



Associations for America's Defense
#1 Constitution Ave, Washington, DC 20002

Phone: (202) 646-7713
Fax: (202) 547-1641

STATEMENT OF

ASSOCIATIONS FOR AMERICA'S DEFENSE

BEFORE THE

DEFENSE SUBCOMMITTEE

OF THE

THE SENATE APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

UNITED STATES SENATE

Presented by

Elizabeth Cochran

Secretary
Associations for America's Defense

June 23, 2010

SD-124

ORGANIZATIONAL DISCLOSURE STATEMENTS AND CURRICULUM VITAE

Associations for America's Defense

Founded in January of 2002, the Association for America's Defense (A4AD) is an adhoc group of Military and Veteran Associations that have concerns about National Security issues that are not normally addressed by The Military Coalition (TMC) and the National Military Veterans Alliance (NMVA), but participants are members from each. Members have developed expertise in the various branches of the Armed Forces and provide input on force policy and structure. Among the issues that are addressed are equipment, end strength, force structure, and defense policy. A4AD, also, cooperatively works with other associations, who provide input while not including their association name to the membership roster.

Participating Associations:

Air Force Association	National Assoc. for Uniformed Services
Army and Navy Union	Naval Enlisted Reserve Association
Association of the U.S. Navy	Reserve Enlisted Association
Enlisted Assoc. of the National Guard of the U.S.	Reserve Officers Association
Marine Corps Reserve Association	The Flag and General Officers' Network
Military Order of World Wars	The Retired Enlisted Association

Elizabeth M. Cochran

Elizabeth M. Cochran assists the Legislative Director for the Reserve Officers Association of the United States. She has worked for ROA for more than a year, working with members of The Military Coalition (TMC) and the National Military Veterans Alliance (NMVA), as well as Congressional members and staff, and others. Mrs. Cochran also worked at the Naval Reserve Association (now the Association of the U.S. Navy). In her last position she was employed by the Council for International Exchange of Scholars (CIES) where she worked in the Global and Specialists Division, on the Fulbright Specialists Program. She has a degree in political science from the University of Kentucky and has traveled quite extensively in Europe and has visited China. Her father and mother both had careers in the Armed Forces, and Elizabeth Cochran is currently applying to join the Navy.

The Reserve Officers Association of the United States (ROA) was founded in 1922 and is chartered by Congress. The Association is a nonprofit 501c (19) corporation organized under the laws of the District of Columbia.

Contact: telephone: 202-646-7743 fax: 202-541-1641 e-mail: ecochran@roa.org

Disclosure

Neither the Associations for America's Defense (A4AD), nor the Reserve Officers Association (ROA) have received grants (and/or sub-grants) or contracts (and/or subcontracts) from the federal government for the past four fiscal years.

ASSOCIATIONS FOR AMERICA'S DEFENSE

INTRODUCTION

Mister Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, the Associations for America's Defense (A4AD) is again very grateful for the invitation to testify before you about our views and suggestions concerning current and future issues facing the defense appropriations.

The Association for America's Defense is an adhoc group of twelve military and veteran associations that have concerns about national security issues. Collectively, we represent armed forces members and their families, who are serving our nation, or who have done so in the past.

CURRENT VERSUS FUTURE: ISSUES FACING DEFENSE

The Associations for America's Defense would like to thank this subcommittee for the on-going stewardship that it has demonstrated on issues of defense. While in a time of war, this subcommittee's pro-defense and non-partisan leadership continues to set an example.

Force Structure: Erosion in Capability

The Obama Administration's 2010 Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR) advances two objectives: further rebalance the Armed Force's capabilities to prevail in today's wars while building needed capabilities to deal with future threats; and second, reform the Department of Defense's (DoD) institutions and processes to better support warfighters' urgent needs; purchase weapons that are usable, affordable, and needed; and ensure that taxpayer dollars are spent wisely and responsibly. The new QDR calls for DoD to continually evolve and adapt in response to the changing security environment.

During his testimony before the House Armed Services Committee (HASC) in February, Admiral Mike Mullen stated, "...I am growing concerned about our defense industrial base, particularly in ship building and space. As fiscal pressures increase, our ability to build future weapon systems will be impacted by decreasing modernization budgets as well as mergers and acquisitions."

In 2009 Secretary of Defense Robert Gates testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee (SASC) that the U.S. should focus on the wars that we are fighting today, not on future wars that may never occur. He also asserts that U.S. conventional capabilities will remain superior for another 15 years. Anthony Cordesman, a national security expert for the Center for Strategic and International Studies, says that Gates' plan should be viewed as a set of short-term fixes aimed at helping "a serious cost containment problem," not a new national security policy.

War planners are often accused of planning for the last war. Secretary Gates speaks to enhancing the capabilities of fighting today's wars. A concern arises on whether DoD's focus should be on irregular or conventional warfare, and whether it should be preparing for a full scale "peer" war.

Hollow Force

A4AD could not disagree more by placing such budgetary constraints on defense. Member associations question the spending priorities of the current administration. "Fiscal restraint for defense and fiscal largesse for everything else," commented then ranking member John McHugh at a HASC hearing on the defense budget in May 2009.

The result of such a budgetary policy could again lead to a hollow force whose readiness and effectiveness has been subtly degraded and lessened efficiency will not be immediately evident. This process which echoes of the past, raises no red flags and sounds no alarms, and the damage can go unnoticed and unremedied until a crisis arises highlighting how much readiness decayed.

Emergent Risks

Members of this group are concerned that U.S. defense policy is sacrificing future security for near term readiness. Our efforts are so focused to provide security and stabilization in Afghanistan and withdrawing from Iraq, that risk is being accepted as an element of future force planning. Force planning is being driven by current overseas contingency operations, and increasingly on budget limitations. Careful study is needed to make the right choice. A4AD is pleased that Congress and this subcommittee continue oversight in these decisions.

What seems to be overlooked is that the United States is involved in a Cold War as well as a Hot War with two theaters as well as varying issues in the Middle East, North Korea, China, Russia, and Iran which are growing areas of risk.

Korean Peninsula

Provocatively, North Korea successfully tested a nuclear weapon at full yield, unilaterally withdrew from that 1953 armistice. The Republic of Korea lost a navy ship sunk to a torpedo. South Korean and U.S. troops have been put on the highest alert level in years.

North Korea has 1.2 million troops, with 655,000 South Korean soldiers and 28,500 U.S. troops stationed to the South. While not an immediate danger to the U.S., North Korea is viewed as an increased threat to its neighbors, and is potentially a destabilizing factor in Asia. North Korea may be posturing, but it is still a failed state, where misinterpretation clouded by hubris could start a war. The North has prepositioned and could fire up to 250,000 rounds of heavy artillery in the first 48 hours of a war along the border and into Seoul.

China

China's armed forces are the largest in the world and have undergone double-digit increases in military spending since the early 90s. DoD has reported that China's actual spending on its military is up to 250 percent higher than figures reported by the Chinese government, and their cost of materials and labor is much lower. In 2009, China's defense budget increased by almost 15 percent and further increased about 7.5 percent for 2010. DoD's 2009 report to Congress on China's military strength estimated in 2008 that its spending ranged from \$105 and \$150 billion, the second highest in the world after the United States. It should be noted that these dollars go further within the Chinese economy as well.

China's build-up of sea and air military power appears aimed at the U.S., according to Admiral Michael Mullen, the chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff. Furthermore China is reluctant to support international efforts in reproaching North Korea, which recently as evidenced by the sunk South Korean naval vessel.

The U.S. military strategy cannot be held hostage by international debts. While China is the biggest foreign holder of U.S. Treasuries with \$895.2 billion at the end of March, we cannot be lulled into a sense of complacency.

Russia

While the Obama Administration has been working on a 'reset' policy towards Russia, including a new START treaty, there are areas of concern. A distressing issue is their relationship with Iran which the U.S. and even the United Nations have brought sanctions against. Additionally Russia sells arms to countries like Syria and Venezuela that also have ties to Iran.

Prime Minister Vladimir Putin stated recently that, "Despite the difficult environment in which we are today, we still found a way to not only maintain but also increase the total amount of state defense order." Russia's defense budget rose by 34 percent in 2009, as reported by the International Institute of Strategic Study in an annual report.

Iran

While Iran lobs petulant rhetoric towards the United States, the real international tension is between Israel and Iran. Israel views Tehran's atomic work as a threat, and would consider military action against Iran as it has threatened to "eliminate Israel." Israeli leadership has warned Iran that any attack on Israel would result in the "destruction of the Iranian nation." Israel is believed to have between 75 to 200 nuclear warheads with a megaton capacity.

Funding for the Future

Since Secretary Gates initiated the practice of reviewing all the services' unfunded requirements lists prior to testifying before Congress the result has been in fiscal restraint. The unfunded lists have shown a dramatic reduction from \$33.3 billion for Fiscal Year (FY) 2008 and \$31 billion for FY-09 to \$3.8 billion for FY-10 and \$2.6 billion for FY-11. Most notable is that the Air Force in prior years represented about 50 percent of the total unfunded requirements list and is now proportionate to the other services.

In 2009 Secretary Gates told SASC, "It is simply not reasonable to expect the defense budget to continue increasing at the same rate it has over the last number of years." He went further saying, "We should be able to secure our nation with a base budget of more than half a trillion dollars." Following through on these statements the Secretary has instituted a plan to save \$100 billion over five years. Two-thirds of the savings are supposed to come from decreasing overhead and one-third from cuts in weapons systems and force structure, meaning less people. For the 2012 budget, the military services and defense agencies have been asked to find \$7 billion in savings.

These impending cuts are in addition to weapon systems cuts from last year which amounted to about \$300 billion. Despite the great need to manage budgets in light of the financial situation that the U.S. faces, we are still conducting two theaters in a war, and should be prepared to fight if another threat challenges U.S National Security.

Defense as a Factor of GDP

Secretary Gates has warned that that each defense budget decision is "zero sum," providing money for one program will take money away from another. A4AD encourages the appropriations subcommittee on defense to scrutinize the recommended spending amount for defense. Each member association supports increasing defense spending to five percent of Gross Domestic Product during times of war to cover procurement and prevent unnecessary personnel end strength cuts.

A Changing Manpower Structure

The 2010 QDR recommends incremental reductions in force structure shrinking the fleet to about 250 to 260 ships, reducing the number of active Army brigade combat teams to 45 and Air Force tactical fighter wings to 17, while maintaining the 202,100 Marine Corps active manpower level. The Heritage Foundation projects there will be a five percent decrease in manpower over the next five years.

A4AD supports a moratorium on further cuts including the National Guard and other military Reserve. We further suggest that a Zero Based Review (ZBR) be performed to evaluate the current manning requirements. Additionally, as the active force is cut, these manpower and equipment assets should remain in the Reserve Components.

Maintaining a Surge Capability

The Armed Forces need to provide critical surge capacity for homeland security, domestic and expeditionary support to national security and defense, and response to domestic disasters, both natural and man-made that goes beyond operational forces. A strategic surge construct includes manpower, airlift and air refueling, sealift inventory, logistics, and communications to provide a surge-to-demand operation. This requires funding for training, equipping and maintenance of a mission-ready strategic reserve composed of active and reserve units. An additional requirement is excess infrastructure which would permit the housing of additional forces that are called-up beyond the normal operational force.

Dependence on Foreign Partnership

Part of the U.S. military strategy is to rely on long-term alliances to augment U.S. forces. As stated in a DoD progress report. "Our strategy emphasizes the capacities of a broad spectrum of partners... We must also seek to strengthen the resiliency of the international system... helping others to police themselves and their regions." The FY-11 budget request included an increase from \$350 to \$500 million for the Global Train and Equip authority that helps build capabilities of key partners.

The risk of basing a national security policy on foreign interests and good world citizenship is increasingly uncertain because the United States does not necessarily control our foreign partners as their national objectives can differ from our own. Alliances should be viewed as a tool and a force multiplier, but not the foundation of National Security.

UNFUNDED REQUIREMENTS

The FY-11 Unfunded Program Lists submitted by the military services to Congress continued in FY-10's steps, which was 87 percent less than was requested for FY-09. A4AD has concerns that the unfunded requests continue to be driven more by budgetary factors than risk assessment which will impact national security. The following are lists submitted by A4AD including additional non-funded recommendations.

Tactical Aircraft

DoD's efforts to recapitalize and modernize its tactical air forces have been blunted by cost and schedule overruns in its new tactical aircraft acquisition programs. For FY-10 the Air Force offered a plan to retire 250 fighter jets in one year alone, which Secretary Gates accepted.

Yet the HASC observed after approving Navy and Marine Corps procurement, and research and development programs in May, that it's concerned about the unacceptable deficit of approximately 250 tactical aircraft by 2017, warning future budget requests must address this.

Until new systems are acquired in sufficient quantities to replace legacy fleets, legacy systems must be sustained and kept operationally relevant. The risk of the older aircraft and their crews and support personnel being eliminated before the new aircraft are on line could result in a significant security shortfall.

Airlift

Hundreds of thousands of hours have been flown, and millions of passengers and tons of cargo have been airlifted. Their contributions in moving cargo and passengers are absolutely indispensable to American warfighters in overseas contingencies. Both Air Force and Naval airframes and air crew are being stressed by these lift missions. As the military continues to become more expeditionary it will require more airlift. ***Procurement needs to be accelerated and modernized, and mobility requirements need to be reported upon.***

While DoD has decided to shut down production of C-17s, existing C-17s are being worn out at a higher rate than anticipated. Congress should independently examine actual airlift needs, and plan for C-17 modernization, a possible follow-on procurement. Given the C-5's advanced age, it makes more sense to retire the oldest and most worn of these planes and use the upgrade funds to buy more C-5s and modernize current C-5 aircraft. DoD should also continue with a joint multi-year procurement of C-130Js.

The Navy and Marine Corps need C-40A replacements for the C-9B aircraft; only nine C-40s have been ordered since 1997 to replace 29 C-9Bs. The Navy requires Navy Unique Fleet Essential Airlift. The C-40A, a derivative of the 737-700C a Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) certified, while the aging C-9 fleet is not compliant with either future global navigation requirements or noise abatement standards that restrict flights into European airfields.

The Air Force-Navy-Marine Corps fighter inventory will decline steadily from 3,264 airframes in FY-11 to 2,883 in FY-18, at which point the air fleet is supposed to have a slow increase.

Tankers

The need for air refueling is reconfirmed on a daily basis in worldwide DoD operations. A significant number of tankers are old and plagued with structural problems. The Air Force would like to retire as many as 131 of the Eisenhower-era KC-135E tankers by the end of the decade. DoD and Congress must work together to replace of these aircraft. A contract needs to be offered. A4AD thanks this committee for its ongoing support to resolve this issue.

NGREA

A4AD asks this committee to continue to provide appropriations for unfunded National Guard and Reserve Equipment Requirements. The National Guard's goal is to make at least half of Army and Air assets (personnel and equipment) available to the Governors and Adjutants General at any given time. To appropriate funds to Guard and Reserve equipment provides Reserve Chiefs with a flexibility of prioritizing funding.

UNFUNDED EQUIPMENT REQUIREMENTS

[The services and lists are not in priority order.]

	Amount
Air Force:	
C-130 Aircraft Armor (79).....	\$ 15.8 million
C-130 NVIS Windows (64).....	\$ 1 million
C-130 Crash Resistant Loadmaster Seat Modifications (76).....	\$ 19 million
C-17 Armor Refurbishment and Replacement (17).....	\$ 2 million
Air Force Submitted Requirements:	
Weapons System Sustainment: Programmed Depot Maintenance (PDMs), High Velocity Maintenance (HVM), Service Life Extension Program (SLEP)/ Scheduled Structural Inspections (SSI), and engine overhauls [<i>ANG & AFR included</i>]...	\$ 337.2 million
Theater Posture: contract maintenance of Base Expeditionary Airfield Resources (BEAR)/War Readiness Material assets; procure Fuels Operational Readiness Capability equipment (FORCE) sets, fuel bladders/liners.....	\$ 70 million
DCGS Integrated C3 PED System.....	\$ 55 million
Battlefield Airmen Equipment/JTAC Modeling & Simulation.....	\$ 28.7 million
Vehicle & Support Equipment Procurement.....	\$ 57.1 million
Air Force Reserve (USAFR):	
LITENING Targeting pod (19).....	\$ 24 million
C-130 Secure Line of Sight/Beynold Line of Sight (SLOS/BLOS) (63)...	\$ 22.1 million
AFRC ATP Procurement & Spiral Upgrade (54).....	\$ 54 million
C-130 Aircraft Armor (79).....	\$ 15.8 million
C-130 Crash Resistant Loadmaster Seats (76).....	\$ 19 million
F-16 All WX A-G Precision Self-Targeting Capability (54).....	\$ 120 million
A-10 On Board Oxygen Generating System (OBOGS) (54).....	\$ 11.1 million
Air National Guard (USANG):	
F-15 Digital Video Recorder (DVR) (upgrades to ANG F-15 aircraft).....	\$ 7 million
C-37B (Gulf Stream) aircraft (4).....	\$ 256 million
USANG requires at Andrews AFB to replace the aging C-38A fleet C-17 (5 minimum).....	\$ 1 billion
Requirement identified by NGAUS, EANGUS, AGAUS, and ROA.	
Security Forces Tactical Vehicles:	
HMMWVs (1700).....	\$ 170 million
LTMVs (500).....	\$ 100 million
Upgraded Personal Protective Equipment:	
IOTVs (4600).....	\$ 3.1 million
ESAPI Plates (9200).....	\$ 7.5 million
Concealable Body Armor (8800).....	\$ 4.4 million
Air Refueling Tanker replacements.....	Unknown
Army Submitted Requirements:	
Line of Communication Bridge (LOCB).....	\$ 15 million
Light Weight Counter-Mortar Radar (LCMR).....	\$ 47.1 million
NAVSTAR GPS: Defense Advanced GPS Receiver (DAGR).....	\$ 51.2 million
Civil Affairs/Psychological Operations (CA/Psy Ops)....	\$ 55 million

Advanced Field Artillery Tactical Data System (AFATDS) Forward Entry Devices.....	\$ 16.2 million
Patriot.....	\$ 133.6 million
Test 7 Evaluation Instrumentation.....	\$ 17.7 million
Army Test Range Infrastructure.....	\$ 22.9 million

Army Reserve (USAR):

Helicopter, Attack AH-64D (3).....	\$ 75.5 million
MTV 5 Ton Cargo Truck, M108s (448).....	\$ 57.4 million
LMTV 2.5 Ton Cargo Truck, M1079 (23).....	\$ 3.7 million
HMMWVs (humvees), ARMT Carrier, M1025 (1037).....	\$ 78 million
Night Vision Goggles, AN/PVX-7B (7740).....	\$ 28 million
Weapons:	
Machine Gun, 7.62MM, M240B (3445).....	\$ 20.6 million
Carbine Rifle, 5.56MM, M4 (6441).....	\$ 3.7 million
Next Generation of Loudspeaker System (NGLS) Manpak, NGLS Vehicle (1344).....	\$ 86.7 million

Army National Guard (USARNG):

ATLAS (All Terrain Lifter-Army System and II), Truck Lift.....	\$ 4.3 million
Chemical Decontamination (JSTDS-SS, CBPS).....	\$ 11 million
Radios, COTS Tactical Radios.....	\$ 10 million
FMTV (Truck tractor: MTV W/E, Truck Van: Expansible MTV W/E) ...	\$ 507 million
Joint Assault Bridge (Carrier Bridge Launching: Joint Assault XM1074)...	\$ 35 million

Navy Submitted Requirements:

Aviation Spares: T/M/S, Fleet aircraft.....	\$ 423 million
Ship Depot Maintenance: deferred surface ship non-docking availabilities....	\$ 35 million
Aviation Depot Maintenance: deferred airframes/engines.....	\$ 74 million

Note: A4AD recommends further investment in the DDG-1000 or a similar concept. This vessel was designed to allow expansion for future systems and technology. Any new construction should permit maximized modernization. Restarting procurement of the DDG-51 (Arleigh Burke) class Aegis destroyers limit the Navy with a 35 year old hull design, which requires 350 people to crew. While higher costs are cited, Congress should find ways to reduce shipbuilding, maintenance and manpower cost, rather than constrain technology.

Navy Reserve (USNR):

C-40A Combo cargo/passenger airlift aircraft (5).....	\$ 75 million
EA-18G, Growler (2).....	\$ 142.8 million
Additional 3 Growlers will be needed in FY-12.	
Navy Expeditionary Combat Command.....	\$ 20 million
MPF Utility Boat (3).....	\$ 3 million

Marine Corps Submitted Requirements:

CH-53 Reliability Improvements.....	\$ 34 million
Warfighter Equipment: KC-130J, UC-35ER, UC-12W.....	\$ 168 million
Readiness: M88A2 Improved Recovery Vehicle, Mine Roller System, Assault Breacher Vehicle, Family of Field Medical Equipment.....	\$ 131 million
Modernization of Child Development Center.....	\$ 18 million

Marine Forces Reserves (MFR)

KC-130J Super Hercules Aircraft tankers (4).....	\$ 200 million
Light Armored Vehicles (LAV).....	\$ 1.5 million
Training Allowance (T/A) Shortfalls.....	\$ 145 million
To provide most up to date Individual Combat & Protective Equipment: M4 rifles, Rifle Combat Optic (RCO) scopes, Light weight helmets, Small Arms Protective Insert (SAPI) plates, Modular Tactical Vests, Flame Resistant	
Logistics Vehicle Replacement System Cargo.....	Unknown

Reserve Components (RCs)

The National Guard Bureau has stated that the aggregate equipment shortage for the RCs is about \$45 billion. Common challenges for the RCs are ensuring that equipment is available for pre-mobilization training, transparency of equipment procurement and distribution, and maintenance.

One of USANG’s top issues is modernizing legacy aircraft and other weapon systems for dual missions and combat deployments.

USARNG equipment challenges include, but aren’t limited to modernizing both the helicopter and Tactical Wheeled Vehicle (TWV) fleets, and interoperability with the active component. Additionally while the ARNG’s total equipment on hand (EOH) is 77 percent, there’s only 62 percent of the authorized equipment in the continental United States (CONUS) available to governors. The Army expects ARNG’s total EOH will fall to 74 percent during 2010.

The USAFR’s primary obstacles are defensive systems funding shortfalls, and modernization of data link and secure communications.

The USAR has concerns about the modernization of equipment and maintenance infrastructure to support ARFORGEN, sustainment of equipment to support deploying units and ARFOGEN, and increases in procurement funding. Additionally Lieutenant General Jack Stultz, chief of the Army Reserve, stated in testimony before the HASC Readiness subcommittee this spring that the USAR is challenged by “still being budgeted as a strategic reserve.”

USNR top equipping challenges are aircraft procurement specifically for C-40A, E/A-18G, P-8, and KC-130J; and equipment for civil engineering, material handling, and communications for OCO-related units.

The USMFR is concerned about ensuring deploying members continue to receive up to date individual combat clothing and protective equipment in theater as well as maintaining the right amount of equipment on hand at RC units to train prior to deployment.

Active Components

In DoD’s new 30-year aircraft investment blueprint it calls for the Air Force to pause for at least 10 years in production of new strategic airlifters and long-range bombers. The plan also slows the process to purchase F-35s causing it to not meet its force level requirements until 2035.

The Marine Expeditionary Fighting Vehicle (EFV) will be delayed for another year.

The Marine Corps (USMC) face a primary challenge of having been a land force for the last decade. The USMC's naval character has taken a back seat to fighting a virulent resistance in an extended land campaign, and some core competencies are waning.

Family

A consistent complaint from military families across the board is the lack of spaces and/or prolonged waiting lists for child care centers. While the military has built up child care systems, it is still an urgent need by many, especially those with special needs.

Retiree

The FY-08 early retirement benefit for RC members was passed, but it excluded approximately 600,000 members. This law should be fixed so that RC members' service counts from post-September 11, 2001 rather than from the bill enactment date in 2008.

Health Care

As the operational tempo for our service members continues to be high and they persist to endure repeated deployments, it becomes ever more essential to provide efficient and timely health screenings for pre- and post-deployments.

Achieving and maintaining individual medical readiness standards throughout a service member's continuum of service is necessary for the military services and components to meet mission requirements as an operational force.

Military Voting

Congress legislatively mandated DoD to develop an internet voting system for military voters, but HASC cut \$25 million from DoD's Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP).

The House stated it was concerned with the immaturity of the internet voting system standards being developed by the Elections Assistance Commission, supported by FVAP. Denying DoD the funding could ensure those standards remain immature, and may compel the States to proceed with their own internet voting systems without federal voting standards or guidelines in place.

As the SASC reported bill supports, the Senate Appropriations Committee should fully fund these important programs. Without these vital funds, military voters will be condemned to continued disenfranchisement, lost voting opportunities, and reliance on State-run systems unsupported by federal standards or evaluation.

Conclusion

A4AD is a working group of military and veteran associations looking beyond personnel issues to the broader issues of National Defense. This testimony is an overview, and expanded data on information within this document can be provided upon request.

Thank you for your ongoing support of the Nation, the Armed Services, and the fine young men and women who defend our country. Please contact us with any questions.