

Senate Seapower Chair: Committee Will Drill Down on Navy's Amphib Issue



SASEBO, Japan (Sept. 15, 2021) The amphibious dock landing ship USS Germantown (LSD 42) departs Commander, Fleet Activities Sasebo, Japan (CFAS), Sept. 15, 2021. Germantown will shift home ports from Sasebo to San Diego after serving as a forward-deployed ship in U.S. 7th Fleet since Jan. 5, 2011. (U.S. Navy photo by Mass Communication Specialist 3rd Class Jasmine Ikusebiala)

WASHINGTON – The new chairman of the Senate's Seapower subcommittee said he plans to drill down on the issue of the Navy's requirement for 31 large and medium amphibious warships and why the 2024 budget does not apparently support that requirement, which is law.

"I'm still mystified with the reticence of the president's budget with respect to meeting our 31 amphib requirement," said Sen. Tim Kaine, D-Virginia, speaking March 2 in his first online press conference since becoming chairman of the Senate Armed Service Committee's Seapower subcommittee.

In the 2024 budget proposal, the Navy plans to decommission three old Whidbey Island-class dock landing ships (LSDs) but declined to fund any more Flight II San Antonio-class amphibious platform dock ships (LPDs) over the next five years.

The 2023 National Defense Authorization Act requires the Navy to sustain a force level of 31 large and medium amphibious warships.

"Last year, when we had the hearing, all three – the SECNAV, the [Marine Corps] commandant, the CNO – all said, 'Look, we're all on the same page,'" Kaine said. "There's no difference between us. They promised that a study would be forthcoming soon. That showed that the requirement that the Marines need to basically meet their objectives and our national security objectives is 31 amphibs."

"The president's budget doesn't suggest that they're making that kind of investment to get us to 31," he said. "I've heard testimony from our Navy and Marine leadership enough to know that the 31 amphibs is the requirement and somebody's going to have to do a pretty amazing job to convince me otherwise at this point. They have been so consistent on that for a significant period of time."

Kaine said, "The Navy should know that we're really going to dig into this. We have been convinced that the number is 31 and we've yet to be told by anybody that it's not 31. So, is there a mismatch between the SECNAV, commandant, and CNO? And with the OSD [Office of the Secretary of Defense] is there a mismatch with OMB [Office of Management and Budget]? I don't

know exactly where the mismatch is, but I think it's above the Navy. I think the Navy and Marines are completely on board on this. The consistency of this testimony has been notable. If that's the case, you're going to see a really strong bias on the committee to make sure [the Navy] has the funds for 31 and not drop below it.

The senator said he has seen "tentative suggestion" that the level of 31 could be reached if the funds were made available next beginning next year "But that is sending a confusing message that suggests that they're not really committed to 31. I think the committee is committed to 31."