

Chairman Frelinghuysen, Ranking Member Visclosky, I want to thank you and this subcommittee for the opportunity to testify on the FY15 Defense Appropriations bill.

I continue to appreciate the hard work that you all do every day to provide the funding and tools our men and women in uniform need to do their jobs and safely return home to their families. I applaud the bravery and sacrifice our military men and women make each and every day.

As I travel around communities in North Carolina, people consistently tell me that their number one priority is restoring fiscal responsibility, and that they sent me to Washington to force the government to live within its means.

Accordingly, I am committed to cutting spending, reducing the size of government, promoting economic growth, and putting our budget on a path to balance. Sometimes this means holding Departments and

Agencies accountable, and that is why I choose to appear before this subcommittee today.

As the Army embarks on a new plan to replace the M113 armored personnel carrier, a series of vehicles that have been in service for over fifty years, I believe it is important for this committee to ensure proper oversight given the series of setbacks in recent years to combat vehicle programs.

As you know, Army's newest approach is called the Armored Multi-Purpose Vehicle, or AMPV, and there have been active studies ongoing for some time on determining an appropriate replacement. In 2008, the Army came to the conclusion that a mixed fleet of modified Bradleys and Strykers would be the ideal replacement for the M113.

As opposed to a one size fits all approach, a mixed fleet makes the most economic sense as it leverages existing programs and allows the vehicle best suited to a particular mission to be utilized.

Strykers provide speed, stealth, and protection, in a variety of roles while tracked vehicles like Bradleys can address the small amount of terrain that is just too extreme to get a wheeled vehicle through.

The AMPV program was out of the spotlight for a while, as the Army focused on the Future Combat System and Ground Combat Vehicle. FCS was cancelled in 2009 and the Ground Combat Vehicle was recently terminated after billions of dollars were invested in the programs. In both cases the Army recommended a two manufacturer approach to development and production. This allows a greater variety of designs and encourages competition to drive prices down. Furthermore, it ensures that our troops deploy with the best vehicle for the job.

With the AMPV as the only armored combat vehicle competition remaining, I had hoped that the Army would continue to utilize the multi-manufacturer approach. Unfortunately, the most recent Request for Proposal (RFP) by the Army for AMPV runs counter to this practice

and instead makes clear that a tracked vehicle, such as the Bradley, is the only solution that it intends to accept. Any competitor that would offer an opposing design will find that the Army has not provided sufficient data or time for other companies to compete.

I believe Congress should not fund a non-competitive solution for AMPV and should require the Army to develop an acquisition plan in order to leverage the advantages of a mixed fleet. A mix of vehicles, such as the Stryker and Bradley, is likely to be a more cost-effective solution that can be fielded rapidly.

Strykers are currently the largest combat vehicle fleet in the Army, and have found broad support for their mix of speed, low operational cost per mile, and resistance to improvised explosive devices. Bradleys meanwhile continue to offer complete off road ability and additional protection for direct engagement. A mix of these two vehicles should continue to be evaluated and considered by the Army as it leverages the

best of both types of vehicles in their quest to replace the Vietnam-era M113.

I hope the subcommittee will encourage the Army to fully evaluate and consider both solutions at hand. Instead of viewing the competing contract as mutually exclusive, I hope they will consider a plan that places the best equipment for the job on the field. If they can demonstrate to the subcommittee they are on the right path, then they can and should move forward with their current plan.

However, I believe a fair analysis that acknowledges the cancellation of the Ground Combat Vehicle and the role it was to play will recognize the benefits of pursuing a mixed fleet solution.

I thank the Members for their time and their consideration of this request.