but the majority of the special forces teams that are able to pick their own weapon picked one that was readily available ten years ago, and they blamed that on Congress, by the way, when ultimately it was the bureaucracy in the Pentagon, and the purchasing requirements that led to that.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes, sir, we have been incredibly risk averse as a United States Army. When General George and I talk about it, there is something called the Calabresi paradox, which is basically this idea that humans are willing to take on risk for extra utility, or happiness and joy, and we, the United States Army, have done the opposite of that, and we have done a very poor job of being more risk loving than our civilian counterparts.

Mr. SCOTT. I agree with you, so let's talk about it from the counter-drone investments. We know how to build them, we have watched the Ukrainians do what they can do with them, we watched what they can do with the Russians. How do you envision the investment in the counter-drone measures moving forward with the private sector?

Mr. DRISCOLL. So, this is one of the things we talk about a lot, and a lot of the technology needs to be scaled to figure out what is the right place in the cost curve in order to shoot something down. And back to generative AI, the ability to process all of this data, and information really quickly to figure out should you fire a fifty cal [caliber] round at it, or a 4 million dollar exquisite defense tool?

We, the United States Army, are incredibly wealthy, but that is a hard portion, and so what we are trying to do is develop solutions all along the cost curve.

Mr. SCOTT. So, I am down to about a minute, but my vision on counter-drone doesn't involve taking it down with a projectile as much as it involves spectrum, and other things that disrupt its ability to reach its target.

General GEORGE. Can I?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes, sir, General George.

General GEORGE. It is going to be a combination of those things, Congressman. To the secretary's point, when you are looking at cost curve, and you are looking at a bullet, and it is cheap to do that, and you may use other systems, like we have a laser that can identify where to shoot that one particular bullet. So, I think it is going to be a combination.

We are looking at EW, there is obviously power challenges with that, we are looking at high power microwave, we are looking at EW, and just like we are talking about Transforming in Contact,

we are getting it forward, testing it everywhere that we can. We have a very big exercise in Europe called Flytrap that is this month and next, that we are having industry be a part of that.

Mr. SCOTT. I am down to five seconds. I respect both of you, I do hope we are also looking at the Israeli laser system that they have put in place, and the potential to bring that into the U.S.

The CHAIRMAN. Great. I would point out that we helped pay for the research and development on that laser research.

Mr. SCOTT. So, we can get a good deal.

The CHAIRMAN. We are going to get a good deal, but Israel is doing some phenomenal work on that Iron Beam technology.

With that, I recognize the gentleman from Connecticut, Mr. Courtney.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to both witnesses for being here this morning. I just want to, again, follow up briefly about the comments the chair made about the budget process that is here. I mean, as we sit here today on June 4th, we are less than four months away from the start of the fiscal year, and my staff actually did do some digging. And if the budget was submitted today, which it hasn't been, that would still by itself be the latest budget submission in history.

And certainly in modern history as far as the budget process. The chair I think described very well that this Committee is straining at the leash to get going in terms of getting a mark for NDAA, and I know the appropriators are trying to sort of cobble together some type of appropriation process. But you are kind of shadowboxing at this point without a budget.

And again, the two of you are not the decision makers in terms of that final release, but again, I think we just have to continue to publicly pound away at the fact that OMB [Office of Management and Budget] has got to get moving, and get that document, I mean we are doomed at this point in terms of avoiding a CR, it seems pretty clear at this point, and that doesn't help anybody in terms of the mission that you are trying to carry out.

Mr. Driscoll, I have just a quick question regarding the FLRAA [Future Long-Range Assault Aircraft] program, which again went through an excruciating process, and the decision has been made, and it is time to obviously move out in terms of that helicopter program. Again, the optimistic estimates are 2028. For delivery, I think some of the more other guarded predictions are 2030. In the meantime, Blackhawks are still carrying out their mission.

There was in last year's budget, a request for about twenty-four units, I believe in that program. And again, I think at the time FLRAA was awarded, it was pretty clear it was going to be a mix of the two in terms of that, and I just wanted to get your thoughts in terms of where you see that sort of formula today.

General GEORGE. Yeah, so great question, Congressman. So, FLRAA is an incredible example, I think, of the Army getting in its own way. The first demo, or prototype, or exhibit was flown in 2018, everybody loved it, and we are sitting here in 2025 without one. There is no other way to describe that than a failure. I think from where we sit today, what General George and I have said to the FLRAA manufacturers is this an incredible opportunity to show

America's might, America's strength, our ability to build things quickly.

We need this asset, and we need it now. And so, we did a call last week with the CEOs [Chief Executive Officers] of the vast majority of the subcomponents, and what we are trying to do is set a stretch goal to have the first one roll off the line in one year. I don't know that we will hit it, but we are going to do our darnedest to try to show that we can do things quickly as a nation again.

I think to your question on Blackhawks, nearly everything we are talking about in ATI, and with our purchasing goals is we believe that we are over indexed on exquisite, slower pieces of equipment. And what we have to do is design things that will pull us more towards some balance, that balance will have autonomy. So, FLRAA could be flown autonomously, Blackhawks today cannot.

We don't know what the right mix is, but we do know that we are just over indexed on these other things. So, I think the work of this committee, and us will be to have productive and tension filled conversations about where that right balance is going forward.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back.

The chair now recognizes the gentlelady from New York, Ms. Stefanik.

Ms. STEFANIK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, gentlemen, for being here today. Secretary Driscoll, thank you for your service to our country, particularly your service in my district at Fort Drum. You know, you are well aware of Fort Drum's strategic importance, and modernization efforts for the Army, and how vital they are for our nation's readiness.

Nearly every facet of the Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield has been modernized to support a rapid deployment force, and the airfield's ten thousand foot runway can accommodate any aircraft in the U.S. Air Force inventory, matching DOD's air defense capabilities to threats, and deterring our enemies. Today Fort Drum's Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield has unfortunately a failing electric power system, and it is currently programmed for funding for FY 27.

I reached out to you via a letter about the importance of this issue, and I would just like your commitment to work with us about potentially moving up that critical funding to FY 26.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congresswoman, I deployed from that runway, so I know it well. I commit that we will take a look at it, and follow back up with your office.

Ms. STEFANIK. Thank you so much. Fort Drum has relied on energy from the local power grid since closing its on-post energy facility in 2023, this is an issue my office has been engaged in for a number of years. The Army Corps of Engineers determined that a small modular reactor would be an optimal option to supply Fort Drum's energy needs. This is an issue that I worked with my colleague, Congresswoman Tenney, who shares Jefferson County with me in terms of representation.

I would just like your commitment today to work with our offices to ensure Fort Drum returns to energy independence and security, including the potential deployment of this small modular reactor to the installation as soon as possible.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Same answer, Congresswoman, I commit we will look at it and follow up quickly.

Ms. STEFANIK. And then lastly, in a previous NDAA, my office worked to secure a provision that required DOD to review their ability to conduct electronic warfare training, and leverage this defense ecosystem in upstate New York that we have helped develop between Fort Drum and the Air Force Research Lab in Rome, New York, which I also represent. This has been an ideal environment, and it led to the Army's decision to choose Fort Drum to host the second multi domain task force in 2025.

And the PEO IEW&S [Program Executive Officer Intelligence, Electronic Warfare & Sensors] incredible work to partner with AFRL's [Air Force Research Lab] future flag series of limited experimentation, which we strongly supported, and has led to great tactical outcomes. Can you speak to the importance of placing as much of the second multi domain task force at Fort Drum as possible to leverage this unique experimentation that will be continued between Rome and all the great work we are doing there? Either.

General GEORGE. I will jump in on that one, Congresswoman. First, I think you know we did the big exercise last November up there, so I am really proud of what 10th Mountain, it has been one of our most deployed units anywhere in the Army, and they are doing a phenomenal job right now, General Naumann, down on the border. I think what we are looking at is that every installation is going to have to do what we started to do that you have helped with up at Drum. We are going to have to be able to train EW, we are going to have to be able to train drones, and working through that.

So, we are going to have to expand all of those systems, and we are certainly looking on the stationing, we can come over and talk to you about that in detail. Right now, I don't know if we have made any changes, or finalized any of that, but I am happy to come over and walk you through that in detail of what we need to be able to do.

Ms. STEFANIK. I appreciate that, this is something my office has advocated for for a number of years, to develop this defense ecosystem specifically in upstate New York because of our unique capabilities, because of both Fort Drum, but also the emerging technology research that is being conducted at Rome AFRL. I also want to invite you, Secretary Driscoll, to come back to Fort Drum.

I have hosted the President there, where he signed an NDAA, I have hosted previous Secretaries of Defense, I have hosted previous Secretaries of the Army, and I would love to host, and welcome you back to Fort Drum.

Mr. DRISCOLL. It would be an absolute honor. My XO [Executive Officer] who was working with me when I got into office just went up there, so I would be delighted to visit her with you.

Ms. STEFANIK. Great, thank you, I will take you up on that, and yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady yields back.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Carbajal.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The Army is fighting an internal battle with trying to balance modernization efforts with

current needs. It seems that the Army would like to modernize, but the system is slow to change. General George, what do you see as the Army's most important asset?

General GEORGE. I would say it is our people, Congressman, without a doubt, number one for us, and where we have to consistently focus, it is why we are so pleased with what we are doing with recruiting, and why we are focused as we are on making sure that we are also adapting them. We are proud of what they are doing, we are getting a great group in.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Thank you. Great answer, I agree with you. In your testimony you mentioned that you are investing in installations, including prioritizing barracks. It was recently reported that one billion dollars of funding meant for barracks renovations is being redirected to the mission at the southern border. Will taking funding away from the barracks delay the timeline in which they are upgraded? And do you think postponing these types of renovations will have an impact on the morale and retention?

General GEORGE. First I just want to mention the retention word kind of triggered me here. We are, I think at six months in we met our retention goals for this year as well, so we are doing very well with retention. Of course we want to continue to improve our barracks, and we are going to continue to do that. We have talked about that a lot, I do think that that is another area we can probably spend our money better.

In that, there is a lot of restrictions that we have as far as how our costs are like sixty-eight percent higher than what you would get outside the gate. We are looking at we have done 3D printing, and that has happened down in Texas of barracks, that I think we can provide great systems. Beyond that I think what we are looking at holistically is that every installation is different, and every installation has different requirements.

When I was up at Lewis, very different than it is at Bragg. And so, that is where we are trying to be very specific—

Mr. CARBAJAL. General, I appreciate the extensive response, but will redirecting a billion dollars impact the ability to do the renovations at the barracks? It is just a yes or no answer.

General GEORGE. Obviously redirecting has an impact, you have to make choices, Congressman.

Mr. CARBAJAL. So, the answer is yes?

General GEORGE. If we took a billion dollars out of barracks, we would be able to fix less barracks.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Thank you, that is what I was looking for.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And Congressman, this is an issue that I—

Mr. CARBAJAL. It is okay, I will get to you, I got the answer I was looking for.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Sorry.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Secretary Driscoll, I assume you are aware of a parade coming up celebrating the birthday which coincides with another interesting birthday. The estimated cost of this is 45 million, it is an interesting time to spend 45 million on a parade when all the services are subject to an eight percent budget cut. If Congress wrote the Army a 45 million dollar blank check, do you think you could find a better way to spend that money than a parade?

And could 45 million dollars deliver any quality of life improvements or capabilities that the war fighters need?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congressman, very sincerely, I think we as the United Stats have an amazing opportunity to tell a story of an institution that is older than our country itself. It is an institution—

Mr. CARBAJAL. I understand.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And I believe very specifically that telling that story will directly lead to a recruiting boom that will fill up our pipeline for the coming years. And I believe our marketing budget we would spend to recruit those soldiers, I think our team believes that the investment of these dollars to tell that story will directly lead to a good, measurable, quantitative outcome for the Army.

Mr. CARBAJAL. So, you are looking at this as a recruitment tool?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes, Congressman.

Mr. CARBAJAL. And you think it is better spent there than supporting the quality of life for war fighters?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congressman, I think we have to spend on both, as General George said. We run our budget, we have to make these hard decisions all the time. I think it would be a massive tragedy to let this moment pass where we can tell this story, and inculcate an entire generation of youth into this amazing story that is the United States Army.

Mr. CARBAJAL. I find that very interesting, but thank you. The Army is touting a total change to the force via deliberate information, transformation, and acquisition reform. General George, are these efforts actually coming to fruition, and can they be scaled to the level that you are expecting without interruptions to the service members?

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 97.]

General GEORGE. Actually all the feedback that I get, Congressman, everywhere we go, is that we need to do this faster, that we need to transform faster. I mean, the challenge is, kind of the question is can we do this back up here, we do need to stop buying obsolete equipment, we are going to need to make the changes that we—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time is expired.

The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee, Dr. DesJarlais.

Dr. DESJARLAIS. Thank you, Chairman, and thank you both for being here today. I am going to deviate from my original questions just to touch on drones considering what happened in Ukraine. I was just recently at Oak Ridge Y-12 this past week, and looking at the facility there, and all the other facilities around the country that are critical to protect, has the Army stepped up its posture any in response to the threat from drones?

I know domestically we have domestic terrorism acts, we know abroad we get attacked at our bases in the Middle East. What is the rules of engagement on the military bases, and high risk sites such as our nuclear production sites?

General GEORGE. So first, I think you will see, Congressman, this is an area that we are very focused on, that we need to spend more money on. Again, I would describe it as a capability portfolio, where we don't need one system. I was kind of explaining that ear-

lier, it is going to be a broad base of things that we need to do. How we are going to do that in a combat zone is very different than how we would do that in the states.

Obviously doing that in the states, and we are working obviously with NORTHCOM [United States Northern Command], you are talking about FAA [Federal Aviation Administration], FCC [Federal Communications Commission], with everything else that is going on, so we are continually working through that. There is legislation on that as far as the 130I, which I am sure you are familiar with, that I think we need to make some changes to, and we are working with NORTHCOM, joint staff, and OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense] to get that up.

But we are very focused on this, and as I mentioned, we are doing a very large exercise in this with all kinds of industry, and everybody this month and next.

Dr. DESJARLAIS. And you showed us some examples of that when a large group of us visited you in Austin. And in your opening statement I find it striking how focused the Army has been on procurement and adaptability. As we have seen, the modern battlefield has undergone rapid changes over the past few years, and because of this the need to procure things better, faster, cheaper, and more reliable has become critically important as we work to keep our war fighters equipped for success.

This has been something that the Committee has been laser focused on under the leadership of Chairman Rogers and Ranking Member Smith for this year's NDAA. So, General George, what have been some of the most notable successes or lessons learned from the Transformation in Contact initiative that can help this Committee enable our military to become a more lethal and agile force?

General GEORGE. I could go on a long time about this, Congressman. I think we had this last rotation that we had had close to four hundred drones in it down at the Joint Readiness Training Center. So, obviously infusing them with technology, drones, autonomous systems, counter-UAS, what we are doing to change the network, the secretary mentioned that this is about being data centric, and being able to pass all these systems moving.

A lot of it though we are learning from the modern battlefield, is changing how you train and operate. Understanding that you can be viewed, there is really nowhere to hide. And what we are doing right now is changing our organizational construct as well, because we are going to have to be more dispersed, more mobile, and we are working through all of those.

And we have made a lot of those changes, we just now need to scale those changes across the Army, and that is what ATI will help us do.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And Congressman, I think the way General George and I talk about this is this paradigm shift between software and hardware. We have created hardware that has required software to function, we need our new hardware systems to basically be software led, and just the software manifesting in the world as this hardware. Because if we can't update these systems in near real time, the enemy is going to be able to disable them,

and we are taking that into account in every decision we are making.

Dr. DESJARLAIS. And if you can, both of you, in one minute, we have been working with the Army, and in the past General Thurgood, to address the persistent manning shortfall across our Patriot battalions. While there has been progress, there are still major challenges that remain as we start to stand up Golden Dome, and try to figure out what that looks like. How is that going? What are you doing to manage that, and get us in a better position? Thirty seconds.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 97.]

General GEORGE. So, we are doing really well on ADA [Army Defense Artillery] folks that are coming into our formation, so we are pleased with that, and we are going to continue to keep the foot on the pedal on that. The other thing is the technology, looking at how we can use technology to reduce the manning inside these formations, and we put some new equipment out, and we are happy to come over and talk to you about that as well.

Dr. DESJARLAIS. Okay, would love to have an update, thank you both.

Yield.

Mr. BACON [PRESIDING.] The gentleman yields.

Ms. Houlahan is recognized for five minutes.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. And thank you, it is nice to see you again, General, and I really look forward to getting to know you a little bit better, and appreciate the idea that you have brought with you a spirit of bipartisanship, that is something that is really important here.

And speaking of bipartisanship, I have a couple of questions that I hope you might be able to help me with. Recently we decided to make sure that there were gender neutral fitness tests, and we implemented those, and it is something that I have been supportive of since I have been here in Congress. I was hoping that I might be able to get you, Secretary, and you, General, your opinions on whether or not you can indeed commit that women will continue to be allowed to be Rangers, will continue to be allowed in the infantry, and continue to be allowed to be trained for those particular positions.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congresswoman, I will hand it to General George just so he can confirm what I am about to say. Which is my seven year old daughter Lila, she wants to join the Army since I have been here, and I hope that she gets to try out. And if she can maintain the excellent standard to join those types of units, and she wants to, I hope she has the opportunity to.

I have not been part of, and I don't believe General George has, a single conversation that has made me believe that a man or a woman that can meet those standards of excellence, that they wouldn't have those opportunities.

Ms. HOULAHAN. General?

General GEORGE. I don't know if you have heard, I agree, we have not had any discussion about this. There is probably a podcast that I can share with you where a lot of our soldiers, female soldiers were out there talking about the changes in this, and that

was a lot of the feedback that I got inside this as well. So, they are very happy with the standards, and where they are going, and they are doing very well in our units.

And I would also tell you that we are—we have also recruited more female soldiers into the Army over this last year as well.

Ms. HOULAHAN. So, effectively you are both committing that women will continue to be allowed to be trained in those particular positions?

Mr. DRISCOLL. As far as I know, Congresswoman, we have not had any conversations that—

Ms. HOULAHAN. And there is actually a reason I am asking, because there are conversations above you that this indeed will end up being a threat. And I really want to make sure that I hold you to that commitment, because if people meet the standards, they meet the standards. My next question has to do with something that Mr. Garamendi touched on. I spent a lot of time, as you know, on quality of life issues bipartisanly with Representative Bacon.

And one of those pieces of legislation that we were able to get through was for barracks improvement, to make it possible that we were able to fund and improve the barracks. Mr. Garamendi mentioned, and it is true that a billion dollars for barracks improvement has been moved, and moved to the border, which would seem to be counter to the law that we literally just passed.

When Mr. Garamendi asked, both of you seemed to not be aware of that particular movement. Would you be able to check into that for me? Because it seems as though this is really, really important, and literally counter, against the law.

Mr. DRISCOLL. We can follow back up with you, Congresswoman. I just want to echo what General George said earlier, these issues matter deeply to us, General George is currently a soldier, I was, my daughter is named after a current soldier's daughter, they live in Army and military housing. I care deeply about this population, and so we commit to following back up with you.

Ms. HOULAHAN. I do as well, having grown up in a military family, and served in the military myself. I very much think that where you live really, really matters to your quality of life. And it is not about—this is about color of money issues, and it seems to me that there is no way that we should be allowed to move a billion dollars worth of money from barracks that we have worked so hard to give you into something like the border.

I am going to move on with what is left of my question. General George, you talked about recruiting, and Secretary, you did as well, and that you have met the recruiting goals. And I think that is terrific, and very much worthy of the applause that I think that you got bipartisanly on this. But would you be able to also confirm that this momentum is also attributable to the past years, and the past administration?

And the Future Soldier Preparatory Organization, and effort that we have had in streamlining entrance processes, and refining waivers, medical waivers, in recruiting and training stronger recruiters. Will you be able to confirm that this is a long time coming, and not something that just happened over the last several months?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congresswoman, I went down and visited the Future Soldier Prep Course at Fort Jackson, and very sincerely there

have been a couple of moments in this job that have just touched my soul. Seeing the soldiers, and how that is—the soldiers who go to that have a why wall about basically how they need to overcome their challenges to join the Army. The outcomes for those soldiers have been great, and that has been a spectacular program.

Ms. HOULAHAN. That has been conducted over the last couple of years, as well as the medical waivers, as well as getting better recruiters, am I correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Correct.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you. I have very little time left, so unfortunately, I will have to ask this last question for the record, which General, has to do with the thousand layoffs that are in the headquarters, and who are they, and how we are going to be accommodating for that.

Thank you, I yield.

Mr. BACON. The gentlelady's time has expired.

Major General Kelly is now recognized.

Mr. KELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to start with what is the most important asset that the Army has? It's one word.

Mr. DRISCOLL. People.

Mr. KELLY. There you go.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Soldiers.

Mr. KELLY. All right, esprit de corps, heraldry, all those things, are they an important part of a unit, and recruiting, and keeping people, and retaining?

Mr. DRISCOLL. It is crucial, Congressman.

Mr. KELLY. Okay, and we do twilight tattoos, the Navy does a thing where they have the Marine Corps, and ships on the deck on the American coast. Is a parade important for esprit de corps?

General GEORGE. We do a lot of these across the country, I mean with Golden Knights, so I say yes, all of this, and also there is a lot of influence—

Mr. KELLY. I bet we will have an Army birthday celebration next week right here in the Capitol, and numerous other places to celebrate our history and heraldry, is that correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. That is correct, and the planning, Congressman, started years ago.

Mr. KELLY. And as an ROTC [Reserve Officers' Training Corps] cadet, they did CALFEX [Combined Arms Live Fire Exercises] exercises to get us to want to be on tanks, or fly helicopters, or see artillery fire, or see A-10s come in, those are an important part of recruiting and attention, right?

General GEORGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLY. So, this parade kind of matters to recruiting, and retention, and heraldry, and all those things, right?

General GEORGE. Yes, sir.

Mr. KELLY. All right. I want to talk a little bit, we talked about diverting the money, but safe neighborhoods matter too, right? And not housing people who are not here illegally in Army barracks, that matters, right?

Mr. DRISCOLL. A safe border is incredibly important, Congressman.

Mr. KELLY. Absolutely, and not housing people who shouldn't be on Army bases on Army bases, and putting at risk our warriors, that matters too, right?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Everything related to that border, Congressman.

Mr. KELLY. So, I want to talk about a little bureaucracy. Okay, you have got a 3D printer who just built some buildings at Bliss, do you think urinal flows go to the strength and reliability of a building? Urinal flows. The answer is no. Okay, we literally slowed down production and did extra testing because we had to test urinal flows, that would apply to every building, not just 3D printed, right?

General GEORGE. There are a lot of challenges, I think, Congressman, with how we are building buildings compared to outside. And we have been over on the Hill trying to explain what those are—

Mr. KELLY. I would just suggest when people put false things in there to make requirements longer, that we probably find them another job, or no job. When you want to do hurricane strength testing in the desert, I would suggest that is not the best use of our people or our assets. I want to go a little bit, General George, and I am really concerned about this, and Mr. Secretary.

I hear us talking about moving AH-64E models, and I hear we are going to the Mike model, and UH-60s, what I want to make sure that we are not doing though, is that we failed one thing on the active component, and the lesser alternative, the secondary, the old strategic reserve thing to the National Guard and Reserve. It matters when we fight, we do not have a large enough Army to fight, we have to all fight at one time, or be prepared to. Do you all agree with that?

General GEORGE. I agree, and I just want to explain on the details. Actually, there are some reductions of the 64Ds in the active component so that we can also have AH-64Es in the Guard, in COMPO [component] 2, and what the National Guard is going to see from Army Transformation Initiative is the age of—they will get much younger, much more capable aircraft out of what we are doing with it.

Mr. KELLY. Thank you, General. And I want to go real quick, one of our members earlier brought up. Let me tell you, in World War II did we fight a very different campaign in the Pacificμthan we fought in Europe?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. KELLY. One was intensively sea warfare, and air warfare, some ground forces, but it was primarily sea and air, is that correct?

General GEORGE. I would actually tell you that we had twenty-one divisions and six corps in the Pacific during World War II. So, I don't see, our job is to be ready anywhere in the world—

Mr. KELLY. My point is ground forces still matter in Europe, that was a primarily ground war, it uses all, both use all.

General GEORGE. I think they matter everywhere, I am obviously biased, but I think history supports that. And infused with the right technology that we would have with drones, and counter-UAS, and all those things, I think the Army is critically important long-range fire is—

Mr. KELLY. We can walk and chew gum at the same time, we can be prepared for Europe and the Pacific is kind of my point. The final thing is just I want to make sure you guys continue our commitment. I think one of our most valuable tools is our state partnership programs, and I think we are using it well. I think we can use it better to get more return on investment for the Army and the nation as a whole.

With that, I yield back.

Mr. BACON. The gentleman's time is expired.

Mr. Crow, you are recognized.

Mr. CROW. Thank you, Chairman. Thank you to both of you for coming in. I join with many of my colleagues in sharing some excitement around you thinking big, and structurally, this Army Transformation Initiative is the way we need to be thinking. But I also join with my colleagues in saying that Congressional engagement is extremely important, and without information, this Committee cannot do its work.

In addition to this Committee, the Army Caucus has not had any engagement with the Department. I am the co-chair of the Army Caucus, we are six months into this year, this is a bipartisan caucus. This is a group of Members of Congress, many of whom are Army veterans, many of whom have Army facilities in their district. They volunteer, and there just hasn't been any engagement.

We are some of your biggest allies, and we can't do that work unless we engage with you. Both of you are combat veterans like me, and I would like to talk about our shared experience in combat. Secretary Driscoll, you led a platoon in Iraq, and I am sure you realized when you were doing that that engaging with civilian populations was important, correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Absolutely, Congressman. And just to your Army Caucus, we will remedy that. That is shame on me for not having you, so I commit to you will get an invite soon, and then yes.

Mr. CROW. Thank you. So, engagement of populations, that is essential to the mission, because we are almost always operating near civilians, correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Correct.

Mr. CROW. And we can't accomplish military missions, combat missions, unless we effectively interface with civilian populations, correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. That is generally true.

Mr. CROW. And as part of that, reducing civilian casualties, making sure that civilians are not pulled into, or are injured as part of our operations is also mission essential, correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army, we always aspire to minimize and mitigate that risk.

Mr. CROW. It would be mission essential to minimize civilian casualties, right?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. CROW. General George, would you share that view?

General GEORGE. I would. I would also come back to with our shared experiences, that we have to really focus on making sure that every soldier is really good at their kinetic mission, and before I went to Afghanistan as a brigade commander, Iraq as a battalion commander, as a field grade, part of everything that we do with

what we are doing with targeting is making sure that we are very precise in what we are doing.

And I think history would show we are very precise, I mean it is combat—

Mr. CROW. Which I agree with, General, the precision is really important, right? Because that actually makes us more combat effective, to be precise, and to make sure we are hitting what we need to hit, and not hitting other things. In addition to losing the support of a civilian population, of which we are often times trying to earn their support by reducing casualties, is that accurate?

General GEORGE. I would say in certain situations, if that is a counter-insurgency fight, then I would be—

Mr. CROW. That would be accurate. And in fact the mission analysis tool, METT-TC (Mission, Enemy, Terrain & Weather, Troops & Support Available, Time Available, Civilian Considerations), you both are familiar with METT-TC, right? In fact, you used it, Secretary Driscoll, when you were in the military, right?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. CROW. And the C stands for what?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Civilian.

Mr. CROW. Yes, it's civil considerations, right? So it is actually built into our analysis planning tool that you think about civilian populations. So, here is my question. In Fiscal Year 2023, this Committee, on a bipartisan basis, created the Civilian Protection Center of Excellence for all the reasons we talked about, that we understand that we can't effectively conduct our mission, win the support of local populations, reduce civilian casualties, and ensure the effectiveness and the precision of our targeting unless we make it a part of the mission, and we focus on it.

The Department has provided notice to Congress that they are going to defund, and get rid of the CP COE [Civilian Protection Center of Excellence]. So, why on a bipartisan basis we passed something that will help put our soldiers in a position of being more successful in our mission, more precise in our targeting, that will be better protecting the civilian populations that we serve in and alongside of, are you going to wind this down?

General GEORGE. I would tell you, Congressman, that what we need to do is make sure that that, beyond the Center of Excellence, is embedded in everything we do from top to bottom. I think you were mentioning METT-TC, that is a very tactical thing that we are doing at every place all the way up. We are doing this when we—

Mr. CROW. I agree with you, General, I don't mean to cut you off, I agree with you. Secretary Driscoll, this was the way to focus and prioritize this effort, why wind it down?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think we are aligned on your goal, Congressman, and we think that there is a more effective way to do it.

Mr. CROW. All right, well I want to hear that more effective way, and I would like the answer to that.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes, Congressman.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 98.]

Mr. BACON. Thank you. The gentleman's time is expired. I am going to recognize myself for five minutes. Thank you both for

being here, I appreciate your leadership. I want to echo some of the concerns that we have heard today, bipartisan today on the news reports that the Secretary of Defense is moving over a billion dollars out of barracks and dorms for the border.

We need a strong border, I get that. But I spent the last year chairing a subcommittee, or a temporary subcommittee looking at quality of life, and in the midst of that, the GAO [Government Accountability Office] came out and gave our dorms and our barracks a failing grade, an F, to include the Army's. We saw pictures of raw sewage in dorms, rodents, mold, dorms and barracks that had no air conditioning, or heat working, and on and on.

And so, we spent the year trying to build a plan to help the services fix this. And what we did learn is over a decade, the services were moving money out of their dorms and barracks towards weapon systems. I get that, we had finite resources. But we built a ten-year hole in our dorms and barracks, and now if the news reports are true, it is very troubling.

We were trying to help with the quality of lief, and I feel like a decision was made that undermined this whole effort that we spent this last year doing. So, I wanted to say that for the record. General George, I think China is rightfully the pacing threat. What is it that you want the Army to bring in a China-U.S. fight. What is the main capability that you see the Army bringing?

General GEORGE. I think the Army is going to be, Congressman, the backbone for a lot of things that are out in the Pacific. You see right now what long range fires is doing, being able to operate in small times, and being able to present those kinds of things out there. It is why we are moving away with some of our systems, or other drones that can actually now be employed much simpler, and not from airfields.

So, I think long range fires, Army is going to have a big role to play in integrated air and missile defense. And again, this is around the world. Command and control, we are used to a lot of moving parts, and big formations, and controlling a lot of that. So, I think we are going to do a lot of that counter-UAS. I could go down across all the war fighting functions.

We always tell everybody that there is no such thing as one, a maritime, air, land. These are joint theaters, and everybody is going to be important to this fight, and so certainly we are going to be an important part of that as well.

Mr. BACON. Thank you. I totally agree. Long range fighters. I think some criticisms towards the Army about if they put the right priority on air defense, but I think we know we need it now.

And, we need to really invest in this area, particularly in a far East conflict. And, also the counter-drone technology is going to be huge.

There are a lot of reports of what China is doing with their drone technology. So, we will be facing the same threats that we are seeing in Europe right now.

To you both, sometimes I hear the President or Vice President, Secretary of Defense talk about solely China as the primary threat. But, I don't hear a lot of talk about Russia.

And yet, since 1991, Russia has forcibly changed their borders nine times. And, we are seeing the big one right now with Ukraine.

Would you agree that Russia is indeed a threat, one? And two, do we have any, are we going to maintain our posture in Eastern Europe with the Baltic countries, Poland, Romania?

I think our presence there is critical for deterrence. Secretary?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think we all agree, and we are following the leadership and guidance of Secretary Hegseth that China is the pacing threat.

But, when General George and I talk about the Army that we believe we are responsible to build, one of the things we have referenced is that often most human beings that thought they could predict the future, have turned out to be wrong since the beginning of mankind. And, we want an Army that can be effective anywhere that we send it.

And so, in all of our planning, we try to build an Army that it stands by and stands ready to go anywhere the President sends us.

But yes, I—

Mr. BACON. So, is Russia a threat?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Russia is a threat.

Mr. BACON. Thank you. General George?

General GEORGE. I would agree with that. And, I just want to kind of, this gets to some of the earlier questions about what kind of equipment.

I don't think that we can have an Army that can be, that is only good at one thing. You know, the Army has to be, our country expects it of us. And, I know we can do that.

And, that is exactly what we are focused on with the transformation initiative.

Mr. BACON. Do we plan on keeping our presence in the Baltics and in Poland? Yield to either one of you.

General GEORGE. Yes, I have not seen any, you know, policy decisions on that right now, Congressman.

Mr. BACON. I can't think of better allies. These folks love our country. I have been to the Baltics many times and Poland.

They love freedom. They know what it is like to live under the Soviet Union or Russian control. They are investing four percent roughly of their GDP [Gross Domestic Product], trying to go to five.

They are great allies, and I just hope we stick by their side and make it very clear with that.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Well, Congressman, I was in Poland and saw how they treated our soldiers, and it is incredible. They are an amazing ally.

Mr. BACON. Thank you.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, we support them.

Mr. BACON. With that, I yield. And, I recognize Mr. Ryan for five minutes.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you both for being here. Thank you also for coming to the finest Service Academy in the world, in my district, for commencement two weeks ago.

It was really an honor to have you both there, and I think we can all agree, the country should be incredibly proud of those 1,002 young men and women that raised their right hand that day. And, I certainly appreciate both of you being there and your leadership to that effect.

Two areas that I wanted to hit, starting with you, General George, I just want to commend you on the record from the beginning of you taking this critical role, saying we are going to really take hard critical looks.

We are going to up our risk tolerance. We are going to experiment with the Transformation in Contact initiative that you undertook.

And then, to see that come to fruition and taking those lessons learned from those, I think it was three brigades that were doing that work across the country, to then inform the transformation initiative that we are talking about today.

I think that deserves significant praise and credit as a model that I think all the services should look at. Can you just briefly talk about one specific success story?

And, I know you mentioned for example, that 300 percent increase in lethality of the one brigade. But, can you share, I think a lot of us are focused on, kind of, the macro, there are a lot of moving pieces here.

But, can you bring that to life? Is there an anecdote or a story you can share from the Transformation in Contact that has informed the larger ATI initiative?

General GEORGE. I mean even before, I will go back to the people, because I have been asked what is our most important asset. I think, you know, what we are learning, is what kind of people also, and what kind of people skills we need to have inside of our formation.

We had a, you know, pretty significant meeting earlier this week about deciding how we are going to add electronic warfare operators inside our formation. How they would do that at Echelon.

It has informed how we need to change our training at all of our centers of excellence, how we are training majors differently, captains above, you know, and all the way up.

So, it is really informing everything we are doing. And, it is not just the technology.

Mr. RYAN. Thank you. Yeah, I think that is a very critical point. And, it leads actually to my second question, which is about our greatest resource, our personnel and recruiting specifically.

Secretary Driscoll, I appreciated your op-ed and the broad recognition of a huge success. And, I think everybody in the committee should be applauding, in a bipartisan way, the success of the Army.

After several years of investment, a strategy change, particularly led by you General George and your team, bipartisan work of the Congress under the Chairman's leadership and the Ranking Member's, specifically Rep. Houlahan and Congressman Bacon's effort on the quality-of-life initiative to raise pay and address other critical quality-of-life issues.

All of that coming together to actually work to see us hitting our goal, not only on time, but ahead of time. So, I commend you all for that.

I do think it is important that this not be a political analysis of the success. And, I am concerned not actually from either of you, but what I have heard from the Secretary and the President of overly politicizing the takeaways of the recruiting success.

So, I just want to raise a few points and ask a few questions to make sure I am understanding how we got here correctly, so that we can learn the correct lessons and build on this success.

I know in FY 22 and 23, we were challenged, did not hit our numbers. That is correct, Chief?

General GEORGE. That is correct.

Mr. RYAN. And then in FY 24, which to be clear, it happened in the last Administration, we hit our goals. We are up 12.5 percent and exceeded the goal and hit 55,150 recruits in FY 24.

Is that right, General George?

General GEORGE. That sounds right. Yes, sir.

Mr. RYAN. And then, I think, we even went 11,000 over and were able to put 11,000 additional folks into the delayed entry program, which fed into the success we have had in FY 25. Is that the right way to think about that?

General GEORGE. Everybody that goes into the delayed entry program, and that is exactly what we are going to do Congressman, you know, from—

Mr. RYAN. For the next year.

General GEORGE. From here on out, is we expect to get, you know, 20,000, for example, in the delayed entry program moving forward.

Mr. RYAN. Great. And, I am running out of time, and we will submit this for the record.

But, I think it is important to highlight that this all started under your leadership General George, and the last Secretary, in October 2023, when we added 1,200 recruiters to your credit, when we started the Future Soldier Prep course, which 24 percent of the recruits came from that course, when we moved to online job boards, when we went back to the old motto that we all love, "Be all you can be," and a lot of other smart initiatives that started in 2023.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Luttrell.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good morning gentlemen. Have either one of you heard of the 1st Battalion 158th Aviation Regiment of the 11th Expeditionary Combat Aviation Brigade?

General GEORGE. I am familiar with not that specific battalion, but the ECAB [Expeditionary Combat Aviation Brigade], yes.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Mr. Secretary?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Directionally, not specifically.

Mr. LUTTRELL. That is unfortunate, because it is being decommissioned, and it is in my district. And, I want one of you two to tell me why that is happening.

Because I would hope, since that is being decommissioned, and Mr. Crow said it very eloquently, we can be your greatest asset or your worst enemy.

And, you have come into my house, where I was born and raised in this county, and you are taking something away from me, and I want to know why.

General GEORGE. We went through, and we have done a lot of war games, Congressmen on what we need for aviation structure. And so, that is what we went down from start to finish on what we were going to do.

I think we have talked a lot this morning about autonomous systems and—

Mr. LUTTRELL. You did speak about modernization. I am curious why you wouldn't try to modernize that unit instead of decommissioning it.

I say decommission because I am a Navy guy. If there is a different term in the Army, please let me know.

General GEORGE. Well, again, I think when you are overstructured on a specific asset and you are under investing in others, you have to make decisions on that.

That is what we are looking to do with a lot of those pilots that are in COMPO 3, they will, we are working right now with them so that they would move and they would fly in the Guard. We have got a lot of talent in there that will go with the Guard or potentially with COMPO 1.

But again, what we have committed ourselves to is that we are not going to keep equipment that we don't need, systems that we don't need, when we know we need to invest in other systems.

Mr. LUTTRELL. If we don't need those particular weapon systems or those air assets, why can't we increase the capability by moving more modern aircraft to that location?

General GEORGE. Again, I think we are going to, over the years, going to start to see a reduction in what we are having for some of our rotary wing aircraft. And, we can talk about how much rotary wing aircraft have been used right on the front lines in some of these, it is less.

We are moving towards the MV-75, which is the FLRAA that the Secretary was talking about in the future here. And, we are hoping to move that very quickly.

But, I think that there are other missions, autonomous systems that can do that. And, again, we had to make a decision. We did not, we were overstructured on that particular aviation.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Well, I would like for you guys to take a harder look at this. And, let me tell you why, because Conroe, Texas is just right outside of Houston, and that area is basically the catcher's mitt for hurricanes in the state, okay, out of the gulf.

And, the 500 soldiers and the 100 civilians that work at that unit are engaged in our community. We see them every day.

And, when Harvey hit, and every other storm that followed Harvey, that asset was flying overhead, rescuing my constituents, day after day. Continued to do so without question.

And, I am getting the call not from them, but from my district. And, I can assure you, when my district starts chewing on me, guess where I am coming?

And, I want those answers. I want, I respectfully request either one of you come to my office and explain to me, in detail, why this is happening.

Why we can't move assets in this place, why can't this particular unit stay, not only because of its deployability, and how great they are every time they go overseas, but because of the asset and what they bring when we get hit by a storm every single year.

Now, if you do take that from us, and I am going to speak hypothetically here, you do take this from us and this goes away, and I have heard 12 to 24 months once you pull the trigger, if that hap-

pens and we get hit again, which we will, you are going to have to explain to me.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, Congressman, we would be happy to come to your office and explain it, the first bucket of ATI.

And, we are allocating, reallocating $48 billion of spending over the next five years. We have had a lot of hard conversations with a lot of well-intentioned. And, the tension in this is at a scale that we are, we would be delighted to share the Army's list.[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 99.]

Mr. LUTTRELL. I would be curious if any of those conversations—

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, we appreciate that you will push back on a lot of it.

Mr. LUTTRELL. Of those folks that you, any of those people that you had those conversations with, because I have been down there. And, kind of see what I am talking about.

General GEORGE. Yeah, Congressman, I will also tell you from a lot of experience through the years of supporting, we will, we have done this.

Most of the time we have to evacuate all of the aircraft out. We still have Cavazos that's right up the road and other—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes Representative Vasquez of New Mexico.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you Secretary Driscoll, General George, for your time today and for your years of service to our country.

I represent New Mexico's Second District, home to White Sands Missile Range. As I am sure you well know, White Sands is the Department's premier research and testing facility, where we have spent decades developing cutting-edge technologies and weapon systems.

I have heard from base leadership during my time here in Congress that they have persistently dealt with drones of unknown origin entering into the airspace without authorization.

Drones are a relatively cheap weapons system with the capacity to rapidly form swarms and launch attacks on targets of significantly higher value. And, I am concerned about White Sands' vulnerability.

They also have the ability to spy on some of our most sensitive technologies while it is being tested at White Sands. The base currently has limited radar capacity to detect drone incursions, but more importantly, they lack both the authority and technology to engage these drones, leaving us potentially exposed to our adversaries.

General George, would you agree that unknown drones entering the airspace of our military bases pose an intelligence and security threat?

General GEORGE. I agree. And, to go further, Congressman, you know, this is an area that we have been talking about that we, and you will see, we are going to invest more in.

We need to experiment more with it. We need to have commercial, you know, more folks, developers that are in there doing that.

And, we need to work with you on the 130-I to make sure that we also get the right authorities to do that. There are areas I

know, for example, where we, you know, we could shoot things down. So, we have to work through some of that.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, Congressman, I would just say, this is a topic I think that likely would have bipartisan support.

And, you have our both, very public admission, and request that we need help to all work together to solve this, because in CONUS [Continental United States], it is difficult. There are a lot of different assets nearby. There is commercial air traffic.

And, the answers are not simple. And so, we as a nation have got to come up with a better solution.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Thank you, Secretary. Thank you. General. Does the Army or Department of Defense keep a log of instances in which unauthorized drones have been entering military airspace?

General GEORGE. We do keep track of that.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Have those been increasing over the last five years?

General GEORGE. I would say drones are increasing in general, whether it is, you know, commercial, and again, this gets back to, you know, being able to identify, understand, you know, and what you are doing to categorize it.

So, and, I think the Secretary has seen that. But, it again gets back to how we are going to have to work together to get after the authorities, flexible funding to make sure that we can actually buy the things and, you know, not one specific system and continue to evolve in this area. And rapidly.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Thank you, Secretary. And, a lot of that technology is being developed in my district in the State of New Mexico. So, I appreciate you lending them a hand to be able to compete for these contracts.

Secretary Driscoll, given the rising use of drones for military and intelligence purposes, what is the Army doing in FY 26 to improve our counter-drone capabilities?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congressman, this is top of mind. We are testing all sorts of capabilities. Directed energy is one that, I think, we have all read about recently that it is a very difficult science problem to solve. We don't have a scalable solution yet.

We are working with tech providers from our SAG-U [Security Assistance Group-Ukraine]that is trying to suck out the best lessons of Ukraine. There are a lot of technology providers in Ukraine. They are calling it in some ways the Silicon Valley of war right now.

And so, what we are trying to do is, instead of needing to innovate as a nation ourselves, we can be fast followers on a lot of these tools. And, the Army is working daily to try to come up with as many solutions as possible.

Mr. VASQUEZ. Thank you, Secretary. And, I want to switch comments.

General GEORGE. Could I just add one, could I add one thing on that Congressman, please?

Mr. VASQUEZ. General, I just want to make sure I get to these other questions here, excuse me. I want to switch topics to the troop deployments on the border.

I represent 180 miles of the U.S.-Mexico border, the entirety of the New Mexico border with Mexico. And, recently the troop de-

ployment to the border has created a military zone that has taken over the management of public lands, federal public lands.

In fact, I have a deer hunt this year in an area where I am no longer able to hunt and no longer able to enter. And, it has become unclear where the boundaries of this military zone actually start and where they end.

And, that is unclear not just to hunters or people who enjoy the land, but also to local governments, county commissioners of those counties who represent those border counties.

How fast can we get the information of where these military border zones actually exist?

And, what can Americans who go into these existing federal public lands managed by the Bureau of Land Management expect some answers about whether they will be apprehended or arrested within these border zones?

Mr. DRISCOLL. We can provide very specifically; I will bifurcate my reply. We can provide that information to your office.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 99.]

And then, to people on that specific land, the Army is working incredibly hard with our soldiers to put out signage. We have taken it over recently.

And so—

Mr. VASQUEZ. Thank you, Secretary. I appreciate that, because so far, we have not received any response from the Department of Defense or the Army. So, thank you.

I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Virginia, Mrs. Kiggans.

Mrs. KIGGANS. Thank you very much to both of you for being with us today. And, although I represent a big Navy district in Virginia's Second District in Hampton Roads, I am the daughter of a Green Beret who served in Vietnam. So, I appreciate again, both of your services.

I wanted to just echo my colleagues' sentiments for prioritizing the quality-of-life work that we did last Congress. We looked at housing, childcare, healthcare, pay and compensation, spouse employment.

These are really important issues, and we hear it time and time again and across the service branches. So, thank you for continuing to prioritize that.

I echo their sentiments just about, you know, I know there is a lot of needs in the balance, and the budget is confined. So, just make sure you don't forget about quality of life.

Along those same lines, we talked a little bit about power grids. And, I know Congresswoman Stefanik mentioned Fort Drum, and we have similar challenges at Naval Station Norfolk, and Naval Air Station Oceana, again in my district.

And, we have an offshore wind project that is actually giving the air station a $500 million power grid upgrade, which I appreciate. It's a little bit of a creative way to do that.

But, there is also talk about, you know, the small modular reactors, which you all mentioned. And then, just adopting, you know, right now we are having to adopt the local power grid.

Which do you prefer, which would work out better for the Army? And then, what are some of the barriers to implementing that power source?

General GEORGE. Are you talking between—

Mrs. KIGGANS. SMRs or is it better just to adopt the local power unit?

General GEORGE. Well, I think it depends again, and you know, the Army has been designated the executive agent for these. And, one thing that I think everybody realizes, and the Secretary mentioned this earlier, power requirements are going to go up.

What we are also very focused on is resiliency of our installations. And, you know, as we refer to them as power projection platforms, making sure that we have resilient energy.

And so, that is what we are focused on.

So, I mean, we are looking forward to this initiative. I think that is one of the things that we have talked about that we need to continually improve with.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, Congresswoman, I would say the way we are thinking about these is, we would prefer in no instance to have an either/or to create this resiliency against threats we don't know.

We think that the right solution is a lot of solutions. And, that as we learn, and as we go about this, and as we go into a conflict someday, we may want to scale up one or another solution.

And so, specifically to that, I think it is both.

Mrs. KIGGANS. I agree. We have an all of the above energy approach in Virginia, which I think is worth utilizing everywhere.

I want to talk a little bit about recruitment and retention. Congratulations on meeting your recruitment goals. This is great. We are still working on the Navy side.

I heard you talk about GENESIS and the Waiver Program. And, I think, Secretary Driscoll, you called it inadequate. And, we have challenges in our own district.

It frustrates the heck out of me when I hear from young people who want to serve, especially in the DoD medical board process. There is a lot of room for improvement.

I was just at Virginia Military Institute a couple weeks ago, my son graduated. But, looking at these young people that want to serve, especially in the Army, that school produces a lot of Army officers. I want these kids to be able to serve.

So, I get really frustrated with some of the pediatric diagnosis, some of the nuances of this waiver process. So, you mentioned Secretary Driscoll, again, that it was inadequate.

Can you just speak to me about what changes you are looking at in this waiver process?

Mr. DRISCOLL. So, the GENESIS program in and of itself is a classic example, I think, of the Army building a solution or being part of a solution that is siloed and ineffective and inefficient.

And, it is probably going to be a better solution to go out and grab a tool that is used in areas in the commercial sector.

So, looking at something like SalesForce. Our recruiting team has started to onboard to SalesForce as its CRM [Customer Relationship Management] and seen incredible results with that.

In a perfect world, we would replace something like GENESIS with something like SalesForce, where we could toggle the amount

of information we are seeing, and weight the different outcomes with a generative AI model.

Being able to say, hey, is this a kid who got an inhaler when they were 12 and two months and never used it? Versus somebody who when they were 17 and a half actively was using an inhaler. Can we take coaches' letters of recommendation and apply it before we output that they even need a waiver?

And so, what we are trying to do is essentially apply logic, because we hate those outcomes too.

Mrs. KIGGANS. Thank you.

General GEORGE. Can I mention one thing on that?

Mrs. KIGGANS. Sure.

General GEORGE. You know, we are looking longitudinally as well. I mean, I think you know, again, the population is changing a little bit more as far as, you know, numbers with ADHD [Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder] or, you know, different issues.

So, we are studying that as well, you know, with how long do soldiers, and what do we get for retention, what kind of things. We have pushed the waiver authorities down, you know, further, so, because of a lot of the frustration.

And, I enlisted, if I would have had to wait, you know, two, three, four months, I probably would have chosen to do something else.

So, that is the biggest thing that we are trying to do. And, I do think that we can get better in our software.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Hawaii, Ms. Tokuda.

Ms. TOKUDA. Thank you, Mr. Chair. As you both know, the Hawaii Board of Land and Natural Resources just rejected the Army's EIS [Environmental Impact Statement] for the Pohakuloa Training Area in my district.

And, in the coming weeks, the EIS for Army Training Areas on Oahu will come before the Board for decision. Given ATI restructuring efforts, does that change the Army's intended footprint needed in Hawaii?

Perhaps doing less with more, with an emphasis on things like advanced manufacturing, 3D printing, additive manufacturing, all in which were contained in Secretary Hegseth's memo, which prioritizes, and are in line, quite frankly, with the work that we are starting to do at Scofield right now.

General GEORGE. I would just start by saying, you know, we have a lot of really important units that are out right now, you know, at Scofield Barracks with the 25th Infantry Division.

Obviously, being able to train for their, you know, potential war fighting missions is critically important to us, and it is why those training areas are very important to us. And, I think that is jointly.

And, I know we are working very closely with the authorities in Hawaii too, you know, kind of move this forward.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, I am heading in July, Congresswoman, I am going to Hawaii. And, one of the things I want to bring on behalf of the Army, make sure we tell that to the community, is how grateful we are for the partnership and the community members they have been.

Our soldiers who have returned from being stationed there have generally nothing but amazing experiences with that community. And, we are grateful.

Ms. TOKUDA. Yes. Well, we definitely take care of our people. We would like to be also taken care of as well as good neighbors.

And, I think that is where, especially if this ATI process is intuitive and learning as you go, given that we need certainty by 2029 when the lease renegotiations are up. You need to really know what kind of footprint and intention you have with our communities in terms of training or whether it is to do a pivot more towards things like additive manufacturing.

I want to move onto some other questions. Mr. Secretary, for over 20 years, the 1st Information Operations Command was the Army's only active-duty unit focused on synchronizing information capabilities and supporting deployed forces to counter adversary influences.

And, its recent shutdown as part of a broader restructuring, raises serious concerns about the future of Army Information Ops [Operations], in particular, China, Russia, and others that set up disinformation, propaganda and cyber enabled influences. Allowing our adversaries to control the information and disinformation space only adds to the fog of war, quite frankly. Mr. Secretary, how is the Army ensuring that the deactivation of the 1st IO [Information Operations] Command does not leave operational gaps or vulnerabilities in our information posture, especially at the tactical and operations level?

And, during this transition, what safeguards and interim measures are you putting in place to ensure the continuity of capability and mission?

General GEORGE. I am going to jump in on that one first, Congresswoman.

Ms. TOKUDA. Okay.

General GEORGE. First, I think we are working that with SOCOM [United States Special Operations Command] and USASOC [United States Army Special Operations Command]. And again, I think everybody sometimes gets, you know, a headquarters caught up with whether or not you are going to do, you know, a mission.

And, I think what we have learned is that is going to be a part of every mission that we are doing. We are looking at how we are updating.

I was talking, or answering a question earlier from Congressman Ryan, and how we talk about our people and train our people differently with information operations, psychological operations. You know, that runs the gamut of this.

It is also technical and how everybody knew what was happening this weekend instantly because of what was happening on the internet. And, how are you having technical solutions to understand that.

Ms. TOKUDA. I think what I am asking though, is when it comes to information operations, we have had a central hub for over 20 years.

We have dismantled other entities within the State Department, the Voice of America, to be able to counter and manage information

and disinformation. You are talking about disaggregating it across all sectors and units, and have individuals trained in that.

We need a centralized source that we can control what information we are putting out and what our adversaries, knowing what our adversaries are putting out there as well. Are you concerned at all that we are lacking in both readiness and capacity in this area as a result of shutting down this Information Operations Command?

It can be a simple yes or no, because I do—

General GEORGE. I am not concerned based on command. I am concerned—

Ms. TOKUDA. So, you have no concerns that we are at a disadvantage to areas like China that are very much attuned to the need to be able to manage this particular space. We will continue on later.

But, I wanted to ask one question about AI. Now, from what we have seen in your May letter to the force on Army, you know, ATI, you have stated that command and control nodes will integrate AI to accelerate decision-making, and I fully support us moving in that direction.

But, when we have looked at other sectors and how AI is distributed, we need to make sure there are clear ethical boundaries and oversight personnel, or there will be serious risk. My question is, can you clarify your vision for AI integration into Command and Control, what it looks like in practice?

Are you talking about AI in an advisory capacity? Or, initiating and executing actions autonomously?

How do we ensure—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. McGuire.

Ms. TOKUDA. Thank you. I will submit questions for the record, Mr. Chair.

Mr. MCGUIRE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, thank you for our witnesses for being here today. We wouldn't have a country without our military, so I really appreciate the service.

In the 250-year Army parade, and I totally agree, we live in an incredible country. Our U.S. Army has an incredible history and that must be told.

And, I think what I appreciate what you said about meeting the recruiting goals four months early, and before the busier and more productive months, that is incredible. I know it is all about teamwork.

We have got to make sure that our folks can, if God willing, be able to come home and survive a fight, if they get in a fight. But, I believe in peace through strength. And, if we have peace through strength, we probably won't have to go to war.

There are a lot of threats at home and abroad, and some people say the enemy is at the gate, and in some ways the enemy is in the gate. And, I would like to make sure, I think we all would, that what happened in Russia with their bombers doesn't happen in the United States.

There should be, we talk about drones, we saw what happened at Langley Air Force Base. Even in my district, we have a nuclear

power plant, North Anna, the sheriff says, hey, there are drones over our plant and we are not sure what we can do.

There was an advisory put out by DOJ [Department of Justice] in 2020, and I think that caused a lot of confusion with the Department of Defense and SLTT [State, Local, Tribal and Territorial]. And, so I have put in a bill, it is H.R. [House of Representatives] 3478, it is called the Manned Aircraft Clarification Act.

And, basically that advisory made generals and other government folks think that a drone was the same thing as a remote-control, I am sorry, a 747 jumbo jet with passengers, is the same thing as a remote-control airplane, which they are not.

So, I would ask you guys to look at that DOJ advisory back in 2020. It needs to be rewritten, updated, and I would ask you to check out the H.R. 3478, Manned Aircraft Clarification Act.

There should be zero restrictions on the ability of government to protect their property and critical infrastructure against drones. Every obstacle creates opportunity for adversaries to do what we saw in Russia earlier this week. So, please check that out.

Ukraine has a goal of building 4.5 million drones this year. And, I read a report, it said the Army Materials Command demonstrated the ability to produce ten Group One drones per week for training exercises used in 3D printing.

And, AMCs [United States Army Material Command] Acting Commander, Lieutenant General Christopher Mohan, recently stated that they could potentially use advanced manufacturing techniques to expand to 10,000 drones per month. You see, that is a far cry from what they are doing in Ukraine. What is stopping the U.S. Army from replicating this success across all our material? Is it technology challenge, training, or funding?

I will start with Secretary Driscoll.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think the shortest answer would be all of it. All of the above. We as a defense industrial base, have decayed and lost our ability to rapidly procure new technology and scale it to the war fighter.

We are very optimistic that these tools and solutions are able to be made and mimicked by American industry to copy exactly what is occurring in Ukraine. We are optimistic that with the bipartisan support of this committee, we are able to get the funding to do this quickly.

There are tools, and General George and I have visited a number of companies, small and medium sized, that we think this renaissance of the industrial base that is hopefully unlocked from Army Transformation Initiative will allow us to put into place the things that would be required to scale to something like keeping up with Russia's one million drones or Ukraine's four million.

But, we are not there today.

Mr. MCGUIRE. And, I apologize, but I have limited time. So, there is one more question I would like to ask. And, I appreciate your answer, Mr. Secretary, to my colleagues Joe Wilson and Elise Stefanik, on the importance of small modular reactors for the Army.

But, I would like to ask about some more details on Executive Order 14299, Deploying Advanced Nuclear Reactor Technologies for National Security. So, Mr. Secretary, you mentioned the issue of

congested logistics and supply chains, where do you see micro-reactors in this context?

And, by the way, in my district, we have BWXT [BWX Technologies]. And, I think, they are going to be the first micro-reactor that is operational in the world.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think micro-reactors can be an incredible asset as we solve against the future energy needs of the United States Army, both in CONUS, OCONUS [Outside the Continental United States], and in peacetime and wartime. And, we are excited to lead that effort.

Mr. MCGUIRE. And, this is a question for either one of you, if you wouldn't mind, is, do you have any idea which services or Combatant and Commands will be receiving these capabilities first, or a time frame for a rollout?

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 101.]

General GEORGE. I don't. We can come back to you, Congressman. I think, you know, a lot of this gets to the technology and how big these systems are.

You know, are they, how mobile are they? And, are they going to be on our bases? Are they going to be on our installations? And, I think that is going to change over time. And, we are going to be working with everybody in the Department to make sure that we are advancing that effort.

Mr. MCGUIRE. I yield back. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back. The Chair now recognizes Representative Cisneros from California.

Mr. CISNEROS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, thank you Secretary Driscoll and General George for being here today. I really appreciate your time.

Secretary Driscoll, you know, diverting a billion dollars away from barracks, like was said, like a $30, $40 million parade. You are being forced to make 8 percent cuts for projects, for pet projects that the Secretary and the President want.

And, this is all happening while we are under a CR. I am kind of getting the impression that is the Army just flush with cash, and got extra money to spend that it can give away?

You know, are we giving you too much? And, you know, really how is this, I know it has kind of been answered already a little bit, but just to go more into depth, like you know, our servicemembers, how is this affecting the quality of life of our servicemembers if we are moving this money away from the barracks?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congressman, just to go on record, you are not giving us too much money.

Mr. CISNEROS. Well, you are giving it away, so.

Mr. DRISCOLL. We are, as stated earlier to your colleagues, we are incredibly honored, and we take very seriously the duty that we have to the American taxpayer, to use those dollars efficiently and effectively for the American soldier.

For the celebration of our 250th anniversary, we very—the planning has been going on for years. The Army believes that this will empower an entire new generation of America's youth to catch this spirit to serve their nation.

And, we are incredibly honored to be able to tell that story. General George and I have reflected how lucky we are to be in these roles in this moment in time, and to tell the story of an institution that has impacted our country so greatly since its founding.

Mr. CISNEROS. You don't think that money could be better well spent on some type of recruiting campaign that would work over a period of time, rather than a one-day event that is just going to take place and then it is done?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes. This parade, I believe, will be seen by Americans across the country. And, I very sincerely, and we can look at the recruiting numbers, I would hypothesize, and I will come back and justify whether I was right or wrong, that we will see an incredible filling of our pipeline of young Americans who want to join.

Mr. CISNEROS. Well, one thing that I know for sure, right, the thing that does affect recruiting, is an investment in actual recruiting.

But, I think with these 8 percent cuts that we are seeing, I am pretty sure there is going to be a big chunk that is going to come out of recruiting. And, that is probably going to hurt numbers over time.

But, General George, you know, the Secretary, Secretary Hegseth has made some comments about wanting to reduce the number of general officers by 20 percent, three star, four star officers by 20 percent.

Department of Defense just went through an exercise of this not that long ago, where a number of officers, senior officers had to be cut. You were part of those discussions. I heard those discussions about where they would come and fighting.

So, where are you planning to make these cuts for these three- and four-star senior officers?

General GEORGE. So, Congressman, we have actually been making some cuts in general officer billets. I would generally agree that again, we are overstructured on headquarters.

And, you know, we are trying to move people down into our formations. And so, I think we are doing that, and we had already made some of those as part of Army Transformation Initiative.

We are going to make some additional cuts. I think it is going to make us better. Oftentimes additional headquarters slow down processes and adds bureaucracy that is actually not going to help us.

I also think that we have updated business systems, I call them readiness systems, that we can actually, you know, do things much more efficiently. I look at a smart board in my office, for example, rather than calling down to somebody else.

So, I do think that we can reduce those numbers. That is part of our plan in what we are doing. And, I think it is going to make us more efficient.

Mr. CISNEROS. Well, look, I would love to see that sheet, and what you think, and where you think you can cut, because from my experience, and what we heard, and what the conversations were, there were a lot of arguments and fights about we need to keep this billet, we need to keep this billet, we can't let this one go.

And, I am suspecting that the Army is going to try and fight for its billets. But, if you are ready to kind of give those up, I guess, you can give them up.

General GEORGE. I think the key is Congressman, is that what we have not, you know, what we have been focused on too, is outside, moving people out of our headquarters.

I mean, I have been out in a couple of places, and we have like, a combat division and we are not filled with their GOs [General Officers] because they are doing other things, you know, that are back on whatever staff they are in at whatever higher headquarters.

So, we need experienced combat leaders in our combat formations. That is exactly what we are focused on with this, and how do we right size to make sure that we are doing that.

Mr. CISNEROS. No, I—look, I do not disagree with that at all. I think they need to be in your formations, right. But—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes Dr. Jackson of Texas.

Dr. JACKSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would also like to thank our guests for being here today and updating our committee.

Since the beginning of the year, the United States Army has had tremendous success by refocusing the force on the needs of the war fighter, attacking inefficiency, and elevating war-winning capabilities.

The American people have recognized this, and this focus on readiness and lethality there, in response, they are raising their hands to serve. In the first quarter, as mentioned, the Army is killing it on their recruitment and their retention.

And, you guys are doing a great job. I want to thank you, and Secretary Hegseth, and General, everybody else on their efforts on this across the services. We are doing a really good job on recruiting and retention, and that is a big change.

I personally want to say, thank goodness we are not wasting money like we did over the last four years, letting DEI [Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion] and then Biden's woke agenda drive our recruiting efforts. That was an absolute waste of time. We are past that now.

To deter and, if necessary, win against our adversaries whenever, however, and wherever they threaten American interest, it is paramount that we provide essential funding for Army programs and capabilities.

Special Operations Forces continue to provide critical capabilities in countering violent extremist organizations globally, while also setting the theater, building partner capacity, and conducting other missions to give our adversaries pause.

The U.S. Special Operations Command operates by five SOF {Special Operations Forces] truths, one of which is, most special operations require non-special operations support. That is why I led a provision in the FY 25 NDAA that prohibits reducing Army SOF enablers until the Army provides a report on the feasibility of using inherent relationships with general purpose forces.

It is irresponsible in my mind to cut SOF forces to support, cut support for SOF forces when the requests from geographic combatant commanders are increasing. And, we have been told that they

are increasingly being told they cannot, that Special Operations cannot meet their needs.

Secretary Driscoll and General George, would you describe the role you see for SOF in the Department, as the Department focuses on readiness and lethality under the Army Transformation Initiative?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I can echo the importance of SOF. I am going down to Fort Bragg next week to visit with them and some of those units down there.

The entire Army Transformation Initiative is premised off agility and learning lessons from the actual soldiers who are out in the field. And, no group is able to do that as effectively oftentimes as our Special Forces soldiers, because they are able to deploy quickly into mission sets that are just a little bit irregular.

And so, we are deeply tied in with their learnings. And, those learnings are impacting the broader Army.

Dr. JACKSON. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

General GEORGE. The only thing I would add, and I would agree on the importance, and they are part of every, they are part of our Transforming and Contact Initiatives.

They are down at our CTCs [Combat Training Centers]. They are in our exercises. And, I have deployed alongside those formations, you know, for the better part of 20 years. And, every time I did, we had actually enablers that were helping them.

So, I mean, I think again, this is not, you know, moving things. This is about sizing our formation to make sure that we have the right capabilities for our joint force.

And, that is exactly, you know, kind of what we are doing. There is no specific plan to go into that again right now. But, I think, you know, we have to continue to evolve and we will continue to work with the U.S. Army Special Operations Command as we move forward.

Dr. JACKSON. Yes, sir. Thank you, General. And, you know, I have spent not near as much time in the operating theater as you have, obviously, on the operational side of the house.

I respect your opinion on all of this. But, I will say I have spent a lot of time with the Special Operations units, and in particular with the Tier 1 units.

I think that the enablers that they have are special, in the sense that they require lots and lots of additional training once they are assigned to those units. And, I just don't think they are interchangeable with enablers that may be in other components of the force.

But, I hope that you guys will take that into consideration. Take care of our special operators. They are on the tip of the spear. They are doing a unique job that no one else can or will do.

Real quickly, I am just going to ask one more question. I am pleased to hear about the Army Transformation Initiative and the efforts to expedite Future Long Range Assault Aircraft.

Secretary Driscoll and General George, could you describe what steps you are taking in the Department to expedite this urgently needed platform with the newly designated MV-75 from the FLRAA program, to fill this key gap that is referred to as the air-ground littoral?

What are we doing to make sure that we can accelerate this, and the fielding of the weapon systems associated with that?

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 98.]

I think it is critically important to the fight in the future.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think this is a place we as an Army can grow very quickly and take into account some of the lessons learned from being a wartime body.

Where I think what allowed us to manufacture and scale so quickly in World War I and II, is we had soldiers on the manufacturing floor. And, today what we are trying to do is work with those manufacturers, have them send us lists of where the federal bureaucracy is getting in their way. If they can't find a resource they need, we have said we will do it.

Dr. JACKSON. Thank you.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And then, very importantly, we are going to try to—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Dr. JACKSON. And, General George, I will take yours offline. I am out of time. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes Mr. Sorenson of Illinois.

Mr. SORENSON. Thank you, Chairman and Ranking Member. And, soldiers on the manufacturing floor, you know what I am going to talk about. I want to talk about manufacturing and how important this is to the Rock Island Arsenal and its storied history.

Good morning and welcome to Secretary Driscoll and General George. Like many of my colleagues, I am frustrated by how the Army has decided to roll out this Army Transformation Initiative. You know, it doesn't matter which side of the aisle that we are on here, we all want to make sure that the Army is lethal. That it is ready to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow. However, you chose to give us a plan with few details, with no budgeting, and a failure to answer a lot of our questions. And now, we are hearing about how this plan will be implemented from my own constituents, not from leadership.

The Army and Congress have always had a better relationship than that. And, as you both know, I represent the largest government owned and operated arsenal.

And, today we need the same commitment from you, as Congress got from Abraham Lincoln, that the Rock Island Arsenal will be fully funded to make the Army all it can be.

Rock Island is proud to be home of the Army Sustainment Command and Joint Munitions Command. Both Commands provide vital, but different, support to the soldier.

However, this Army Transformation Initiative calls for the integration of these two, putting Joint Munitions Command and Army Sustainment Command together.

Joint Munitions Command has been essential in overseeing Ukraine's defense of their sovereign ground. We need to make sure it remains at the ready for the next fight.

But, now hundreds of jobs are on the line at Rock Island, and for what? We can't afford for expertise to be lost right at the spot where we have always bolstered our munition production.

JMC is already a lean machine, with the smallest number of employees in Army Material Command, while overseeing 18 sites.

Secretary Driscoll, you spoke in your opening statement today that the Army has been slow to innovate. Please explain how merging these two essential missions at Rock Island will help the expertise within the Army but also help us scale up munition's productions before 2027, as well as our growing organic industrial base.

Mr. DRISCOLL. We as a nation are incapable currently with all of the bureaucracy, and regulation, and over-regulation, and calcification, of our just kind of rational decision-making bodies at creating the munitions that we need.

What we are trying to do with ATI, is get rid of as many headquarters functions that we believe are overlapping and actually slowing it down. Where more human beings may seem like it is helpful. I think in our impression and what we have learned, it is actually harming us.

And so, what we have tried to do is look across all of our headquarters units and say, where can we possibly, and where can we streamline things, and add a little bit of speed, and save some dollars, and reinvigorate the spending to things that will actually output more munitions.

Mr. SORENSON. So, where are things being overlapped from Rock Island? Where does that occur?

General GEORGE. I just was going to jump in here. I mean, we can't, where we have redundant capabilities with two headquarters that are a stone throw away from each other, and you know, you even look at right now what you could do with modern technology. So, it was the question before, do we need, you know, two geo headquarters a stone's throw away from each other that can do some of the, you know, same functions?

We want the same thing you do as far as keeping, and we are very proud of the 3D printing capability that we have at Rock Island. We are very proud of the technicians that we have. Those are the kinds of capabilities that we, you know, that we need and we will continue.

And, I have been out there to see that.

Mr. SORENSON. Great.

General GEORGE. We have commercial industry actually coming on to use those capabilities. So, again, I don't think, I just don't want to conflate headquarters with, you know, with actual capability, especially when they are just, you know, a couple of blocks apart.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, I just want to echo, Rock Island is a gem in our—in the assets in the tools that we have.

Mr. SORENSON. Let's get you out there. But, you know, at the end of the day, you know, we need to make sure that, you know, the Army Transformation Initiative isn't flawed.

You know, I worry that this decision has unfortunately more to do with just an arbitrary cutting of the federal workforce than it does strengthening our Army and our National Security.

You know, Secretary Hegseth's one sentence in the memo is absolutely unacceptable when it comes to changing major commands and eliminating hundreds of civilian jobs.

And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back. I would say that I have conveyed the same sentiment, Mr. Sorenson, to General George.

And, that is, if budget is driving policy, you are going to have a problem out of this committee. If policy is being driven first, and budget is a consequence, then we are going to be open ears.

But, you can't just try to make your policy, or your construct fit a number that is arbitrary. We need you to let us know what you need, and then let us worry about funding it, because that is what we are here for.

So, just know that you are, there's other people that see this the same way you do. Which is why we need a budget, so we can talk about these things.

But, I can't overstate, we are not going to be hostile to dramatic changes, if it is being driven by the need for change and not just to meet some budget number that somebody has handed to you.

I will get off my sermon pulpit now and go to Representative Higgins of Louisiana.

Mr. HIGGINS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, thank you for your passion and your leadership, sir.

I support the Chairman's description early in this hearing, Mr. Secretary and General, regarding our intention in this committee to have policy drive our narrative and our legislation. Budget is part of our larger concern for our country, and we will address that appropriately.

But, what we ask of the United States Army, which I am a proud Army veteran, we ask for you to deliver to this committee what your needs are. And then, under the Chairman's leadership, we will drive towards accomplishing that.

I would like to mention recruiting, Mr. Secretary and General, congratulations for hitting your recruiting goal early this year. I expect you are going to get a big bump during the rest of the year.

And, let me say that it was very clear to many of us, because been brought up in this hearing, you know, what is the driving factor behind recruiting. And, to me it has always been American families are the driving force between successful recruiting or failed recruiting.

And, for several years you have had families, like mine, advising their youngsters to refrain from joining the military if they were on a fence.

And, since November of last year, there has been quite a shift. You know, families are getting confident in the future of the United States military, and therefore you are seeing the surge of recruitment.

And, congratulations on that, because families are again supporting their children's consideration for service. It has never been about money.

It has always been about, you know, what are the principles reflected in the United States Army, and the United States Navy, and the Air Force, Marine Corps. Do those principles reflect the core values and principles of traditional American families? And, if that alignment is solid, then your recruitment will be productive. So, thank you for that.

General and Secretary, you each mentioned the expanded capability of buying capability, your quote General, versus being restricted by ″specific programs in order to provide the best available tech.″ Again, your quote General. Would you mind elaborating on that?

I know you have earlier in this hearing, but please explain to America, what shift we are trying to accomplish within this committee to deliver to the United States Army, the ability to buy the most effective technology that is available right now, or next month, or in three months, or six months, as opposed to being locked into a specific program. Will you clarify that General?

General GEORGE. Yes, Congressman. I think, again, I will give a couple of quick examples. But, drones are a perfect example that we know that that technology is rapidly advancing.

And, if you bought a drone now, and I had used one in Afghanistan that was still in service actually when I became the Chief, that was like 20 years old. You know, that was old technology.

So, we can't be locked into things. We need to just have a capability. We can come over here, and that is what we are talking about with agile funding. We could lay out exactly what we are buying.

So, you know, we want the oversight to make sure that we are doing that. But to maintain pace—

Mr. HIGGINS. And, that is what you are calling capabilities, correct?

General GEORGE. That is the capability. Drones, autonomous systems would be one. Electronic warfare systems are going to change. The network is going to adapt.

I mean, like phones, no one is, you know, everybody adapts their phones, updates and does things like that. We can do the same thing.

Mr. HIGGINS. Yes, sir. So, General, just to clarify, in the interest of time here, we want to provide the Army what you are envisioning here with the capability to buy, say showroom. If a company produces a new model that fits your capabilities that Congress has authorized and funded, you want the freedom to be able to go to the next showroom over and purchase that model versus the last one you bought. Is that correct?

General GEORGE. I think we also need to be responsible enough to that when we build things, we build them modular. So, the larger systems, we know active protection is going to change. We know the network is going to change.

That you could maybe make modifications on those systems as well, so we are not building one integrated system that takes five or six years to come to fruition that we know is going to have to change.

So, we have to change too, how we are doing business, Congressman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. HIGGINS. Understood. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Maryland, Ms. Elfreth.

Ms. ELFRETH. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, gentlemen. And, General, thank you again for your hospitality and candor when this committee visited in Austin.

I echo the congratulations from this committee on recruitment numbers, and certainly it is years of thoughtful and strategic planning in the making led by your team, General.

So, we greatly appreciate that. I am also, I agree with, and I am relieved to hear that you say, our most critical asset in the U.S. Army is our personnel.

So, before I start questions, I do want to just echo my colleague, Congressman Houlahan's concerns about some of the statements that Secretary Hegseth has made, as it relates to rolling back the opportunities for fully qualified women, who meet every fitness standard, to serve in certain roles in the U.S. Army.

Now, obviously, Secretary Hegseth will answer for himself when he is in front of this committee next week. But, I unfortunately, I didn't hear a commitment from either of you.

Mr. Secretary, I heard that you hope for these opportunities to remain for your daughter and for others. But, I would, I don't want to presume to tell you your responsibilities, but I would hope advocating for personnel, for their hopes, their commitments, their abilities, in back rooms where these conversations are being had, is a responsibility that you both take to heart. So, I sincerely hope that commitment is forthcoming.

Moving on to energy, again, relieved to hear Mr. Secretary, your thoughtfulness on this issue, representing multiple installations that are vulnerable to sea level rise and severe storms.

Not to mention just the general antiquated nature of our grid system, including the fact that 99 percent of our base electricity comes from outside the installation. Clearly a problem.

You talked about SMRs, but can you speak a little bit to your planning for other pieces of this puzzle? It is not just SMRs obviously, it is also storage, it is also grid resilience.

Can you speak how you are prioritizing installation resilience?

Mr. DRISCOLL. So, we don't talk about this as often, but what we think, and what we believe, and kind of one of our core hypotheses to transformation is, to go get the best of the civilian sector and create the, have the Army be the ingestion point of that on behalf of the Pentagon. And, we have talked to the leadership up and down on that.

So, what we just did earlier this week is, we are trying to get some of the minds at some of our best funded VC [Venture Capital] and PE [Private Equity] backed companies to give us insight into what they are working on today, to try to figure out how do we actually just take some of their prototypes and get them on our bases so we can learn if it can work.

And so, we are optimistic that we will have some announcements on that in a couple of quarters.

Ms. ELFRETH. That is exciting. I think you heard you have a lot of allies on this committee for that priority.

I want to move on to Fort Detrick, which is not in my district, but in Maryland. And, as you know, the Army's Medical Research and Development Command, headquartered at Fort Detrick, has been transitioned to the Defense Health Agency.

MRDC [United States Army Medical Research and Development Command] when it was under Army control, was a world-class life cycle incubator for research, development, and acquisition, not just for war fighters, but for world health generally, on the cutting edge of Ebola and COVID-19 [Coronavirus Disease 2019] outbreaks and responses.

However, the DHA [Defense Health Agency] contracting authority is managing, now managing that medical R&D [Research and Development], which is different from what they have been used to, their capabilities in the past.

So, Mr. Secretary, I am curious, how are you working with DHA so that we don't lose all of that research, all of the thought leaders that live at Fort Detrick?

How are we going to continue to move this ball forward?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Just personally, my wife is a physician and a public health physician no less. And, this is a topic that is incredibly important in the Army.

We believe we can continue to be a leader and innovator here. We are working with that agency. It is complicated that it has been merged, and we are working through some of the issues that come when you merge across a lot of different services.

But, it is important, and we are happy to follow up with more details if helpful.

Ms. ELFRETH. I appreciate that. It is not just the merger, as well, there are some critical infrastructure challenges, including a new incinerator that is direly needed on that installation. So, yes, I would love to follow up with you and your team on that.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 100.]

I also shared this committee's concerns about the future of the Army. And, Mr. Secretary, I hear you say that you want greater flexibility in addressing emerging threats, and I understand that.

At the same time, that complicates our constitutional obligation to conduct oversight over taxpayer dollars and over the Army.

So, I am going to let you set your own game or set your own goals here. When you return to this committee this time next year, what measurement of progress should we hold you to?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think that constitutional oversight is incredibly important, completely and utterly supportive of it. I think what I have learned since being here is, we went from directionally 12 funding lines 20 or 30 years ago, and we are now narrowly told over 1,400 different funding lines of what we can buy.

The intent of this is not to allow us to do things with our money that you wouldn't support. It is as General George mentioned, for you to bucket us into appropriate areas, us to provide the receipts, and when we get too close to the line, for you to provide that oversight.

Ms. ELFRETH. I look forward to that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady's time has expired. The Chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Gooden.

Mr. GOODEN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. General George, the Army says it is cutting bureaucracy and reinvesting in lethality. But, historically we have seen so-called cuts in headquarters just result in reshuffled org charts and no real savings.

Could you show me exactly how much manpower and overhead will be eliminated under ATI, and how much of those resources are being redirected to frontline units, specifically those based in Texas like Fort Cavazos and Bliss?

General GEORGE. Yeah, we could come over, Congressman, and walk that to you in detail after the budget comes through. And, again, what we are trying to do, we have a budget. And we are trying to build the very best Army for that. And, again, everything that we have looked at that is on that list, we know we can better use that money in different capability. And that is what we are focused on.

So, I mean, salaries are money. The things that we have to do. And we have, you know, duplication and effort, or we have inefficiencies, we are all about making those adjustments.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, Congressman, just to add, the end strength, the actual soldiers, when we talk about these thousand soldiers that are up in headquarters, it is not cutting them from the United States Army. It is cutting them from jobs that they hate. We, the Army, have forced them to push paper back and forth. And we are returning them to do the job that they love, which is what they signed up to do.

And so at least as far as I know, no soldier that is among the group that we have told, "hey, we are pushing you from headquarters back out to your units," has been anything other than thrilled.

General GEORGE. The goal is to grow our combat formations, to put people in combat formations.

Mr. GOODEN. Good to hear. Thank you. I also want to thank you for your support for Gray Eagles, for the Army National Guard through the appropriations in Fiscal Year 23 and 25. And it is my understanding the Army Gray Eagles are now currently helping to protect our borders. And that has significantly increased their operational tempo.

Patrolling the border seems like a perfect fit for the National Guard to perform. And I wonder if the Army is giving any thought to adding Gray Eagle force structure into all eight divisions.

General GEORGE. Not really, Congressman. And, again, you know, with Gray Eagle, you take Gray Eagle as it's a very—it's a great platform, has been a great platform for us. It's very expensive.

There's 150 people in a company. It requires an airfield. And I think there's platforms out there right now that are probably a tenth of the cost, can be operated with three or four people, and can fit in the back of a truck.

And so, you know, that is kind of what we are looking at going. We could have more of those systems. We could have more capability for less money, and they would be updated. And moving forward, I think that is where we need to move.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, Congressman, for the Gray Eagle in particular, we are grateful as the United States Army for any asset we have been given or the dollars you gave us to go purchase. We want to use it in its most effective way.

There are tools, as General George mentioned, that are significantly cheaper and better. That what we are saying is we don't think we should purchase any more.

Mr. GOODEN. Thank you. I have got one more question for you. Talking about AI, the Army in particular pays for humans to translate everything and translation services. It probably wasn't on your radar today. But the definition of government waste is in essence what we are doing now.

And generative AI, foreign language translation solutions are being used today by several Army units to drastically increase the efficiency of Army linguists but more could be done. And I am wondering if you could discuss any plans, if you have any, to expand AI language translation technology across all Army divisions and where, in your budget, you would allocate these resources?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I can take the first part, which is almost nothing gets me more excited than the use cases of things like generative AI both for the warfighting function of the Army but also the Army as a business. General George and I reference us as two discrete functions. One is a very lethal killing machine and then the other one is just a large enterprise scale business that moves people and things around the country and the world.

AI is going to unlock so much value immediately on the Army as an enterprise business that we are looking actively for every single place that we can possibly take. We have over 200 business systems enterprise level systems that we use.

I am picking a number that I think General George would agree with. I don't think we need more than 20. And AI is going to be incredible for things like language services in helping us achieve that.

Mr. GOODEN. Super. Maybe at the next hearing, we will hear what gets you more excited than that. So, thank you. And I appreciate the work you are doing. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Bell.

Mr. BELL. Thank you, Mr. Chair and Ranking Member. Hello to our witnesses. Thank you for being here and for your service as well.

And one thing that I will say about this committee that is encouraging to me on my short time—in my short time here in Congress is that members on both sides of the aisle take our security and our national defense very seriously. And I think members on both sides of the aisle agree that we have some tough choices to make.

And we must invest in our national security. Everyone understands that. We must modernize our Armed Forces. Everyone understands that. But we also know that money is not infinite and resources are limited.

So at a time when so many across the country, including in my own district in St. Louis, are still recovering from, and in our example, the worst national disaster since the late 1950s, when our adversaries are sparing no expanse in investing in AI technology, cyber warfare technologies, hypersonic missiles, we have to ask those tough questions because we recognize we have some tough choices to make.

And so, I do have to ask a question, is a parade really the best use of $45 million? And as we have heard from many of my colleagues, and as the Administration has said, military recruitment and enlistment are at some of its highest levels, I think one of our members said that on the recruiting side, we are killing it in a good way. And this is the highest levels of recruitment that we have seen in years. Is this correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Correct.

Mr. BELL. And highest since, if I'm not mistaken, since 2021. Is that not correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think it goes back farther than that, but correct, very high.

Mr. BELL. But good, correct?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Very.

Mr. BELL. And that is an incredible achievement. And I think on both sides of the aisle we all appreciate that, especially at a time when we are facing growing threats from our adversaries. That is something worth celebrating. But that is also exactly the point.

You indicated that recruitment is surging and that is without a $45 million price tag. So why are we now planning to spend that money on a parade with the hopes of spiking recruitment when we are already spiking recruitment? Why don't we just do what we are doing?

And that is not my question. Because we are talking about symbolic displays when our real needs lie elsewhere. Meanwhile, our adversaries are coming. And we are the measuring stick—we are the goals that they are trying to reach and surpass. So, in my opinion, we should be investing in what truly strengthens our military, not gestures that come at the expense of more urgent priorities.

Secretary Driscoll, with the Army investing heavily in advanced tech and modernization, how do you ensure that funds are not diverted away from essential soldier support programs such as mental health, family services, and housing, which are critical for long-term retention and morale.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am sorry. Would you mind repeating the question?

Mr. BELL. Absolutely.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I lost a little in there.

Mr. BELL. I shouldn't lose my time for that, Mr. Chair. Secretary, with the Army investing heavily in advanced tech and modernization, how do you ensure that funds are not diverted away from essential soldier support programs, such as mental health, family services, and housing, which are critical for long-term retention and morale?

Mr. DRISCOLL. We totally agree, Congressman. So, one of the ways we try to look to see quantitatively if the Army is healthy with our soldiers is we think of retention as a trailing indicator of success and recruiting as a leading indicator of the success and the healthiness of the Army.

We are thrilled to say that on the retention piece, so the soldiers that are currently in the Army getting to see, are we delivering to them the things that they need to care for their families and care for themselves?

We hit our annual retention goal six months into this year. And so, for us, that is a—we take that as a pretty good indicator that we are delivering on our word to them.

Mr. BELL. And we hope to continue that?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes, Congressman.

Mr. BELL. Thank you. I think that is my time. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Harrigan.

Mr. HARRIGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And gentlemen, thank you so much for your testimony today. And before kind of hopping into this slide that I have got here, I just want to say that since coming to Congress, I have worked to continually educate everyone that I possibly can up here in Washington that we have a very stark choice when it comes to our defense.

We can either continue to invest in the military that we have today or we can invest in the military that we actually need to deter and defeat China. They are not the same choice. We cannot choose both.

And you, gentlemen, have chosen, voluntarily, something that rarely is seen in this town, to take the road of courage, which is to make change. That is exactly what the Army transformation initiative is and what it does though eliminating legacy assets, force structures, and contracting mechanisms.

It actually gives us the opportunity to create the Army that we truly need in order to deter and defeat China. So, you have my sincere thanks for your efforts. And you will have my support.

Part of the Army Transformation Initiative is making sure that we start winning the economics of conflict. And you cannot have a discussion about winning the economics of conflict without having a discussion about sUAS [Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems] today.

And I think as we all have seen, as the Ukrainian battlefield has fundamentally changed the rules of modern conflict, where currently drones, FPV [First Person View] drones, are accounting for greater than 80 percent of the casualties that are inflicted on that battlefield today, small arms only account for 2 percent, artillery accounts for less than 12, the rules are changing. And if we are to win the economics of conflict, we must address sUAS.

As we saw with Ukraine over the weekend in Operation Spiders Web, 117 different drones at an average cost of $800 per unit, costing Ukraine less than $100,000 worth of investment, inflicted more than $7 billion worth of damage against the Russians.

This is capability that we need. It is also capability we need to defend against. And we have neither at scale right now.

We know that we are significantly behind both our adversaries and our allies in our ability to produce sUAS at scale. Last year China spent $29.4 billion on drones with some experts estimating that their production volumes and capacities may exceed 500,000 units per month. Last year the Ukrainians produced 4 million sUAS units and are on track to produce over 5 million units this year.

The Russians are on track to produce similar numbers. And in our current posture, we in this country, we are only capable of producing 50,000 sUAS per year.

So General George, my question for you is given what we are seeing play out in Ukraine and across the globe, do you think that the United States is currently behind in the attributable sUAS space as well as the counter sUAS space? And if so, how do we close the gap?

General GEORGE. I agree with everything you said, Congressman. We have to get—cost curve is a big part of it. And then we have to be able to produce things at scale. And I think that that's one of the things that we are talking about with our industrial base that we need to be able to produce brushless motors, controllers, you know, all those things that we know go into that. That right now Chinese companies, let's say DJI [Shenzhen Da-Jiang Innovations Sciences and Technologies Ltd.], is producing 15 million drones a year. And we need to have the ability to do that.

So that is where—when we talk about scale, and we are doing some of that with 3D printing, that is exactly what we need to be able to do. And on the flip side, the same thing with scaling on counter-UAS.

Mr. HARRIGAN. Thank you, General George. And Secretary Driscoll, as you and General George have overhauled Army business processes, how will you deploy AI driven industrial base analytics and visibility to flag Chinese chokepoints in our critical materials, restore U.S. forging and casting capacity and redesign systems for surge ready sustainment so that our logisticians and warfighters aren't left waiting for parts in the next fight?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congressman, this is an incredibly important topic. And much like many of our answers, the solution exists already in the commercial space. And we have done a poor job of integrating that into our systems. And we are actively working on it and hoping to be able to announce a solution in the coming weeks or months.

Mr. HARRIGAN. Thank you, gentlemen. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Washington, Ms. Strickland.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Thank you, Chairman Rogers. It is nice to see you Secretary Driscoll and General George, formerly of First Corps at Joint Base Lewis-McChord so glad to see your role in the Army.

So, in our testimony today, you have head a lot about quality of life. And I was appointed to serve on the quality-of-life panel. And we know that housing has always been a very, very important factor.

And I heard one of you say that recruitment is how you actually judge whether we are doing well. But I would also say retention is just as important.

We are thrilled, in a bipartisan way, to see the recruiting numbers go up. That is a multiyear, bipartisan effort that started in 2023. And even in August of 2024, we had record numbers of recruiting for Army. So, kudos to everyone, and let's see those numbers continue to rise.

But I want to talk about the basic allowance for housing. I know that in the reconciliation bill, there is a provision for a one-time infusion of nearly $3 billion into the basic allowance for housing ac-

count. But there is no further direction on how that money is going to be allocated.

So, let's assume this bill becomes law. How does the Army intend to use this money? Are you going to, for example, raise the basic allowance for housing up to 100 percent and keep it there? Are you going to take it up to 98 percent? Can you be more specific about how we plan to use this basic allowance for housing? And I will start with Secretary Driscoll and then General George.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And just to your point, Congresswoman first, the retention we totally agree. We are thrilled. We told one of your colleagues earlier that we hit our 12-month goal six months into this year, which makes us feel good about the state of the Army. And to your point, those mechanisms and that experience that those soldiers had began years and years and years ago to make them want to sign back up to enlist.

For BAH [Basic Allowance for Housing] and for what we do with military construction and for how we provide our soldiers, what they deserve, where they deserve to live individually and where they deserve to live with their families, one of the fundamental problems we have, and we desperately need your help is, when we build something on the base, like just inside of our gate, we just did a study, it is 68.5 percent more expensive than on the other side. And as far as we can tell, the vast majority of those inefficiencies are not from us. They are legislated to us.

And so, as we think about soldier housing and work together to solve it, we want to work with you to get rid of a lot of those regulations.

Ms. STRICKLAND. I appreciate that. And now can you go to my question about the basic allowance for housing? $3 billion in the reconciliation bill, how do you plan to distribute that money? Are you going to raise it to 100 permanently, to 98 percent permanently? That is my specific question.

General GEORGE. I would have to follow up. I don't remember. I know that was the intent was to, you know, fully cover the cost. I don't remember if that was a step. You know, the challenge when I was out at Lewis was, you know, these things go—you know, happen very quickly as far as what happened out there was a very hot housing market and then put, you know, a real strain.

So, I think we also need to just figure out how we are a little bit more dynamic in our process when prices go up. Obviously, no one minds getting a little bit more in our checkbook. I know I didn't from growing up.

Ms. STRICKLAND. Right.

General GEORGE. You know, the problem is when the costs go down and how you adjust, you know, some of those things. But I do think we need to be a little bit more flexible in how we are figuring, you know, some of those things out moving forward so that we are more responsive, which is what was the problem that I experienced up at JBLM. We weren't quick enough with, you know, with our soldiers and getting them the money as the prices were going up.

Ms. STRICKLAND. So, what do we plan to do with this $3 billion? Is there a plan?[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 98.]

General GEORGE. It is specifically labeled—I would have to come back to you. It is specifically labeled for housing and, you know, BAH. And that is what we would use it on if that is how it is being—

Ms. STRICKLAND. So the basic allowance for housing will go up?

General GEORGE. Is that specific to Joint Base Lewis-McChord or—

Ms. STRICKLAND. It just says basic allowance for housing $3 billion in the reconciliation bill. And my question is, how do you plan to deploy that money? Is it going to go up?

General GEORGE. That would go against housing.

Ms. STRICKLAND. All right. And then one final comment I want to make. You have heard a lot about funding for barracks obviously. And I am going to add, and pile onto to this, just to emphasize how important this is to so many members who sit on this committee. And it was a little disheartening to hear that you are going to reprogram a billion dollars from barracks housing to put to the southern border.

And we have got people at Camp Humphreys. We have got people at JBLM. We have people around the world. And if you visit with those barracks, as you all know, the condition is deplorable. A college parent taking their student to see the quality of those dorms would actually raise holy hell about it or have them disenroll from that school.

And so, I think my question is, you know, please think carefully about restoring that money. It is a quality of life—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. SCHMIDT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, Mr. Secretary, thank you for being here. And we appreciate the time you have given to us this morning.

General, we had a briefing some time ago in which you presented to us. And one of the issues that was discussed briefly, as we look forward kind of toward the horizon and the need to continue to integrate UAS operations into our land forces operations, we had some discussion about the importance of identifying maneuver space, operation and training space in the continental U.S. where that can occur. Can you paint out for us briefly sort of what that thought process looks like?

Are we trying to identify locations? I represent Fort Riley, for example, as one example. But locations other than the NTC [National Training Center] in Louisiana where we can do those types of operations? What is our thought process?

General GEORGE. Yeah. So, there is a very good training area that is very close to Fort Riley that we can train. And our challenge has been to every local leader that we are working with at all the local levels that everybody is getting together just like they have been doing with you out at Fort Riley.

We know drones are going to be part of our formations. We are going to have to start training those—you know, those kinds of things. And so, working with the local authorities. And I always give the example when I was a division commander, you know, we sent the paperwork up and then we worked it locally. And we had it all figured out before, you know, the paperwork came back.

And so, a lot of these I think are going to be local solutions because they have to take local considerations from FAA or FCC that is, for example, in the State of Kansas. And so, we are talking about that, and we are going to have leaders together again this month, and we will talk about that topic again. I think we are going to have to make some—we are going to have to continue to adapt.

Mr. SCHMIDT. Thank you, General. Well, we want to be supportive generally, not just from a Fort Riley standpoint. But I will assure you from a Fort Riley and 1st Infantry standpoint, we would like to be helpful in making sure that all of the appropriate local players are engaged and are helpful. We want to make that happen.

I might also ask, either for you, General, or for you, Mr. Secretary, however you want to take this. I also represent Fort Leavenworth, the intellectual center of the Army. We are obviously the ATI discussion with great interest and particularly as the some of the TRADOC changes in the combination with the futures command. Can you tell us what we need to be focused on or what we might expect or what you can share at this point in terms of the role of the Combined Armed Center going forward, the Center of Excellence. We want to make sure that Fort Leavenworth and its many intellectual and training assets not only remain but are bolstered in all of this so that we are meeting the needs of the Army going forward.

General GEORGE. CAC, Combined Armed Center, is critically important to us. That is going to, you know, remain there. How we do business there is—and we were talking about how we are training and, you know, we are partnering right now, for example, with Arizona State University and seeing how we might do some distance learning a little bit different.

It is still—you know, we are still going to have majors that are going there. But how can we make other offerings? Just like anywhere else, we are looking at, you know, what we can do. Do we have outdated systems that we have been doing?

One example is, I think we need to update our doctrine much more rapidly in what we are doing. And so, part of that is going to be upscaling the people that we have there. Part of that is going to be changing the systems that we have, the business software, the automation, and the things that we have right there so that skills are going to change.

So, I think we are just getting started with all of that. And we are having—we just had a big conversation on this yesterday. Overall, I don't see, you know, much change at Leavenworth. But there will be puts and takes as we move forward to adapt like any business would do.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And Congressman, I would just say for a TRADOC, we haven't hit that a lot in this hearing yet. But a lot of the tools that exist that COVID pushed forward for learning, we hope that can—we can use those for our soldiers to train them where they are, train them in the community where their kids are already in school. Prevent them from having to travel and uproot their lives for four to six months at a time. And we are incredibly

optimistic, like General George was saying, that those tools already exist.

We are working with them to pilot programs to see how much military training can be done remotely. Can we use things like Meta's glasses to help train and create a layering with artificial reality that will allow it to achieve much of those goals a lot faster and a lot cheaper for the American taxpayer?

Mr. SCHMIDT. Thank you, Mr. Secretary, and thank you, General. And I just want to say I know General Beagle's time at Leavenworth is as limited as it always is. And our team wants to be very helpful and supportive of the Army moving forward and do that as we can. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr. Davis.

Mr. DAVIS. Thank you so much, Mr. Chair. General George, thank you so much for your continued service. It's always good to see you.

Mr. Secretary, I want to first and foremost with all of my heart thank you. To be out there at the Vietnam Memorial Wall watching that wall together, preparing for the American people to come out for Memorial Day. It meant a lot to see you that day. And it was early in the morning. And we still made it after a long day overnight here.

My question is starting with the global transport in eastern North Carolina, I know you are familiar with North Carolina, which I proudly represent North Carolina's First Congressional District has tremendous capability in leveraging its multimobile functions to partner with the U.S. Army.

Secretary Driscoll, how do you see the value of partnering with entities such as the Global Transpark in the east and units like the 18th Airborne Corps at Fort Bragg given the Global Transpark's unique skill and scope to serve as a mobility platform for the Army's tactical equipment and aircraft?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I think those partnerships, Congressman, are incredibly important and incredibly valuable. A lot of them, we get our best practices from watching and learning how they do it. The more soldiers that are around civilian counterparts, we are able to strengthen our ability to do transportation in the contested logistics and with the tyranny of distance, we are going to face an INDOPACOM [United States Indo-Pacific Command]. We have got to learn a lot of lessons. We have to update the tools we are using and the best practices.

Mr. DAVIS. Yeah. Lieutenant Colonel Hamilton actually came and visited the Global Transpark and saw the site, you know, the training potential, large scale nature of the s exercises. And where I would like to get to, I would love to see you in eastern North Carolina extend an invitation personally to you.

Now I am going to give you the toughest question you have had today. Mr. Chair, I am asking for you not to rule me out of order. Western Carolina barbecue or Eastern Carolina barbecue?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am a mountains of North Carolina boy, so I am a Western North Carolina. But I have learned to appreciate that vinegar flavor.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, I tell you, you have a staff that they seem to have been here all morning. We might have to have a taste test and figure that out.

Shifting back to the east, East Carolina University is the heartbeat of Eastern North Carolina leading in research, and we are depending and relying so much on federal assistance in terms of what is going into the research dollars.

The school has endured a long-term successful partnership with the Army already through the Pathfinder Airborne Program. Through the NDAA and the defense appropriations process, we are working trying to make sure that we can get an additional $8 million in that effort.

Innovation is the greatest comparative advantage in the U.S. military. So, I guess, to both Mr. Secretary and to the general, do you support, preserving, and broadly speaking, in expanding the mission through Pathfinders Airborne Program to continue to enhance the value in particular of the soldier lethality technology account?

General GEORGE. We certainly support increasing our lethality and our partnerships. I mean, again, I think to the Secretary's earlier comment, whatever we can do that is already being done, we can take advantage of that is being done in our universities, that is being done commercially, that's what we want to do.

We are—you know, we are just talking—we are going through a process right now of making sure that we review how we spend our S&T [Science and Technology] and, you know, what we are doing, we are not duplicating our efforts that could be done in other places. And I think that that is what we have to constantly review. So, we appreciate what Eastern Carolina University has done.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And I would just echo, I think—I hope what is coming through in a lot of our remarks is we, the Army, have not done a historically good job sometimes of taking what already exists in the civilian sector, whether it is in education in our institutions or whether it is in for-profit or nonprofit companies. But we are trying to get better so that we can save dollars and reallocate them to the things that we need.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, Mr. Secretary, I can say, having someone from Boone, North Carolina serving our country means a lot. But I am standing by the east and when you find out in Kinston, North Carolina, home of the Global Transpark that we hold the world record in the most barbecue sandwiches sold in an eight hour period.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I look forward to having one of those.

Mr. DAVIS. All right. I yield back, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. If you want some good barbecue, you can come to Alabama. The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Crank is recognized.

Mr. CRANK. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, Mr. Secretary. General George, thank you. It is good to see you again. I know you have a soft spot, General George for Fort Carson. It is also home, of course, to Piñon Canyon Maneuver site. and I want to talk about that for a minute. That's located 150 miles south of the main base. Piñon Canyon, of course, provides the Army with

significant strategic and operational value by serving as a critical training ground for large scale force-on-force maneuver exercises.

However, as you know, large portions of Piñon Canyon are restricted for military use because of a natural gas pipeline that runs right through the middle of the site.

This pipeline is unnecessary, and it is redundant to our power needs. And I am glad to have your support in finding a solution to have it removed. In the meantime, can you describe for the committee the restrictions that this pipeline places on the Army's ability to train at Piñon Canyon?

General GEORGE. Okay. It has been a couple days since I have been out there. But, yeah, I think it's privately owned.

Mr. CRANK. It is.

General GEORGE. And so, you know, it will be up to—and they are using, as far as when I was out there, they are using the pipeline. So, when we would cross it, I would describe it more as it was an inconvenience when we were training. I mean, it is still a great training area that we were able to be down there.

You had to cross at certain crossing points. It's a pretty vast area. So that was a challenge. Would it be better if the pipeline, you know, wasn't there? Yes, it would be helpful.

Mr. CRANK. Could we do live fire exercises there if we didn't have that back one?

General GEORGE. Obviously not. You wouldn't do that. There is—I know that we have a sizable impact area down on Fort Carson. We could, you know, obviously add that. But, again, when we rack and stack things as far as cost, I am not sure, you know, that that is where I would invest first.

Mr. CRANK. Okay. I'm also very proud of the work that the Fourth Infantry Division from Fort Carson, working with Northern Command, is doing down on the border to stop the flow of illegal immigration.

We've heard a lot about that. I think it is important. We have seen what this administration has been able to do to stop the flow of illegal immigration and the military support doing that and some of the folks from Fourth Infantry Division and Fort Carson doing that.

Can you give me an update on their activities down at the border?

General GEORGE. Yeah, I am sure the Secretary will probably want to jump in, too. But the Second Brigade, 4th ID [Infantry Division] is down there. Every report we get, and we probably at least every other week, I am up on the net with the commander that is in charge down there, the division commander that's down there.

We're also trying to—besides the great job that they are doing with that mission, we're also trying to be very focused on what we can do to update those units. And, you know, they're doing a lot of the kind of missions that they would do, whether it was reconnaissance or guard missions. So, we're also looking at how we can update their network, what we can do to provide them additional capabilities. So we're also looking—this is an opportunity that we can continually transform those units as well.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And I would just echo, I have been down to the border twice now, one when 10th Mountain took over the mission

there. And talking to the law enforcement on the border, my experience from what they have said and what our soldiers have said is the mission is going well.

They find it an honor to work with the law enforcement and provide support for them as they do their job. The Customs and Border Patrol have said the assets that the Army has been able to provide have made a big difference. And we are excited that our soldiers are down there being supported.

Mr. CRANK. And it's remarkable within months, we have seen a 97 percent reduction in the number of humans coming across that southern border. So, thank you for that.

I won't have really much time on this. But Secretary Driscoll, I wanted to talk to you, Fort Carson, home of the 11th Expeditionary Combat Aviation Brigade. And that is one of the two aviation brigades the Army is proposing to inactivate. And I have heard concerns that the Army Reserve force structure would be unable to absorb the newly orphaned 11th Brigade Personnel, resulting in a loss of technical skills and years of experience if they are forced to reclassify.

Are you considering integrating these soldiers into training roles to keep them relevant and sharp if we need them for current and future requirements?

Mr. DRISCOLL. We have not heard of those concerns. We can absolutely follow back up with your office.

And just to the broader point, as we are shuffling and reordering all of this, we realize this is a sacred responsibility to take care of those soldiers and that they provide an incredible asset to our Army, and we are taking that into account.

Mr. CRANK. Thank you.

General GEORGE. If I could just jump really quick, Congressman, that is the idea. That is, you know, one of those units is right there close to Fourth Infantry Division and right close to 4th CAB [Combat Aviation Brigade] and we could use those pilots so that—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from California, Mr. Tran.

Mr. TRAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. General George, good seeing you again. Secretary Driscoll, welcome. The Army Transformation Initiative has generated more questions and answers in the Department's attempt to deliver critical warfighting capabilities, optimize our force structure and eliminate waste and obsolete programs.

In particular, I am concerned with how the ATI positions the Army to better counter a near peer adversary like the People's Republic of China.

China's ability to rapidly field new capabilities can be attributed to its centralized political and military decision-making, state-directed industrial base, incremental fielding of new systems and their blatant theft of foreign intellectual property, all with little to no public oversight.

Secretary Driscoll, what acquisition reforms will help us counter China's ability to rapidly field capabilities compared to our slower system that is bound by checks and balances across the DOD and Congress, reliance on private sector defense contractors, protected IP [Intellectual Property] and real oversight?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Congressman, I wouldn't want it to be seen as if we don't want the checks and balances. I think that is an incredibly important part of our system of government. And so, I hope that it is not coming across that we don't want the constitutionally mandated oversight function of this or any body.

I think what we have reflected on, what I told one of your colleagues earlier, what we think there are a couple of fundamental things that are slowing down our ability to keep up.

One of them is our own bureaucracy. We have nearly 35. If you define the number of human beings in the United States Army in our civilian sector and our soldiers that are helping us buy things, we have, like, 35,000. It's just too many people. Like they are all—many of them are noble patriotic people. But we have got to, as an Army, streamline a bit.

When we receive our funding, and it is so nearly focused of 1,400 line items, it prevents us from being able to purchase the modern updated version of a thing. And when you look at something like drones that are needing to be updated in Ukraine nearly every 10 days to 14 days, our way of funding as a country just doesn't fundamentally work.

And so, what we are asking is to work with all of you to create buckets of funding to drones. And then we would use those dollars to purchase them, show you our receipts, and you would ask the constitutionally mandated questions to make sure we are doing that accurately.

Mr. TRAN. That is great. Thank you. General, anything to add?

General GEORGE. I mean, I just—the agile funding is a big piece of it. And we could, you know, in modern technology we could come over with a database and show you that every day if you want, you know, had the appetite for that.

I think we are also trying to change requirements is a big part of what we are doing. And we are trying to describe things, what we need, like we were doing out on the West Coast when we were, you know, bringing industry in. And, you know, they would understand our problems. That is part of what we are doing with Transforming in Contact. We have the engineers with our users, with our soldiers, that understand the problems that we are trying to solve. And we don't have these big 300-page documents.

And then I think we have to start buying—looking at everything we buy as being more modular in open system architecture. Again, you go back to the technology that we have in our pocket, and we got to buy a little bit more like that, even for larger systems that we do.

But getting away from the program or record is, I think, in a lot of these things is very important for us.

Mr. TRAN. I appreciate those remarks, gentlemen. Russia's war on Ukraine has also exposed weakness in the U.S. munitions industrial base, providing Ukraine with over 1.5 million 155 millimeter rounds has pushed the U.S. industrial base to capacity while China's capacity for peacetime production of artillery shells still outpaces that of the U.S.

Secretary Driscoll, can you speak specifically about the investment the Army is making to modernize our munitions industrial base to ensure that we have sufficient stockpiles of munitions and

capacity to surge if needed? And how does this compare to China's munitions industrial capacity?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I will answer in reverse order. We are worse. I was down in Camden, Arkansas, at a General Dynamics load, assemble, and pack facility recently, which is trying to help us with 155s. And it was an investment from this committee and your colleagues that I think helped with that. And even that is insufficient. We are not where we need to be.

Mr. TRAN. Do you know how long it will take us to get to that point where we can be sufficient?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Under our current funding and our current constraints, I guess it would be 20 years or more.

Mr. TRAN. Jesus. Great. With all that talk of barbecue, I am hungry. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Well, thank you, Mr. Tran. You raise an issue that is very important. And your answer is dead on the money right and unacceptable. We have got to get after this munitions production capability issue. And we have got to do it in World War II fashion of speed.

So, I want ideas, thinking out of the box, about solutions, and you will find this committee very receptive to being helpful.

But thank you for raising that Mr. Tran. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Guam, Mr. Moylan.

Mr. MOYLAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Secretary Driscoll, and General George. Thank you for your service in presenting the Army's FY 26 priorities before this committee.

Secretary, in FY 25 cycle, I worked to increase the National Guard minor military construction budget so that sufficient funds will be available to the Guam National Guard unfunded priorities, including a new hardened operations center.

As we move into the FY 26 cycle, will your budget prioritize facilities used by the Guam Army National Guard? And how can I work with your department to advance the needs of the Guam Guard in the Indo-Pacific?

Mr. DRISCOLL. We would love to work with you and hear more about that. And I can follow up with specifics through your office.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 100.]

Mr. MOYLAN. I appreciate that. General George, talk to me about the steps the Army is taking to address critical gaps identified in the May 22 GAO report on the Guam missile defense system, particularly the lack of long-term installation support strategy, personnel requirements, and basic readiness infrastructure for soldiers and families supporting Guam missile defense mission.

How are you ensuring the Army does not repeat the same logistical missteps with the deployment of GDS [Guam Defense System] elements that GAO highlighted?

General GEORGE. First, I want to just tell you, Congressman, we are very proud of the Guam Guard. You now that from being out there. And I think they are part—as you know, part of that unit that we have out there. And we are trying to actually make that a better mix, you know, the people that actually live there, and, you know, defending their, you know, Guam, right there from the Guam Guard.

We are working with the Navy. As you know, the Navy is in charge of all the installations that is there. When I came out to visit, one of our big things was making sure that, you know, we understood our soldiers, how they were living, what they were doing. They are very tough out there in doing that. But I would agree that we need to make some adjustments. We just recently signed an MOU [Memorandum of Understanding] with both the Navy, I think with Admiral Paparo, and the commandant of the Marine Corps.

There is a base there. There is structure there for our soldiers that could actually stay in that structure. And that is the plan right now for them to move, you know, the folks that we do have.

So, all that we would have is part of that, you know, the missile defense that is out there would be able to stay. And I think in facilities that are finished and are very nice.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And, Congressman, I would just echo that Guam, we talk about it often. I think next month I am going out there to visit it. And so, it comes up in conversations if not daily, at least weekly.

Mr. MOYLAN. We have great barbecue in Guam.

General, what steps are being taken to ensure that the Guam National Guard has access to modernized equipment, consistent training resources, and integration of regional exercises under the FY 26 budget?

General GEORGE. I think you will see, Congressman, this comes out, we talk about the Army. Part of what we were just talking about with aviation, what we are doing to change our mobile brigade combat teams, this applies across every component, and we need to update it. Every component is going to have to fix their network. Every component is going to have to become more mobile and lower signature. Every component is going to have to use drones. So, it is going to be all a part of that.

And obviously, you know, what that unit is doing out there that's part of that integrated air missile defense system, you know, they will be a priority for making sure that they can do those things.

Mr. MOYLAN. Thank you. Mr. Secretary, can you also clarify whether the Army is actively planning any movements of personnel or units from South Korea to Guam?

Mr. DRISCOLL. We can't. I can't provide any sort of confirmation on those specific movements. But I think the Secretary of Defense and President are very actively engaged in the posturing of our troops around the world. And we support them.

Mr. MOYLAN. Okay. Finally, just a few more seconds on that system, General. There was an incident raised with serious concern about the infrastructure and surveillance with drones. We did have an incident out there. And can you speak about the Army's assessment of the incident and what steps are being taken to strengthen against drones?

General GEORGE. We have been talking a lot about drones. I think we need to do a lot. I am not familiar with your specific incident that happened out there. But I will call the TAG [The Adjutant General] out there and find out what he did. So, thank you.

Mr. MOYLAN. Thank you, gentlemen. Mr. Chair, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair recognizes the gentlelady from New Hampshire, Ms. Goodlander.

Ms. GOODLANDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Secretary Driscoll, General George, thank you so much for being here today. You know, I wanted to be on this committee because it has a long bipartisan tradition. And I am really grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, for your leadership on acquisition reform. I kind of talk about this line of effort, which has strong bipartisan support in a slightly different way.

To me, monopolies and corporate abuses of power in our defense sector have undermined our military readiness. They have been a prolific driver of waste, fraud, and abuse for the American taxpayer. And they have really hurt American small businesses, which are the beating heart of our economy.

I am very encouraged that you, Secretary Driscoll, have prioritized one of the most pernicious corporate practices, the monopolization of repair in the Army transformation initiative.

I am encouraged about your commitment to, as I understand it, and I want to be sure I understand it, that you have committed to ensuring that any existing or future contract is going to include a right to repair for our military and our servicemembers. Is that right?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Very explicitly, Congresswoman, on a go forward basis, we have been directed to not sign any contracts that don't give us a right to repair. On a go back basis, we have been directed to go and do what we can to go get that right to repair.

And I can say on a personal— how important I think this is, we hope that anyone listening to us, who hopes to pitch us a contract going forward will look back at their previous agreements they have signed with us. And if they are unwilling to give us that right to repair, I think we are going to have a hard time negotiating with them.

Ms. GOODLANDER. So how are you resourcing and executing on this commitment?

Mr. DRISCOLL. We have directed our staff to, throughout all of contracting follow, through on it.

Ms. GOODLANDER. And how much do you expect this will save the American taxpayer?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I would be pulling a number that I think would be hard to defend with math, Congresswoman. But I think as important as the dollars is, we were telling your colleagues, when we tour bases, you see pieces of equipment that can be upwards of $2-, $3 million that will be unused for a year at a time because it is something that we can 3D print for a cost of $2 to $20. And beyond just the sinfulness of not using that asset, the American soldiers see that, and they are not able to use it. And that is incredibly demoralizing. And so, this is a virtuous cycle that I think benefits us in lot of ways.

Ms. GOODLANDER. And can you commit that you will work with this committee on a bipartisan basis to codify a right to repair for our military and service members?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I can commit that it is an incredibly important topic. And I would do whatever I can personally and, in this role, to help.

Ms. GOODLANDER. Well, I hope we can count on you for that. I wanted to ask you; I think you do agree that the Army should pass a clean audit. I hope you agree.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The trust—General George and I talk a lot about the responsibility and duty that we have to the American taxpayer. And an audit is a trailing indicator of that responsibility. I think the way that most audits function as I understand them, the United States Army and how we manage our equipment, makes us uniquely difficult to pass audits.

Ms. GOODLANDER. But it is uniquely important to make sure you are passing—

Mr. DRISCOLL. Absolutely.

Ms. GOODLANDER. —a clean audit.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Ms. GOODLANDER. So, are you on track to pass a clean audit in this fiscal year?

General GEORGE. I can tell you that we have had more discussions about audit here in the last couple of weeks. So, yes, we are completely focused on doing—

Ms. GOODLANDER. Are you on track to pass a clean audit in this fiscal year—

General GEORGE. That's our goal. I think it would be very hard to do that. But we are trying to do everything that we can in the—

Mr. DRISCOLL. We are mandating, Congresswoman, by December 31, 2028.

Ms. GOODLANDER. Oh, I am well aware, yeah.

Mr. DRISCOLL. We are pushing as hard as we can to do it as quickly as possible. I am cautious to say yes because of the unknown unknowns.

Ms. GOODLANDER. I understand. I just—we all want to crack down on waste, fraud, and abuse. And passing a clean audit is essential to that task. It is essential to public trust. And I hope we can work together to make sure that we get the Army across the finish line just like our colleagues in the Marine Corps.

I want to also put a plug for—I am on the Small Business Committee. We have two important programs. Are you familiar with the Small Business Innovation Research and Technology Transfer Programs administered by the Small Business Administration?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am not.

Ms. GOODLANDER. Well, I would love to educate you on these programs. They will be expiring on September 30. And they have done a lot for tens of thousands of small businesses that want to be a part of our defense industrial base and that could do a lot of good for this country. So, I hope that we can work together to extend those programs which have been so important to competition in the defense industrial base.

With that, I yield back. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlelady yields back. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Fallon.

Mr. FALLON. Mr. Chairman, thank you. And thank you, Mr. Secretary, and thank you, General, for being here.

Okay, on the recruiting. So, Secretary, you were talking about hitting the recruiting goals. And I was the first one to cheer. And

that is huge because we really for the last, was it, three, four, five years, we weren't hitting those goals and we were in a crisis.

So, praise the Lord. One thing I would really like to hear your thoughts on, and General, if you wanted to pipe in as well, is we hit our goals, but I want to know why. Why? What happened where we were unsuccessful for two, three, four years. I mean, I have my own suspicions, but I want to begin without the uncertainties.

So, I would really encourage you both to look into what happened? Why are we succeeding? Because obviously we want to replicate that. So, I just wanted to hear your thoughts on that, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. DRISCOLL. So, I will speak in time and work backwards. So most recently, the focus on a return to warfighting and lethality, as far as we can tell qualitatively on these tours, like it seems to be resonating with soldiers.

It seems when I was at the future soldier prep course, that ones who wanted to join who were at the very front edge of their careers were excited to join in a time where they thought could contribute to the safety of their community by being on the front line of keeping Americans safe.

I think there is some structural changes that this committee worked hard on over the years before to help with things like the future soldier prep course. Some of these soldiers who were right on the edge of the fitness standards are right on the edge of the testing to get in and just needed a little bit of academic tutoring to get over, I think that helped a lot.

It seems to be a very virtuous cycle whereas the momentum has picked up, we have been able to fill all of the gaps that we had in individual specialties. We think we are going to go into next year with 25,000 soldiers in the delayed entry program.

And so, what is nice about the momentum that has been built by this committee and the Army in the last six months since President Trump came into office, we hope that that will carry forward into next year as well, and we expect it to.

Mr. FALLON. You know, and General, I would just like just an honest brokering of why we succeeded, what has changed, whatever that is. And I am not looking to score political points. I just want to know the truth and what that is.

General GEORGE. I will add on to what the Secretary was talking about. It's leadership, obviously. For us, it's been picking the right recruiters. And one of the things, I mean, what we don't want to do is say, hey, we're all good to go, is that we are continuing to look at this.

One of the things that we are looking at is the tech that we need to update to make it easier for recruiters. We have tried to reduce the forms when you come in. It was something like 670 forms that had to be filled out. And we have reduced that below 10. And it is now going to be in a database.

So, I think this is something that we need to continue. I mean, it is a big portion of what we do. That is the one thing that we, I think have consistently are taking a brief on that together, you know—

Mr. FALLON. Thank you.

General GEORGE. —each and every month. And that is going to continue. This isn't a hey, we are good to go now.

Mr. FALLON. Sure. And I wanted to also thank Chairman Rogers for his leadership on the quality of life. I think that will probably, when we ask why they came in, be one of the reasons why we have succeeded.

We also, as our job, and certainly as the subcommittee of chair of military personnel, making sure that your recruiters have the access that they need in those high schools, particularly if they are getting federal grant money. I think that's very important.

I want to in my limited time skip to when I took this job, I promised to do what is in the best interest of the United States and what is in the best interest of the U.S. military on this committee. I am fully committed to that because we have people that say that and they say, well, not in my district.

And I am not going to be one that says, I want to protect my district at the expense of the United States or at the expense of the military readiness and taxpayer dollars.

But I think from a policy perspective when you talk about Red River Army Depot, there is a currency and redundancy to some degree.

You know, I remember when we asked the Germans after World War II in the post-action report, and they said—one of the things they said was if you just kept bombing the ball bearing plants, we would have been belly up. But you didn't. You kept moving. And we are like, thank the Lord.

But that specificity, now if we learned those lessons, I am sure the Chinese did, too. And if they take out certain things that don't have any redundancy, then what are we going to do? How are we going to man things?

And what I would love to visit with you about very quickly is we have a skilled workforce that can help us with drones. I know that drones unmanned, you are talking UAVs [Unmanned Aerial Vehicles], UUVs [Unmanned Underwater Vehicles], the unmanned surface, are the future whereas we are moving away from Humvees and JLVTs as well. But I just really wanted to make sure that we look at that when we are talking about Red River moving forward from a policy perspective, not from a district perspective.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yeah, I just wanted to quickly praise you for making that comment about not from a district perspective. My commitment to you is—and the healthy tension of this is we should debate the merits of our argument.

We have not taken one single parochial interest into account in this. And so, we would be happy to dive in—

Mr. FALLON. Wonderful.

Mr. DRISCOLL. —with you on that.

Mr. FALLON. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Vindman.

Mr. VINDMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Secretary Driscoll, General George, it's great to see you again and thank you for your testimony.

I appreciate the testimony you provided that emphasized Transformation in Contact and a commitment to a continuous adaptation, and I couldn't agree more.

But when it comes to FPV drones, we're still behind. As this past weekend demonstrated, Ukraine has really redefined drone warfare using 3D printing, commercial parts, and on-the-fly adaptation. And frankly, I don't think it's an overstatement to say that this is a revolution in warfare, much like the machine gun was in World War I, or the carrier in World War II.

They treat drones the way artillery treats shells, disposal, cheap, fielded in the tens of thousands. That is why FPV drones currently account for 70 percent of combat casualties between Ukraine and Russia, yet we continue to treat drones as durable assets, centrally managed, selectively deployed, and maintenance intensive.

I learned on Monday, I was out at Quantico, which is one of the three installations in my district. I also have Walker and Dahlgren. And this is a rare thing, giving the Marines credit, they have a drone team, and the Army just stood up a drone team for a competition. And I find this encouraging, but we have to do, obviously, a ton more. Quantico is also actually using one way attack drones.

And I am not sure if the Army has found yet a test range for that. And I will get into that in a little bit more detail. But I had an opportunity to detonate a one-way attack drone on a range in Quantico. We have to have that capability across the force.

Two questions here. I saw a couple of different drones out there. Some that were actually built by the Marines and some that were purchased. One was an ISR [Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance] drone that we purchased for $55,000. The Ukrainians are manufacturing these. And the Marines are actually building them for $500.

Shouldn't we be treating these drones more like artillery and ammunition, more disposable, and building them rather than spending tons of money on them?

Mr. DRISCOLL. You couldn't, Congressman, have any two bigger supporters of that argument. I think drones is highlighting, very specifically at a very important moment in human history and in warfare, the system that we have that has built up over the last 30 and 40 years of defense spending is not sufficient for this moment. And we, as a country, have got to get to a place where we can create, attributable drones, that are at least directionally in the same price point as our enemies because otherwise even as wealthy as we are, a $4 million shot against an $800 drone, we can only do that so many times. And, kind of more importantly, even if we could afford it, creating something so exquisite to take down such a cheap piece of equipment, the time costs are important too.

General GEORGE. I was just going to say we need to get you back out into an Army unit, Congressman.

Mr. VINDMAN. I am ready to go.

General GEORGE. We were just down at JRTC [Joint Readiness Training Center]. I mean that unit, the 101st, had actually built more than 100 of their own drones. I mean, we are doing that really throughout the Army at innovation labs.

This gets back to the earlier comment we were having though. What we need is, we need to be able to scale production. And that

is parts. That gets back to the organic industrial base and what we are doing here. And it gets back to agile funding and how we are able to—you know, everybody wants to buy these big exquisite, you know, one—

Mr. VINDMAN. You have supporters here, General, on this committee certainly. And so, one of the things—I watched, Secretary, you talked about, you know, the Ukrainians are years ahead of us in this regard. We don't want to reinvent the wheel.

I think what we ought to do is if we are going to buy U.S. manufactured drones, certainly at any cost, they ought to be tested in cooperation with our friends in Ukraine in a real combat environment.

The other thing is, and I don't have a great deal of time, so I am going to try to move this pretty quickly, is we actually need to develop the whole .mil PF around drone warfare doctrine, organization training material, leadership, education, personnel facilities, the whole kit and kaboodle. And we have to do this fast.

I mean if we—I have just got skin in the game, not just because I am a retired soldier or a soldier in retired status, but I have got a nephew in the 82nd on the tip of the sphere. And we have a number of folks in that position.

So, what authorities do you need to get this done? When are we looking at base defense and so on? Seven seconds.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 102.]

General GEORGE. Agile funding, we need to figure out how we are going to train locally to do some of this. And then we do—this gets back to the organic industrial base. I think we need to start making some of these things and inviting industry in to do this so that we are not buying, you know—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Van Orden.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Earlier, one of my colleagues was mentioning this celebration, the parade for the Army, 250 years, kind of a big deal. And I would just like to gently remind him that you cannot put a price tag on patriotism. You cannot.

And celebrating arguably—not even arguably—the best Army that has ever existed in the history of the planet deserves attention. So, send him an invite, dude. You know who he is. He sits right over there. Do it. Do it.

General, what percentage of the Army is enlisted?

General GEORGE. You should have asked me to throw out stat. I would say 80 percent.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. 82.

General GEORGE. Yeah.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Where are your enlisted people, sir? Where are they?

General GEORGE. Well, thankfully there is not a ton of them in the Pentagon. That is not where we need them. They are the out there—they are the ones that are—

Mr. VAN ORDEN. I will give you that.

General GEORGE. They are the ones leading our formations and are out there doing the individual training and are the experts on that.

We do have some that are in the Pentagon to include our wonderful Sergeant Major of the Army.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. I get you.

General GEORGE. A couple, but not a bunch.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Senior enlisted leaders are just that, they lead—and the same thing in the Navy. And the reason I bring that up is we are here talking about force postures and budgets and all this everything, right? And if 82 percent of your force are enlisted people, which is true, men and women, soldiers, both, I would just say that maybe some of them should be here to hear this at a different level.

And one of our COMNAVSPECWARCOM guys, commander of Naval Special Warfare Command, made this habit. It was kind of weird. We thought it was goofy to begin with. But he just randomly picked SEALs [Sea, Air, and Land] out of different SEAL teams and made them go to WARCOM [United States Navy Special Warfare Command] and work there for like a month because as enlisted guys, we're always like, like, you know, what are you guys doing out there? Having cocktail parties and stuff? No.

Your force needs to know what you are doing. And Mr. Secretary, please.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I am so excited to answer this question Congressman.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Yeah.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Some of the first people I brought up onto my staff were the E3 [Third Enlisted Pay Grade], who was my driver and now works in the Pentagon. I see him every single day. And then the E5, who is now a sergeant major, who my daughter is named after his daughter, is on staff, too. And I talk to them every single day.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. It is great. And I got to tell you General George, I am so impressed with you. I was there in Austin. And the way that you are looking at these, you know, a different way to do things better, it is just admirable.

And we are here, and I know Chairman Rogers, we got your back 100 percent. So, whatever we can do to—I don't want to say break the primes, but make the primes be more responsive to the American public is something that we will be doing.

And honest to goodness, if you can give me a list, like please give me a list of the top five dumbest programs that the Army is currently involved with so that we can make sure that when we do these rescission packages that they are included. Every single dollar that is spent in a manner that does not focus on killing the enemy is a dollar wasted for the Department of Defense. General?

General GEORGE. I think the top five are on our Army transformation initiative. But we will give you the next five if you want because I think that is what we are talking about. I mean, this is something that we need to constantly look at. And it is part of our everyday discussion, Congressman.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 101.]

Mr. DRISCOLL. And that support, Congressmen and Congresswomen, is incredibly helpful. I mean, I think different people look at their jobs very differently. And so there is nothing wrong with advocating for your constituents. But you could imagine that over the last three or four weeks, I think we have probably fielded 40 to 60 calls on anywhere we are pulling the dollar. We have rightfully been responsible for explaining our logic for pulling that dollar. And so having the silent majority also say, hey, this is important is valuable.

Mr. VAN ORDEN. Well, Mr. Secretary, I happen to know a guy. His name is Mike Rogers. And I know that he is deadly serious about making sure that you are the most efficient killing machine. And that is what we are here to support you in. So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman. I would note that we have been called for votes. So, we are going to let Dr. McCormick and Mr. Messmer do their questions and then we will adjourn. So, Dr. McCormick, you are recognized.

Dr. MCCORMICK. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I will try to keep this brief because I know we won't have time for everybody. But it was interesting talking about the munitions quandary. I know that we had a big backlog and that we haven't figured out how to do it. Even though we are one of the most innovative countries in the world ever in history, but I thought it was also surprising when you gave the answer that that's something we are still working on.

According to what I have been observing in Ukraine, 155 rounds really don't get used anymore. Why? Because triangulation and counterfires are basically devastating. So, what we are using is mobile applications instead of that sort of munitions anymore. So, why do we even care about that? This is exactly the problem. We keep on looking backwards instead of looking forward.

We are taking about futures command. And I really enjoyed your presentation too. And we talked about 30 percent of Air Force assets, which are obsolete. We don't even know why we are funding the billet. Well, we do know why. It's a political reason that we have politicians protecting their own rather than being innovative and looking at what is good for the country and for the future of strategy and tactics.

But once again, let's put aside the 155 rounds and talk about what kind of mobile applications, what kind of drones, HIMARS [high mobility artillery rocket system], whatever it is, how we are going to use wire-guided munitions and how going back—now that is a backward that is looking forward.

But I want to talk about that, the fact that we even legitimize talking about 155 rounds. It's almost an obsolete platform now. When we go out and look at different platforms into the future, we can't even lament the things we haven't done right in the past.

I mean, our best asset is the fact that China keeps on trying to copy the things that don't work anymore. And I don't want to give too much in the hearing. But that's what I am talking about. What is the future and how do we streamline what we are going to do as far as countermeasures, too?

Look at what Ukraine just did in Russia. Phenomenal. It reminded of Israel and some of the innovative things they have used.

Futuristic looking, how are we encouraging the Army to look forward rather than back in the way we are preparing for the next war?

And I know you talked about it, General, in futures command. But, I mean, besides you, how are we developing our young officers to not think about past wars but think in the future in innovation tactics strategy and even manning and weaponizing.

General GEORGE. I think our young leaders are doing a really good job of thinking forward. And, again, some of the things that you were just talking about, Congressman, where we struggle is stopping doing some of the, you know, hey, I still—somebody still wants us to buy stuff that we necessarily don't need.

I agree with you that we need to invest more in drones. That is our plan to do that same thing with EW, same thing with long range fires. I think all those things could be done much cheaper, too. And that is why we are working with other companies. If you want magazine depth, you know, the other way of doing that is to actually bring the cost down. And I think that there are innovative companies that can do that. And it is the same with on what we need on training.

I would argue that we are still probably going to have—indirect fire is still going to be something that is going to happen. I think the stat that was given out that it was only 18 percent of the casualties. And I can come talk to you about that in a classified setting. It kind of goes through some of that.

But, I mean, we are going to need some of that too because those are not—EW is not an issue for some of those things. Same with mortars and what you are going to need as a tactical edge. They are still using that. So I think it is a combination of things. And we are definitely looking to the future.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And Congressman, I would just quickly say, anything I think we are saying about our procurement process or bureaucracy, the shining star in all of this and the gem that we have as a nation is our soldiers.

So, I was down at Fort Jackson a couple of weeks ago. And these are soldiers who have been in the Army for five weeks. And what we have started to do is put a drone up while they do their lanes. And then when they do their after action review they see themselves and what the drone can do.

And this is what is remarkable about it. As these drill sergeants have iterated through these classes, they have actually learned lessons from people in the Army for five weeks that have trickled up to the Pentagon and spread to our other units on how we can approve, which is absolutely remarkable.

Dr. MCCORMICK. And I actually love what the Army is doing in their futuristic thinking for training personnel. I was at University of North Georgia. Love their scientific approach to fitness. But, I also simultaneously see we are still doing a huge massive airborne training of 12,000 soldiers per year on something that we will probably never use again, which also harms over 100 people per year that we are going to have pay disability to for the rest of their lives and really takes them out of the battlefield on something that really is an obsolete tactic in my opinion.

So, I don't want to belabor that point because I know we are out of time. And I want to give you some time. So, I am going to yield the rest of my time. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. MESSMER. Thank you, Chairman, and thank you, gentlemen, for being here.

General George, a recent report stated that given multiple successful end-to-end flight tests of hypersonic missiles, the Army intends to field LRHW [long-range hypersonic weapon] missiles to the first unit by the end of fiscal 2025. Is that still on time?

General GEORGE. Yes, it is, Congressman.

Mr. MESSMER. Do you see any foreseeable setbacks that can delay it any further?

General GEORGE. I think the big thing that we are trying to do with that is look at are there other things that can happen out there where we can actually build those missiles that are less expensive and more rapidly. I think that is the thinking that we are doing on right now.

Mr. MESSMER. Okay. Super.

General GEORGE. And that's on track, and we have been partnering with the Navy with that system and that's on track.

Mr. MESSMER. Great to hear. All right. Secretary Driscoll, our Army National Guard provides operations for pennies on the dollar compared to active duty units while providing a lot of the same capabilities.

As the Army moves to implement ATI, is the Guard being considered as an option to keep end strength levels the same while freeing up funds in the budget to modernize and capitalize on cost savings?

Mr. DRISCOLL. We are having, at least that we are part of, very few conversations where end strength will go down. What I have heard the President say is he wants a, and I think he said it at West Point two week ago, an even larger Army.

I think to your point on the National Guard, they are an incredible asset for our nation. They have been around for very long time. And one of the things that General George and I have prided ourselves in Army Transformation Initiative is we had done nothing to the regular Army that was different from the Guard. And we have tried to treat them exactly the same. And General George has done an incredible job of working with his superiors in the Guard.

General GEORGE. I would just add, and we just talked to like 50 of the TAGs, and this is before all of this came out to tell them, you know, kind of what was going on. I think the one area that I think we need to adjust inside the Guard is I think we need to have actually more people than we have structure. And I know that that is a—you know, always been a challenge because everybody wants to keep a certain amount of structure.

But what you don't have is the flexibility to send people to training, you know, that you need to do and send people to school, whatever that is. So, that's the conversation that we have actually had with them is we are going to have to make some adjustments, just like we are doing in the active component on different types of things that we need.

Like we know we need more cyber. We need more counter UAS. We may need different or something else. And I think we are going to have to have the flexibility moving forward. And we are working with the director of the Army National Guard and the TAGs to make sure that we are doing that.

Mr. MESSMER. Thank you. General George, on the Readiness Subcommittee, General Mingus mentioned foreign military sales as a way to sustain Humvees and JLTVs moving forward. As often highlighted, those familiar with the FMS [foreign military sales] process, bureaucratic red tape, approval times, and delivery delays have plagued that process for years.

What reforms are needed to the FMS process to better to support allies who want to purchase U.S. equipment in our defense enterprises that seek to sustain American defense production lines like the Humvee and JLTV?

General GEORGE. As you know, Congressman, the Army doesn't own that, you know, process. I agree that there is a lot we need to do to make sure that we are moving that much more quickly. I got a call yesterday actually from an Army chief—I have had a couple of those in the last month—about JLTV specifically and looking to buy those.

And, you know, people are just like us. They want, you know, when you decide you have a need, you are ready to get the stuff quickly. And they also like American equipment because it's good. So, we can certainly send something over and have our team come over and talk to you about that in detail.

Mr. MESSMER. I would appreciate that.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And Congressman, just to foreign military sales, I think it is even more important than just those two platforms. The more we can smooth our demand signal across us and our allies for things like PAC-3s [Patriot Advanced Capability-3] that we need, the more joint ventures that could be stood up in places around the world.

And so when you start to think of things like pre-positioned stock, the best outcome is that people we trust are building the same things we are using. So if we go into conflict, they can either send their people or their things.

And so foreign military sales is, an example, I think of the United States acting in a massively overprotected fashion that is harming us dramatically.

Mr. MESSMER. Okay. Thank you. My last one—well, I will yield back the rest of my time so we can all get moving. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields back. Gentlemen, you did a great job. Thank you very much for your service to our country. And we are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 1:44 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

APPENDIX

JUNE 4, 2025

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

JUNE 4, 2025

STATEMENT BY
THE HONORABLE DANIEL P. DRISCOLL
SECRETARY OF THE ARMY

AND

GENERAL RANDY A. GEORGE
CHIEF OF STAFF
UNITED STATES ARMY

BEFORE THE

HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

FIRST SESSION, 119TH CONGRESS

ON THE POSTURE OF THE UNITED STATES ARMY

JUNE 4, 2025

NOT FOR PUBLICATION
UNTIL RELEASED BY THE COMMITTEE

When the Army deployed a Typhon launcher to the Philippines in April 2024, Beijing called the move "provocative and dangerous." Having the Typhon, a U.S. Army mid-range fires system, positioned on Philippine soil undoubtedly forced the Communist Party of China to adjust its calculus. To our partners in the Indo-Pacific, it was a symbol of deterrence, strength, and partnership.

Competition today is rapidly evolving in all domains. Our Army maintains a critical role in deterrence by maintaining relationships with the armies of our allies and partners, and ensuring continued access to key terrain on land, space, and cyberspace. When competition turns to crisis or conflict, we enable joint force maneuver with our Multi-Domain Task Forces, Patriot batteries, or other ready combat formations. Then we close with the enemy, seize and hold ground, and sustain the fight until the battle is won.

We are also agile – our Army can transform rapidly by adapting dual-use technology to warfighters' needs and evolving our formations, tactics, and doctrine to account for lessons learned. Yet, transformation takes determination and willingness to accept some risk. Every day, battlefield systems get faster, smarter, stronger, and stealthier, fueled by rapid growth in commercial technology. These technological advances complicate the battlefield and force combatants to constantly evolve their equipment and tactics.

Staying ahead requires energy and effort. If America plans to win the future fight, our Army cannot afford to wait for lengthy acquisitions timelines or arbitrary planning time horizons. We must get better and buy better all the time, so we have embraced a model of continuous transformation, capitalizing on the ingenuity of our soldiers to make incremental adjustments to how we fight and operate and ensure that our Army stays ready.

However, the pace of our Army's transformation is not quick enough. In the race to stay cutting edge, we are falling behind our adversaries. This is largely due to sluggish and outdated bureaucratic processes both internal and external to the Army. It is essential that we break down barriers to transformation, build greater efficiency into our organization, and boldly put resources towards war-winning capabilities.

What We Have Been Doing: Growing More Lethal and More Agile from the Bottom-Up

Focused on the Mission

Over the last year, our Army has been engaged around the world, contributing to deterrence by training and exercising with partners and allies.

In the Indo-Pacific we have forward-deployed formations almost continuously, participating in exercises like Super Garuda Shield 2024, an Indonesia-hosted exercise that actively involved 11 nations this year, and Balikatan 2025, a full-scale battle simulation alongside the Armed Forces of the Philippines. Army formations in the Indo-Pacific also stand prepared to provide the Joint Force with critical support – command and control, medical, intelligence, and logistics – through all stages of competition, crisis, and conflict.

Our Army has also been committed to defending the homeland, with nearly 8,000 Active, Reserve, and National Guard, supporting the Department of Homeland Security on our Southern Border. We have been active in the European theater with units stationed or forward deployed to Germany, Poland, the Baltics, Romania, and Bulgaria. Finally, Army formations remain busy in the Middle East, contributing to the defense of Israel and the fight against the Houthis, Iranian-Aligned Militia Groups, and other violent extremists. Every one of these formations is focused on building and maintaining lethality, whether through training or tackling real-world challenges.

When not deployed, our teams have been conducting tough training at their home stations and our combat training centers (CTCs). Leaders at every echelon – from squads to divisions – are being pitted against opposing forces with peer technology in the dust, rain, heat, and snow. Units are also experimenting with emerging technology and warfighting concepts at joint and multinational exercises and at Project Convergence.

We are breaking down barriers to training every day. Commanders and first sergeants should be in the field building their teams, not stuck at their desks, overwhelmed by administrative tasks that do not enhance unit cohesion or lethality. We recently reduced mandatory training requirements and are continuing to purge formations of excess equipment that wastes money and maintenance hours. In essence, we are continuing to find ways to take things off leaders' plates and keep our Soldiers in the fight. As we continuously transform, we will identify things we can *stop* doing to optimize our Soldiers' time and allow them to focus on the mission.

Transformation in Contact (TiC)

Deployments and training provide unique opportunities for our formations to focus on transformation, so over the last year, we empowered three different division headquarters and brigades to "transform in contact" during CTC rotations. Using existing FY24 funds, we provided these units with cutting-edge commercial and military technology – including infantry

squad vehicles, unmanned aerial systems (UAS), counter-UAS, electronic warfare (EW) capabilities, and C2 Fix systems – and encouraged them to experiment with their equipment, structure, and tactics.

Feedback from TiC participants validated that our formations can evolve quickly when we pair the skill of developers with the warfighting ingenuity of soldiers. By adjusting how they organized and employed equipment, TiC units were able to more effectively see the battlespace, strike, and maneuver against opponent forces in training, and survive using deception and protection. They also had lower energy and maintenance requirements. Additionally, TiC reinforced that troops in the arctic have different operational requirements than those fighting in the jungle or in the dry heat of the desert, and it is more effective to buy equipment in tailored tranches to support specific mission needs.

Transformation in Contact is a proof of concept for how we can efficiently utilize available tools and dollars to make meaningful investments in our force. As we scale these transformation efforts across the whole Army, we will need to employ agile funding and flexible acquisitions options to maintain momentum.

Deliberate Transformation

Extensive command suites, massive logistics convoys and tent cities are relics of the past. Outdated, too, are many of our acquisitions processes and practices. During the last two decades of conflict, we accommodated long-lasting, inflexible programs of record, many of which took years to come online, did not keep pace with technological advances, and came with special maintenance contracts and field service representatives. These practices will not support an efficient or effective Army that can adapt to the demands of today.

Changing these practices is hard, but as we move forward, we are resolved to choose war-winning capabilities for our soldiers and maintain the right to repair our own equipment.

First and foremost, we are investing in our Network. Leaders must be able to see the battlespace and effectively make decisions while staying mobile and keeping a low profile on the electromagnetic spectrum. C2 Fix, which accelerates modernization of our existing systems, is already helping to make our teams more lethal and more mobile. Next Generation C2, the next stage in our transformation, will allow leaders at the Corps level and below to synchronize all elements of combat power.

We are also deliberately investing in other systems that improve soldier lethality and enhance our Army's contribution to the joint fight: the Next Generation Squad Weapon, directed energy, the Integrated Battle Command System, autonomous systems, counter-unmanned systems, and long-range precision fires, to name just a few.

At the same time, equipment that is effective today may be rendered obsolete by the technology of tomorrow. We must be able to upgrade software and components and replace them with new technology as it becomes available. This means that the Army needs systems that are modular and software-centric, wherever possible. Our new Infantry Squad Vehicle uses 90% commercial-off-the-shelf parts and is customizable because of its modular design. Systems like this are a step in the right direction, enabling us to iteratively improve our force without restarting the long development process. We will continue to look for ways to build flexibility into designs and modernize our acquisition practices to become a better customer to the Defense Industrial Base—driving competition, accelerating the development of cutting-edge technologies, and enabling rapid procurement of capabilities that enhance lethality on the battlefield.

Delivering Ready Combat Formations

To win in combat, our troops must be capable warfighters; they also must be able to get to the fight and have the tools, parts, fuel, and ammunition to maintain momentum and dominate our adversaries.

Our Army has grown tolerant of long lead times for parts and delays in production – a massive handicap and an impediment to our readiness and lethality. To combat this, we have been working on innovative solutions in additive manufacturing. Last year, when units were told that they would have to wait twelve months for a backordered 20 dollar part, Army Material Command (AMC) 3D printed the part instead. The job took a matter of hours and ended up costing 16 cents a piece. AMC is now developing containerized manufacturing shops and sets so that units can fabricate parts forward and get soldiers the parts they need when they need them. We are also exploring ways to use AI predictively to forecast our maintenance needs.

We are dedicated to growing our ammunition stockpiles because even our best weapons are useless without bullets. Over FY24, we invested $3.2B in our Organic Industrial Base, including our ammunition plants, focusing primarily on ensuring that our production lines are resilient and able to rapidly produce critical munitions and components.

Powering Down Resources to Soldiers & Families

Warfighting is a team effort. Soldiers, American industry, our communities, our families – every part of the team must be ready. Our installations support this effort and provide us with power projection platforms across the country and abroad.

When it comes to installation investments, we have continued to prioritize barracks and housing to ensure that soldiers and families have safe places to live. As we plan for future installation investments, we will also focus on force projection – railroads, commercial truck loading complexes, runways, and training ranges – as well as base resiliency measures and facilities that have deferred maintenance deficits. Most importantly, we will look for ways to spend taxpayer dollars more effectively and find efficiencies in our military construction processes.

We know that the needs of families and communities at Fort Bragg are different from those at Fort Drum or Fort Bliss. When we try to implement prescriptive, one-size-fits-all solutions from Washington, D.C., we fail to deliver effective programs and resources. To the fullest extent possible, we will empower installation commanders to make the resourcing decisions that they need for their respective communities.

Recruiting and Retention

In the last several years, our Army has faced significant challenges with recruiting the force our country needs while maintaining the standards our Army requires. This has put pressure on our teams and forced us to make hard choices on structure. In response, the Army has transformed our Recruiting Enterprise, and these efforts have paid dividends. Only halfway through this fiscal year, we have already secured more than 50,000 contracts, which is over 80% of the year's total mission. Once accessed, soldiers recognize that the Army is a great place to serve, as evidenced by our consistently strong retention numbers.

We will always look for ways to update our processes and build efficiency in recruiting. For instance, we continue to explore AI and data tools that will make our recruiters more successful and help them find the best candidates for service.

Where We Are Going: Army Transformation in the Future

To stay lethal in a swiftly changing world, our Army must transform even more rapidly at every level. We must cut out the stuff, structure, and systems that bog us down and invest our limited time and resources into the things that make us stronger and better. This will require us to make tough choices and bold changes.

In the coming years, our Army will seek to grow capabilities that help us build stronger teams, win in battle, and ensure our Army families are ready. Period. Our soldiers deserve investments that support mission success, and our nation deserves an Army that can win.

We will put taxpayer dollars towards building more capable and mobile fighting formations that can dominate inside or along contested zones and effectively sense, synchronize, supply, and strike using iteratively upgradable technology. We will invest in firepower that can support the joint team in all domains through long-range fires, cyber, and electronic warfare systems. We will invest in programs and infrastructure that allow us to build and retain talent, tailored to meet the needs of each of our unique Army communities. Finally, we will preserve flexibility in all these investments and build agility into our processes, while at the same time, reinforcing transparency of how taxpayer dollars are spent, because our transformation cannot be stop-and-go; it must be constant.

Conclusion

The Typhon launcher in the Philippines exemplifies the Army's changing capabilities and role in a single theater, but it reflects the continuous transformation effort throughout all our formations.

Our Army is the most capable and lethal ground force in the world, but we do not take this position for granted. As we move forward in our continuous transformation journey, we will do our part to meet the challenges ahead, especially those posed by Beijing. We will contribute to America's web of deterrence by providing layered and integrated capabilities to Combatant Commanders: dispersed teams, distributed sensors, and lethal fires, all linked by low-profile command and control systems.

It is our job as leaders to build and maintain the Army that our nation needs and demands. This We'll Defend!

Biography

Department of the Army

Hon. Daniel P. Driscoll
Secretary of the Army



Daniel P. Driscoll is the 26th Secretary of the Army, sworn in on February 25th, 2025, following his nomination by President Donald J. Trump and confirmation by the United States Senate.

As Secretary of the Army, he oversees operations, modernization, and resource allocation for nearly one million Active, Guard, and Reserve Soldiers and more than 265,000 Army Civilians.

A former Army officer and business leader, Secretary Driscoll brings experience spanning military service, law, and the private sector.

Secretary Driscoll was commissioned in 2007 as an Armor Officer through the U.S. Army Officer Candidate School. While on active duty, he led a cavalry platoon in the 10th Mountain Division at Fort Drum, New York, and deployed to Baghdad, Iraq, in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom in 2009. His military awards include the Army Commendation Medal, Ranger Tab, and Combat Action Badge.

After departing active duty, Secretary Driscoll attended Yale Law School and worked in Yale's Veterans Legal Services Clinic. He has held leadership roles in investment banking, private equity, and business operations, including as Chief Operating Officer of a $200 million venture capital fund. Secretary Driscoll holds a Bachelor of Science in Business Administration from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill and a Juris Doctor from Yale Law School. He is a member of the North Carolina State Bar, the Rotary Club, VFW Post 1134, and Iraq and Afghanistan Veterans of America.

A native of Boone, North Carolina, Secretary Driscoll comes from a family with a legacy of military service. His grandfather served in the Army during World War II as a decoder, and his father served during Vietnam as an infantryman. He is married to his high-school sweetheart, and they have two children.

GENERAL RANDY A. GEORGE
41ST Chief of Staff of the Army
UNITED STATES ARMY

General Randy A. George assumed duties as the 41st Chief of Staff of the Army on September 21, 2023 after most recently serving as the 38th Vice Chief of Staff of the Army.

George commissioned from the U.S. Military Academy in 1988 as an infantry officer. He served as a lieutenant in the 101st Airborne Division and deployed in support of Desert Shield/Desert Storm. Following the Armor Officer Advanced Course in 1993, George was stationed at Fort Carson where he was the assistant operations officer for 3rd Brigade, 4th Infantry Division and then commanded C Company and later Headquarters Company in 1st Battalion, 8th Infantry Regiment.

George received his Master of Science in Economics in 1999 from Colorado School of Mines and then served at the National Simulation Center in Fort Leavenworth before attending the Command and General Staff College.

In 2001 George went to Italy and served as the executive officer of 2nd Battalion, 503rd Infantry Regiment, 173rd Airborne Brigade. He was later executive officer and then deputy commander of the brigade, during which time he deployed in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. Returning to the 101st Airborne Division in 2004, George commanded 1st Battalion, 187th Infantry Regiment and deployed a second time to Iraq. He then went to United States Naval War College as an instructor and then student. He deployed again as part of the initiatives group for the commanding general, Multi-National Corps-Iraq in 2007.

In 2008 George returned to the 4th Infantry Division, where he commanded 4th Brigade Combat Team and deployed to Afghanistan in support of Operation Enduring Freedom. Following command, he was a fellow on the Council of Foreign Relations, chief of the strategic policy division for the Pakistan-Afghanistan coordination cell on the Joint Staff, executive officer to the 33rd Vice Chief of Staff of the Army and then executive assistant to the commander of U.S. Central Command. He then returned to Fort Carson as the deputy commanding general (maneuver) of 4th Infantry Division.

After two staff assignments as the director of force management for the Army G-3/5/7 and deputy director for regional operations and force management in the J-3, George took command of the 4th Infantry Division in June 2017. In this role he deployed again to Afghanistan.

George's most recent command was of I Corps at Joint Base Lewis McChord, after which he served as the senior military assistant to the Secretary of Defense.

He is married to his West Point classmate, Patty. They have two children, Grant and Andrea.

WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING

JUNE 4, 2025

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. CARBAJAL

General GEORGE. The Army Transformation Initiative is designed to ensure that the Army remains the most lethal and ready land force in the world by accelerating transformation through delivering critical warfighting capabilities, optimizing force structure, and eliminating waste and obsolete programs. These efforts are actively being implemented across the Total Army, and transformations are designed to be scaled while minimizing interruptions to the soldiers. Soldiers are now testing never-before-seen gear and providing feedback in real-time, which shapes what we build and how we field it. Soldiers will have opportunities to reclassify into emerging military occupational specialties or test new equipment as new capabilities are fielded. [See page 23.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY DR. DESJARLAIS

Mr. DRISCOLL. Regarding our Air Defense manning status, currently, within the Active Component Manning Guidance, all 10th, 32nd, and 94th Army Air Missile Defense Commands are operating within Manning Category B (80-90%). New accessions currently within U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) have greatly increased and are in the Manning Category A (90-100%). TRADOC is expected to be at full accession authorization by October 2025. Promotions for CMF14 (Air Defense Artillery) have increased within the Staff Sergeant population to 105% of authorization to assist with building the required number of NCOs needed within FORSCOM and TRADOC requirements. Army Headquarters also has incentivized qualified Soldiers to re-enlist with bonuses and location incentives. Overall projected outlook for CMF14 is continued growth at 100% of authorization. CMF14 Enlisted Branch will continue to prioritize Category B units equitably, to ensure Army, Unit, Soldier, and Family needs are met.

The DoD is initiating development and deployment of Golden Dome for America (GDA) to protect citizens and critical infrastructure and guarantee a secure second-strike capability. The GDA architecture is pending the Secretary of Defense's review and approval, the Army will ensure that any necessary support is fully provided to achieve the homeland missile defense policy in accordance with E.O. 14186, the Iron Dome for America. [See page 25.]

General GEORGE. The DoD is initiating development and deployment of the Golden Dome for America (GDA) to protect citizens and critical infrastructure and guarantee a secure second-strike capability. While the GDA architecture is pending the Secretary of Defense's review and approval, the Army continues to ensure that any necessary support is fully provided to achieve the homeland missile defense policy in accordance with E.O. 14186, the Iron Dome for America. [See page 25.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. CROW

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army makes every effort to mitigate civilian harm in accordance with U.S. laws and DOD directives. Civilian protection is embedded in Army doctrine and training. Following such, there are improvements in targeting methodology and precision fires have reduced the potential for civilian casualties.

Before the Civilian Protection Center of Excellence was established, protecting civilians was an integral part of everything the Army did. The responsibility to protect civilians does not reside in a single office. Protection of civilians is best accomplished through integration of standardized military education and training throughout the force. The Army has integrated and institutionalized Civilian Harm Mitigation and Response practices across the force. The imperative to protect civilians is embedded across Army training, professional education, doctrine, and targeting processes. Moreover, during military operations, civilian protection is part of warfighting functions and processes - including intelligence, targeting, fire control, and military orders processes. [See page 30.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY DR. JACKSON

General GEORGE. The Army is taking corrective protocol to accelerate fielding of the MV-75 Future Long Range Assault Aircraft (FLRAA). The Army is requesting additional funding for the FLRAA program to support acceleration, starting with additional funding requested in the Fiscal Year 2026 budget request. These funds accelerate design completion, prototype builds, and initiate production planning to enable an early production decision. Furthermore, the Army is purposefully moving forward with producing FLRAA in tandem with completing testing to accelerate fielding of this critical capability. This accelerates the purchase of long lead materials and production aircraft earlier than previously planned. These steps accelerate fielding to the first Army unit by 18 months. [See page 48.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. STRICKLAND

General GEORGE. The details of how the Department plans to apply amounts included in the FY26 budget for reconciliation (including the supplemental payments for Service Member housing) will be included in the reconciliation justification materials. These materials should be provided to Congress in the next few weeks. In accordance with the $2.9B proposed for the Department of Defense, the Army expects $153M across all components for supplemental BAH payments. The table below shows the appropriation breakout for all Army Military Personnel, to include the BAH supplemental payments and the increase in Temporary Lodging Expense (TLE) days. [See page 59.]

APPN	Requirement	Reconciliation ($K)
MPA / 2010	BAH Supplement	$ 140,721
MPA / 2010	Increase in TLE days	$ 39,306
Subtotal MPA / 2010		**$ 180,027**
NGPA / 2060	BAH Supplement	$ 9,106
NGPA / 2060	Increase in TLE days	$ 6,061
Subtotal NGPA / 2060		**$ 15,167**
RPA / 2070	BAH Supplement	$ 3,284
RPA / 2070	Increase in TLE days	$ 3,654
Subtotal RPA / 2070		**$ 6,938**
TOTAL ARMY MILPERS		**$ 202,132**

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. VASQUEZ

Mr. DRISCOLL. A map of the New Mexico National Defense Area previously provided to your staff is attached. The Army staff is prepared to provide any additional details or answer any additional questions. [See page 38.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. LUTTRELL

Mr. DRISCOLL. As part of the Army Transformation Initiative, two Army Reserve Expeditionary Combat Aviation Brigades (ECAB)-the 11th and 244th ECABs-will inactivate. Currently, the Army is overtly invested in manned aviation - a structure that was procured to support the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Resources freed from the inactivation of the 11th and 244th ECABs will be used to increase the Army's readiness to fight and win on the modern battlefield by investing in emergent technologies such as drone swarms, autonomy for contested logistics, and electronic warfare capabilities. Several missions are assigned to the 11th and 244th ECABs will be executed by Regular Army and Army National Guard Aviation units. Domestically, disaster relief and MEDEVAC missions will not be affected as Army National Guard Aviation units have sufficient capacity to support those missions. [See page 36.]

General GEORGE. As part of the Army Transformation Initiative (ATI), two Army Reserve Expeditionary Combat Aviation Brigades (ECAB)-the 11th and 244th ECABs-will inactivate. Present day, the Army is over invested in manned aviation -structure that was procured to support the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. Resources freed from the inactivation of the 11th and 244th ECABs will be used to increase the Army's readiness to fight and win on the modern battlefield by investing in emergent technologies, including but not limited to drone swarms, autonomy for contested logistics, and electronic warfare capabilities. Missions currently assigned to the 11th and 244th ECABs will be executed by Regular Army and Army National Guard Aviation units. Disaster relief efforts and MEDEVAC missions domestically will not be affected as

Army National Guard Aviation units have sufficient capacity to support those specific missions. [See page 36.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. MOYLAN

Mr. DRISCOLL. ARNG G-9 provides a dedicated and transparent process called the Infrastructure Requirements Plan (IRP), to prioritize all ARNG project requests from the states/territories. Recently, ARNG-G9 Installations and Environment Directorate provided MILCON training and guidance directly to Guam Construction Facility Management Office to empower and train them to identify facility requirements and develop the required programming documents to gain Unspecified Minor Military Construction (secure UMMC) and MILCON funding.

The Guam Army National Guard (GUARNG), with over 1,300 Soldiers, faces persistent infrastructure limitations due to its geographic isolation and strategic location in the Indo-Pacific. The Army has identified Guam as a priority under the Pacific Deterrence Initiative and is continuing to coordinate with the National Guard Bureau to elevate Guam requirements within the $395 million projected minor military construction (MCNG) allocation. The FY 2026 budget will continue to prioritize Guam Army National Guard infrastructure, including unfunded FY25 projects such as the hardened operations center. This aligns with our Indo-Pacific strategy and the National Guard Bureau's posture in forward-deployed territories. Fully funding the MCNG request will support resilience, readiness, and responsiveness of Guam-based forces. Continued congressional support ensures the Guard remains postured to meet regional challenges.

The GUARNG's Barrigada Readiness Center (project number 140051) for $55 million is included in the FY26 Major MILCON program. [See page 67.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. ELFRETH

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army is working with the Defense Health Agency (DHA), and other medical research sponsors including the Defense Threat Reduction Agency Joint Science and Technology Office and the Joint Program Executive Office for Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear Defense to ensure the long-term sustainability of the medical research, development, and acquisition enterprise. The Army remains committed to ensuring the vital medical research capabilities, infrastructure, and expertise critical to the Nation's defense remain aligned to the Interim National Defense Strategic Guidance and informed by emerging threats and adversary capabilities. Fort Detrick remains an Army installation. Therefore, the Army will collaborate with the DHA, to ensure critical infrastructure is maintained. Pending the issuance of a final air permit by the Maryland Department of the Environment, construction of the medical waste incinerator will begin October 2025 with expectation to be completed in June 2027. [See page 53.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. VAN ORDEN

General GEORGE. The next five opportunities for increased efficiency in support of a leaner, more ready, more resilient, and more lethal force include:

Warfighter Information Network-Tactical (WIN-T). The system is approaching its End of Useful Life due to Next Generation Command and Control (NGC2) investment. It is an obsolete network compiled with security issues not survivable in the future battlefield that will sunset when NGC2 comes online.

Synthetic Training Environment (STE) Live Training Systems, more specifically the Soldier Virtual Trainer (SVT). This system has faced delivery and integration challenges. To be effective, it should align with operational platforms and field more rapidly.

Legacy Counter-Rocket, Artillery, and Mortar (C-RAM) generator programs. These systems can be replaced with more efficient, commercially available off-the-shelf alternatives, reducing sustainment costs, and improving readiness measures.

Counter-explosive hazards equipment. Originally designed for counterinsurgency (COIN) operations, much of this equipment is no longer aligned with the Army's current operational focus and priority theaters.

Redundant or outdated sustainment systems. Program of Record development for maintenance equipment such as tool kits and fabrication sets take too long and are too costly to the Army. There are cheaper Commercial-Off-the-Shelf (COTS) solutions available on the market that are more cost-effective. Specific examples of outdated or redundant systems include: Shop Equipment Welding Trailer, Forward Repair Systems, Metal Working and Machining Shop Set, General Mechanic's Tool Kit. These areas highlight opportunities to improve efficiency, reduce sustainment burdens, and reinvest in capabilities that more efficiently align with the Army's future and operational needs. As budgetary pressures intensify, we are committed to ongoing evaluation and disciplined resource management to ensure our formations remain lethal, agile, and strategically relevant. [See page 75.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. MCGUIRE

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army is diligently working with the Air Force, Navy, as well as other Defense research, development, and prototyping organizations. to synchronize efforts to meet the timelines established in EO 14299. For the Army, we are partnered with the Defense Innovation Unit to prototype a small modular nuclear reactor an have teams visiting prospective sites and expect an order of merit list by the end of the calendar year. The Army is also closely tracking the progress of Project Pele, managed by the Strategic Capabilities Office, which is on track for goal would be to have operational demonstration reactors roughly in fiscal year 2027 at Idaho National Laboratory. [See page 44.]

General GEORGE. The Army is diligently working with the Air Force, Navy, and other DoD research, development, and prototyping organizations to synchronize efforts and synergistically meet timelines established in EO 14299. For the Army, we are partnered with the Defense Innovation Unit to prototype a small modular nu-

clear reactor and authorize teams visiting prospective sites and will have an order of merit list by the end of the calendar year. The Army is also closely tracking the progress of Project Pele, managed by the Strategic Capabilities Office, which aims to have operational demonstration reactors roughly in fiscal year 2027 at Idaho National Laboratory. [See page 44.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. VINDMAN

General GEORGE. The conflict in Ukraine has shown the urgent need to transform into an Army that is lean, agile, empowers its soldiers, and embraces innovation. Lessons learned from operational environments such as Ukraine are actively monitored due to rapidly changing tactics, techniques, and procedures of drone warfare. Regardless of the source for an observation, trend, or insight, we have reputable systems and processes in place to rapidly analyze the source or trend for U.S. Army implications. This process feeds the development of changes to Doctrine, Organization, Training, Materiel, Leadership, Personnel, Facilities, and Policy (DOTMLPF-P).

The Army requests support for its agile funding concept to establish an environment in which the Army fosters expansive innovation and accelerates deployment of emerging technologies. The Army's current ″program-based″ budget structure is rigid and limits the Army's ability to evolve rapidly and outpace adversaries, as well as rapid acquisition authority to give Organic Industrial Base Commanders more local authority to quickly procure equipment for manufacturing and refurbishment operations for response to emerging threats more rapidly, and allow the Army to mass MILCON work at specific locations to deliver Organic Industrial Base facilities more quickly and at lower cost.

Agile funding will first focus on countering small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (C-sUAS). As it relates to base-defense, the Army employs a multi-pronged approach, in collaboration with the Joint Counter-Small UAS (C-sUAS) Office (JCO), other Services, and Combatant Commands, to ensure C-sUAS DOTMLPF-P domain solutions are aligned with emerging operational requirements regardless of location. [See page 74.]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING

JUNE 4, 2025

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. WILSON

Mr. WILSON. As you shift away from the procurement of ground vehicles like the Humvee, JLTV, and some armored fighting vehicles, what are you doing to ensure we maintain the capability to fight and win against our adversaries in Europe or the Middle East?

General GEORGE. The Army is halting procurement of ground systems like the High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle (HMMWV), Joint Light Tactical Vehicle (JLTV), and the M10 Booker because lessons from recent conflicts indicate these systems are no longer survivable, transport and sustain. Instead, we're shifting resources toward fielding more advanced and survivable platforms that better support Soldiers in combat, like the M1E3 tank and the Infantry Squad Vehicle (ISV).

This supports our strategy in Europe and the Middle East as the Army's approach is to prioritize our ability to fight in an evolving security environment while also enhancing burden sharing among Allies and partners to bolster deterrence together. These new platforms increase speed and maneuverability at the tactical edge, are easier to transport to and sustain in forward areas and are adaptable to a diverse set of mission and operational requirements. These changes improve our Soldiers' lethality and survivability across a range of challenges -, including those in Europe and the Middle East, posed by emerging technologies such as unmanned vehicles, persistent surveillance, and ubiquitous electronic warfare threats - while allowing for greater prioritization into emerging programs and capabilities.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. GARAMENDI

Mr. GARAMENDI. Secretary Driscoll, the Army plays a significant logistics and sustainment role for the joint force, particularly in the INDOPACOM AOR. Accordingly, as the Army proposes its Army Transformation Initiative, decisions on logistics and sustainment require close coordination with the joint force to take into account the Army's role as a logistics provider. How has the Army coordinated with the joint force to determine where to focus its investments on logistics/sustainment assets and how is the Army ensuring there are no gaps in meeting joint logistics requirements as a result of ATI?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Success of the Joint Force in a global contested environment depends on assured movement to and from the continental United States along land, air, and sea supply lines. The Army coordinates and communicates regularly with the other Military Services and the Joint Staff to ensure the logistics and sustainment capabilities are robust, responsive, aligned, and campaign-capable to ensure the Army's and Joint Force global mission requirements are supportable across the conflict continuum. The Combatant Commands (COCOMs) have unique operational and sustainment requirements based on their respective geography, logistics infrastructure, and theater threats. Each COCOM has a J-4 Logistics Directorate responsible for planning, coordinating, and synchronizing military logistics operations within its area of responsibility. The Army works closely with the COCOM J-4s to ensure existing logistics capabilities and future ATI requirements are integrated into overall operational plans. Army participation in wargames such as Unified Pacific ensures the COCOMs identify requirements and direct necessary modifications to established cross-service logistics plans. In USINDOPACOM, where sustainment is challenged by the tyranny of distance, the Army is supporting COCOM and sister service logistics plans through agile positioning and movement of maintenance capabilities forward in that theater.

Mr. GARAMENDI. General George, the U.S. Army's fully mission capable rate for its watercraft has steadily declined from 75% in 2020 to less than 40% in 2024. Additionally, the overall fleet size of 70 is inadequate to fulfill INDOPACOM logistics requirements. Despite these existing concerns, the Army Transformation Initiative included a proposal to cancel the Maneuver Support Vessel - Light contract. What investments does the Army have planned for watercraft, specifically as it relates to replacing the Maneuver Support Vessel. Without the rapid fielding of a replacement, how does the Army plan to supply its soldiers that are dispersed across a large region?

General GEORGE. The Army is committed to prioritizing and resourcing watercraft sustainment and modernization to ensure its existing organic watercraft fleet is mission ready and able to support the Joint Force. Through focused efforts, readiness rates of the current watercraft fleet have improved by 20% since late 2024. The Army Transformation Initiative directs the enterprise to explore multiple options, including the potential termination of future Maneuver Support Vessel-Light acquisition. The Army must ensure future investments in watercraft solutions are practical, flexible, and sustainable in the long-term. To mitigate existing gaps in Army intra-theater maritime lift capabilities, we are pursuing a mixed watercraft fleet strategy. Contractor owned and operated vessels are being tested in the Indo-Pacific as potential supplemental capabilities. We are also actively testing unmanned, semi-autonomous watercraft vessels produced by the commercial industry.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. WITTMAN

Mr. WITTMAN. The Army Transformation Initiative calls for significant reductions in Army forces and legacy programs. As the Army considers these cuts, it should consider the strategic, technical, and cost impacts carefully. he Army has historically relied on its in-house analytic community, including support from its federally funded research and development center (FFRDC), the Arroyo Center, which it created to ensure timely access to deep and needed expertise, which is independent and objective. The Arroyo Center has a proven record of identifying significant value. As just one example: a study costing government $500,000 reaped over $100 million in savings, illustrating the payoff of independent analysis. As the Army undergoes a transformation, it is vital it continues to leverage the value this analytic partner brings in making the Army more efficient, more ready, and more lethal.

Q1: Using Analysis to Make Informed Choices - Please explain how the Army intends to continue using rigorous, strategic, technical and cost-saving analysis and capabilities, including from its FFRDC, as it undertakes a significant transformation effort?

Q2: Leveraging Institutional Knowledge for Transformation Success - How does the Army plan to utilize the Arroyo Center's decades of institutional knowledge and cross-functional expertise to ensure transformation decisions are informed by historical lessons learned and comprehensive analysis of multi-domain operational implications?

Q3: Quick-turn Independent Analysis - I understand that the Army often utilizes its FFRDC for quick-turn analytical questions that are complex and challenging - the kind of support only an FFRDC can provide. How will the Army ensure that it receives the analytical support it needs in a timely manner for these types of complex and challenging time-sensitive questions?

Q4: Congressionally Directed Studies - Congress often directs Army to use its FFRDC to answer Congressional questions. How will Army ensure that its FFRDC can continue to deliver analysis in support of Congressionally Directed Studies?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Q1: As the Army undertakes its major transformation effort, it remains fully committed to leveraging the strategic, technical, and cost-saving analytical capabilities of its FFRDC and Federally Funded Research and Development Center () along with the organic analytic capacity of the Army's Operational Research Military and Civilian staff, consistent with past practice. Simultaneously, the Army's in-house analytic community will continue to evolve and adapt to meet emerging demands. Together, these two analytical pillars form a robust, forward-looking foundation that ensures complex decisions are informed by objective insight, innovation is guided by analysis, and mission success is underpinned by strategic analytic rigor. Currently, the FFRDC is conducting transformation-focused analyses on multiple high-priority topics, including launched effects, Golden Dome, and Homeland Defense.

Q2: The Army is strategically refining and realigning its relationship with the RAND Arroyo Center and its organic analytic capabilities to meet the evolving requirements of the Army Transformation Initiative. As the Army adapts to new operational realities, so too must its partnerships. The Arroyo Center's decades of institutional knowledge and cross-functional expertise remain indispensable. Moving forward, the Army will continue to draw upon this deep analytical foundation to address complex, multi-domain operational challenges. By integrating historical lessons learned with cutting-edge analysis, the Army ensures its transformation decisions are both informed by experience and positioned for future success. Reflecting this continued engagement, the Army is actively developing fiscal year (FY)Fiscal Year 2026 research proposals in collaboration with the Arroyo Center and holds a

funded position with RAND Arroyo in FY26 and across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP)

Q3: The Army remains fully committed to preserving its ability to obtain timely, high-quality analyses through its FFRDC. Quick-turn independent analysis is a vital component of this support-specifically designed to address complex, time-sensitive challenges faced by senior leaders, many of which are difficult to anticipate. This capability remains an integral and indispensable element of the Army's analytical support infrastructure.

Q4: The Army has a long-standing, trusted relationship with its FFRDC for delivering high-quality, independent analysis in support of Congressionally Directed Studies. This partnership plays a critical role in providing objective insights on complex and sensitive issues. The Army remains fully committed to sustaining its FFRDC's ability to fulfill these mandates and ensuring continuity, responsiveness, and analytical excellence in addressing Congressional priorities.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. NORCROSS

Mr. NORCROSS. How will the changes to Army programs and posture in the Army Transformation Initiative be reflected in your vision for what the Army will look like 10 and 20 years from now?

General GEORGE. The Army Transformation Initiative is an effort to transform the Army so that we can man, train, and equip our formations to fight in any environment. The changes we're making are informed by the evolving nature of ground conflict which we are capturing in the ongoing work on how we conceptualize Army Warfighting - as part of the Joint Warfighting Concept. This ensures the Army is investing in the capabilities we need to fight and win wars today and in the future, while divesting from the things that we know we don't need. All the decisions we've made to transform the Army are directly aligned with and serve to increase the lethality of the Joint fight. Through ATI, we know we will require a diversity of solutions, rather than a single fix, to become more mobile and reduce our signature, improve our networks and build an integrated data layer, increase the integration of drones within our formations, conduct and protect against electromagnetic warfare, and fight alongside unmanned systems. Continuous Transformation, through ATI and the AWC, is enabling us to create the adaptability required to fight and win in any conflict.

Mr. NORCROSS. Please describe in detail the analysis and strategy that the Army conducted to create the Army Transformation Initiative: how did those analyses and strategic decisions result in the trade-offs you are making in the Army Transformation Initiative?

General GEORGE. Many complex factors informed the shaping of the Army Transformation Initiative (ATI). We know that the United States cannot afford an Army built for yesterday's wars. Our pacing challenge is the People's Republic of China. Drawing on lessons from Ukraine and the Red Sea, observed Chinese capabilities, and experimentation through Transformation in Contact, ATI targets what matters most: mobility on land and in the air, drones and counter-drones in every formation, Electronic Warfare, deep-strike fires, and resilient networks. These efforts remain closely aligned with the Joint Force. ATI is backed by tough choices to streamline the force and push capability forward.

This transformation is resource-informed and threat-driven. The Army is set to scale what works for our Soldiers, eliminate redundancy, and prioritize investments that deliver measurable advantage. The Army Transformation Initiative turns urgency into action, converting battlefield lessons into real-world capabilities. It is how we ensure that America's Army stays ahead of its adversaries-faster, more flexible, and prepared for the wars of tomorrow.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. SCOTT

Mr. SCOTT. Recent news reports indicate the Army plans to shift Pacific prepositioned equipment from afloat to land-based storage, potentially creating stationary targets. What is the strategic justification for this move, and how will the Army ensure rapid deployment across island chains without afloat Army pre-positioned stocks (APS)? Moving APS to land-based sites increases vulnerability to adversarial strikes. What measures are in place to harden APS facilities and ensure equipment, including watercraft, can be deployed under attack in a major theater war?

General GEORGE. The strategic justification for shifting APS-3 from afloat to land-based storage centers on responsiveness to a rapidly evolving threat from China.

Current afloat platforms are too slow to react to increasingly compressed warning times and are vulnerable to early destruction. Land-based APS, particularly within the first island chain, offers faster response times critical for supporting USINDOPACOM operations and aligns with the Interim National Defense Strategic Guidance. While storing equipment on land creates easier targets than slow moving ships, land-based APS sites are also configured in ways that allow units to draw and disaggregate equipment from those sites once there are operational indications and warning of potential threats. To mitigate increased vulnerability, the Army is focusing on redistributing APS equipment across multiple locations in the USINDOPACOM area, as well as Europe, and the Middle East.

Mr. SCOTT. The Army's watercraft fleet has shrunk by about half since 2018, with readiness rates below 40% in 2024. How is the Army addressing this decline, and what specific investments are planned to restore watercraft capabilities critical for JLOTS and intratheater lift? Moreover, what immediate mitigation plans are in place to meet current and near-term operational requirements, particularly in the Indo-Pacific?

General GEORGE. The Army is taking decisive steps to reverse the decline in watercraft readiness and restore critical capabilities for Joint Logistics Over-the-Shore (JLOTS) and intra-theater lift. This includes targeted investments in sustainment-level maintenance, modernization of the organic fleet, expand force structure and integration of autonomous systems to boost availability and operational flexibility. To meet immediate and near-term requirements-especially in the Indo-Pacific-the Army is expanding the use of contractor-owned and operated platforms, improving forward-positioned maintenance, and repositioning assets globally. These efforts, combined with increased collaboration across joint, allied, and commercial partners, aim to ensure robust maritime capability and capacity for the full spectrum of operational timelines.

In addition to using contractor-owned watercraft, the Army is working with our sister Services and our Allies and partners to create more robust and redundant transportation and lift capabilities. We are also exploring semi-submersible, uncrewed watercraft for future use, creating additional operational flexibility and reducing soldiers placed in harm's way to transport supplies and other materials.

Mr. SCOTT. With afloat Army Prepositioned Stock (APS) providing flexibility for rapid response, as demonstrated in past operations like the Gulf War, how is the Army ensuring that land-based APS sites, such as Powidz, Poland, remain viable in contested environments with disrupted supply lines?

General GEORGE. In an earlier period, prior to near ubiquitous sensing and long-range fires that challenge the U.S. military's ability to project power, the slow-moving afloat APS offered important flexibility, as seen in the Gulf War. The Army now aims to maintain prepositioned equipment and munitions in locations like Powidz that are relatively more proximate to potential battlefields. Land based APS sites in forward locations like Powidz are configured for timely withdrawal and movement. To mitigate vulnerability with disrupted supply lines, the Army is also establishing forward sites for ground-based precision munitions to enhance defense, while working with host and neighboring nations to streamline bureaucratic obstacles and enhance local security at port facilities, as well as using Charleston, SC as a preparation hub. While APS afloat offers some advantage in terms of relatively rapid displacement, it is both vulnerable to adversary targeting and fiscally prohibitive. The Army will continue its deliberate effort to provide an operationally relevant APS structure that is simultaneously fiscally sustainable.

Mr. SCOTT. How is the Army coordinating with the Navy and Military Sealift Command to ensure JLOTS capabilities are maintained and prepositioned appropriately for amphibious operations?

General GEORGE. The Army is collaborating with the Navy and USTRANSCOM to shape JLOTS requirements, while simultaneously enhancing interoperability to bolster coordination, frequency, and sustainability of JLOTS capabilities. Recognizing the need to align force structure, training, and equipment management, the Army is reviewing these areas to better meet JLOTS demands. To address existing gaps, it is developing a comprehensive Army watercraft modernization strategy and has established the Army Watercraft Enterprise Governance to oversee and synchronize fleet integration, modernization, maintenance, and readiness. Key initiatives include prioritizing sustainment maintenance funding, integrating Tactical Enterprise Logistics Systems for better accountability, updating business practices to strengthen maintenance, and developing forward maintenance options via Multiple Award Task Order to enhance global sustainment and reduce CONUS repair costs. These efforts also bolster partnerships with allies through expanded country agreements.

Mr. SCOTT. GAO reports have noted fragmented oversight of APS programs across services. What steps is the Army taking to implement joint oversight and ensure prepositioned stocks, including watercraft, are maintained at high readiness levels?

General GEORGE. Over the past 18 months, the Army has been making significant efforts to realign its prepositioned equipment program with national security priorities and the rapidly evolving security environment, in coordination with the Joint Force. These changes are aligned with the Secretary of Defense's Interim National Defense Strategic Guidance which clearly orients joint operations, activities, and investments toward the Indo-Pacific theater and the Homeland. The Army integrates its oversight and readiness reporting efforts within the DoD's Global Pre-Positioned Material Capabilities Working Group to enable joint oversight of the Services' prepositioned stock programs.

The Army is also conducting a comprehensive review of its entire approach to power projection equipment and munitions. Including APS, this review is accounting for changes in the operational/strategic environment to Combatant Commander requirements, and changes that ensure long-term fiscal sustainability. Part of that strategy is to develop keen readiness model to more accurately assess equipment readiness and issue times across all theaters. As the Army works through its analysis and crafts this comprehensive strategy, it remains engaged with Combatant Commanders and leaders across the DoD to inform and incorporate joint perspectives.

Mr. SCOTT. The Army is drafting a watercraft modernization strategy for 2030 and 2040. Can you outline how this strategy addresses current fleet shortages and incorporates lessons from recent operations, such as the Gaza deployment?

General GEORGE. The Army's Watercraft Modernization Strategy addresses current fleet gaps by building a future AWC mixed fleet consisting of organic, contract, and autonomous vessels with the right balance of suitability, survivability, and availability. Informed by lessons from recent operations like Gaza, it prioritizes resilience and adaptability in and throughout contested environments. The strategy is based upon and synchronized with the overall Army Transformation Initiative (ATI) to ensure mission-ready AWC capabilities meet multi-domain operational and combatant commander worldwide requirements. Developing and resourcing a policy of fixing as far forward as possible will become increasingly important and will effectively change maintenance policy over time as modernization takes place.

Mr. SCOTT. Has the intelligence and data provided by Ukraine on Russian technology, captured equipment, battlefield operational guides, weapon performance, and countermeasures against U.S. and Allied systems saved U.S. taxpayer dollars? Will it have saved the lives of U.S. service personnel in a war against an enemy peer nation?

General GEORGE. The intelligence and data provided by Ukraine has been instrumental in informing cost-benefit analysis for the investment and development of U.S. and allied systems.

Based on the performance data of our current precision guided munitions in Ukraine, we have learned how they perform in a contested electromagnetic spectrum. This has not only informed the development process of our future long-range precision weapons, but we are also exploring the testing of commercially available alternatives to conduct long-range fire missions. These include one-way attack drones and loitering munitions. A contested electromagnetic spectrum is likely to be a fixture in any future conflict with a peer nation. Long-range precision weapons and testing scalable commercial options that can function in these environments saves U.S. taxpayer dollars from being wasted in equipment and munitions that would be ineffective in future conflicts.

The Army is also integrating lessons learned on small unmanned aerial systems (sUAS) from not only Ukraine, but also Yemen, and ensuring lessons learned are incorporated into the development of our doctrine, training, and materiel solutions to counter these threats. This will undoubtedly save lives of U.S. Service personnel in future wars as sUAS become fixtures on the battlefield.

Mr. SCOTT. The U.S. Army has been actively supporting the demonstration and evaluation of the Scorpion Mobile Mortar System. As the world's fastest, fully digital, auto-aiming mobile mortar system, capable of shoot off concrete and other hard surfaces, it represents a significant advancement in multi-domain battle capability. Offering both 81mm and 120mm mortar calibers and featuring the ability to fire eight rounds in under two minutes - from stop to depart. This stands in stark contrast to today's traditional medium and heavy mortar weapon systems, which take an average of seven minutes to emplace and fire their first round. Given the operational advantages of the Mobile Mortar System, could you provide an update on the status, as well as the associated funding plans and fielding requirements for the Mobile Mortar System?

General GEORGE. The Army is currently modernizing infantry battalion mortars. The Infantry Battalion Mortar System (IBMS) Program of Record which began in FY25, will include a new cannon, new High Explosive (HE) ammunition, a new mortar mobility system, as well as an improved Mortar Fire Control System (MFCS). Joint Program Executive Officer for Armaments and Ammunition and the DEVCOM Armaments Center are evaluating two separate mortar mobility systems: SLING developed by Elbit Systems in Israel and Scorpion developed by New Technologies Global Systems (NTGS) in Spain. The selection will be a competitive process in FY26 and will be done through a DoD Ordnance Technology Consortium (DOTC) Other Transaction Agreement (OTA). Once selected, the IBMS mobility system will undergo integration and qualification in FY26-27. In FY26, the Army requested $28.297 million in Research, Development, Test and Evaluation funding for the program and fielding requirements have not yet been finalized.

Mr. SCOTT. The U.S. Army is supporting the continued development and integration of the Advanced Combat Engine (ACE) - an innovative Opposed Piston (OP) technology that utilizes a two-stroke diesel combustion system with pistons operating in opposing reciprocating motion. This engine architecture provides significant improvements in power density and thermal signature reduction. The Army's modernization priorities emphasize enhancing vehicle mobility, lethality, and survivability - three attributes that are often in contention due to the inherent trade-offs between protection, firepower, and weight. ACE's unique capabilities offer a pathway to mitigate these trade-offs by enabling increased vehicle performance without proportionally increasing weight or logistical burden. In addition to its technical merits, ACE supports broader national priorities by strengthening the U.S. defense industrial base, contributing to supply chain resilience, and advancing the development of next-generation combat platforms in alignment with Army 2030 objectives. Despite this alignment, there appears to be insufficient funding of the ACE program to ensure its integration. While the Army has consistently stated its commitment to investing in innovative and efficient technologies, what specific steps is the Army taking to accelerate the transition of mature technologies such as ACE into fielded systems? Given that ACE is on track to be validated and production ready by FY27, what level of planning, resourcing, and integration support does the Army intend to provide to ensure a successful transition to production? What vehicle platforms are considered as candidates to leverage ACE's operational advantages? How does the Army assess the potential impact of ACE in enhancing operational readiness, reducing logistical burdens, and enabling future force design?

General GEORGE. The Army is committed to exploring and rapidly fielding innovative technologies that can bring additional capability to the battlefield by utilizing commercial off the shelf technology to its fullest extent, a modular open systems architecture approach and competition to develop and procure the best in breed for our Soldiers. The Army is exploring capabilities such as the Advanced Combat Engine (ACE), for their potential to bring additional capabilities to our current ground combat vehicle fleet. The Army is still evaluating the ACE effort, and capabilities similar to it, and has not made any decisions on the specific platforms regarding upgraded engines. Engine enhancements for our ground combat vehicles could enhance power, reduced thermal signature, and improved fuel efficiency represents the kind of advancements that should provide our Soldiers with a decisive edge on the future battlefield.

Mr. SCOTT. The multinational support for Ukraine has underscored the importance of coalition operations. How is the U.S. Army leveraging these lessons to strengthen interoperability with NATO and other partners?

General GEORGE. The U.S. Army is actively adapting to lessons learned from conflict zones in Europe and the Middle East. Knowledge gained from the battlefield in Ukraine directly informed the Army Transformation Initiative and is driving the U.S. Army's force modernization efforts, including training, doctrine development, sustainment, and improvements in command-and-control systems. We incorporate scenarios based on the conflict in Ukraine into our training exercises, such as Project Convergence Capstone 6, where we regularly simulate threats from electronic warfare and drones. We regularly participate in multinational exercises like the DEFENDER EUROPE series. During these training events, we test and improve interoperability practices between the U.S. Army and NATO Allies. The focus is on integrating new technologies, such as unmanned aerial systems (UAS), counter-UAS systems, and various other sensors. The U.S. Army, working with NATO Allies, is developing common and secure standards across our communication and command-and-control systems, such as Joint All-Domain Command and Control (JADC2). This allows us to share information and coordinate activities across all domains with our allies. Alliance interoperability is routinely tested during WARFIGHTER exercises and partners' national-level exercises.

Mr. SCOTT. The Russo-Ukraine War has featured intense urban combat, such as in Mariupol and Bakhmut. What insights is the U.S. Army drawing to improve its training and tactics for urban operations?

General GEORGE. The experience of soldiers in the Russia/Ukraine conflict has demonstrated the significant impact of Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) on the modern battlefield and highlighted the importance and difficulty of securing urban centers. The Army is currently re-evaluating its doctrine, tactics, and training to prioritize a deliberate approach to urban operations with precision engagement to minimize collateral damage. This may necessitate enhanced training for soldiers in specialized skills, including building clearing and close-quarters combined arms tactics in realistic environments, including multi-level buildings and rubble-strewn landscapes. The Army continues to leverage technology-based capabilities like communications jamming, locating targets using geolocation, UAS, and counter-UAS to enhance lethality and survivability during urban operations.

Mr. SCOTT. Ukraine's success with decentralized decision-making has enabled rapid battlefield adaptability. How is the U.S. Army incorporating this approach into its training and command structures?

General GEORGE. U.S. Army command and control doctrine and leadership development specifically focuses on enabling decentralized decision-making within a commander's intent, with an emphasis on developing subordinates who we expect to demonstrate initiative. Our observations and interactions with the Ukrainian Armed Forces indicate that both our doctrine and our leader development are properly focused on those human elements of command and control essential to flexibility and adaptability to the circumstances of combat.

Given that mission command is the Army's approach to command and control that empowers subordinate decision making and decentralized execution appropriate to the situation, it is an integral part of how we train and informs our command structures, defined as the way we organize for training and combat, as well as how we organize during training and execution of combat operations.

When it comes to our command-and-control system, the U.S. Army's Next Generation Command and Control (NEXTGEN C2) initiative is building on the last two years' work to maximize the interoperability of our current command and control system. The Ukrainian use of off-the-shelf systems and applications-based approaches is reflected in the approach the Army is using to modernize its current C2 system, which will ensure common data can be passed between and among echelons and across different systems, to include those of our allies and partners as well as the entire U.S. Joint Force. We have likewise made adjustments to the size of our tactical headquarters and how they are organized based on lessons from the war in Ukraine and now routinely train using small command posts with dispersed nodes to increase their survivability.

Mr. SCOTT. Ukraine's ability to sustain operations despite intense Russian attacks on supply lines has been notable. What logistical lessons is the U.S. Army applying to enhance its own supply chain resilience in contested environments?

General GEORGE. The Army is applying numerous logistics lessons-learned from Ukraine to enhance supply chain resilience in global contested environments. Conducting sustainment operations in a sensor-rich environment is unavoidable; our enemies observe our movement in real-time and will target our assets in near real-time. Demand reduction, agile placement of pre-positioned stocks, forward maintenance activities, and logistics network resiliency will mitigate our enemies' efforts to degrade our supply chain and the Army's ability to conduct sustainment from the homeland. Advances in Artificial Intelligence, Large Language Models, and Machine Learning are helping the Army delivers predictive and streamlined data requirements to reduce bandwidth requirement in denied, disrupted, intermittent, or limited network environments. We are incorporating emerging technologies like advanced manufacturing to execute production of key commodities at point of need to reduce demand on the distribution network and minimize sustainment footprints, providing commanders the ability to adjust sustainment plans as the operational environment changes in real-time.

Mr. SCOTT. The war has highlighted the critical role of artillery and long-range precision fires. What changes is the U.S. Army making to its artillery strategies and investments based on Ukraine's experiences?

General GEORGE. The war in Ukraine highlights two critical areas our future strategies and investments must address: range and reliability in an Electronic Warfare (EW) environment.

In terms of range, the Army is now procuring the Extended Range Guided Multiple Launch Rocket System (GMLRS) that offers twice the range of standard GMLRS (150KM v/s 70km). The Precision Strike Missile (PrSM) increases our long-range missile range from 300KM with the Army Tactical Missile System (ATACMS)

to 500KM in PrSM Increment 1. The Army also invested in refreshing the composition of our main 155mm artillery propellant, the Modular Artillery Charge System, as a pathway to increasing range in cannon artillery. Finally, new propellant will pair with Extended Range Artillery Munitions to extend cannon ranges beyond 100KM, with expected delivery in FY32.

In regard to reliability in an EW environment, the Army observed the EW impacts to Excalibur and GMLRS over the course of the conflict. Assured Precision Navigation and Timing (APNT) capabilities such as M-Code and anti-jam guidance sets are a cornerstone of our long-range fires strategy. PrSM will incorporate M-code by FY29. GMLRS will include M-Code by FY27, and the Army plans to begin development of anti-jam for GMLRS in FY27. By the end of FY25, the Army's Precision Guidance Kit fuse for 155mm cannon munition will contain anti-jam technology and M-code guidance. Our strategy expands EW compliance across the spectrum of our sensors, cannons/launchers, and munitions.

Mr. SCOTT. Ukraine's innovative use of drones for reconnaissance, targeting, and strike missions has been pivotal. How is the U.S. Army integrating these lessons into its own unmanned systems development and battlefield tactics?

General GEORGE. Ukraine has demonstrated the changing character of warfare, defined by near-constant sensing and targeting, dispersed operations over large areas, and the exponential growth of unmanned systems utilization. In response, through the Army Transformation Initiative (ATI), the Army is significantly increasing its investment in drone technology and plans to field unmanned systems across all formations and echelons. Simultaneously, the Army is leveraging its Transformation in Contact (TiC) initiative to enable rapid, iterative experimentation with commercial-off-the-shelf unmanned systems allowing Soldiers to begin training and developing new tactics, techniques, and procedures for drone employment further informing future requirements. The Army is also exploring options to implement a small, yet effective, UAS lethality training course and reduce minimum requirements for UAS operator training and qualification.

Mr. SCOTT. Is Putin going to stop in Ukraine?

General GEORGE. Russia remains a serious military threat to U.S. and European security, and thus credible deterrence remains a strategic imperative. The U.S. has been actively engaged in efforts to secure a peaceful settlement to the war.

Mr. SCOTT. The U.S. has $3.85 billion remaining in authorized Presidential Drawdown Authority (PDA) to transfer stockpiled munitions to Ukraine? What specific types and quantities of artillery ammunition in Army storage, could be rapidly transferred to Ukraine? How is the Army assessing which munitions are surplus without compromising U.S. war plans?

General GEORGE. The Army assesses munitions for potential transfer by comparing current inventory against the Total Munitions Requirement (TMR), which is based on Operation Plans, training requirements, and contingency stocks. Munitions exceeding the TMR, particularly those nearing the end of their service life or easily replenished by the Defense Industrial Base, are considered potential surplus. Before any transfer, a risk assessment is conducted to ensure it doesn't compromise U.S. war plans, and DoD approval is required. If risks are identified, mitigation strategies, such as accelerated production, are implemented.

Larger deliveries of 155mm High Explosive rounds and Modular Artillery Charge Systems (MACS) are projected for FY26. These are expected to accelerate the replenishment of U.S. inventories. The Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness and the Army recommend postponing further evaluation of Presidential Drawdowns until artillery projectiles and related components (propellant charges, fuses, and primers) have been delivered to DoD inventory. Upon delivery a re-evaluation may be conducted.

Mr. SCOTT. The U.S. Army has significant equipment in long-term storage, such as 3,700 M1 Abrams tanks and 13,000 M113 armored personnel carriers. How many M1 Abrams tanks and M113 armored personnel carriers could be refurbished and sent to Ukraine, and what logistical or maintenance challenges would the Army face in doing so?

General GEORGE. Abrams. The Army has approximately 1,500 Abrams M1A1 assets with claimants or assessed beyond repair. The Army did not execute a traditional Depot based repair program for the 33ea Abrams for Ukraine, the work was executed at Ft. Hood through a joint Program Management Office Abrams and General Dynamic Land Systems effort using Ukraine Security Assistance Initiative funding. Anniston Army Depot could execute Abrams repair as a surge program, with the requisite prioritization against other Abrams Production schedules.

Funding: All requirements are unfunded without identified potential funding sources o Repair: 15K for Transport & 2.3M for Repair per Abrams. The Army requires Second Destination Transportation funding to move equipment from Sierra

to the repair site. o Delivery: 10K for Transport per Abrams - The Army requires Second Destination Transportation funding to move equipment from the production site to Port of Embarkation. o Training: 5.5M for a Battalion Set (31 Abrams). Abrams deliveries require training; previously executed in Western Europe.

Supply Chain: A surge of repair of M1A1 Abrams for Ukraine adds additional risk to U.S. Army readiness by creating additional unplanned demand for common repair parts of the Abrams platform. The U.S. Army and Ukraine versions share approximately 2/3 of their parts (commonality), and the unplanned demands may not be readily supportable by industry partners.

Exported Abrams require modification from the U.S. Army configuration to an exportable Configuration. This includes but is not limited to armor configurations, changes to the targeting and sighting hardware, and removal of U.S. Army radios and communication equipment and replacement with commercial equipment. Armor re-configuration and targeting and sighting hardware will drive delivery timeline-18-24 months from funding to delivery.

Other Limitations: There are a small number of hardware items the Army redesigned after the initial delivery to Ukraine in support of foreign customers due to obsolescence and no further requirement for the US Army. These add unique logistics requirements and associated funding to sustain long term.

Previous Abrams deliveries were supported with a repair parts package as part of the delivery; estimated at up to 72M per 31 tanks. Additional analysis and timely planning may reduce this cost.

M1A2 SEPv2s have not been provided to Ukraine. Introducing mixed variants/configurations increases logistics complexities and risk for the partner nation, above the previously provided configuration.

M113. The Army has over 900 M113 assets in inventory, and the Army is actively executing M113 repair work at Anniston Army Depot for Ukraine. Workload is 9 per month with a surge quantity at 12 per month based on recent Ukraine programs.

Funding: All additional requirements are unfunded without identified potential funding sources

Repair: Per M113 - 10K for Transport & 675K or 275K for Repair - representing a higher standard of repair for the larger cost. The Army would require Second Destination Transportation funding to move equipment from Sierra to the repair site.

Delivery: Per M113 - 2K for Transport. The Army requires Second Destination Transportation funding to move equipment from the production site to the Port of Embarkation.

Training: There is no training requirement for the M113, the Armed Forces of Ukraine can train in country without U.S. Army oversight.

Supply Chain: The Army previously fenced 240ea M113 Family of Vehicle assets at Sierra to support domestic demands for repair parts. Using assets in this pool, as well as adding additional demand to surge of repair of M113s for Ukraine adds additional risk to US Army readiness by creating additional unplanned demand.

Other Limitations: The Army leverages several M1064 (the mortar carrier variant) parts to support the AMPV production line. Using assets in this pool could present a risk to AMPV production.

Mr. SCOTT. How is the Army prioritizing investments in combat trauma care capabilities to address evolving threats, such as large-scale combat operations or near-peer adversaries? Are there plans to increase funding or personnel allocations for advanced trauma training programs, such as Tactical Combat Casualty Care (TCCC), to ensure all soldiers are proficient?

General GEORGE. Medical Center of Excellence is prioritizing combat trauma care modernization to keep pace with large-scale combat operations and near-peer threats. Army Medicine is leading the way by revamping trauma training across all domains, starting in institutional courses and continuing with real-world sustainment and self-development. A major focus is ensuring that all medics are proficient in Tactical Combat Casualty Care, which has become a standard baseline in programs like the 16-week Combat Medic Specialist Training Program, integrating Tier 3 Tactical Combat Casualty Care curriculum and other operationally relevant medical skills.

Army Medicine trains over 13,000 personnel annually, constantly updating curriculum based on Joint Trauma System guidelines, real-world conflict lessons (like those from Ukraine), and new medical capabilities. Advanced training efforts include the Enhanced Combat Medic proof of concept, a 22-week program focused on advanced pre-hospital care and field scenarios. Specialized courses, like the Tactical Combat Medicine Course and Brigade Combat Team-Trauma Training, ensure physicians, Non-Commissioned Officers, and brigade-level medics are prepared for the demands of Large-Scale Combat Operations.

Although there's no approved plan for more funding or added personnel at this time, Army Medicine continues to adapt and stretch its resources. Courses like the Army Trauma Training Course, Field Hospital Trauma Management Course, and Combat Paramedic Course (aligned to Tactical Combat Casualty Care Tier 4) ensure medics and surgical teams receive hands-on trauma training. The goal remains clear: build a highly capable, trauma-ready force that can save lives on any battlefield.

Mr. SCOTT. What steps are being taken to integrate emerging technologies, such as portable ultrasound, telemedicine, or AI-assisted diagnostics, into forward-deployed medical units? How is the Army evaluating the adoption of next-generation medical devices, like advanced hemostatic agents or lightweight resuscitation systems, for use in austere environments?

General GEORGE. The Army works closely with the Defense Health Agency (DHA), DARPA, and commercial partners to identify, experiment with, and field technologies which mitigate medical gaps in forward deployed units.

The Portable Ultrasound Device will be integrated into standard Army Medical Equipment Sets for Role 1 and Role 2 units, along with Special Operations Forces units. Some devices already exist in units as non-program-of-record equipment, but the broader requirements and acquisition process, for Commercial-Off-The-Shelf, FDA-approved, medical capabilities, requiring revisions to more quickly respond to the needs of the operational force.

The Army continues to scale its Telemedicine platforms, enabling real-time remote consultation between forward-deployed providers and medical specialists in rear echelons. Telemedicine works well when appropriate bandwidth exists, but the technology still struggles in low-bandwidth and austere environments. The Army continues to conduct iterative experimentation with telemedicine and piloting secure, low-bandwidth telemedicine platforms tailored for denied, degraded, intermittent, or limited environments.

AI-assisted diagnostics continue to be evaluated for prehospital triage, vital sign monitoring via wearable sensors, and integration with electronic health records. AI-assisted technologies are progressing rapidly, but additional experimentation is essential to ensure reliability under combat conditions.

Regarding the adoption of next-generation medical devices, the Army evaluates clinical effectiveness, operational reliability, logistical feasibility, user feedback, and sustainability. The Medical Capabilities Development Integration Directorate and the Medical Test and Evaluation Activity conduct experimentation and operational trials, respectively, in realistic training scenarios and field exercises to ensure next-generation medical devices are not just innovative but truly deployable in austere, front-line conditions. The Army remains integral in the development of FDA-approved, advanced hemostatic agents such as the Freeze-Dried Plasma and Cryo-Preserved Platelet programs. These programs, recently transferred to the DHA as part of the DoD Medical Reformation, are focused on providing resuscitative fluids farther forward in austere environments.

Mr. SCOTT. Are there initiatives to expand simulation-based training for combat medics to better prepare them for high-stress, resource-constrained scenarios? How is the Army addressing gaps in trauma care proficiency among non-medical personnel, such as ensuring all soldiers can perform life-saving interventions under fire?

General GEORGE. Yes. The current Joint Capabilities Integration and Development System (JCIDS) Capability Development Document (CDD) for Medical Simulation Training Center-Next Generation (MSTC-NG) has initiatives for Tactical Combat Casualty Care (TCCC) Tier I through IV to enhance training at the unit level for all Service Members - Tier I, Combat Life Saver (CLS) - Tier II, and Combat Medic - Tier III with facilitating Simulations at the Training Support Centers (TSC) and MSTC for use by commanders. Development of requirements has been completed, and the MSTC-NG CDD is ready for staffing at Army Futures Command (AFC), pending Commanding General of Medical Center of Excellence (MEDCOE) approval, and introduction to the Army Requirements Oversight Council (AROC).

The MSTC-NG CDD has a full suite of simulation initiatives to increase realism in medical training in the facility and during medical training for all levels of TCCC. These include a Learning Management System that provides Measures of Proficiency and Measures of Effectiveness (MOPS and MOEs) for a lifelong learning record; modular Simulation Systems that reduce maintenance and service costs through a cooperative program of record, and Combat Effects kits that allow a hyper-realistic moulage of casualties in all environments of training. The program also includes training and instruction for medical leaders on how to effectively use the MSTC-NG for optimal use in training Casualty Response in Combat.

MEDCOE is modernizing casualty evacuation (CASEVAC) operations through numerous efforts across DOTMLPF-P. Specifically materiel modernization includes the Individual First Aid Kit (IFAK), Vehicle Aid and Litter Kit (VALK) and the Combat Lifesaver Bag (CLS). The MEDCOE conducted a week-long set review and working group with stakeholders across the force to include FORSCOM and PEO Soldier that identified several upgrades to significantly improve capabilities. Once the new configuration is approved, the new kits are planned to be available for units to procure NLT 3QFY26. CASEVAC doctrine is being updated with the new Field Manual (FM) 3-08 due to be published 1QFY26. MEDCOE is leaning forward in developing common core programs of instruction for CASEVAC for all Army Centers of Excellence in anticipation of FM 3-08 being published. The Directorate of Training and Doctrine, in conjunction with the Directorate of Simulation, is working on improving the current CLS and First Responder training across the Army.

Mr. SCOTT. What measures are in place to reduce the time from point of injury to definitive care, particularly in contested environments with limited air superiority? Are there plans to enhance the capabilities of forward surgical teams or mobile medical units to handle mass casualty events in prolonged field care scenarios?

General GEORGE. Several key measures are currently in place to reduce the time from point of injury to definitive care, especially in contested environments where air evacuation may be delayed or denied. Forward Resuscitative Surgical Detachments are typically positioned close to combat units and are capable of stabilizing and performing lifesaving surgery. Pre-positioned medical logistics such as blood products, surgical kits, and resuscitation gear can also help with immediate transfusion, hemorrhage control, and resuscitation.

There are active and ongoing plans to enhance forward surgical teams to better manage mass casualty events and prolonged field care scenarios. The Army continues to examine how the changing character of war impacts the ability to provide timely definitive surgical care to injured and wounded Soldiers. In response, the Army initiated measures to improve mobility, agility, and capacity. Such measures include integration of the Prolonged Care Augmentation Detachment with Equipment Sets to manage casualties for up 72 hours (longer if required); more mobile shelter systems; smaller and lighter medical equipment; medical systems that reduce logistical demands while increasing capacity; information systems like Battlefield Assisted Trauma Distributed Observation Kit (BATDOK) that document and coordinate medical care sooner and farther forward on the battlefield; and the Tactical Medical Overlay to increase transparency and inform operational and clinical decision making. Likewise, additional programs under development such as a multimodal MEDEVAC shelter system that will double current medical ground transport capacity; a multimodal-multipurpose shelter system that will enable mobile and scalable surgical care and post operative care; a chemical sterilization system that will expand forward surgical capacity; and an additive manufacturing capability for essential and emergency oral/maxillofacial repair will further enhance capabilities to handle mass casualties.

Mr. SCOTT. How is the Army collaborating with other branches and allied forces to standardize combat trauma care protocols and ensure seamless medical interoperability during joint operations? Are there ongoing efforts to align Army trauma care standards with NATO or other international frameworks to improve coalition medical responses?

General GEORGE. International militaries use both the Joint Trauma System (JTS) Clinical Practice Guidelines (CPGs) and the Tactical Combat Casualty Care (TCCC) Guidelines. The Army uses the JTS and TCCC as standard guides for trauma care on the battlefield. Further, we participate in joint training exercises and working groups with other services to ensure medical standardization, including similar training and sharing best practices. Further, the Army is working with NATO to potentially adopt the U.S. Joint Trauma Registry, which would allow allied countries to share trauma data and access best practice guidelines. We have gained a medical center certification in Europe and are aligning trauma and burn care in the Middle East to meet the needs of U.S. and NATO forces.

Mr. SCOTT. What support systems are being implemented to address the psychological toll on combat medics and trauma care providers exposed to high-intensity operations? Are there programs to enhance resilience training for medical personnel to maintain performance during extended deployments?

General GEORGE. Army Medicine recognizes the need to train medical forces to be psychologically prepared for the stress of future conflicts. Yes, the Army provides programs to enhance resilience training for medical personnel. The Combat and Operational Stress Control is available across the spectrum of operations by embedding Behavioral Health personnel and chaplains with operational forces. These personnel support all deployed Soldiers, including medical personnel. Additionally,

medical personnel attached to brigades that have Holistic Health and Fitness (H2F) Performance Teams receive performance, resilience, and readiness support from their H2F Performance Team.

Mr. SCOTT. How is the Army leveraging data analytics to track and improve combat trauma care outcomes, such as survival rates or complications from delayed evacuations? Are there established metrics to evaluate the effectiveness of current trauma care protocols, and how are these informing future policy decisions?

General GEORGE. The Joint Trauma System currently collects patient quality data for analysis and uses findings to inform policy as well as clinical practice guidelines. These guidelines inform Army training, material, and capability developments. Army capability developers have also been working with the Joint Trauma System and the Joint Operational Medical Information Systems program to identify key data points which may be used to inform these analytics from a future operational health record. The Army is also developing a tactical operational health record (PHOENIX MED) and a capability needs statement for a tactical medical overlay (TACMEDO) in conjunction with Army Futures Command and PEO Enterprise. These capabilities have requirements to capture data from clinical encounters as well as medical battle tracking (C2 and MEDLOG) which will provide near real time medical surveillance and performance improvement guidance to clinicians and medical leaders as well as aggregate data to inform trauma and disease non battle injury (DNBI) protocols and policy decisions.

Mr. SCOTT. What is the Army's strategy for partnering with civilian medical institutions or industry to accelerate research into combat-specific trauma care innovations? Are there prioritized R&D efforts focused on addressing specific challenges, such as traumatic brain injury (TBI) or hemorrhage control in austere settings?

General GEORGE. The Army's Medical Research and Development Command (MRDC), through its Combat Casualty Care Research Program (CCCRP), and the Defense Health Agency (DHA), actively partner with civilian medical institutions and industry to accelerate research into combat-specific trauma care innovations. This collaboration uses expertise from both military and civilian sources to reduce deaths and injuries on the battlefield.

Current prioritized R&D efforts focused on addressing specific challenges:

Traumatic Brain Injury (TBI): Divided into the study of penetrating brain injuries and the effects of blasts on the brain. Partnering with industry and academia on adaptive platform clinical trial to test drugs to treat TBI, far forward brain hemorrhage detection, mobile applications to assess mild TBI and return to duty - Hemorrhage Control: Researchers are working to prevent deaths from bleeding by addressing problems like low body temperature and blood clotting. The Army leverages DHA medical acquisition and sustainment to develop a solution that can be used in austere environments that will temporarily stop non-compressible hemorrhage in the abdomen until definitive care can repair the traumatic injury. -Other Focus Area: Resuscitation, trauma and regenerative medicine, battlefield analgesia, medical monitoring, critical care equipment, clinical trials, head and face injuries, innovative blood products and blood components, drugs to control hemorrhage and shock, brain protection to prevent TBI, and blast-related brain injuries.

Mr. SCOTT. How is the Army ensuring a reliable supply chain for critical trauma care resources, such as blood products or medical equipment, in contested or remote operational theaters? Are there contingency plans to address potential disruptions in medical logistics during large-scale conflicts?

General GEORGE. To ensure a reliable supply chain for critical trauma care resources in contested or remote operational theaters, the Army is implementing several strategic initiatives aligned with Army Campaign Plan 23-30 Objective 11.B.4 and HQDA EXORD 318-22 under the umbrella of Medical Logistics in Campaigning (MiC).

Launched in 2022 under the direction of Army Materiel Command, MiC is a multi-year, holistic effort to fully integrate medical logistics into the Army Sustainment Enterprise. It aims to distinguish and support operational medical logistics capabilities across all components (COMPOs). Implementation began with select units in FY24, with full operational capability targeted by FY27.

Key efforts under MiC include:

Integration of medical materiel into Army ERP systems, enabling a unified operating picture and centralized management of the medical commodity. Development of a national curated catalog for medical materiel to streamline and standardize ordering processes. Embedding medical materiel within multi-class supply support activities, enabling ″train as we fight″ readiness and logistical alignment. Establishing regionally aligned field-level maintenance capabilities in accordance with AR 750-1, ensuring forward maintenance and sustainment.

In addition to MiC, the Army is leveraging data analytics and predictive logistics through the Army Medical Logistics Command's Integrated Logistics Support Center, which serves as the Life Cycle Management Center for medical materiel. These tools enable:

Predictive maintenance and improved equipment readiness. Demand forecasting for optimized resource allocation. Enhanced supply chain resilience through early identification of potential disruptions. Real-time, data-driven decision-making across the logistics enterprise.

The Army Medical Logistics Command is also collaborating with the Joint Chiefs of Staff as part of a Joint DOTmLPF-P Change Recommendation, focused on addressing identified gaps in operational medical logistics. This effort seeks to improve planning, coordination, synchronization, and execution across joint and coalition forces.

Mr. SCOTT. Is the Army revising its medical doctrine to reflect lessons learned from recent conflicts or exercises regarding combat trauma care? What policy changes are being considered to empower medics with greater autonomy in administering advanced interventions in the field?

General GEORGE. Yes, the Army is updating its medical doctrine to keep up with the fast-changing battlefield and lessons learned from recent conflicts. These changes help ensure medics can provide effective care in complex, large-scale operations and across multiple domains. The goal is to stay ahead of emerging threats and provide better support to Soldiers in combat. A big part of the update is expanding what medics are trained and allowed to do in combat, like performing more advanced procedures and using whole blood. The Army has also introduced a new pilot course called ″Advanced Emergency Medical Technician″ to improve the readiness and skills of 68W Combat Medics. These changes reflect a broader shift in how medical teams are used in combat. Tactics and procedures are being refined based on real-world feedback to ensure medics are prepared for today's missions and tomorrow's challenges.

The Army is updating its medical policy to give medics more authority to perform advanced procedures in combat, especially in challenging or remote environments. These changes reflect the need for more flexible, capable care during dispersed operations and potential Multi-Domain and Large-Scale Combat Operations. The Office of the Surgeon General is working to clearly define what combat lifesavers, medics, and paramedics can do based on their training and certification. Updates include expanded use of procedures like needle chest decompression, surgical airways, and whole-blood transfusions, along with more authority to use key medications for bleeding control. Training is also evolving to support these updates, with a focus on advanced care skills like Resuscitative Endovascular Balloon Occlusion of the Aorta, and critical care transport. The goal is to improve survival during medical evacuation and make medics more consistent, capable, and independent across Army and joint missions.

Mr. SCOTT. From your discussions with your Estonian, Latvian, and Lithuanian counterparts, what are the most pressing security concerns they face, and how is the U.S. Army adapting its support to address these threats?

General GEORGE. The Baltic nations view Russia as a significant, persistent, urgent, and existential threat given Russia's invasion of Ukraine and military buildup on the eastern flank. In their view, a frozen conflict in Ukraine or ceasefire that includes major concessions to Russia would embolden Moscow to reconstitute on NATO's northeastern flank with much greater capability than existed pre-war. Al three countries are model NATO Allies that invest heavily in defense through modernizing their armed forces, developing joint initiatives such as the Baltic Defense Line, and through Alliance integration. NATO's enhanced Forward Presence in the Baltics includes multinational, combat-ready battlegroups in each country - the Baltics view that presence as essential to deterrence. Additionally, the U.S. Army deploys rotational forces to all three countries, participating in multinational exercises and training to improve interoperability and develop critical capability and capacity in our partner forces. Each country purchased sophisticated, interoperable U.S. military systems, and we are working with them to rapidly develop capability in critical areas such as mobile artillery and air defense.

Mr. SCOTT. How do you ensure alignment between U.S. Army priorities and the defense strategies of Baltic nations (Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania) in addressing regional security challenges?

General GEORGE. The priorities conveyed by the Baltic Land Force Commanders are fully aligned with the U.S. Army priorities of warfighting, continuous transformation, strengthening the profession, and delivering ready combat formations. They intuitively understand the threat on their eastern border and, like us, are studying lessons learned in Ukraine and are vigorously implementing those lessons

into their own force design and Army modernization efforts. At the operational level, United States Army Europe and Africa Command cooperates closely with the Baltic armies, conducting combined planning, exercising, and training, and through regular senior leader dialogue. The U.S. Army recently participated in Estonia's national large-scale exercise HEDGEHOG, which tested the deployment and integration of approximately 15,000 Estonian and NATO Allied troops from ten countries. These events provide an unmatched opportunity to improve alliance interoperability, but also develop partner capability and capacity in critical areas that enhance deterrence in the Baltic region. NATO also integrates the Baltic nations through the Regional Plan Center. This new generation of regional defense plans improves the coherence of NATO's collective defense planning with Allies' national planning of their forces, posture, capabilities, and command and control.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. MOULTON

Mr. MOULTON. Secretary Driscoll, according to the RDT&E Programs Exhibit (R-1) given to committee last week by the Department, the Army will not request funding in FY2026 for the Improved Turbine Engine Program (ITEP). The administration is also not planning to spend any of the funds in the reconciliation package on ITEP. The House-passed reconciliation package includes $63,000,000 for ″the development of advanced rotary-wing engines,″ the same as the FY25 PB request for ITEP. The assumption among Members of Congress and staff is that this money was for ITEP. In the original development of the reconciliation package, conducted in conjunction with OMB, was this money originally intended for ITEP? If the Department no longer intends to spend this money on ITEP, and reconciliation passes, on which programs will these funds be spent? It is my understanding that costs to terminate the ITEP contract may run over $500m, far more than the cost to complete the Engineering and Manufacturing Design phase of the ITEP program. What is the Army's estimate of termination costs to terminate the ITEP program? What is the Army's best estimate of total cost to complete EMD for the ITEP engine? Where will the funds for termination costs come from, if the Department makes the decision to terminate? Does a validated COCOM requirement continue to exist that cannot be met by the current Blackhawk and Apache engines? What is the additional lifetime cost above current estimates to maintain the Blackhawk and Apache fleets if their engines are not upgraded?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army will prioritize any allocated funding to address critical capability gaps aligned with Interim National Defense Strategic Guidance based on our ongoing assessments. The Army plans to fully obligate and expend FY25 enacted ITEP funding to support ongoing development and testing efforts under the Engineering, Manufacturing and Development (EMD) contract, including further integration testing on the Black Hawk. If ITEP is terminated, vendors will provide a proposal for termination costs and would fund through future allocations.

The Army's cost estimate to complete the EMD of the ITEP engine is approximately $700M.700 million

While the ITEP engine offers potential performance enhancements, the Army's combatant command requirements are currently met through alternative aircraft employment strategies utilizing the T701 engine. The total lifetime cost saving of the Blackhawk and Apache fleets without the ITEP engine is unknown as the Army is re-evaluating its current force structure and requirements associated with aircraft.

Mr. MOULTON. The Guard and Reserves make up nearly 53 percent of the Army's total force. As the Army moves forward with modernization priorities like multi-domain operations, long-range fires, and integrated air and missile defense, how is the Army National Guard being resourced and integrated into these efforts to ensure it remains an interoperable and capable part of the Total Army? Are there specific modernization gaps or delays affecting the Guard that Congress should be aware of?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army National Guard (ARNG) continues to integrate into the Total Army through deliberate modernization aligned with Army priorities. ARNG is actively participating in the Army's Total Army Analysis (TAA) process for force structure capabilities. The recent Army Structure Memorandum (ARSTRUC) publication directed the ARNG to convert from its existing tactical Air Defense Avenger Battalions to the Division Air Defense (DivAD) Battalion. The ARSTRUC also stated that all 12x ARNG High Mobility Artillery Rocket System (HIMARS) would convert from the existing two Batteries with eight launchers to the three Batteries with six launchers configuration. Both efforts support long range fires and integrated air and missile defense initiatives.

Regarding modernization gaps, the HIMARS conversion is an interim solution until the full material is available for the units to convert to the three Batteries with nine launchers design. ARNG will continue to work with HQDA on the availability of the launchers from procurement and the additional Command and Control (C2) and supporting equipment.

The ARNG Division Air Defense Battalion will be resourced without the Integrated Fire Protection Capability (IFPC) Battery. ARNG will continue to work with HQDA on the resourcing of IFPC capabilities for DivAD formations.

Reductions to Blackhawk procurement will present challenges to the ARNG's modernization of the Blackhawk fleet which is arguably the most versatile of all rotary wing aviation platforms and a critical tool used in the war fight and for domestic operations. The legacy fleet of 391 UH-60L Blackhawk aircraft is approaching the end of its useful life and is not affordable without inordinate maintenance investments. Of these, 64 have a planned modernization way ahead but the ARNG will have a remaining 327 legacy platforms requiring sustainment past the end of useful economic life without additional investment in Blackhawk modernization.

The ARNG continues to integrate into the Total Army through deliberate modernization aligned with Army priorities. ARNG is actively fielding new capabilities such as Long-Range Precision Fires, Integrated Air and Missile Defense, and Next Generation Combat Vehicles through the ATI. While resourcing remains a challenge, particularly with deferred equipment recapitalization and depot maintenance funding, the Guard remains interoperable through Total Army integration strategies, prioritized force structure realignment, and targeted investment in dual-use capabilities. Congress can assist by ensuring timely, consistent funding that supports Guard modernization on par with active components to eliminate capability gaps.

The ARNG comprises approximately 335,500 Soldiers, representing 39% of the Army's operational force and 53% of its total force when including the Army Reserve. As part of the Army's modernization strategy:

$2.1B1 billion has been invested across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) for Guard equipment modernization.

ARNG is transitioning 3 Armored Brigade Combat Teams and 2 Stryker Brigade Combat Teams to new configurations under the ATI, enabling alignment with the Army 2030 vision.

Over $480M in FY26 depot maintenance supports platforms such as the AH-64 Apache, CH-47 Chinook, and UH-60 Blackhawk, ensuring rotary-wing readiness.

Congressional Impact: Without timely resourcing of the full budget request, modernization delays could affect 24 BCTs, potentially degrading total force synchronization and joint deployment timelines by up to 30-60 days in contingency scenarios.

Mr. MOULTON. General George - what operational risk does the Army incur without the capabilities of the ITEP engine?

General GEORGE. Without the capabilities of the ITEP engine, the Army would incur minimal risk for operations in a limited number of high, hot environments; particularly those encountered in Afghanistan and Iraq. Given the focus on the Indo Pacific as the priority theater, the risk would be acceptable and sufficiently mitigated by the fielding of the MV-75 FLRAA.

Mr. MOULTON. As the battlefield moves to cyber space, how are you planning to use the Army Guard in preparing to protect the homeland? What role do you see for the Army National Guard in responding to cyber-attacks?

General GEORGE. The Army National Guard is uniquely positioned to defend the homeland in cyberspace, bridging military expertise with civilian technical skills through its cyber workforce and specialized units. The Cybersecurity Service Provider-Army National Guard (CSSP-ARNG) and ARNG Cyber Brigade will continue to provide comprehensive cybersecurity services, including incident response and vulnerability analysis, to defend the Department of Defense Information Network and support domestic cyber incident response and critical infrastructure security across all states and territories.

Mr. MOULTON. The Army's Gray Eagle unmanned aircraft system provides critical intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capabilities that are increasingly essential for division-level operations. Given the Total Army's pivot to multi-domain operations and large-scale combat readiness, what is the Army's plan and timeline for fielding Gray Eagles to Army National Guard divisions?

General GEORGE. Beginning in September 2026, the Army will field all new MQ-1C deliveries to one Army National Guard Division. The Army is also finalizing plans to activate one additional Gray Eagle Company within the Army National Guard in FY27, located in Arizona. However, the Army has announced it will halt further Gray Eagle procurement due to concerns about its effectiveness in multi-domain operations and large-scale combat. Recognizing the critical need for division-level intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities, the Army and

the Army National Guard are actively conducting analysis to identify and field a suitable replacement for the Gray Eagle. The results of this analysis will inform the plan and timeline for equipping both Regular Army and Army National Guard divisions with a next-generation ISR capability.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. STEFANIK

Ms. STEFANIK. Secretary Driscoll, thank you for your service to our country, particularly your service in my district at Fort Drum. You know you're well aware of Fort Drum's strategic importance and modernization efforts for the army and how vital they are for our nation's readiness. Nearly every facet of the Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield has been modernized to support a rapid deployment force, and the airfield's 10,000-foot runway can accommodate any aircraft in the US Air Force inventory matching DoD's air defense capabilities to threats and deterring our enemies today. Fort Drum's, Wheeler-Sack Army Airfield has, unfortunately, a failing electric power system, and it's currently programmed for funding for FY27. I reached out to you via a letter about the importance of this issue, and I would just like your commitment to work with us about potentially moving up that critical funding to FY26?

Mr. DRISCOLL. At Fort Drum, and other Army installations, energy sources remain vulnerable to disruptions, which affects our ability to execute the mission. To address these vulnerabilities, the Army has developed a planning process that considers all types of power generation to provide electricity and bolster operational readiness and installation energy resilience. Advanced nuclear energy is one promising source of power that is in the early stages of development. The Army is aggressively pursuing opportunities to employ this new technology, including from small modular reactors, where it will increase mission readiness. Site characterization is underway for nuclear power plants at several candidate installations. Conducting the site characterization now will help us to identify and resolve site-related safety and environmental issues in advance, thereby streamlining planning and execution. A decision on where advanced nuclear power will be sited is forthcoming. Whether it involves nuclear energy or other forms of power generation, we will work with your office as we seek to resolve the power system challenges at Fort Drum. We recognize the critical need to ensure Fort Drum is energy resilient.

Ms. STEFANIK. Thank you so much. Fort Drum has relied on energy from the local power grid since closing its on-post energy facility in 2023. This is an issue my office has been engaged in for a number of years. The Army Corps of Engineers determined that a small modular reactor would be an optimal option to supply Fort Drum's energy needs. This is an issue that I worked on with my colleague, Congresswoman Tenney, who shares Jefferson County with me, in terms of representation, I would just like your commitment today to work with our offices to ensure Fort Drum returns to energy independence and security, including the potential deployment of this small modular reactor to the installation as soon as possible.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Army installations energy sources are vulnerable to disruptions which affect our ability to execute our mission. The Army has been considering all available energy technologies to overcome its energy vulnerabilities and has developed a solution set that includes all types of power sources, including nuclear, to provide electricity and bolster operational readiness and installation energy resilience. Advanced nuclear, including from small modular reactors, power will be a critical source of power and will increase mission readiness. We are partnered with the Defense Innovation Unit to prototype a small modular nuclear reactor and are conducting site characterization for nuclear power plants of our candidate army installations. This will help us to resolve site-related safety and environmental issues in advance, thereby streamlining the overall licensing process. We will work with your office to ensure Fort Drum returns to energy independence and security, including the potential deployment of this small modular reactor. A decision on nuclear power plant sites is forthcoming. We will do what we can to make Fort Drum energy independent.

Ms. STEFANIK. And then lastly, in a previous NDAA, my office worked to secure a provision that required DOD to review their ability to conduct electronic warfare training and leverage this defense ecosystem in upstate New York that we have helped develop between Fort Drum and the Air Force Research Lab in Rome, New York, which I also represent. This has been an ideal environment led to the Army's decision to choose Fort Drum to host the 2nd Multi-Domain Task Force in 2025 and PEO IEW&S's incredible work to partner with AFRL's Future Flag series of limited experimentation, which I strongly support and has led to great tactical outcomes. Can you speak to the importance of placing as much of the second multi-domain

Task Force at Fort Drum as possible to leverage this unique experimentation that will be continued between Rome and all the great work we're doing there?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Army Structure Memorandum 25-29, published in February 2024, finalized stationing decisions for all Multi -Domain Task Forces (MDTF). The 2d MDTF is split-stationed between Germany and Fort Drum, NY. The headquarters element and Multi-Domain Effects Battalion are stationed in Germany. The Long-Range Fires Battalion (LRFB) and Indirect-Fire Protection Capability (IFPC) are stationed at Fort Drum, NY. The LRFB is scheduled to activate in October 2025, followed by the IFPC in October 2027.

Ms. STEFANIK. And then lastly, in a previous NDAA, my office worked to secure a provision that required DOD to review their ability to conduct electronic warfare training and leverage this defense ecosystem in upstate New York that we have helped develop between Fort Drum and the Air Force Research Lab in Rome, New York, which I also represent. This has been an ideal environment led to the Army's decision to choose Fort Drum to host the 2nd Multi-Domain Task Force in 2025 and PEO IEW&S's incredible work to partner with AFRL's Future Flag series of limited experimentation, which I strongly support and has led to great tactical outcomes. Can you speak to the importance of placing as much of the second multi-domain Task Force at Fort Drum as possible to leverage this unique experimentation that will be continued between Rome and all the great work we're doing there?

General GEORGE. ARSTRUC 25-29, published in February 2024, finalized stationing decisions for all MDTFs. 2d MDTF is split stationed between Germany and Fort Drum, NY. The headquarters element and Multi-domain Effects Battalion (MDEB) are stationed in Germany. The Long-Range Fires Battalion (LRFB) and Indirect Fires Protection Battalion (IFPC) are stationed at Fort Drum, NY. The LRFB activates in October 2025 and the IFPC BN in October 2027.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. HOULAHAN

Ms. HOULAHAN. Thank you. I have very little time left, so unfortunately I will have to ask this last question for the record, which General, has to do with the thousand lay offs that are in the headquarters, and who are they, and how we are going to be accommodating for that.

General GEORGE. The Army civilian workforce at headquarters is in the midst of transformation resulting from the Army Transformation Initiative. Through transformation, the civilian force structure will be optimized by eliminating redundancies and inefficiencies to maximize readiness. Civilian employees are vital to sustaining the readiness of our military forces. Reductions in the workforce have created a degree of workforce uncertainty. I will ensure maximum use of all voluntary means to reshape the workforce and mitigate terminations and involuntary separations to the greatest extent possible.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. CROW

Mr. CROW. Sec. Driscoll, what is the Army's plan to modernize Army National Guard aviation, specifically the legacy UH-60L fleet, to ensure interoperability, survivability, and readiness in both Large Scale Combat Operations and domestic response missions?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Under the ATI, the Army is divesting legacy equipment, such as the UH-60L, to reinvest resources into emergent technologies such as Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS), Launched Effects (LE), and the Future Long Range Assault Aircraft (FLRAA) across all components. The Army will continue to modernize the Army National Guard's aviation lift capability by fielding FLRAA directly to National Guard units and cascading UH-60M aircraft to the National Guard as FLRAA is introduced to Regular Army units. The Army will also cascade UH-60Ms to the National Guard under ATI and will continue to field modernized UH-60V aircraft to the Guard as well.

Mr. CROW. Sec. Driscoll, if the Army cancels Multi-Year Procurement-11, will there be a funded replacement plan to modernize the legacy Guard Black Hawk fleet so that the Guard isn't expected to continue operating aircraft well into the 2030s that are no longer interoperable or sustainable?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army is rebalancing investments across its portfolios to ensure all components remain ready and sustainable for future operations. Currently, the Army is over-invested in manned aviation- - a structure that was procured to support conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan. The Army is rebalancing its aviation fleet to a blend of unmanned or autonomous systems. Certain missions traditionally conducted by manned platforms such as the Black Hawk may be better accomplished

with lower cost unmanned and/or autonomous systems. Fielding these emergent technologies will ensure National Guard aviation units remain interoperable and sustainable into the future.

Mr. CROW. Sec. Driscoll, in your letter to the Force regarding the Army Transformation Initiative, you state that 1,000 staff positions at Headquarters will be eliminated, commands will be merged, and general officer positions will be trimmed. What are the main drivers of this shift in the force structure?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Eliminating uniformed staff positions at Headquarters restores critical grades and military occupational specialties (MOS) to our tactical formations, while consolidating redundant processes, units, and systems.

Mr. CROW. Sec. Driscoll, given the stated goals of the Army Transformation Initiative, has the Department considered offsetting Active Duty personnel draw-downs by increasing end strength in the National Guard in order to retain our warfighters and capitalize on cost savings?

Mr. DRISCOLL. All Army COMPOs - Regular Army, Army National Guard, and the Army Reserve-are currently over-structured now and at the end of the FYDP. This means that each component has more authorized positions than actual personnel, including future recruitment. ATI changes to force structure and aims to realign faces and spaces personnel into across all components while maximizing lethality and investing in capabilities essential for winning future conflicts. Total Army Analysis (TAA) is the Army's annual process to make necessary force structure adjustments which match resources to strategy.

Mr. CROW. Sec. Driscoll, as you consider cuts to the Active Duty Army force structure, is the Guard being considered as a landing place for that force structure?

Mr. DRISCOLL. To aligning force structure adjustments with strategic resource priorities, the current TAA cycle is implementing ATI to maximize lethality in all components by adjusting all Components (Regular Army, Army National Guard, and US Army Reserve) force structures of to better reflect the demands of modern warfare. These changes will transform the Total Army to align with the Interim2025 Interim National Defense Strategic Guidance Strategic Guidance and operational demands while supporting the joint force in the future operating environment and simultaneously creating a leaner and more lethal force, singularly focused on warfighting.

During TAA, the Army examines all force structure and capabilities in all COMPOs to determine the optimal force mix and balance across the three components to meet the Interim National Defense Strategic Guidance objectives outlined in the and Joint Force requirements.

The Army will subsequently and selectively reinvest in the fighting force we need to achieve Peace through Strength.

Mr. CROW. . GEN George, Congress mandated the creation of the Civilian Protection Center of Excellence and, as the joint proponent for civilian harm mitigation and response, the Army plays a key role in these efforts. How will the Army ensure it can carry out the full scope of its responsibilities under US law and policy?

General GEORGE. The Army will carry out its responsibilities under U.S. law and policy. Regarding Army efforts to mitigate civilian harm, the Army will continue to comply with the Law of Armed Conflict and DOD directives pertaining to civilian harm mitigation and response efforts. Protecting civilians is an integral part of everything the Army does. Improvements in targeting methodology and precision fires have reduced the potential for civilian casualties. Army doctrine and training encourages civilian protection at all times.

The Army has integrated and institutionalized Civilian Harm Mitigation and Response (CHMR) practices across the force. Protection of civilians is best accomplished through integration of standardized military education and training throughout the force. Moreover, during military operations, civilian protection is part of warfighting functions and processes-such as the intelligence, targeting, fire control, and military orders processes.

Mr. CROW. GEN George, according to the DoD's baseline for reprogramming document, the Pentagon is diverting over $1 billion of funding from the Army's facilities, sustainment, restoration, and modernization account to support operational needs at the southern border. Please explain how the Army intends to provide adequate living quarters for its unaccompanied soldiers despite these funding cuts? How will these cuts affect ongoing barracks modernization efforts and repairs?

General GEORGE. The Army needed to balance the operational requirements in FY25 with $1 billion from the FSRM account to provide resources for higher priority Department of Defense missions. The President's FY26 budget makes significant investments to replenish that funding with over $8.5 billion in FSRM, an increase of approximately 23% from FY24. On-time enactment of the FY26 request will help minimize delays of these projects. In addition to the funding for these projects, the

Army-with Congressional support-has provided installations $4.2 billion in funding to sustain current building inventory across all components.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. BERGMAN

Mr. BERGMAN. As the administration proposes to focus on the Indo-Pacific, many see this as a fight where naval and air forces will play the dominant role and the Army will have a more modest support role. Mr. Secretary, could you share with the committee your view of the Army's role in any future conflict in the Indo-Pacific?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army will play a vital and indispensable role in virtually every aspect of any future conflict in the Indo-Pacific enabling the Joint Force to fight and win. of contingency, the Army brings both complementary and unique capabilities-command and control, long-range precision fires, air defense and other protection, engineers, sustainment, and cyber assets- the Joint Force, providing the Commander additional opportunities to exploit adversary weaknesses. Units such as the Multi-Domain Task Force are crucial to ensuring that our military can target, track, and conduct precision strikes in a complex, fast-paced environment. In a theater with unparalleled logistical challenges unlike any other, the Army enhances bottom-line capacity while also bringing capabilities only the Army can provide, such as large-scale ground-based sustainment and security operations. The Army supports the air campaign by providing world-class air defense capabilities, ensuring that enemy aircraft and missiles are unable to destroy and degrade friendly forces. Additionally, the Army plays a vital role in finding and destroying the enemy's air defense capabilities, allowing Joint Force aviation assets to conduct synchronized operations against the enemy without having to fight through a robust air-defense network. The Army also has a growing role in the execution of the maritime campaign, by supporting Navy forces from land to establish sea control and sea denial. The Army is fielding missiles capable of striking moving land-based or maritime targets by 2027, by directly supporting surface operations by engaging enemy naval vessels operating on the surface. These capabilities are complementary and add resilience to the Joint Force, simultaneously increasing the risk for our enemies.

Mr. BERGMAN. Executive Order 14115 requires the Department of Defense, including the Secretary of the Army, to complete a review of major defense acquisition programs by July 8 and to recommend cancellation of programs that are over budget, behind schedule, or fail to meet key performance metrics. Given that Global Household Goods Contract (GHC) appears to meet all of those criteria-and that a legacy program is currently being used to fix its failures-will the Army recommend cancellation of the GHC contract as required under the EO? If not, why?

Mr. DRISCOLL. On June 18, 2025, The Department of Defense announced the cancellation of the GHC for cause. The GHC commercial vendor, Home Safe Alliance, has committed to completing all military household goods moves it currently has in progress for soldiers and their families. Prior to GHC termination, the Army had already recommended suspending additional GHC shipments be conducted for the remainder of the peak 2025 Permanent Change of Station (PCS) season. Over 95% of FY25 Army shipments have been executed through the legacy Defense Personal Property System, not GHC. The legacy Tender of Service system remains active and continues to effectively handle Army household good movements.

Mr. BERGMAN. What is the Army's strategy for complying with the Supply Chain Illumination legislative requirements in last year's NDAA?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army continues to implement its current policy - outlined in Army Directive 2023-16 - to enhance its ability to detect, manage, and monitor supply chain threats and risks throughout a system's lifecycle (AD) by forging relationships with industry, requiring original equipment manufacturer/vendor assessments, and notifications to materiel developers on supply chain risks/disruptions. Additionally, in response to Section 849 of the FY25 NDAA (Supply Chain Illumination Incentives), the Army is collaborating with the Under Secretary of Defense for Acquisition and Sustainment (USD(A&S))'s Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM) Integration Center to develop a standardized and collaborative solution for reviewing current supply chain risk management processes and contractual requirements to identify best practices, obstacles, and any authorities or resources required to develop and implement incentivization. The findings will be incorporated into the report due to Congress by September 30, 2025, and the Army will assess the findings and determine how to best implement the recommendations into its practices and processes.

Mr. BERGMAN. How is the Army implementing the Defense Business Board recommendations to the Secretary of Defense concerning industry supply chain best practices? Please specifically address the Board's recommendations regarding use of

commercial tools and the need for continuous monitoring of your vendors independently from prime-contractor voluntary self-reporting.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army is implementing the Defense Business Board's supply chain recommendations by leveraging AD 2023-16, SCRM for Weapon Systems. The directive establishes policies and responsibilities to integrate SCRM throughout a system's life cycle enhancing the Army's ability to detect and manage supply chain threats and risks. The AD tasks organizations conducting SCRM to leverage commercial tools, standards, best practices in addition to ensuring requirements for SCRM are integrated into contracts and program risk management plans.

Mr. BERGMAN. The Committee understands that many of the supply chain risk management efforts throughout the Army rely both on paper-based and manpower intensive processes, do not provide near real-time monitoring as suggested by the Board, and are often stand-alone programs and contracts that are not integrated Army wide, or even major Command wide. What is your plan to address this situation?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army is collaborating with the USD (A&S)'s SCRM-IC-led) data tools and governance working group. This group aims to identify and implement SCRM data and analytics best practices, inform policy, and oversee the implementation of a DoD federated SCRM data lake to enable integration and sharing across the Services. The SCRM-IC seeks to reduce duplication of effort, foster innovation using secure technologies, and eliminate technical barriers to build bridges between silos and address the currently fragmented, manpower-intensive SCRM processes.

Mr. BERGMAN. Now that GSA has put in place almost $1.0 billion of best-of-breed supply chain illumination tools and products available at fixed subscription rates for all federal agencies, what is your plan to have Army organizations use them?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army participated in the June 2025 Department of Defense Supply Chain Risk Management Summit, which featured an overview of the contract and opportunities to engage with the selected vendors of the supply chain illumination tools and products. Information about the contract including the pricing catalog has been disseminated across multiple Army organizations for them to leverage once the period of performance for existing agreements or contracts end, and funds are available.

Mr. BERGMAN. Please provide for the record the supply chain risk management programs in place today for each major organization in the Army Material Command and how they will be integrated in the future such that the government only pays for supply chain illumination data annually but then shares it more broadly with the Army, in a manner consistent with industry best practices recommended by the Board.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Validated commercial data sources can be included into the Enterprise Supply Chain Risk Management (eSCRM) tool currently under development. This commercial data would be integrated with authoritative government datasets, enabling comprehensive analysis and accessibility across Army SCRM stakeholders. It is essential for identifying changes in the global marketplace that may trigger alerts against vendors and for tracing their supply chains to the lowest tiers and critical raw materials. A key best practice to ensure consistency and reduce the cost of supply chain illumination is to ensure this commercially provided supply chain data is ingested into existing aggregation platforms (e.g., Advana or Vantage), not purchased as ad hoc reports or subscriptions to commercially provided dashboards and visualization tools.

Mr. BERGMAN. In September 2024, Army Times reported significant performance and readiness improvements attributed to the H2F program, including:

6,489 fewer musculoskeletal injuries
2,962 fewer long-term behavioral health profiles
Nearly 14,000 fewer substance abuse profiles
4,455 more soldiers passing the ACFT
88,000 more soldiers qualifying expert in marksmanship

Given these reported gains, why has the Department decided to remove athletic trainers from the H2F program?

General GEORGE. The Army currently lacks the funding authority to contract healthcare services through a personal services contract (PSC). The Defense Health Agency (DHA) recognizes athletic trainers (ATs) as allied healthcare professionals, and coordination between the DHA and the Military Departments has been ongoing to ensure the ability of ATs to provide safe care within the full scope of their licensure and training. As an interim measure while policy and funding authorities are established and clarified, in April 2025, the Army made the decision to divert H2F funding away from contracting ATs and replace them with four additional Strength

and Conditioning Coaches (SCC), for H2F teams fielded in FY26 and beyond. Teams fielded prior to FY25 will retain a composition of four ATs and seven SCCs.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. SHERRILL

Ms. SHERRILL. Picatinny Arsenal continues to be a cornerstone of Army munitions research and innovation. What investments are included in the FY26 budget to support modernization and infrastructure upgrades at Picatinny Arsenal and how is the Army leveraging Picatinny's capabilities to accelerate development of next-generation weapons and munitions in alignment with the Army's Multi-Domain Operations (MDO) strategy?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army agrees that the Picatinny Arsenal and its workforce provide incredible support to munitions research and innovation. The Army appreciates Congress' support of the conventional munition's enterprise, including Picatinny Arsenal, to increase modernization capabilities including investments in prototyping capability, Advanced/Additive Manufacturing, classified computing, advanced modeling and simulation, and energetics development and characterization.

The Army continues to assess specific infrastructure upgrades at Picatinny while the Picatinny team supports Army modernization priorities by leveraging lessons learned on the changing character of war, drawn from events in Ukraine and Israel while developing cutting edge technologies with particular emphasis on innovation at the round. Some of the key efforts include but not limited to: 155mm Cannon Cargo Artillery capable of delivering ubiquitous payloads to enable operations in contested environments, proximity fuze technology that enables medium caliber weapon systems to more effectively counter the small UAS threat, the new family of 6.8mm ammunition that provides the Next Generation Squad Weapon its enhanced lethality over currently fielded weapons, lethal UAS solutions, and Counter UAS with high explosive proximity and point detonating assets.

Ms. SHERRILL. What is the Army doing to recruit and retain highly skilled engineers and scientists at R&D facilities like Picatinny Arsenal and how does the FY26 budget support STEM and workforce pipeline programs in partnership with local universities and technical schools, particularly in NJ-11?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Special hiring authorities, like LabDemo, Cyber Excepted Service, and AcqDemo, are essential tools for the Department of Defense to compete for the best and brightest minds in science, technology, engineering, cyber and acquisition. By adapting aspects of traditional personnel management, these authorities allow us to recruit and retain individuals with specialized skills essential for defense strategy. Within the Army, we will continue to take full advantage of these special hiring authorities to support a more effective, agile, and mission-aligned workforce in the defense labs. Additionally, the Army will continue to use all the Direct Hiring Authorities authorized by the Office of Personnel Management and DoD for hiring post-secondary and recent graduates into these critical STEM positions.

The Army recognizes the vital importance of a robust STEM workforce to maintain our technological advantage. Picatinny Arsenal, home to the DEVCOM Armaments Center, JPEO Armaments and Ammunition, and Army Lethality is central to that effort. DEVCOM Armaments Center continues to prioritize deliberate investments in strategic STEM partnerships with local universities and technical schools, including but not limited to the New Jersey Institute of Technology, Stevens Institute of Technology and County College of Morris. Key investment areas include:

Internship & Fellowship Programs: Leveraging our Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratory authorities provided by Congress, we are sustaining existing internship and fellowship opportunities to expose students to cutting-edge research in areas crucial to national security-advanced energetic materials, integrated armaments solutions, and AI-enabled systems engineering.

Collaborative Research: We are fostering Army prioritized collaborative research projects with university faculty and students to build relationships and identify potential future employees through the Small Business Innovation Research and University Affiliated Research Center programs. Additionally, we leverage Test Service Agreements to make our unique facilities available for research when applicable.

Workforce Skill Development: Offering targeted training in digital engineering and manufacturing, ensuring a highly skilled team capable of mentoring next generations.

Ms. SHERRILL. As a veteran and advocate for women in national security, I remain concerned about retaining and promoting talented women in the Army. How does the FY26 posture support leadership development, career progression, and retention of women in the Army-particularly in operational and technical roles and

what data is the Army tracking to ensure women are advancing equitably in combat and command positions?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army G1 and our Director of Military Personnel Management (DMPM) are developing and piloting a wide array of programs designed to identify, develop, and retain the military's best and brightest within the force. This includes the newly chartered Army Junior Officer Council (AJOC), and a broader reaching Officer Retention Program (ORP) that will use a whole-Soldier capability analysis to identify those who seek to incentivize for continued service, either in their current field or across emerging critical capabilities as we pivot from legacy system to achieve superior capabilities against near-peer adversaries. If the ORP pilot proves effective, expansion into a Warrant Officer and Enlisted program will follow, covering the entire service.

The AJOC will provide a venue to facilitate a direct feedback loop on issues impacting officer and warrant officer retention. This feedback loop will inform DMPM programming development to dynamically address problems impacting overall retention. Additionally, it conducts both local and national leadership development programming to address systemic gaps in capability or expressed desires from junior leaders for additional learning opportunities. Pilot programs are established at Fort Hood, Fort Huachuca, Fort Stewart, and Baumholder with an EXORD to be published expanding it to all existing Brigade-level Commands soon.

The Officer Retention Program is designed, specifically, to address generational differences impacting retention of Generation Z. It deviates from previous programming-which largely used economic incentives to entice continued service-by identifying the interests, goals, and opportunities impacting this generation and enabling tailored incentives that more effectively connect with this cohort and prioritizing incentives to those who are in the top tier(s) of performance.

Ms. SHERRILL. Picatinny Arsenal continues to be a cornerstone of Army munitions research and innovation. What investments are included in the FY26 budget to support modernization and infrastructure upgrades at Picatinny Arsenal and how is the Army leveraging Picatinny's capabilities to accelerate development of next-generation weapons and munitions in alignment with the Army's Multi-Domain Operations (MDO) strategy?

General GEORGE. The Army agrees that the Picatinny Arsenal and its workforce provides incredible support to munitions research and innovation. The Army commends Congress' support of conventional munitions enterprise, including Picatinny Arsenal, to increase modernization capabilities including investments in prototyping capability, advanced manufacturing, classified computing, advanced modeling and simulation, and energetics development and characterization.

The Army continues to assess specific infrastructure upgrades at Picatinny while the Picatinny team supports Army modernization priorities by leveraging lessons learned from events in Ukraine and Israel on the changing character of war while developing cutting edge technologies with particular emphasis on innovation at the round. Some of the key efforts include but not limited to; 155mm Cannon Cargo Artillery capable of delivering ubiquitous payloads to enable operations in contested environments, proximity fuze technology that enables medium caliber weapon systems to more effectively counter the Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (UAS) threat, the new family of 6.8mm ammunition that provides the Next Generation Squad Weapon its enhanced lethality over currently fielded weapons, lethal UAS solutions, and Counter UAS with high explosive proximity and point detonating assets.

Ms. SHERRILL. What is the Army doing to recruit and retain highly skilled engineers and scientists at R&D facilities like Picatinny Arsenal and how does the FY26 budget support STEM and workforce pipeline programs in partnership with local universities and technical schools, particularly in NJ-11?

General GEORGE. Special hiring authorities, like LabDemo, Cyber Excepted Service, and AcqDemo are essential tools for the Department of Defense to compete for the best and brightest minds in science, technology, engineering, cyber, and acquisition. These authorities allow us to recruit and retain individuals with specialized skills critical to national security. Within the Army we will continue to take full advantage of these special hiring authorities to support a more effective, agile, and mission-aligned workforce in the defense labs. Additionally, the Army will continue to use all the Direct Hiring Authorities authorized by the Office of Personnel Management and Department of Defense for hiring post-secondary and recent graduates into these critical STEM positions.

The Army recognizes the vital importance of a robust STEM workforce to maintain our technological advantage. Picatinny Arsenal, home to the DEVCOM Armaments Center, JPEO Armaments and Ammunition, and Army Lethality is central to that effort. DEVCOM Armaments Center continues to prioritize deliberate invest-

ments in strategic STEM partnerships with local universities and technical schools, including but not limited to the New Jersey Institute of Technology, Stevens Institute of Technology and County College of Morris. These investments focus on:

Internship & Fellowship Programs: Leveraging our Science and Technology Reinvention Laboratory (STRL) authorities provided by Congress, we are sustaining existing internship and fellowship opportunities to expose students to cutting-edge research in areas crucial to national security - advanced energetic materials, integrated armaments solutions, and AI-enabled systems engineering.

Collaborative Research: We are fostering Army prioritized collaborative research projects with university faculty and students to build relationships and identify potential future employees through the Small Business Innovation Research (STTR) and University Affiliated Research Center (UARC) programs. We also leverage Test Service Agreements to make our unique facilities available for research when applicable.

Workforce Skill Development: We are investing in targeted training for our existing workforce in areas like digital engineering and advanced manufacturing, ensuring a highly skilled team capable of mentoring the next generation.

Ms. SHERRILL. As a veteran and advocate for women in national security, I remain concerned about retaining and promoting talented women in the Army. How does the FY26 posture support leadership development, career progression, and retention of women in the Army-particularly in operational and technical roles and what data is the Army tracking to ensure women are advancing equitably in combat and command positions?

General GEORGE. The Army G1 and our Director of Military Personnel Management (DMPM) are developing and piloting a wide array of programs designed to identify, develop, and retain the military's best and brightest within the force. This includes the newly chartered Army Junior Officer Council (AJOC), and a broader reaching Officer Retention Program (ORP), that will use a whole-Soldier capability analysis, using both subjective and objective data elements, to identify those who we desire to incentivize for continued service, either in their current field or across emerging critical capabilities as we pivot to achieve superior capabilities against near-peer adversaries. If the ORP pilot proves effective, expansion into a Warrant Officer and Enlisted program will follow - covering the entire services.

The AJOC will provide a venue to facilitate a direct feedback loop on issues impacting officer and warrant officer retention, which will feed DMPM programming development to dynamically address problems impacting overall retention. Additionally, it conducts both local and national leadership development programming to address systemic gaps in capability or expressed desires from junior leaders for additional learning opportunities. Pilot programs are established at Fort Hood, Fort Huachuca, Fort Stewart, and Baumholder, GM with an EXORD to be published expanding it to all existing Brigade-level Commands soon.

The Officer Retention Program is designed, specifically, to address generational differences impacting retention of Generation Z. It deviates from previous programming - which largely used economic incentives to entice continued service - by identifying the diverse interests, goals, and opportunities impacting this generation and enabling tailored incentives that more effectively connect with this cohort and prioritizing incentives to those who are in the top Tier(s) of performance.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. JACKSON

Mr. JACKSON. As you know, HADES is a modernized, crewed intelligence collection platform that aims to provide the Army with advanced aerial ISR capabilities, including the speed, range, and endurance needed for future missions. According to recent reporting, the Army may seek to procure half of the original planned fleet. While understanding that the INDOPACOM AOR is the strategic priority, we must ensure that our combatant commanders and policymakers have the ability to collect intelligence in any AOR, including AFRICOM, CENTCOM, EUCOM, etc. Is the Army taking on risk in terms of its future ISR collection capabilities by reducing HADES procurement? How does the Army intend to fulfill its intelligence collection requirements around the globe? Were there cost overruns or schedule delays within the HADES program? Will the resources originally planned for HADES procurement go towards other Army intelligence priorities or programs?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army remains steadfast in its commitment to delivering advanced Aerial Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (A-ISR) capabilities that are both threat-informed and globally responsive. The HADES platform authors a pivotal role in this effort, offering a unique ability to integrate multiple sensor modalities on a single-crewed aircraft. This enables persistent, theater-level cov-

erage that bridges the differentiation between national and tactical ISR assets. HADES represents a significant advancement in deep-sensing capability, extending the Army's reach to detect, identify, and track threats across multiple domains-including those previously inaccessible to the legacy A-ISR fleet. While originally designed to address the range and endurance demands of the USINDOPACOM area of responsibility, HADES is equally capable of supporting emerging intelligence requirements across USEUCOM, USCENTCOM, USAFRICOM, and USSOUTHCOM. Platform allocation will be managed annually through the Global Force Management GFM process in alignment with Secretary of Defense priorities. The program remains on-cost and on-schedule. Although future production quantities are under review, this should not be interpreted as a reduction in commitment to the mission. Rather, it reflects the Army's broader effort to balance capability development with evolving operational demands and fiscal constraints. Any future adjustments or realignments to HADES funding will be informed by global threat dynamics, the maturation of joint-sensing capabilities, and the operational needs of the warfighter.

Mr. JACKSON. How the Army is working with the other Services and Combatant Commands to ensure that counter-UAS doctrine and training align with emerging operational requirements - whether in overseas locales, at domestic installations, or along the southern border?

General GEORGE. The Department of Defense (DoD) employs a multi-pronged approach, and the Army plays a pivotal role in collaboration with other Services and Combatant Commands to ensure counter-small UAS (C-sUAS) doctrine and training align with emerging operational requirements regardless of location.

The Joint C-sUAS Office (JCO) serves as a synchronizer for these efforts to which the Army actively contributes. This collaboration is highlighted across several areas:

Joint Doctrine Development: The JCO collects data from the CJCS Joint Lessons Learned Program (JLLP) and the Joint Lessons Learned Information System (JLLIS). This data is incorporated into the Joint C-sUAS University (JCU) curriculum and Joint C-sUAS doctrine. Additionally, the Army contributes and applies these lessons learned to refine its own Service-specific doctrine and training.

Service-Led and Joint Training: Services lead their own specific C-sUAS training. Specifically, the Army's C-sUAS training is designed to be interoperable and meet operational requirements. This includes the use of Army mobile training teams to support collective unit level training. Additionally, Army units regularly participate in combat training center rotations (e.g., at the National Training Center or Joint Readiness Training Center) that incorporate sophisticated C-sUAS scenarios and require coordination with partners and Combatant Commands. The Services, to include the Army, provide institutional training and professional military education which incorporates C-sUAS concepts. Joint C-sUAS training is also available to DoD service-members at the JCU and through the JCO's online training modules that help supplement and reinforce individual C-sUAS knowledge through self-paced courses.

Mr. JACKSON. As the Army invests in emerging counter-UAS technologies like directed energy, how are the Army and the Joint Counter-Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems Office engaged with industry to ensure servicemembers can rapidly deploy these technologies in response to the proliferating threat of drones?

General GEORGE. The Joint Counter-small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (C-sUAS) Office (JCO) continuously works with industry through structured initiatives, such as C-sUAS demonstrations and weekly industry touch-points. To rapidly employ emerging technologies, the JCO leverages Other Transaction Authority (OTA) contracts to purchase systems and also, in coordination with Combatant Commands and the Services, conducts Operational Assessments (OA) of promising technologies. A key output of these activities is Soldier feedback on the training, effectiveness, and qualitative data pertaining to overall system performance. This feedback directly informs iterative system improvements, improves training and doctrine, shapes evolving tactics, techniques, procedures, and refines future acquisition strategies to continuously enhance Warfighter lethality. The Army Transformation Initiative (ATI), which builds upon the Transformation in Contact (TiC) effort, prototypes organizational changes and integrates emerging technologies into formations. A specific focus area within ATI is closing C-sUAS capability gaps. The Army is shifting from program-centric to capability-based portfolios to facilitate rapid equipment fielding and accelerate innovation cycles.

Mr. JACKSON. How are you working with the interagency to deploy leading-edge counter-UAS systems at CONUS installations? What additional authorities can Congress provide to augment domestic counter-UAS? Does the Army believe that current 130i authorities are sufficient, or is an expansion required to effectively mitigate UAS threats?

General GEORGE. In accordance with the DoD/FAA Title 10 U.S.C. ⧫ 130i Coordination Package Checklist, the Army works with multiple Agencies to deploy leading-edge Counter-Unmanned Aircraft Systems (C-UAS) capabilities at installations across the U.S. and its Territories and Possessions. Requirements within the 130i Checklist include coordination with the FAA to obtain C-UAS specific airspace restrictions; coordination with the FAA and Federal Communications Commission to obtain necessary spectrum / frequencies authorizations; and coordination with Federal, State, Territorial, Tribal, and Local law enforcement, community, public outreach, and public affairs entities to establish comprehensive C-UAS response plans. Additionally, on installations with shared Department and Agency occupancy, coordination is required to establish C-UAS responsibilities as it pertains to the mitigation of the UAS threat on that installation.

Additionally, the Joint Counter-Small Unmanned Aircraft Systems (C-sUAS) Office (JCO) consistently engages with the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to incorporate RDT&E efforts for Homeland-focused C-sUAS sensors and defeat capabilities. DHS-JCO collaboration also aims to integrate lessons learned from recent small-UAS events into an all-encompassing 130i process. This includes policy, authorities, interagency coordination, and the operational deployment and use of enhanced capabilities during crisis or exigent circumstances. The JCO's participation in the DHS-led National Capital Region C-UAS Security Enhancement initiative enabled shared awareness through the integration of select DHS sensors into the ATHENA Common Operating Picture. In addition, the JCO planned and facilitated the QUANTUM EAGLE 2025 (QE25) exercise at Fort Novosel, AL, which identified limitations and gaps in installation commanders' Homeland C-sUAS authorities and operations. As a result of QE25, the JCO has coordinated with the FAA to streamline the 130i process to determine the potential spectrum and flight safety risks posed by counter-position, navigation, & timing defeat systems. Further, the U.S. Army is a partner in the Replicator-2 initiative to increase our installation CUAS protection capability across more installations to protect our most critical infrastructure and force concentrations efforts, with a focus on protecting against more advanced threats in restrictive environments like the homeland.

Protection from UAS threats is a significant concern for the Army. The Army supports efforts to expand existing authorities to ensure that DoD facilities and personnel are adequately protected. Accordingly, the Army supports efforts to expand the definition of 10 U.S.C. ⧫ 130i covered facilities to include language that would provide for the protection of buildings, grounds, and property to which the public are not permitted regular, unrestricted access and that are under the jurisdiction, custody, or control of the DoD and the persons on that property. The Army believes there would also be benefit of the inclusion of protections for Army and Air National Guard facilities.

Mr. JACKSON. As you know, HADES is a modernized, crewed intelligence collection platform that aims to provide the Army with advanced aerial ISR capabilities, including the speed, range, and endurance needed for future missions. According to recent reporting, the Army may seek to procure half of the original planned fleet. While understanding that the INDOPACOM AOR is the strategic priority, we must ensure that our combatant commanders and policymakers have the ability to collect intelligence in any AOR, including AFRICOM, CENTCOM, EUCOM, etc. Is the Army taking on risk in terms of its future ISR collection capabilities by reducing HADES procurement? How does the Army intend to fulfill its intelligence collection requirements around the globe? Were there cost overruns or schedule delays within the HADES program? Will the resources originally planned for HADES procurement go towards other Army intelligence priorities or programs?

General GEORGE. The Army remains steadfast in its commitment to delivering advanced Aerial Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (A-ISR) capabilities that are both threat-informed and globally responsive. The HADES platform plays a pivotal role in this effort, offering a unique ability to integrate multiple sensor modalities on a single crewed aircraft. This enables persistent, theater-level coverage that bridges the gap between national and tactical ISR assets. HADES represents a significant advancement in deep-sensing capability, extending the Army's reach to detect, identify, and track threats across multiple domains-including those previously inaccessible to the legacy A-ISR fleet. While originally designed to address the range and endurance demands of the USINDOPACOM area of responsibility, HADES is equally capable of supporting emerging intelligence requirements across USEUCOM, USCENTCOM, USAFRICOM, and USSOUTHCOM. Platform allocation will be managed annually through the Global Force Management (GFM) process in alignment with Secretary of Defense priorities.

The program remains on- a timely schedule with costs and trajectory. Although future production quantities are under review, this should not be interpreted as a

reduction in commitment to the mission. Rather, it reflects the Army's broader effort to balance capability development with evolving operational demands and fiscal constraints. Any future adjustments or realignments to HADES funding will be informed by global threat dynamics, the maturation of joint-sensing capabilities, and the operational needs of the warfighter.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. MACE

Ms. MACE. I've been alarmed at recent reports that the Army is considering deactivating the Army Prepositioned Stocks Afloat (APS-3) program. The Army's actions to date - including canceling contracts for two APS-3 ships and allowing them to be reflagged out of the U.S. fleet - reduces our readiness and undermines our national security. Getting rid of seven ships providing strategic sealift seems to be the wrong plan at the wrong time. Q1: Did the Army allow two APS-3 ships to be reflagged out of the U.S. fleet? Q2: Did the Army direct three additional APS-3 ships to return to the United States for offloading? Q3: Does the Army currently plan to deactivate these three ships once they are offloaded? Q4: Does the Army plan to fully deactivate APS-3? Q5: What is the strategic rationale behind any potential deactivation of APS-3?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Q1: Did the Army allow two APS-3 ships to be reflagged out of the U.S. fleet? Answer: Under the APS-3 (Afloat) construct, two contractor-leased vessels operated to house overwhelmingly small arms ammunition (98% small arms and 2% artillery, anti-tank missiles, and engineering explosives). Total Army Munitions Requirements determined that specific munitions were in excess of our global requirements, thereby eliminating the need to maintain those contracted vessels, which have an annual operating cost of $30 million (FY25). The Army eliminated unnecessary costs along-with ammo according to the needs of the Army and released the ships back to their commercial companies. The companies that own the vessels, not the Army, made determinations on the reflagging of those vessels.

Q2: Did the Army direct three additional APS-3 ships to return to the United States for offloading?

Answer: The Army, with the approval of the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF), directed the download of all APS vessels, which included two contractor-leased vessels and five U.S. Navy-owned Large, Medium Speed, Roll-on/roll-off (LMSRs) carrying APS equipment sets. The SECDEF's decision was based on analysis considering operational feasibility, threat environment, and fiscal sustainability. This Army analysis determined that operationally (1) land-basing APS-3 provides effective responsive services to adversarial aggression in the Indo-Pacific, (2) land-basing APS-3 increases forward positioned equipment in the Pacific, Europe, and the Middle East, (3) land-based APS effectively demonstrates our commitments to allies and partners in the regions where it is land-based, (4) land-basing APS-3 in the Indo-Pacific reinforces our security commitment to the region, as highlighted in the Interim National Defense Strategic Guidance (INDSG), (5) land-basing APS-3 reduces U.S., allied, and partner vulnerability to adversaries rapidly seizing objectives by enabling forces to mount a credible response, and (6) latest sites reduce barriers to cooperation for forward presence and posture, multi-national exercises, humanitarian relief and disaster response, and other security cooperation. Additionally, from a fiscal perspective: (1) land-basing APS-3 provides the Army with better financial flexibility to support other INDSG-directed priorities and (2) land-basing APS-3 mitigates the continuously increasing vessel cost and maintenance over the Future Year Defense Program (FYDP), with potential to save $1.5B5 billion in APS initiatives across the FYDP. As stated, the downloaded equipment will be re-distributed globally, with emphasis on USINDOPACOM.

Q3: Does the Army currently plan to deactivate these three ships once they are offloaded?

Answer: The five LMSRs belong to the Navy and are managed by the U.S. Maritime Administration (MARAD) of the Department of Transportation. Through an inter-service agreement between the Army and Navy, the Army utilized vessels ($293 million for FY25) to store and transport APS-3 sets in exchange for assuming all associated operating costs. Once the APS-3 offloading is complete, the Army has no further operational involvement with the vessels. The vessels are set to be released to Military Sealift Command by the end of FY25 for return to MARAD and will be available for use through requests to USTRANSCOM.

Q4: Does the Army plan to fully deactivate APS-3?

Answer: No, the Army is not ″deactivating″ APS-3 equipment sets. While there will not be one location labeled ″APS-3,″ those equipment sets are being redistrib-

uted to reinforce our ability to support priority operational plans, primarily in USINDOPACOM, while also in Europe and the Middle East.

Q5: What is the strategic rationale behind any potential deactivation of APS-3?

Answer: The Army conducted a comprehensive analysis of the effectiveness, strategic advantage, and fiscal costs of land-based versus afloat APS. The Army evaluated and determined that APS located on land within the first island chain provides a faster response time in support of operations. Equipment prioritized from APS-3 will be sent to locations in USINDOPACOM, with the rest distributed across APS locations in Europe and the Middle East, thereby increasing our capabilities in support of Combatant Command requirements and alignment with the INDSG.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. RYAN

Mr. RYAN. The Army has invested billions in failed custom software development for programs over the last 4 years without demonstrable results for the warfighter, with critical business and mission command capabilities collectively years behind schedule or canceled outright for no performance by their lead systems integrator. Billions in development funding is consumed with limited operational capability delivered. Given Executive Order 14265's directive to modernize defense acquisitions and spur innovation, why does the Army continue funding custom development through traditional contractors when commercial alternatives exist? What specific steps are you taking to address these systemic acquisition failures and shift toward the commercial technology adoption approach mandated by the Administration?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army is actively working to minimize reliance on custom software development when commercial alternatives exist. In accordance with Army Directive 2024-02, commercial software solutions are minimized to the maximum extent practical in efforts to reduce risk and costs. We are also leveraging microservices architecture to extend commercial solutions without heavy customization and using Commercial-Off-the-Shelf software where appropriate, with a focus on interoperability and modularity. The Army actively aligns its acquisition strategies with the Administration's directive to spur innovation by executing Commercial Solutions Openings and Other Transaction Agreements, and adopting modular open systems approaches to integrate cutting-edge commercial technologies with support from non-traditional defense contractors and commercial technology providers.

Mr. RYAN. In its April report to Congress, the Army listed the Tactical Intelligence Targeting Access Node - or - TITAN among its top 5 performing programs as measured by cost, schedule, performance, budget execution, testing execution, contract execution, and service priority. Since February 2024, the Program has delivered 4 TITAN prototypes on time and on budget in service of a top modernization priority while meeting budget, testing, and contract execution thresholds that set the program ahead of its peers. Please share with the committee why TITAN is considered one of the top performers and how the Department anticipates utilizing TITAN in the future? How do you anticipate broadening this program to the rest of the force (National Guard & Reserve)? If there are resource concerns in FY26, please share with the Committee how we can continue this successful program.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The TITAN program is an exemplar for the use of rapid prototyping and addresses critical warfighting gaps for the Army. TITAN continues to deliver prototypes on schedule, iterating on changes needed, driven by lessons learned during exercises, soldier feedback, and emerging priorities. The TITAN program is operating within cost and progressing throughout duration of the Middle Tier of Acquisition rapid prototyping effort within four years. This Army program has shown the effectiveness of using non-traditional vendors and adapting commercial products to achieve Army needs. Additional TITAN prototypes will go to Army units in the USINDOPACOM and USEUCOM areas of responsibility and throughout the INDOPACOM and U.S. Army Forces Command (FORSCOM) units in CONUS later this year, continuing to inform the capability and future needs. National Guard and Reserve soldiers are part of the soldier engagement strategy throughout the prototyping program and their needs are being integrated as part of the program. The Army has no resource concerns at this time and believes the requested funds in the FY26 President's Budget will project continued success on this critical program.

Mr. RYAN. In its April report to Congress, the Army listed the Tactical Intelligence Targeting Access Node - or - TITAN among its top 5 performing programs as measured by cost, schedule, performance, budget execution, testing execution, contract execution, and service priority. Since February 2024, the Program has delivered 4 TITAN prototypes on time and on budget in service of a top modernization priority while meeting budget, testing, and contract execution thresholds that set the program ahead of its peers. Please share with the committee why TITAN is con-

sidered one of the top performers and how the Department anticipates utilizing TITAN in the future? How do you anticipate broadening this program to the rest of the force (National Guard & Reserve)? If there are resource concerns in FY26, please share with the Committee how we can continue this successful program.

General GEORGE. The TITAN program is an exemplar for the use of rapid prototyping and addresses critical warfighting gaps for the Army. TITAN continues to deliver prototypes on schedule, iterating on changes needed, driven by lessons learned during exercises, soldier feedback, and emerging priorities. The TITAN program is operating within cost and progressing towards completion of the Middle Tier of Acquisition (MTA) rapid prototyping effort within four years. This Army program has shown the effectiveness of using non-traditional vendors and adapting commercial products to achieve Army needs.

Additional TITAN prototypes will go to Army units in the USINDOPACOM and USEUCOM Areas of Responsibility and FORSCOM units in CONUS later this year, continuing to inform the capability and future needs. National Guard and Reserve soldiers are part of the soldier engagement strategy throughout the prototyping program and their needs are being integrated as part of the program.

The Army believes the requested funds in the FY26 Presidential Budget will enable continued success on this critical program.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. TOKUDA

Ms. TOKUDA. How is the Army ensuring that the deactivation of 1st Information Operations Command does not leave operational gaps or vulnerabilities in our information posture-especially at the tactical and operational levels? And during this transition to new units like Theater Information Advantage Detachments, what safeguards or interim measures are in place to ensure continuity of capability and mission in Army IO?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army recognizes achieving US advantage in competition, crisis, and conflict. The inactivation of 1st Information Operations Command provides the necessary force structure to establish Theater Information Advantage Detachments (TIADs) into theater Army Service Component Commands (ASCCs): U.S. Army Pacific, U.S. Army Europe and Africa; and in U.S. Army Cyber Command to address transregional information requirements. The establishment of the TIADs provides those Army Commands with a dedicated, persistent force, which will improve the integration and efficacy of Operations in the Information Environment in their respective theaters and in the Cyber domain.

Several factors contribute to Army risk mitigation during this period of transition. The Army's three Theater Information Operations Groups (1x Reserve and 2x National Guard) will continue to provide support to requests for forces from Joint Commanders executing operations in the information environment. Though the Army will not establish TIADs until 2026, ASCCs have been exercising the concept since 2023, while establishing provisional capability in advance of fielding. Finally, the ASCC G39 Information Advantage staff actively coordinate with sister services and Combatant Command staffs to meet routine and emerging information operations demands.

Ms. TOKUDA. In your May Letter to the Force on the Army Transformation Initiative, you stated that ″command and control nodes will integrate artificial intelligence to accelerate decision-making.″ Can you clarify what your vision for AI integration into command and control looks like in practice? Are we talking about AI in an advisory capacity, or initiating or executing actions autonomously?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) demonstrate tremendous potential to enable our warfighting commanders to make more, better, and faster decisions than the enemy. The integration of AI/ML is necessary to enable human decisions at machine speed and counter the scope and scale of adversary capabilities. The Army's vision for AI/ML integration into command and control is to utilize these tools to rapidly organize and analyze data to improve commanders' decision advantage. The recent Project Convergence Capstone 5 experiment, the Army utilized Next Generation with AI and ML decision support tools for operational use cases, such as target recognition/processing and predictive logistics with route planning, enabling commanders to make more informed decisions. The Army is also actively partnering with the Defense Innovation Unit to compete Forward Counter Unmanned Aircraft Systems Command and Control System (FCUAS C2) -- which will succeed its current Forward Area Air Defense Command and Control (FAAD C2) and have AI/ML built in. The Army will continue to use experimentation to refine AI/ML decision aids and tools to assist, but never replace, the commander.

Ms. TOKUDA. According to the GAO, the Army has shrunk the watercraft fleet by half since 2018, and the current mission capable rate is under 40 percent - far short of the Army's own mission capable goal of 90 percent.

Unless the Army swiftly tackles these problems, I'm worried that the current state of the Army watercraft fleet will pose serious challenges to the Army's ability to respond to any near-term contingency in the Indo-Pacific theater. How does the Army Transformation Initiative tackle the Army watercraft program, if at all? Maintenance and repair are critical to addressing the Army watercrafts' low mission capable rates. I know the Army plans to do some of this work overseas, but how can we ensure that critical U.S. military assets like Hawai'i and Guam also have the facilities, resources, and expertise to perform the necessary work on Army watercraft if necessary?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army Transformation Initiative (ATI) requires the Army logistics enterprise to ensure future watercraft solutions are practical, flexible, and sustainable in the long-term. ATI enables the enterprise to explore multiple options, including increased testing of autonomous/semi-autonomous commercial solutions and potentially terminating future acquisition of the Maneuver Support Vessel-Light. To mitigate existing gaps in Army intra-theater maritime lift capabilities, we are pursuing a mixed watercraft fleet strategy. Contractor owned and operated vessels are being tested in the Indo-Pacific as potential supplemental capabilities. The Army prioritizes watercraft sustainment and modernization to ensure its existing organic watercraft fleet is mission ready and able to support the Joint Force. Readiness rates of the current watercraft fleet have successfully improved by 20% since late 2024. Additionally, we are expanding forward maintenance capabilities closer to the point of need to enable expeditious repair. We will balance facility investments at strategic locations like Hawai'i and Guam that support the Indo-Pacific watercraft fleet through established requirements processes and will ensure commensurate resources and expertise are aligned.

Ms. TOKUDA. How is the Army ensuring that the deactivation of 1st Information Operations Command does not leave operational gaps or vulnerabilities in our information posture-especially at the tactical and operational levels? And during this transition to new units like Theater Information Advantage Detachments, what safeguards or interim measures are in place to ensure continuity of capability and mission in Army IO?

General GEORGE. The Army recognizes the importance and role of information in achieving US advantage in competition, crisis and conflict. The inactivation of 1st Information Operations Command provides the necessary force structure to establish Theater Information Advantage Detachments (TIADs) into theater Army Service Component Commands (ASCCs): U.S. Army Pacific, U.S. Army Europe and Africa; and in U.S. Army Cyber Command to address transregional information requirements. The establishment of the TIADs provides those Army Commands with a dedicated, persistent force, which will improve the integration and efficacy of Operations in the Information Environment (OIE) in their respective theaters and in the Cyber domain.

Several factors contribute to Army risk mitigation during this period of transition. The Army's three Theater Information Operations Groups (1x Reserve and 2x National Guard) will continue to provide support to requests for forces from Joint Commanders executing operations in the information environment. Though the Army will not establish TIADs until 2026, ASCCs have been exercising the concept since 2023 and, in some cases, have established provisional capability in advance of fielding. Lastly, the ASCC Information Advantage staff actively coordinate with sister services and Combatant Command staffs to meet routine and emerging information operations demands.

Ms. TOKUDA. In your May Letter to the Force on the Army Transformation Initiative, you stated that ″command and control nodes will integrate artificial intelligence to accelerate decision-making.″ Can you clarify what your vision for AI integration into command and control looks like in practice? Are we talking about AI in an advisory capacity, or initiating or executing actions autonomously?

General GEORGE. Recent advances in artificial intelligence (AI) and machine learning (ML) demonstrate tremendous potential to enable our warfighting commanders to make more, better, and faster decisions than the enemy. The integration of AI/ML is necessary to enable human decisions at machine speed and counter the scope and scale of adversary capabilities. The Army's vision for AI/ML integration into command and control (C2) is to utilize these tools to rapidly organize and analyze data to improve commanders' decision advantage. For example, at the recent Project Convergence Capstone 5 (PCC5) experiment, the Army utilized Next Generation Command and Control (NGC2) with AI and ML decision support tools for operational use cases including target recognition/processing and predictive logistics

with route planning, enabling commanders to make more informed decisions. The Army is also actively partnering with the Defense Innovation Unit to compete Forward Counter Unmanned Aircraft Systems Command and Control System (FCUAS C2) -- which will succeed its current Forward Area Air Defense Command and Control (FAAD C2) and have AI/ML built in. The Army will continue to use experimentation to refine AI/ML decision aids and tools to assist, but never replace, the commander.

Ms. TOKUDA. According to the GAO, the Army has shrunk the watercraft fleet by half since 2018, and the current mission capable rate is under 40 percent - far short of the Army's own mission capable goal of 90 percent.

Unless the Army swiftly tackles these problems, I'm worried that the current state of the Army watercraft fleet will pose serious challenges to the Army's ability to respond to any near-term contingency in the Indo-Pacific theater. How concerned are you by this status quo, and what does it mean for the Army's ability to project power into the Indo-Pacific?

General GEORGE. Through focused efforts, readiness rates have improved by 20% since late 2024. We recognize that the current Army organic watercraft fleet has limited capacity to meet Combatant Command requirements. To mitigate this gap, the Army is pursuing a mixed watercraft fleet strategy and is testing contractor owned and operated vessels in the Indo-Pacific. Additionally, we are expanding forward maintenance capabilities closer to the point of need to enable expeditious repair.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. MOYLAN

Mr. MOYLAN. In January 2024, a drone was detected and ultimately shot down over the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) site in Guam. This incident raised serious concerns about the vulnerability of critical missile defense infrastructure to surveillance, interference, or even direct attack by unmanned aerial systems. Can you speak to the Army's assessment of the incident and what steps are being taken to strengthen the protection of critical missile defense infrastructure in Guam against similar incursions?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Following the January 2024 drone incident over the THAAD site in Guam, the Army is implementing a multi-layered defense strategy to enhance the protection of critical missile defense infrastructure against drone incursions. This involves upgrading radar and sensor systems for improved drone detection, deploying counter-drone technologies like jamming and directed energy weapons, strengthening perimeter security and airspace management, enhancing cybersecurity, providing specialized training to personnel, and improving incident response procedures. Guam's strategic importance and unique environment measures tailored specific challenges and potential threats in the region, with a focus on intelligence gathering and coordination with other agencies. We know that this threat is not limited to Guam, and that is why we are working through initiatives such as Replicator 2 to deploy advanced counter UAS capabilities to our most critical installations rapidly. We are also establishing a threat working group to fully understand the asymmetric UAS, cruise and ballistic missile and advanced threats facing Guam to identify residual risk and mitigation strategies. The Guam Defense System (GDS) Joint Program Office is responsible for synchronizing a whole-of-government approach to counter all strategic and operational threats. We receive exceptional support from the intelligence and interagency airspace management communities- a critical element to addressing the protection requirements for GDS component systems.

Mr. MOYLAN. The Pentagon and General Brunson have denied reports that approximately 4,500 troops are being considered for relocation from South Korea to other Indo-Pacific locations, including Guam. In response to inquiries, the Army stated unequivocally that ″USARPAC and Eighth Army have no official notification or indicators that any forces will be permanently reassigned from South Korea to Guam or any other location.″ The Army attributes the origin of this claim to South Korean media attempting to influence the country's June 3rd election. General Brunson, the Commander of U.S. Forces Korea, has publicly refuted the reports. However, Secretary Driscoll indicated he could not confirm or deny any specific troop movements, noting that Secretary Hegseth and President Trump are actively involved in global force posture decisions. Given these conflicting accounts, please clarify: Is the Army or the Department of Defense currently engaged in any discussions to transfer U.S. troops from South Korea to Guam or other Indo-Pacific locations?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Army forces can be ordered to deploy to and from the USINDOPACOM area of responsibility, which includes USFK forces in South Korea,

through the Global Force Management Allocation Plan (GFMAP) approved by the Secretary of Defense. The FY25 GFMAP temporarily ordered Army air defense forces in support of USCENTCOM, and those forces are scheduled to return to South Korea. The Army does not currently anticipate sourcing this requirement for an extended period with other forces existing within the USINDOPACOM AOR. Further, the FY26 GFMAP is signed and does not order a reduction in forces.

Mr. MOYLAN. In January 2024, a drone was detected and ultimately shot down over the Terminal High Altitude Area Defense (THAAD) site in Guam. This incident raised serious concerns about the vulnerability of critical missile defense infrastructure to surveillance, interference, or even direct attack by unmanned aerial systems. Can you speak to the Army's assessment of the incident and what steps are being taken to strengthen the protection of critical missile defense infrastructure in Guam against similar incursions?

General GEORGE. Following the January 2024 drone incident over the THAAD site in Guam, the Army is implementing a multi-layered defense strategy to enhance the protection of critical missile defense infrastructure against drone incursions. This involves upgrading radar and sensor systems for improved drone detection, deploying counter-drone technologies like jamming and directed energy weapons, strengthening perimeter security and airspace management, enhancing cybersecurity, providing specialized training to personnel, and improving incident response procedures. Given Guam's strategic importance and unique environment, these measures are tailored to address the specific challenges and potential threats in the region, with a focus on intelligence gathering and coordination with other agencies. We know that this threat is not limited to Guam, and that is why we are working through initiatives such as Replicator 2 to deploy advanced counter UAS capabilities to our most critical installations rapidly. We are also establishing a threat working group to fully understand the asymmetric UAS, cruise and ballistic missile and advance threats facing Guam to identify residual risk and mitigation strategies. The Guam Defense System (GDS) Joint Program Office is responsible for synchronizing a whole-of-government approach to counter all strategic and operational threats. We're receiving exceptional support from the intelligence and interagency airspace management communities, a critical element to addressing the protection requirements for GDS component systems.

Mr. MOYLAN. The Pentagon and General Brunson have denied reports that approximately 4,500 troops are being considered for relocation from South Korea to other Indo-Pacific locations, including Guam. In response to inquiries, the Army stated unequivocally that ″USARPAC and Eighth Army have no official notification or indicators that any forces will be permanently reassigned from South Korea to Guam or any other location.″ The Army attributes the origin of this claim to South Korean media attempting to influence the country's June 3rd election. General Brunson, the Commander of U.S. Forces Korea, has publicly refuted the reports. However, Secretary Driscoll indicated he could not confirm or deny any specific troop movements, noting that Secretary Hegseth and President Trump are actively involved in global force posture decisions. Given these conflicting accounts, please clarify: Is the Army or the Department of Defense currently engaged in any discussions to transfer U.S. troops from South Korea to Guam or other Indo-Pacific locations?

General GEORGE. At the Army Service Component Command level, the commander has not been directed or given guidance to reduce troop levels in South Korea aside from already planned in-activations of Army forces ordered through Army Structure (ARSTRUC) orders. Routine adjustments to force posture occur regularly, but these are standard operational procedures. Furthermore, Army forces can be ordered to deploy to and from the USINDOPACOM AOR, which includes USFK forces in South Korea, through the Global Force Management Allocation Plan (GFMAP) approved by the Secretary of Defense. The FY25 GFMAP temporarily ordered Army air defense forces in support of USCENTCOM and those forces are scheduled to return to South Korea. USARPAC does not anticipate sourcing this requirement for an extended period with other forces existing within the USINDOPACOM AOR. Further, the FY26 GFMAP is signed and does not order a reduction in forces. This indicates to USARPAC that current planning documents do not support a large-scale relocation of Army forces from South Korea.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. DAVIS

Mr. DAVIS. Secretary Driscoll and General George: How do you assess the potential for the Army to increase next-generation combat vehicle advanced technology to develop more advanced ground-to-ground Vehicle Aided Target Recognition?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army has promised to develop more advanced ground-to-ground Vehicle Aided Target Recognition by delivering critical warfighting capabilities in an iterative process through the use of testing and Soldier experiments (such as Transformation in Contact and Project Convergence), which provide opportunities for early Soldier feedback on the development of Aided Target Recognition (AiTR) systems using Artificial Intelligence (AI). A tank gunner, helicopter pilot, or rifle-armed soldier can be rapidly cued to threats with AiTR to enable his target engagement decision, making the timing crucially important. Army scientists, engineers, and weapons developers work to test, assess and refine emerging technologies intended to reduce sensor-to-shooter time giving our forces a timing and target-ID accuracy advantage in war. Army soldiers routinely test new generations of infrared and electro-optical targeting technologies like Advanced Targeting and Lethality Aided System, or ATLAS. AiTR also integrates into the design of XM30 and M1E3.

ATLAS is an emerging tech software solution attempting to integrate tactical Electro-optic Infrared sensors with AiTR Artificial Intelligence algorithms trained on a vast set of military specific data to detect, classify, and track threats day/night and in all environments for long range target acquisition. The AiTR accurately detects and classify images of enemy threats in real time at similar or better performance than human operators but much faster than humans can process information. The information from the AiTR is used to cue an operator for final target identification and engagement decisions. theThe ATLAS AiTR will enable platforms to search wide areas for threats at machine speed and automatically the operator to targets from a moving platform and in heavy obscuration.

Mr. DAVIS. How would these advances help us counter non-peer, near-peer, and peer threats to our national security?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Advances in AiTR will counter non-peer, near-peer, and peer threats by incorporating these capabilities into military platforms: shortening and improving human decision making by condensing the vast amount of data available within a vehicle to digestible chunks, thereby lessening the cognitive load on Soldiers and enabling accelerated engagement times. AiTR optimizes crew performance by developing reliable, intuitive, and adaptive automated target detection for crewed vehicles. AiTR integrates advanced fire control technologies providing the right firing solution, and adequate ammunition to engage targets that decrease the amount of time a tank crew needs to find and destroy targets and potentially reduce the need for hardware upgrades. The commander gains a tremendous advantage on the battlefield.

Mr. DAVIS. Secretary Driscoll and General George: How do you assess the potential for the Army to increase next-generation combat vehicle advanced technology to develop more advanced ground-to-ground Vehicle Aided Target Recognition?

General GEORGE. The Army has great potential to develop more advanced ground-to-ground Vehicle Aided Target Recognition by delivering critical warfighting capabilities in an iterative process through the use of testing and Soldier experiments (like Transformation in Contact (TiC) and Project Convergence) which provide opportunities for early Soldier feedback on the development of Aided Target Recognition (AiTR) systems using Artificial Intelligence (AI). A tank gunner, helicopter pilot, or rifle-armed soldier can be rapidly cued to threats with AiTR to enable his target engagement decision, making the timing crucially important. Army scientists, engineers, and weapons developers are working to test, assess and refine emerging technologies intended to reduce sensor-to-shooter time giving our forces a timing and target-ID accuracy advantage in war. Army soldiers are testing new generations of infrared and electro-optical targeting technologies like Advanced Targeting and Lethality Aided System, or ATLAS. AiTR is being integrated into the design of XM30 and M1E3.

ATLAS is an emerging tech software solution attempting to integrate tactical Electro-optic Infrared (EOIR) sensors with AiTR Artificial Intelligence algorithms trained on a vast set of military specific data to detect, classify, and track threats day/night and in all environments for long range target acquisition. The AiTR can accurately detect and classify images of enemy threats in real time at similar or better performance than human operators but much faster than humans can process information. The information from the AiTR is used to cue an operator for final target identification and engagement decisions. Further, the ATLAS AiTR will enable platforms to search wide areas for threats at machine speed and automatically the operator to targets from a moving platform and in heavily obscuration.

Mr. DAVIS. How would these advances help us counter non-peer, near-peer, and peer threats to our national security?

General GEORGE. Advances in AiTR will counter non-peer, near-peer, and peer threats by incorporating these capabilities into military platforms: shortening and improving human decision making by condensing the vast amount of data available

within a vehicle to digestible chunks, thereby lessening the cognitive load on Soldiers and enabling accelerated engagement times. AiTR optimizes crew performance by developing reliable, intuitive, and adaptive automated target detection for crewed vehicles. AiTR can integrate with advanced fire control technologies providing the right firing solution and the right ammunition to engage that target to massively decrease the amount of time a tank crew needs to find and destroy targets and potentially reduce the need for hardware upgrades.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. MCGUIRE

Mr. MCGUIRE. Secretary Driscoll, the Army Transformation Initiative memo also directs the Army to achieve, by 2027, long-range missiles capable of striking moving land and maritime targets. Solid rocket motors remain a critical component of nearly all such systems; however, procuring specialty materials, such as advanced composites and energetics for propellants, remains a key vulnerability in the solid rocket motor supply chain.

What is the Army's strategy to ensure a robust, resilient, and scalable domestic solid rocket motor supply chain to support the full spectrum of long-range strike capabilities, including hypersonics?

Furthermore, has the Army considered adopting a campus model to co-locate manufacturing and ensure reliable access to critical specialty materials?

Mr. DRISCOLL. It's clear: the need to rapidly expand the solid rocket motor supplier base increases in production capacity of munitions. The existing solid rocket motor supplier base is strained to meet current production capacity levels. To that end, the Army explores opportunities to engage with emerging non-traditional suppliers with established, non-traditional supply chains, innovative solid rocket motor technologies, alternative propellant mixes, and automated facilities as contributors to the expanding solid rocket motor supplier base.

Several companies have expressed interest in, or have demonstrated, the capability to manufacture solid rocket motors at a pace and scale that could significantly increase the global solid rocket motor supply. Initial entrants and domestic companies are bringing promising solid rocket motors, processes, and non-traditional suppliers to the attention of Army senior leaders as potential solutions to satisfy current and future solid rocket motor needs. The Army will persist with opportunities that leverage these emerging companies to ensure a robust, resilient, and scalable domestic solid rocket motor supply chain. These efforts support the full spectrum of long-range and hypersonic weapons strike capabilities. Potential efficiencies and benefits may be achieved resulting from co-located manufacturing and reliable access to critical specialty materials.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. CRANK

Mr. CRANK. Army installations across the country are grappling with shared challenges during peak entry periods, as labor-intensive manual identity checks lead to backups, traffic congestion, and increased strain on security resources. These delays disrupt surrounding communities and hinder operational efficiency by impacting personnel productivity and overstretching installation security teams. The reliance on manpower for these processes also further exposes installations to potential vulnerabilities in force protection during periods of high traffic. Recognizing the urgent need for more efficient and secure access control solutions, the Project Manager Force Protection Systems, through the Automated Installation Entry (AIE) System, has sought to address these challenges by incorporating biometric technologies to create ″Fast Lanes″ for a registered ″″Trusted Traveler″ population at each installation. This program plays a crucial role in reducing traffic congestion, improving identity verification and security, and reprioritizing manpower. What is the status of deploying the biometric ″Fast Lanes″ at the 20 highest priority installations in FY25 and FY26? How many installations will be complete by the end of FY25 and FY26? What are the specific actions that have been taken, or are planned to be taken, to accelerate the deployment and expansion of biometric-enabled ″fast lanes″? Has the Army considered investments in the integration and continuous innovation of the system, including its expansion to pedestrian and visitor management solutions?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Question 1) What is the status of deploying the biometric ″Fast Lanes″ at the 20 highest priority installations in FY25 and FY26?

Answer: The Army completed a successful pilot in FY24 of Facial Recognition (FR) ″Express Lanes″ which demonstrated an ability to increase throughput while also enhancing security at Redstone Arsenal and subsequently awarded a contract for

fielding in the same fiscal year. Due to a contract protest, the schedule was delayed. In mid-FY25, upon resolution of the contract protest, the Army moved forward with a plan to initially field the capability at Fort Bragg and Fort Riley based on Office of the Provost Marshal General prioritization. The Army expects to complete the fielding of these two locations in 1QFY26.

Question 2) How many installations will be complete by the end of FY25 and FY26?

Answer: The Army anticipates completing an additional two to four installations in FY26.

Question 3) What are the specific actions that have been taken, or are planned to be taken, to accelerate the deployment and expansion of biometric-enabled ″fast lanes″?

Answer: Acceleration of deployment and expansion is contingent on installations meeting new DoD infrastructure requirements and funding.

Question 4) Has the Army considered investments in the integration and continuous innovation of the system, including its expansion to pedestrian and visitor management solutions?

Answer: The Army is expanding multiple biometric capabilities including FR capabilities, to pedestrian access control and vetting in visitor management systems. Biometric vetting provides the capability to adjudicate non-US citizens requesting access to Army installations against the DoD Biometric Watch List.

Mr. CRANK. ″ The positioning and navigation systems of military vehicles rely heavily on the Global Positioning System (GPS), which depends on a network of satellites vulnerable to disruptions from terrain, electromagnetic storms, solar activity, or adversarial actions such as sabotage, jamming and spoofing. Recent advances in software-based, intelligent localization technologies now allow for precise vehicle positioning entirely independent of GPS, spectrum allocation, terrestrial beacons, or external infrastructure. These systems offer reliable, continuous navigation in GPS-denied settings, including tunnels, urban and rural canyons, and contested electronic warfare environments with no inherent time or distance limitations in urban terrain. Evaluated by the U.S. Department of Transportation and available at a fraction of the cost of hardware-centric solutions, these software-defined systems offer scalable, low-SWaP alternatives that merit serious consideration alongside or in place of current solutions. 1. Has the Department of the Army conducted a formal evaluation of GPS-independent, software-based intelligent positioning and navigation technologies, as aforementioned, as either a supplement to or replacement for hardware-dependent systems that are still reliant on GPS as a primary truth source and face operational drift in prolonged denied environments? 2. Please provide to the Committee all relevant documentation in which the Department has assessed the operational benefits and cost-effectiveness of adopting these intelligent software-defined systems across Army vehicle platforms. If no such analysis has been completed, please provide a timeline by which the Department will conduct a comprehensive evaluation and submit its findings to the Committee. 3. Additionally, please provide an estimated total procurement cost to equip necessary Army ground vehicles with software-based, intelligent GPS-independent navigation systems that meet the aforementioned criteria.

General GEORGE. The Army is currently running the xTech Overwatch competition, assessing the U.S. market for autonomous unmanned platforms (UAVs, UGVs, and stationary sensors) that can identify and occupy advantageous overwatch positions, adapt to terrain constraints, and execute mission objectives with minimal human intervention, all requiring integration with robust GPS solutions. These systems must integrate multi-modal sensor fusion, AI-driven target recognition, secure communications, and adaptive decision-making to enhance situational awareness and mission effectiveness. Competition of integrated systems evaluated over six hundred different technical solutions; forty vendors will perform a live technology demo in October 2025. Once the Army conducts broader evaluations, the acquisition community will use the information to determine if this technology can be incorporated into existing or new programs of record. At that time, the Army can assess procurement and platform integration costs.

RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. HAMADEH

Mr. HAMADEH. Combat Readiness Standards Questions were raised by Congresswoman Houlahan regarding new standards of fitness for combat roles in the United States Army and how they might affect opportunities for women to become Army Rangers. Starting January 1, 2026, men and women assigned to any of the 21 com-

bat-focused military occupational specialties will have to meet the same standards of fitness.

Question 1: The new scorecard used for the Army Fitness Test, approved May 1 and effective June 1, 2025, requires all combat soldiers be able to complete only 10 push-ups in two minutes, with the highest baseline of 15 for ages 17-21, to pass that portion of the Army Fitness Test. Have there been any plans to amend the scorecard to further increase this baseline?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army Fitness Test scorecard was approved on 15 May 2025 with an effective date of 1 June 2025. Present day, there are no additional adjustments scheduled for the hand-release pushup event; however, the Army has a process to periodically review and adjust standards when required. For clarity, 15 repetitions remain the minimum baseline for 17-21-year-old Soldiers in combat roles; only combat Soldiers 52 and older must perform a minimum of 10 repetitions.

Mr. HAMADEH. Questions were raised by Congresswoman Houlahan regarding new standards of fitness for combat roles in the United States Army and how they might affect opportunities for women to become Army Rangers. Starting January 1, 2026, men and women assigned to any of the 21 combat-focused military occupational specialties will have to meet the same standards of fitness.

Question 2: A January 25, 2020 study by the Modern War Institute at West Point found that physical fitness components such as agility, mobility, and flexibility were undertrained in typical field training exercises. With our increased awareness of the effectiveness of drones in modern warfighting, how will these fitness components be emphasized in the future to train our combat personnel to evade new lethal technologies?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The typical field training exercise relies on the conduct of doctrinal unit-level collective training tasks. The Army recognizes that physical fitness is a major contributor to individual Soldier readiness to perform combat related tasks during unit-level collective training and has adjusted fitness standards accordingly. As emerging technologies and threats emerge near and far, the Army will review and revise tactical and physical training across the spectrum of training opportunities.

Mr. HAMADEH. Questions were raised by Congresswoman Houlahan regarding new standards of fitness for combat roles in the United States Army and how they might affect opportunities for women to become Army Rangers. Starting January 1, 2026, men and women assigned to any of the 21 combat-focused military occupational specialties will have to meet the same standards of fitness.

Question 3: Is it the position of the United States Army that combat readiness is more important in warfighting than Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA), including diversity of gender?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Yes.

Mr. HAMADEH. Transgender Army Personnel Secretary Hegseth's recent memo encouraged members of the Armed Services diagnosed with gender dysphoria to voluntarily discharge by this week. Those who do not will undergo involuntary discharge starting June 6, 2025.

Question 1: There have been recent estimates that there will only be about 1,240 transgender Army personnel affected by the Department of Defense's new orders. Can you provide further details on how this process will be carried out in the United State Army?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army strives to develop a seamless process that treats these individuals with dignity and respect. The process starts upon a commander having personal knowledge that an individual has or may have gender dysphoria. Once a commander has knowledge of such information, they will direct medical readiness review. If the medical verification identifies that the individual does have gender dysphoria, then the commander will initiate the separation process. The separation authority is at the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Manpower and Reserve Affairs level if that person is appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate.

Individuals with gender dysphoria have volunteered to serve our country and will be treated with dignity and respect. For those who seek voluntary separation, process and procedures require medical verification to establish that they meet the separation criteria of a current diagnosis or history of, or exhibiting symptoms consistent with, gender dysphoria.

Identification of Service members will occur with unit commanders, working in coordination with supporting medical assets, to confirm compliance with Individual Medical Readiness (IMR) standards per DoD Instruction 6025.19, ″Individual Medical Readiness Program″ (July 13, 2022). Commanders who are aware of Service members in their units with gender dysphoria, a history of gender dysphoria, or symptoms consistent with gender dysphoria will direct individualized medical record

reviews of such Service members to confirm compliance with medical standards under the IMR program.

Consistent with existing law and Department policy, commanders protect the privacy of protected health information in the same manner as with any other protected health information. Such health information is restricted to personnel with a specific need to know for the conduct of official duties.

Mr. HAMADEH. Secretary Hegseth's recent memo encouraged members of the Armed Services diagnosed with gender dysphoria to voluntarily discharge by this week. Those who do not will undergo involuntary discharge starting June 6, 2025.

Question 2: What risks (combat, operational, or otherwise) are posed by gender dysphoria, which is on the DSM-5, afflicting our members of the Armed Services?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Gender dysphoria refers to a marked incongruence between one's experienced or expressed gender and assigned gender of at least 6 months' duration, as manifested by conditions associated with clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning.

Gender-affirming surgeries and hormone therapies can temporarily or permanently impact deployability because surgical recovery and the logistical requirements of hormone therapy in operational environments present challenges. The length and nature of these limitations vary depending on the individual and the specific treatments.

The Department of Defense's (DoD) mission requires Service members to abide by strict mental and physical standards. DoD is committed to mission success by ensuring that the individuals who serve are physically and mentally capable of performing their duties even in the harshest conditions. The lethality, readiness, and warfighting capability of our Force depends on Service members meeting those standards. As the President of the United States stated in Executive Order 14183, ″Prioritizing Military Excellence and Readiness,″ January 27, 2025, ″It is the policy of the United States Government to establish high standards for troop readiness, lethality, cohesion, honesty, humility, uniformity, and integrity. This policy is inconsistent with the medical, surgical, and mental health constraints on individuals with gender dysphoria.″

Mr. HAMADEH. Women in Combat Roles An August 14, 2015 Marine Corps report found that women were significantly less accurate with military weapons than their male counterparts, significantly more prone to injury, and a Fiscal Year 2021 Department of Defense report found that incidents of sexual assault had increased over recent years with the introduction of women into combat roles.

Question 1: Regarding women's opportunities to become Army Rangers, are the above referenced challenges considered or felt while admitting personnel to this important post?

Mr. DRISCOLL. No. Army assignment decisions are based on the Soldier's qualifications and ability to fill a valid requirement. All Soldiers undergo a vigorous training and selection process prior to becoming fully qualified for assignment and selection as an Army Ranger.

Mr. HAMADEH. An August 14, 2015 Marine Corps report found that women were significantly less accurate with military weapons than their male counterparts, significantly more prone to injury, and a Fiscal Year 2021 Department of Defense report found that incidents of sexual assault had increased over recent years with the introduction of women into combat roles.

Question 2: Seeing the necessity to innovate in drone operating technology and training, could female service members in the Army be better suited for this type of warfighting, as opposed to direct combat?

Mr. DRISCOLL. The Army conducts personnel assignments without regard to sex, color, race, religious preference, ethnic background, national origin, age, marital status, or sexual orientation. Assignment decisions are based on the Soldiers' qualifications and ability to fill a valid requirement.

Mr. HAMADEH. Combat Readiness Standards Questions were raised by Congresswoman Houlahan regarding new standards of fitness for combat roles in the United States Army and how they might affect opportunities for women to become Army Rangers. Starting January 1, 2026, men and women assigned to any of the 21 combat-focused military occupational specialties will have to meet the same standards of fitness.

Question 1: The new scorecard used for the Army Fitness Test, approved May 1 and effective June 1, 2025, requires all combat soldiers be able to complete only 10 push-ups in two minutes, with the highest baseline of 15 for ages 17-21, to pass that portion of the Army Fitness Test. Have there been any plans to amend the scorecard to further increase this baseline?

General GEORGE. The Army Fitness Test scorecard was approved on 15 May 2025 with an effective date of 1 June 2025. Currently, there are no additional adjust-

ments scheduled for the hand-release pushup event; however, the Army has a process to periodically review and adjust standards when required. For clarity, 15-repetitions is the minimum baseline for 17-21 year-old Soldiers in combat roles; only combat Soldiers 52 and older must perform a minimum of 10-repetitions.

Mr. HAMADEH. Questions were raised by Congresswoman Houlahan regarding new standards of fitness for combat roles in the United States Army and how they might affect opportunities for women to become Army Rangers. Starting January 1, 2026, men and women assigned to any of the 21 combat-focused military occupational specialties will have to meet the same standards of fitness.

Question 2: A January 25, 2020 study by the Modern War Institute at West Point found that physical fitness components such as agility, mobility, and flexibility were undertrained in typical field training exercises. With our increased awareness of the effectiveness of drones in modern warfighting, how will these fitness components be emphasized in the future to train our combat personnel to evade new lethal technologies?

General GEORGE. The typical field training exercise remains connected to the conduct of doctrinal unit-level collective training tasks. The Army recognizes physical fitness contributes greatly to individual Soldier readiness to perform combat related tasks during unit-level collective training and has adjusted fitness standards accordingly. As emerging technologies emerge, the Army will continually review and revise tactical and physical training across the spectrum of training opportunities.

Mr. HAMADEH. Questions were raised by Congresswoman Houlahan regarding new standards of fitness for combat roles in the United States Army and how they might affect opportunities for women to become Army Rangers. Starting January 1, 2026, men and women assigned to any of the 21 combat-focused military occupational specialties will have to meet the same standards of fitness.

Question 3: Is it the position of the United States Army that combat readiness is more important in warfighting than Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Accessibility (DEIA), including diversity of gender?

General GEORGE. Yes. On Jan. 20, 2025, President Trump's Executive Order (EO) 14151, Ending Radical and Wasteful Government Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (DEI) Programs and Preferencing, and EO 14148, Initial Rescissions of Harmful Executive Orders and Actions, repealed former President Biden's EO 14035, DEI and Accessibility in the Federal Workforce, and required all previous services to immediately rescind DEI programs.

Mr. HAMADEH. Transgender Army Personnel Secretary Hegseth's recent memo encouraged members of the Armed Services diagnosed with gender dysphoria to voluntarily discharge by this week. Those who do not will undergo involuntary discharge starting June 6, 2025.

Question 1: There have been recent estimates that there will only be about 1,240 transgender Army personnel affected by the Department of Defense's new orders. Can you provide further details on how this process will be carried out in the United State Army?

General GEORGE. While a specific number of affected personnel is not truly known currently, the Army strives to develop a seamless process that treats these individuals with dignity and respect. The process starts upon a commander having information of knowledge that an individual has or may have gender dysphoria. Once a commander has information of knowledge, they will direct an individual medical readiness review. If the medical verification identifies that the individual does have gender dysphoria, then the commander will initiate the separation process. Additionally, through Periodic Health Assessments (PHAs) and upon medical verification of gender dysphoria, the commander will direct the separation.

Mr. HAMADEH. Secretary Hegseth's recent memo encouraged members of the Armed Services diagnosed with gender dysphoria to voluntarily discharge by this week. Those who do not will undergo involuntary discharge starting June 6, 2025.

Question 2: What risks (combat, operational, or otherwise) are posed by gender dysphoria, which is on the DSM-5, afflicting our members of the Armed Services?

General GEORGE. The question of risks posed by gender dysphoria in military service is complex. It's imperative to approach this issue with evidence-based assessments, focusing on individual capabilities and minimizing assumptions based solely on a diagnosis of gender dysphoria.

Gender dysphoria refers to a marked incongruence between one's experienced or expressed gender and assigned gender of at least 6 months' duration, as manifested by conditions associated with clinically significant distress or impairment in social, occupational, or other important areas of functioning. While not directly caused by the condition itself, risks related to treatment for gender dysphoria and military service are as defined:

Unit cohesion: There are concerns that a Service member's transition could potentially disrupt unit cohesion, affecting morale or teamwork. There is data which indicate an increase in suicide attempts in the transgender population. Medical deployability: Gender-affirming surgeries and hormone therapies can temporarily or permanently impact deployability because surgical recovery and the logistical requirements of hormone therapy in operational environments present challenges. The length and nature of these limitations vary depending on the individual and the specific treatments.

Physical standards: Transition-related medical treatments affect physical characteristics. While not guaranteed, alterations to physical characteristics have the potential to impact a service member's ability to achieve height, weight, AFT, and other combat related requirements.

Mr. HAMADEH. Women in Combat Roles An August 14, 2015 Marine Corps report found that women were significantly less accurate with military weapons than their male counterparts, significantly more prone to injury, and a Fiscal Year 2021 Department of Defense report found that incidents of sexual assault had increased over recent years with the introduction of women into combat roles.

Question 1: Regarding women's opportunities to become Army Rangers, are the above referenced challenges considered or felt while admitting personnel to this important post?

General GEORGE. No. Army assignment decisions are based on Soldiers' qualifications and ability to fill a valid requirement. All Soldiers undergo vigorous training and selection processes prior to becoming fully qualified for assignment and selection as an Army Ranger.

The Army engaged in many efforts to improve our sexual assault prevention and response efforts. These are crucial to maintaining a mission ready force, not only for Rangers, but across the enterprise. It's important to note the DoD Fiscal Year 2023 Annual Report on Sexual Assault in the Military included results from the 2023 Workplace Experiences Survey of Military Members (WESM) which estimates the prevalence of sexual assault. occurrences That report estimated a 19% decrease in women experiencing unwanted sexual contact from the prior survey conducted in 2021. Additionally, the percentage of victimized Service members choosing to report the crime (the sexual assault ″reporting rate″) increased from 20 percent in Calendar Year 2021 (CY21) to 25 percent in FY23. While these are positive trends, the Army remains keenly focused on implementing the approved recommendations of the Independent Review Commission on Sexual Assault in the Military (IRC-SAM) to accomplish long-lasting change.

Mr. HAMADEH. An August 14, 2015 Marine Corps report found that women were significantly less accurate with military weapons than their male counterparts, significantly more prone to injury, and a Fiscal Year 2021 Department of Defense report found that incidents of sexual assault had increased over recent years with the introduction of women into combat roles.

Question 2: Seeing the necessity to innovate in drone operating technology and training, could female service members in the Army be better suited for this type of warfighting, as opposed to direct combat?

General GEORGE. The Army conducts personnel assignments without regard to color, race, religious preference, ethnic background, national origin, age, marital status, or sexual orientation. Assignment decisions are based on the Soldier's qualifications and ability to fill a valid requirement.

○