

[H.A.S.C. No. 110-119]

HEARING
ON
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2009
AND
OVERSIGHT OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED
PROGRAMS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS
SECOND SESSION

FULL COMMITTEE HEARING
ON
**BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE
DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE**

HEARING HELD
FEBRUARY 27, 2008



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 2009

45-253

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED TENTH CONGRESS

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina	DUNCAN HUNTER, California
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas	JIM SEXTON, New Jersey
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi	JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii	TERRY EVERETT, Alabama
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas	ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas	HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
ADAM SMITH, Washington	MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California	WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina	ROBIN HAYES, North Carolina
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California	W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania	J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey	JEFF MILLER, Florida
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
RICK LARSEN, Washington	FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey
JIM COOPER, Tennessee	TOM COLE, Oklahoma
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia	ROB BISHOP, Utah
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam	MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
MARK E. UDALL, Colorado	JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma	CANDICE S. MILLER, Michigan
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana	PHIL GINGREY, Georgia
NANCY BOYDA, Kansas	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
PATRICK J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania	TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia	BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire	THELMA DRAKE, Virginia
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut	CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa	K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND, New York	GEOFF DAVIS, Kentucky
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania	DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona	
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts	
ELIJAH E. CUMMINGS, Maryland	
KENDRICK B. MEEK, Florida	
KATHY CASTOR, Florida	

ERIN C. CONATON, *Staff Director*

ANDREW HYDE, *Professional Staff Member*

STEPHANIE SANOK, *Professional Staff Member*

CATERINA DUTTO, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF HEARINGS

2008

	Page
HEARING:	
Wednesday, February 27, 2008, Fiscal Year 2009 National Defense Authorization Act—Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force	1
APPENDIX:	
Wednesday, February 27, 2008	41

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 27, 2008

FISCAL YEAR 2009 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT— BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Hunter, Hon. Duncan, a Representative from California, Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services	3
Skelton, Hon. Ike, a Representative from Missouri, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services	1

WITNESSES

Moseley, Gen. T. Michael, USAF, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force	6
Wynne, Hon. Michael W., Secretary of the Air Force	4

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS:	
Wynne, Hon. Michael W., joint with Gen. T. Michael Moseley	45
DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD: [There were no Documents submitted.]	
WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING: [There were no Questions submitted during the hearing.]	
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:	
Mrs. Boyda	84
Mr. Forbes	79
Dr. Gingrey	84
Mr. Hayes	79
Mr. Kline	83
Mr. Lamborn	85
Mr. LoBiondo	82
Mr. Miller	80

FISCAL YEAR 2009 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT—BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, Wednesday, February 27, 2008.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:04 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ike Skelton (chairman of the committee) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. IKE SKELTON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM MISSOURI, CHAIRMAN, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

The CHAIRMAN. Ladies and gentlemen, welcome to our full committee hearing, which is on the fiscal year 2009 budget request from the Department of the Air Force. I am pleased to welcome back the secretary of the Air Force, Michael Wynne and the chief of staff of the Air Force, the Honorable Michael “Buzz” Moseley.

We thank you and all those that you lead for that wonderful job that you do. And that includes the total force, active duty, Guard, Reserve as well as your civilian employees. We are proud of what you do.

The Air Force has been in some form of continuous combat since 1990 stressing its people, its equipment. In Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF) and Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF), the Air Force has committed more than 250 aircraft to support combat operations and flew approximately 33,000 sorties last year alone in the Central Command area. This pace of operations and the aging of your aircraft inventory is taking a toll on the Air Force. I know we will hear about that.

I am concerned about this heavy operational pace. This may not be sustainable, and it may not be safe. The ongoing investigation into the multiple F-15 crashes, those of last year and already several this year, underline the importance of this issue. For a time, the entire F-15 fleet was grounded.

Just this weekend, the Air Force suffered the first ever crash of a B-2 bomber in Guam, which, as you know, is stationed at Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri, a tremendous loss. I must note that my home state feels this very much as well as one of the F-15s that crashed was being flown by the Missouri National Guard, an F-15 that literally broke in half during flight.

Even as the Air Force has been straining to keep up, it has been reducing end strength, sacrificing, in my opinion, its most valuable asset, its people. The budget request asks for end strength of 316,600 active duty airmen, a reduction of almost 13,000 just from

last year's level, for a reduction of 100 in the Air Force Reserve. Since 2005, the Air Force has reduced end strength by over 40,000, though your budget documents suggest that you intend to halt this slide in 2010.

I can't help but conclude that a significant factor in the current strain on the Air Force is a lack of people. In fact, your unfunded priority list suggests as much, identifying a requirement for \$385 million to add back almost 19,000 airmen, split between the active duty and the Reserve. Today, we need a definitive answer to the simple question, "Does the Air Force need to reduce end strength in 2009, or begin to add its people back," very simple. Which answer helps us with a national military strategy? We intend for you to answer that.

The Air Force's aircraft inventory is aging, as we all know, in part because modernization budgets have not been able to support purchases in high quantity for high-priced assets like the F-22, C-17, and the C-130. I note that you have shared with the committee an impressive list of over \$19 billion of unfunded requirements, more than double that of any other service. At the same time, this budget punts on such critical national security questions as the future of the F-22 and C-17 programs.

Do you expect Congress to resolve the issues, or is there a compelling case for deferring or punting these questions to next year to a new Administration? Can we force the Air Force into budgeting for today to fulfill the national military strategy? My review of your budget and the full committee hearing we held on this topic last fall suggests that the answer is no.

The Air Force is ground zero for another great debate that is starting to occur over the roles and missions of the armed forces that started, as you know, in 1947. There was an agreement in 1948 that was the Key West Agreement, amended in 1953 and 1958, and a lot has changed, missions, technology, weapons systems, the design of the forces. All that has changed.

And one of the roles and missions issues that you wanted us to solve was the joint cargo aircraft as well as who owns the Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) in our bill last year. That is for the roles and missions issue that should be done within the Department of Defense (DOD).

And in our bill this last year, we required that that be done. And I certainly hope that all of you at the highest level in the Department will take that seriously because we certainly do. And I might point out that we have a panel that is about to submit a report on that very issue.

Now you have a sense that this year's budget request raises almost as many questions as it answers. And I hope the testimony today will help us answer those questions.

Again, we thank you for your valued service. It is wonderful what you do, the challenges that you have. We want to hear. We are here to help you succeed. And sometimes our ideas go beyond yours, such as roles and missions, such as Goldwater-Nichols and others. But that is what we are here for, and in our Constitution we are charged with it.

Mr. Hunter.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DUNCAN HUNTER, A REPRESENTATIVE
FROM CALIFORNIA, RANKING MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON
ARMED SERVICES**

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thanks for having this important hearing today.

And I want to thank our witnesses, join you in thanking Secretary Wynne and General Moseley and all the great Americans whom they represent who represent us so very well.

Gentlemen, last year when we came together for the posture hearing, I brought up the fact that every year we hold a hearing on your budget, and little, if any, progress is being made to recapitalize your force and improve your acquisition processes. And if you recall, last year I read a portion of my opening statement from the Air Force posture hearing that we held in 2006. And if you will bear with me, I would like to read that to you again.

I said at that time, "The DOD budget legacy is one of misprocurement opportunity. And this," as you point out in your statement, "gives us the oldest fleet of aircraft in the history of the Air Force with the fleet having been engaged in or supporting some level of combat for the past 15 years. The aircraft fleet has been operating at utilization rates far beyond those that were planned for it."

"The consequence of age and high operational tempo (op tempo) is reflected in reduced readiness rates. And it is to the Air Force's credit that professional fleet management has achieved the safety record that it has achieved."

Gentlemen, I believed that to be true when I said it in 2006, and when I said it again last year. And despite the recent mishaps that we—I know we will talk about some today—I believe it is still true today as well.

The cost to maintain your aircraft continues to increase, and your mission reliability rates continue to decrease. It is clear to me that many of your current readiness challenges are a result of misprocurement opportunities in the 1990's. Now, according to the Government Accountability Office (GAO), the Air Force identified the need for a fighter to replace its F-15 fleet in 1981. And after more than two decades of technology development and prototyping, actual F-22 system development began in 2003.

The F-22 was declared operationally capable in 2006. And that is 25 years from the time you identified the requirement until it was declared to have achieved initial operational capability.

We can also look at the Joint Strike Fighter, which will replace the legacy F-16 fleet. It began concept development in 1996 and is not forecast to be operationally capable until 2013.

So here is our problem. We can't develop and field the complex weapons systems demanded by today's global security environment in one budget cycle or even under one Administration. We can't pull an F-22 out of the hat if our planning factors and intelligence assessments prove wrong.

I know it is another service, but I am reminded of the Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicle (MRAP), if we take that as an example. It is a simple design. It is an armored wheeled vehicle for moving troops. It wasn't a new design. It evolved out of an existing design from the 1970's. And yet even with full funding, multiple

contractors, and designation as the Department of Defense's top priority, it has taken us over a year to field 4,700 of the 15,000 vehicles that are required.

So what I am trying to say is that we are living with readiness challenges in the Air Force because we failed to adequately fund and develop airplanes in the 1990's. And the decisions we make today will impact the readiness and the capability of the Air Force in the next two decades.

Gentlemen, it is clear that the budget in front of us does not meet your requirements. You sent this committee \$18.3 billion in unfunded requirements for fiscal year 2009.

And, Secretary Wynne, you have said that you are approximately \$20 billion short each year for the next five. At the top of your list of requirements that are not met by the 2009 budget request is \$183 million to maintain your B-52 fleet at levels necessary to meet national military strategy requirements.

Next on the list is \$1.1 billion for additional F-22s. Add to that \$385 million to buy back some of the personnel cuts you were forced to take last year and \$3.9 billion for C-17s. And we have got a pretty good bill adding up here.

So, gentlemen, I understand how we got here, and I understand that we are not going to fix these problems overnight. What I need to know from you is what we can do to assist you in getting this right and bringing the much-needed modernization to the United States Air Force. Again, thank you for your expertise in making due with less over a fairly extended period of pretty stressful times for the United States Air Force.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the testimony.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Hunter.

Mr. Secretary.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MICHAEL W. WYNNE, SECRETARY OF
THE AIR FORCE**

Secretary WYNNE. Mr. Chairman, members of this committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify on behalf of America's Air Force. Thank you as well for your support to our improved readiness via retirement and recapitalization. We are working hard to see it through. We urge you to quickly pass the pending supplemental as it will help.

Across the total force of active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian, we are America's strategic shield in air and in space, and in cyberspace. We are contributing to today's fight with increasing ordnance drops. And we stand watch at the missile fields.

We stand ready in the nuclear field. And we are an effective air superiority and strike force to both deter and dissuade any opponent who may consider our forces to be stretched in the global war on terror (GWOT). We are gratified to hear that role reaffirmed by the chairman of the Joint Chiefs in a deliberate message to those who might seek to dissuade or deter us from our own options in the future.

This is why we seek to move forward and not backward into fifth generation fighters, into new expeditionary tankers, and into long-range strike assets. It is why we seek to modernize space assets as the executive agent force base and not see further fragmentation

of the management of this now vulnerable area. It is why we have established the Cyberspace Command and see this as a war-fighting domain in which we need to dominate to remain a net centered force for the future.

Clearly, beyond the global war on terror, we must not lose America's asymmetric advantage in the strategic forces. Your Air Force has been in the fight for 17 years, as you noted and yet over the same 17 years has seen under-funded modernization. We thank you for initiatives to restore fleet management to the United States Air Force, a responsibility that we don't take lightly.

When General Moseley and I came to our posts, we set about a strategy to restructure our Air Force, truly develop a lean and efficient Air Force in order to husband the resources for investment. We worry about the industrial base and the need to look after the open lines.

I am pleased to report to you that the Department and the Air Force have indicated a desire to not close the F-22 line and to develop the long-range strike asset. It is to these that we would like to apply the saved resources over the near-term while the F-35 proves itself through rigorous tests and is effectively capped on production.

We ask that you agree with an approach for the F-22 aircraft while we work to restore our readiness with younger aircraft. The F-35 and the F-22, in fact, are complementary, in our judgment, with the F-22 bigger, faster, planned to fly higher, and can carry more air-to-air weapons internally. Also with less than 20 penetrating bombers in our current fleet, it is time to develop an alternative as well.

We have talked about being under-funded, but here have worked to offer a balanced budget prioritized to best defend America. And we will continue to do that over the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP).

The Air Force Research Laboratories is well-engaged in technology development, expanding the opportunity for energy alternatives while reducing our demand in our fleet and at our bases, also in unmanned flight, in propulsion, and material science as well as in human effectiveness.

As regards space, at Kirkland Air Force Base, a branch of the Air Force Research Laboratories is creating inherently defensive space assets. In cyberspace, career development, including the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT), and also war-fighting schools are keys.

Combatant commanders and agencies partner with us in this increasingly contested domain. I have worked in space for almost two decades and have worked in commercial and classified space as a supplier and a customer. We need consolidated leadership to maintain our current strategic advantage.

Congress asked for a relook at responses to the space commission. And we should really consider what is in the report.

The Air Force is undergoing a back to basics as well as back to blue complementary efforts to restore a steady demand and a knowledge base. I recommend we keep the executive agency where it is.

I have engaged airmen in both theaters of operation. And the question to ask is, "Are the continuation of our presence and the continuation of the ground force tasking referred to as in lieu of tasking?" My answer is that they performed so well that our Army colleagues don't want to give them up. And they do perform well, many winning bronze and silver stars.

Your Air Force is currently protecting the air sovereignty of these fledgling nations. And until their air force can do this, I would not be surprised to see our Air Force remain to do that mission.

This is why we are reexamining our force structure, although we have prioritized right now recapitalization in the President's budget. I again thank you for the privilege of leading the best Air Force in the world. Our airmen every day earn the respect of our friends as well as our enemies. We worry for their quality of life as we seek efficiencies and as we implement joint basing. But we never worry about the sense of mission they bring to the task.

I will not have the privilege to represent them in this setting for the force posture again. And I hope I have reflected their pride in service as I have felt myself. I am ready now to take your questions. Thank you, sir.

[The joint prepared statement of Secretary Wynne and General Moseley can be found in the Appendix on page 45.]

The CHAIRMAN. General Moseley, please.

STATEMENT OF GEN. T. MICHAEL MOSELEY, USAF, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE

General MOSELEY. Chairman Skelton, Congressman Hunter, distinguished committee members, sir, in lieu of a verbal statement, if you would allow me to introduce a few great airmen that are out every day doing exactly what you expect us to do. And I would like to have them stand up when I introduce them.

For the committee, the secretary and I truly appreciate your continued support for soldiers, sailors, Marines, Coast Guardsmen, and airmen. Today we are privileged to be able to have a discussion with you about your airmen. And thank you for that opportunity to talk about the posture of your Air Force and our vision for the future and strategy to achieve it.

So, Mr. Chairman, if you would allow me to start with Lieutenant Colonel Bryan Turner. He is a Virginia Air National Guardsman who flies F-22s at Langley Air Force Base as part of the first Raptor classic association. He is a living symbol of the Air Force's ironclad commitment to total force integration, maximizing the strengths of the Guard, Reserve, and active components.

He has logged over 3,600 flying hours in fighters to include F-16s A, B, C, and D, and the F-22, including 300 combat hours in Desert Storm, Allied Force, and Iraqi Freedom. Additionally, one of his roles at Langley Air Force Base is flying Operation Noble Eagle sorties over the top of Washington and New York in support of air sovereignty and air defense missions.

Let me introduce next Captain Kari Fleming. She is a C-17 pilot from Charleston Air Force Base, South Carolina. She is a 2003 graduate of the United States Air Force Academy, and Charleston is her first and only operational assignment.

Still, she has amassed over 1,200 flying hours, including 900 hours in the C-17, including 124 combat missions and 278 combat hours since 2005, missions that have included aeromedical evacuation operational air drops. Just ask her how many times she has landed the big airplane in the dirt. She says many times, and it does okay.

Next, Captain Scott Nichols. He is an HA-60G combat search and rescue pilot from Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, Arizona. Like Kari, Scott is an Air Force Academy graduate 1999. He is also a weapons school graduate, December 2005 graduate.

Since May 2002, he has been deployed five times, three times to Kandahar, Afghanistan and two times to Balad Air Base in Iraq. He has logged over 2,000 total flying hours, including 158 combat hours and 53 combat support hours. He has recovered special ops predators. He has recovered people.

He has been a part of multiple saves. And for a fighter pilot, there is nothing like the sound of a jolly green in a combat rescue helicopter with a Pararescueman (PJ) on the end of the rope that will come get you. So Scott Nichols is that guy that comes to get you.

Next is Tech Sergeant Jim Jochum. He is in the other business that we have got. He is an aerial gunner on a special operations AC-130 gunship out of Hurlburt Field in Florida. He joined the Air Force in August 1989 and had spent five years as a maintenance airman before he joined Air Force Special Operations.

Since November 1995, he has logged over 4,300 flying hours, 2,500 combat hours, 367 combat sorties in the AC-130, more than anyone else in Air Force Special Operations Command. Since October 2001 he has accrued 892 days deployed, about 3 years. He wears an air medal with 16 oak leaf clusters, 16 oak leaf clusters.

Next, Tech Sergeant Michelle Rochelle. She is a lead operator for a joint team of cyber operations. She is under the tactical control of U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM) Joint Functional Component Command for Network Warfare. Thus, she has direct involvement in the global war on terror and supplying strategic intelligence to America's political and military leaders. She represents the vanguard of the forces we are organizing, training, and equipping to operate in cyberspace for the nation's combatant commanders.

She is a reminder that we believe the cyber domain is critical, the nexus of cross-domain dominance in our war-fighting domains. And Tech Sergeant Rochelle is at the leading edge of what this means to us as we look at options and opportunities inside cyberspace.

Last is Tech Sergeant Michael Shropshire. He is currently acting operations (op) superintendent for the 12th Combat Training Squadron at Fort Irwin, California, which is our longstanding relationship between Nellis Air Force Base in Fort Irwin with the things that we do at Nellis and the things that the Army does at the National Training Center.

He enlisted in July 1992 as a battlefield airman who spent his entire career associated with the United States Army. Multiple deployments, Joint Endeavor in Bosnia, Operational Iraqi Freedom. He wears a silver star and a bronze star. He won a silver star for

individual heroic actions while surrounded, cut off, under a hail of enemy gunfire in the largest sand storm in four decades alongside his Army comrades.

He coordinated close air support, 12 joint direct attack munitions, or JDAMs, on 10 Iraqi T-72 tanks while constantly switching from his radio handset to his rifle, individually engaging enemy soldiers at close range. He wears a bronze star for exceptional performance as a terminal air controller during the 3rd Infantry Division's push on Baghdad about this time of 2003.

So, Mr. Chairman and Congressman Hunter, thank you for the opportunity—

[Applause.]

General MOSELEY. Sirs and committee, thank you for the opportunity to take my verbal statement and be able to introduce to you six great airmen that are out there doing exactly what you expect us to do and making this look so easy that people sometimes think that it is easy. So, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Hunter, sir, we appreciate the time and look forward to your questions.

[The joint prepared statement of General Moseley and Secretary Wynne can be found in the Appendix on page 45.]

The CHAIRMAN. In a word, we as a committee and all the American people should be very proud of the young men and women that you just introduced. We thank you for your service and dedication, not just to the Air Force, but to America. You are the best, and we recognize that, and we appreciate you.

Do you have further comments, General?

General MOSELEY. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. I will have one question before I call Mr. Hunter. Back in the days when I tried lawsuits, from time to time a witness would testify to a fact, and there would be a record, maybe of a deposition or a comment to another witness or something that the person testifying had written that contradicted the testimony in chief.

Today there is something I don't understand because the testimony in chief before us based upon the request for 2009 Air Force end strength calls for a reduction of 12,963, a reduction from 328,316. And yet in an official document which was sent to our committee at the behest of Mr. Hunter, called an unfunded requirement list, there is an unfunded requirement in personnel end strength for \$385 million, which is an increase of 18,884 personnel.

Now, if this were a jury trial back in Lafayette County, the question put to the witness would be which time, Mr. Witness, are you right or are you telling the truth? I won't ask such a crass question as that. But I must tell you I am disturbed by on the one hand your official end strength request is that of a reduction of 12,963 personnel, and the unfunded requirement list is an increase of 18,000 plus.

I think those of us in this committee are entitled to an explanation, Mr. Secretary.

Secretary WYNNE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You know, when we committed to the plan of 40,000 reduction, which was translated to about 57,000 back in 2005, it was a plan given a scenario that did not have an increased ground forces and a scenario in which some of the missions that we are currently per-

forming as in ground force tasking might be relieved and returned to us.

As we proceeded in time, we have continued to say that to ourselves that as the ground forces have been increased—and they are trying to increase—that perhaps this would be the satisfaction of the plan that we had in place. At the same time, we found ourselves with an increased mission space due to the increase because of the requirement to provide logistics liaison officers as well as joint tactical air controllers to any additional brigade combat teams that would have been developed and deployed to the tune of about 1,000.

We also have not been relieved of other missions that we had thought by this time we would be relieved of. There is faint hope that by the cycle completing itself in 2009 that these things, too, will come true. And so, an optimistic look said continue to husband your resources and apply it to investment in the 2009 timeframe. And the pessimists amongst us said this is not going to happen, it has not happened in three years. We should at least hedge our bet.

And I think that is the conundrum that you see. So as to what time is true, I think the question has a certain validity to it.

We had a fairly robust debate, and we finally elected that what we should do is in the program budget we should adhere to the plan, and then in the unfunded requirements list we should state our worries and our concerns and maybe if we could hedge our bet, we should hedge our bet. And, Chief, that is kind of, sir, what I see.

The CHAIRMAN. You know, you can't have it both ways. Tell us what you want right now. Are you standing by your unfunded list that you sent us for an additional 18,884?

Secretary WYNNE. No, sir, I must stand by the 316,000. I will tell you that as a result of the—

The CHAIRMAN. But you must stand by the cut?

Secretary WYNNE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. But on the unfunded requirements, you were telling the truth then, weren't you?

Secretary WYNNE. Yes, sir, that is a question of hedging your bet against an uncertain future.

The CHAIRMAN. I kind of feel like Mark Twain. The more is explained to me, the more I don't understand it. What do you want this committee to do, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WYNNE. I will tell you what our plan is, sir, and then you, of course, have to decide.

The CHAIRMAN. No, wait a minute. Let me interrupt. Let me interrupt. Just simply what do you want this committee to do so we can get on? Because other folks want to ask questions as well. What do you want this committee to do?

Secretary WYNNE. Yes, sir. We really would prefer to hedge our bet at 330,000. We look like we can stop our decline at around 322 by not taking actions following June. And because we are already down below 330 right now.

The CHAIRMAN. So you are telling us you are standing by the unfunded requirement that you sent this committee?

Secretary WYNNE. When you asked me a personal opinion to what I would like to do, I need to hedge our bet.

The CHAIRMAN. I asked you a personal and professional opinion. Let us not hedge our bets. You are asking for us to pay attention and try to follow the unfunded requirement level?

Secretary WYNNE. Yes, sir. But as you know, I must support the president's budget as it was submitted. But, sir, you have asked a personal opinion, and you have gotten it.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Hunter.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, the last full committee hearing, we had we were so cut up with votes; a lot of our folks didn't get a chance to spend a lot of time with the secretary. So let me pass on this, and I will ask my questions at the end of the hearing.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Ortiz.

Mr. ORTIZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The fiscal year 2009 budget includes \$497 million for F-15 depot maintenance to fix many of the planes that have experienced recent structural cracks. And I have been told that the fees should be closer to around \$50 million total. And I am concerned because these are the planes that protect our skies here in the continental United States.

What are the number, the total number of planes that require repair? And how did you come up with the figure of \$497 million? Was this your figure or a DOD figure? How did we get to that number?

Secretary WYNNE. I will take that on a little bit. And at the time, it was we had lost, I think, seven F-15s over the last nine months approximately. There is a concern about making sure that we have the proper maintenance activity and the proper depot overhaul to do this.

There is a concern that we make sure that we have a ready, flyable airplane in that world. The DOD felt like we had excess money over in the F-22 long lead and shutdown costs. They perceived that we had a problem that they could fix by moving that money wholesaley into the F-15 depot repair line to essentially repair that airplane.

We have worked to try to figure out what would be the cost. And, of course, most of the cost would not be depot repair. It probably would be in excess of maintenance and operations because you really have to do this in between flights. In other words, as airplane lands, you get out your inspection criteria and you make sure it is ready for the next flight.

On the other hand, we have noted that some of the langerons have to be replaced. This is at least a depot special weapons and tactics (SWAT) team, if not a deep depot operation. And so, I would tell you that that is what the money was reserved for and where it came from and where it went.

Mr. ORTIZ. And I agree with the questions that the chairman was asking, you know. We want to know how we can help you. And I think this is why we are here.

And I know sometimes, you know, there are differences between what the Secretary of Defense needs and what your service needs. But we really need to know.

Now, I was amazed at your airman that you introduced has been deployed five times. Five times—that is too many. And now in some areas we see now your recommendation is to cut down. But other agencies, other services are increasing. And one of the problems that we have had is that if we increase the end strength—in your case, you are decreasing—we might not have the equipment to train them with.

This is not the reason why you are cutting down. We don't have the equipment to train them. Sometimes we train them in Kuwait or someplace else before they go to Iraq or Afghanistan. But we really want to know. We want to help you. Now, going back to the \$50 million, you think that is adequate to fix the planes so that they can continue to protect our Nation?

Secretary WYNNE. I would say, sir, that our current estimate is roughly that figure. I think the impact in operations and maintenance is as yet not well-defined. Although what we see is an absorption problem where we have to fill our pilots' time, make sure they are fit and ready. And we worry about making sure we have an adequate flight regime to make sure they continue their training.

This could impact the operations and maintenance. But as far as depot operations, our sense is that that was probably adequate, \$50 million.

Mr. ORTIZ. So you do feel confident that they are getting the right training, flight training? You have not cut down on the hours of flight training?

Secretary WYNNE. No, sir, one of the things that you might have seen is a reallocation as the fleet changes and as the fleet in the future is expected to be is you may see a difference in flight hours. But it is not per pilot. It is across the board, and it is a soup-to-nuts look. So I would have to defer to the chief. But I believe the adequacy of training is present.

Chief.

General MOSELEY. Congressman, last year because of the funding and affordability issues we did cut operations and maintenance (O&M) and flying hours. But we cut it too much. And the guidance back to the staff was to put the flying hours back.

This year in this budget there is a lower number of flying hours, but that wraps up a fewer number of airplanes. It also wraps up a different way the training command is doing business. So there is not the requirement overall for those flying hours. But, sir, rest assured I watch this every day relative to the quality of training of our people that fly machines.

Mr. ORTIZ. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Everett, five minutes.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary and General Moseley, for your service to the country. I notice you have got five Global Hawks. You have 38 Predators, nine Reapers. And I congratulate you for that.

I am a big believer of our unmanned aerial systems (UASs). And I also point out to my colleagues that the Predator was a congressional add, for those of you who may doubt the value of congressional adds. It is not a bridge to nowhere. It is a bridge to the fu-

ture, as we are seeing our UAS systems. We are only beginning to understand everything they can do for us in the way of intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) and other things.

But my question is this. This committee as well as the Intelligence Committee has language that directs the Secretary of Defense to advise the appropriate committees on an annual basis during the phase-out of the U-2 that there will be no loss of ISR. And I would like for you, if you will, tell us where we are with the phase-out of the U-2 and how long we think it might be before there will be no loss of ISR by using the Global Hawk.

Secretary WYNNE. Well, what we have determined is that there are some real attributes in the U-2 system. There are users who really appreciate the stream of data coming from a U-2. We are trying now to replicate that system because the U-2 is constrained by pilot hours to a specific regime of flight.

We are trying to replicate that system as best we can in the Global Hawk. It is probably aimed at the Global Hawk Block 30 or Block 40. So that kind of timing—we had a lot of combatant commanders up on the net, not just you all, sir, to make sure that our ramp on, ramp off still offered the right kind of ISR. We are still investigating the specifics of that because it has to do with how soon can you get on contract for additional Global Hawks, how soon will the integration work out. And so, we are erring on the side of caution.

General MOSELEY. That is, the Global Hawk has, sir, because you have watched this for years, is you can keep the U-2 up for 11 or 12 hours max. You can keep the Global Hawk up for 24 to 30 hours. So once you get the sensor suite right, you can almost double, if not triple the coverage over a combatant commander's area of responsibility (AOR).

The key here, though, is to have the right sensors. And that has been the nub that we have been working with the commanders, like in Korea and in the Pacific, to make sure we have the right sensor suite aboard the Global Hawk that replaces the U-2. And until that happens, there is no desire to divest ourself of that final U-2 capability.

Mr. EVERETT. Global Hawk will not have wet film, right?

General MOSELEY. Sir, but it has got digital capability. I mean, the wet film and the wet film world requires a whole different set of processing and additional people and additional facilities and additional equipment.

Mr. EVERETT. But we are using it today?

General MOSELEY. Yes, sir. But we are also using the digital capability, not just off the Global Hawk, but the satellites as well as the Predators.

Mr. EVERETT. Let me switch. I noticed on Transformational Communications Satellite (TSAT), for instance, that in the outyears that there is about a \$4 billion cut on TSAT. And I was wondering how that will sync with the idea that we can't go forward with the Future Combat Systems (FCS), and as I understand it, unless we have got TSAT.

Now, I am aware of the fact that we are putting up Wide Global SATCOM (WGS) and Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF). And let me also put a question in there. Are we able to

sync our terminals with the new AEHF's we are putting up and WGSs? But the overall question is how are we taking into account the fact that I am told we can't go forward really with future combat systems unless we have got TSAT.

Secretary WYNNE. Well, the issue is com on the move, is in a simple way to a disadvantaged user. And what the Army is faced with is they are going to have to concentrate their coms, if you will, at a different level in order to contact the AEHF. I would tell you that the cycle of user equipment is aligned in the outyears to the TSAT.

We were faced with a direction to put in AEHF four. The right thing to do was to delay the TSAT to accommodate that. The terminals are easily transferred.

Mr. EVERETT. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

We will call on Mr. Taylor. Immediately after he asks his questions, we will break for the one vote that is pending on the House floor.

Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary and General. Gentlemen, through unofficial channels this committee was made aware of the need for first body armor, then up-armored Humvees, then Improvised Explosive Device (IED) detonator jammers, and then last, the need for MRAPs. In every instance the Department never came to us and said we need this. We heard either from the moms and dads of young people in the field or actually from the people in the field that people were dying needlessly.

Mr. Secretary, in general you have a heck of a lot of aircraft in that theater. I very much appreciate the young lady flying out of Charleston. That is a long way there and back. It is a dangerous situation.

You have 130's flying from Kuwait to Baghdad on what appears to be every 20 minutes or so. Are there threats to those aircraft that this committee has not yet been made aware of? And does your budget fund every possible protection to those aircraft?

And what brings this to mind—I am sorry—I got to the chapter last night in Charlie Wilson's War where with the introduction of the Stinger, three Hind aircraft went down in the span of about five minutes. Up until then, that was the hunter. From that moment on, that aircraft became the hunted.

I would sure hate to see our aircraft and our crews in a similar situation change that quickly because we weren't paying attention. And so, that is the analogy that I will use for the crews of our 130's, for the crews of our 17s and the other aircraft in theater. Are we taking all the necessary precautions—

Secretary WYNNE. Well, sir—

Mr. TAYLOR [continuing]. Against threats that we know of and threats that might be out there from another country that might make their way to the hands of the Iraqi insurgents?

Secretary WYNNE. We are exceptionally concerned about the integrated air defense systems that are on the market. We have not seen anything in the theater that would concern us at this point

that allows us that. But we are concerned about future engagements because we see the proliferation of, if you will, better integrated air defenses, which is a very high corollary to the introduction of the Stinger missile in Charlie Wilson's War.

The fact is that that is one of the reasons that we have stipulated that we want to move forward into the next generation of long range strike and the next generation air superiority weapon. It is also for air defense on the ground.

And I would say this, sir, that right now we think we have seen the right mix. For example, we got laser vision glasses because we found out that there were, frankly, rich kids in Iraq and Afghanistan that had the lasers that were focusing on our windshields, something I would have never thought of. Now the pilots have to essentially armor-up their eyes to prohibit that.

But we are, in each case, jumping on it and trying to make sure that we have covered the contingencies. We also have people looking out the windows, if you will, for any kind of missile attack. And we have the missile warning systems.

Right now we think we are adequately protected for the engagement we are in. But we are worried about the engagements that we are not in yet because they are armoring up.

Mr. TAYLOR. As they fall off, is there anything on your unfunded requirement list that would respond to the possible needs of our war-fighters, either in Iraq or Afghanistan as far as a vulnerability to either aircraft, anti-craft missiles, or any other threat to those aircraft?

Secretary WYNNE. Chief.

General MOSELEY. Congressman Taylor, I would tell you from a chief's perspective and from the perspective of the guy that commanded that operation out there for over two years, you are never satisfied. You are never satisfied that someone doesn't have an advantage, and you are always looking for some way to provide infrared countermeasures, radar countermeasures against lasers.

On our unfunded requirements list we have a variety of things that we could not afford or that were affordability issues that cut across a wide number of things. But, sir, please rest assured that we don't leave a rock unturned that we can't figure out a way to defend the crew and the aircraft.

Whether it is an old aircraft that we are operating out there—and you have seen some of those and you have flown on some of those—or whether it is a new aircraft off of a production line that we can embed that capability from the very beginning onto the system. So whether it is infrared or whether it is radar or whether it is laser, sir, we try very hard not to miss something.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, gentlemen.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Gentlemen, thank you very much. We will break briefly for the one vote and return and look forward to resuming the hearing.

Secretary WYNNE. Thank you, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

[Recess.]

The CHAIRMAN. Will the witnesses please take the seats?

According to my sheet, Mr. Bishop is next on the list.

Mr. Bishop for five minutes.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Mr. Secretary, General, I appreciate you being here. I recognize fully that there are, you know, some things that is government that we can spend, some things that we should, some things we absolutely must—

The CHAIRMAN. May I suggest you get a little closer to the microphone?

Mr. BISHOP. You can't hear that? Is this easier now? Can you hear that?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP. Do you want to hear this?

General MOSELEY. You bet, sir.

Secretary WYNNE. You bet.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay, we will see in a couple of seconds whether you still do. Now, you are in the absolutely must spend category, and I appreciate that. The chairman was exactly correct when he said that we had been basically at war since the 1990's.

But unfortunately we have also had a basic procurement holiday that same time that we were involved in all that, which has caused significant issues. And I recognize that the top 10 items that you have called for are in the procurement category for aircraft.

I also recognize that we have, in my opinion, taken air superiority for granted in this country. We have had it since the Korean War. We assume it is always there. And sometimes we don't understand the connection between the successful ground operations and the successful air operations and that they both have to work hand in hand for us to go along with that.

So I would guess the easy question I have is simply first if for some reason, both miraculously and appropriately do significant increases in the Air Force budget, I am making the assumption that your request is procurement over personnel. But the question would be is there some kind of nexus between that. If, indeed, we could increase the procurement side of your budget, does that take the pressure for the personnel side of the budget?

General MOSELEY. Congressman, that is a great question. The dilemma that we have been in with the holiday on delivering aircraft affect you in a variety of ways. By keeping the aircraft longer, the costs per flying hour goes up. The break rates go up, which means you need more maintenance, which means you need more crew chiefs, you need more flight line maintenance. So there is a direct tie between recapped, reset, modernized inventories and the numbers of people that you have working each aircraft.

The difference in the C-5 and the C-17, for example, is a significant number of people. The difference in the F-15 and the F-22 is a significant number of people. So there is a—you are exactly right.

Sir, this year in this budget we buy 93 aircraft. Fifty-two of those are UAVs. And so, you can see where we are trying to work our way through a variety of portfolios that include strategic lift, theater lift, the air superiority piece, et cetera and trying to balance that with manned and unmanned systems to fight today's fight, but also position ourselves for the potential threats 10 years from now or 15 years from now.

So, sir, the reset and recapitalization piece is a big deal for us. And we are working that hard inside this budget. And as you have seen on the unfunded requirements list, if we had an additional dollar, those are the things that we would spend it on.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. Thank you, General. I appreciate that.

Secretary, could I just say in a very parochial issue? You know, recently there was a small dust-up that developed between one of the industries in my particular area and a decision made on a legal position by the Department of Defense. Your office used the legitimate procedures in the process, but the turnaround in the decision-making process was amazingly quick to actually kind of work this through and solve any potential problems in the future.

I was amazed that government could work that quickly. So I would just like to thank you, your staff especially for what they were doing in a very parochial issue, which was significant still to me that you did it well. And you and your staff should be complimented for doing that.

Mr. Chairman, I don't want to take that much time. I will yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

Ms. Tauscher, please.

Ms. TAUSCHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, General, it is good to see you again. Thank you for bringing those great airmen with you. And congratulations on their work and all the people that you represent.

As you know, I have Travis Air Force Base in my district. And my constituents and I couldn't be prouder of the men and women who contribute to the Nation's airlift needs. The debate about the C-5s and the C-17s is something that we have talked about before.

We all understand, I think, that they are two very important platforms that have very similar missions but have different capabilities. And obviously the C-5 has a vintage problem, as we say, if you are over 55.

Secretary Wynne, I am looking at, not only the unfunded requirements list, but what the President's budget has said. And I understand that the Secretary of Defense removed about \$217 million from the budget submission that was going toward the production line shutdown of the C-17. So what we effectively have is Under Secretary Young saying that the work in the amp programs are national security important, so we have to keep that money in there. So the C-5 they are going to continue going off into the future getting remodeled and refurbished.

There is no money to buy C-17s. I think that somehow the Administration has gotten onto the fact that the Congress will add C-17s if they don't ask for them. And that is a nasty little habit for the Administration to have gotten into because it doesn't provide us the kind of strategic lift that we need with any sense that we could actually buy them with a multi-year procurement and get the savings that we should be getting.

So we are buying them, but we are paying the most money we can for them. And I understand that we have been offered a deal by the contractor, kind of 15 for 12, which is a pretty good deal. But because we can't make a decision on multi-year procurement, we are not getting the best price for them.

And so, I think we are in this trick bag here of trying to keep both feet on the accelerator keeping the C-5s going, not asking for C-17s, depending on the Congress to do it, but not getting the best price. And in the end, I don't think the American people are very well served. I don't think the Air Force is well-served. And our strategic lift needs are clearly not well-served.

So I am looking for you to tell me, Secretary Wynne, what should we make of the 15 additional C-17s that are listed on your unfunded requirements list.

Secretary WYNNE. Well, first of all, the C-5 Acquisition Decision Memorandum (ADM) certified the program for the B aircraft. It did not certify the work for the A aircraft. However, the law on retiring C-5s has not been changed. So what we probably will do at this juncture is to go ahead and proceed with the C-5B program as the ADM has said.

And by the way, I think that Lockheed stepped up to a pretty good contract arrangement on that. We will take the As, and we will sort through the As to try to figure out which ones we should amp, which brings it up to sort of international standards for flight. We will amp a variety of C-5As along the way.

To your question on C-17s, one thing that we have not been successful on is, frankly, selling the fact that we are running the wheels off and the wings off of the airplane going in and out of theater.

Ms. TAUSCHER. I am sold.

Secretary WYNNE. And so, we cannot seem to sustain a budget through the President's budget. I will tell you that again, to hedge against a future, as we mentioned before, we have added the 15 to the unfunded list because we see that the future may well see the Air Force continuing to supply logistics, continuing to supply aeromed, continuing to supply quite a few of the flight requirements in both theaters and strategically across the world.

So that is where we are. And I can't offer you much else. You know the positive nature of our personal views.

Ms. TAUSCHER. Well, I would like to engage the chairman briefly.

Mr. Skelton, I think that, you know, this is where the rubber meets the road literally. We have a situation here where we are chasing our own tail. We are keeping C-5s online that we know that we can't—that we don't want to, but we have to because we have a critical mission for them to complete.

We are not procuring C-17s through the President's budget and through the Pentagon because they can't afford them because money is going elsewhere. The Congress is stepping in. But even though the Congress is stepping in and buying, you know, a dozen a year pretty much, we are not getting the savings because we can't do multi-year procurements. So we are just chasing our tail around.

And I think we need to look at strategic airlift. I know that we have tried to look at different studies, and we have had a number of different things. General Moseley and I have engaged in this conversation.

But, you know, I think that we are not serving anyone well, certainly not the airmen and the great Americans that are flying on these planes that we are exhausting and overusing, nor the stra-

tegic needs of the American people for other contingencies by not making these decisions. It is about the money. The money is going other places. We understand that.

But we in the Congress have the responsibility to say stop. And I think this is where we have to say stop because we cannot afford in the future to turn around and have airlift needs and the needs to bring—whether it is humanitarian aid in the United States or troops and other things to a fight and say, you know, back in 2007 and 2008 and 2009 we really should have said stop, and now we don't have the lift requirements that we need.

So I hope, Mr. Chairman, that we will begin to really take this fight to the Administration and make some choices. And, you know, I am not suggesting it is another air frame that we start to cut away from, but this is an unsustainable situation for us.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentlelady. That is our constitutional duty. Thank you for your comments.

Before I call on—it looks like Mr. Turner would be next—General, as you know, we lost a B-2 in Guam just a few days ago, which was stationed in Whiteman Air Force Base in my home state of Missouri. And I received a call from Brigadier General Harencak telling me that both of the pilots will fly again, which, of course, is good news.

And I also know that the whole matter of the crash is under investigation and comments need to be limited. But what can you tell us without invading the province of the investigators regarding the B-2 crash, please?

General MOSELEY. Chairman, thanks for the opportunity. Sir, as you know, we have a safety investigation board that is now present at Andersen in Guam headed by general officer. And any comments that I would have would be inappropriate until we know what the safety investigation board finds.

I will tell you that we have both our pilots back. We did have a spine or back compression on one. But I am told that that is okay and we are going to be able to return to flying status on both pilots. That is the first thing that a service chief and a secretary always asks when you get these calls in the middle of the night is how about the pilots and the crew. So that part is a 100 percent good news story.

Sir, I am real hesitant to comment because I truly have not asked into the safety investigation board for any updates because I don't think that is appropriate for me. That would be interpreted as I am attempting to either accelerate or somehow shape that board. And I will resist that. So, sir, I apologize, but I don't have that information.

The CHAIRMAN. No, you are giving the right answer. I think it is important that the pilots will again be on flight status. And we are, of course, very, very pleased about that as well. I know, their families and all at Whiteman and Missouri neighbors will feel very pleased that they are returning as such.

Mr. Turner.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank both of you for your discussion today on the important issue of your end strength. And you can see that the struggle in this committee as we look to the budget request and

then unfunded priorities request with respect to personnel. Over the past year we have heard several times as both the defense secretary and yourselves have come before this committee and indicated that your projected reductions probably could not or even should not be met as you look to the responsibilities of the Air Force.

I noted also that in your unfunded priorities you also have an item for 1,800 civilians. And we certainly are aware that the Air Force as it has been trying to hit lower numbers has taken hits both in active duty and in also civilians.

I have a concern about as we look to the issue of your acquisition programs. Your ability to have personnel resources certainly impacts the ability of those programs to be successful. Could you speak a moment about the impact on personnel reduction of the effective functioning of your acquisition programs?

Secretary WYNNE. Well, sir, one of the things that we are trying to do there is to make sure that we have resurrected—for example, that during the procurement turndown we lost almost a third of our procurement professionals. And these people are not sort of walk out the door, hang around, and then walk back in the door. These are developed over many years.

Part of it is the cost control group, infinite cost estimating team that was at Wright Patterson and was, frankly, premier throughout the world. We are now in the phase of going back to blue, but at the same time, we need residual expertise, and we need to make sure we appropriately replace and replenish our acquisition professionals. And we are on the road to do just that and try to satisfy that.

Part of this is as a result of Secretary Gonsler's view that he was on contracts and making sure that we all took another look at our contract professionals. And that is one area that we are striving to replace.

Mr. TURNER. Also then in looking to the issue of Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC), I am understanding is you have included almost \$1.2 billion in the 2009 request. It is also the understanding that there has been a general reduction in BRAC 2005 for fiscal year 2008. Apparently the Air Force's reduction is somewhere around \$235 million. Without the restoration of the 2008 funding, how will the Air Force complete the BRAC 2005 process, and how does it affect your timeline of September 2011?

Secretary WYNNE. I think it is going to have an effect on the completion, but maybe not the start. The law reads that you have to initiate the base realignment and closure action and have a viable, executable plan.

The problem is is that when we lost some money in the 2007 timeframe, we recognized that just to do the engineering job, the architectural engineering job, and make sure we did all of the, frankly, facilities, infrastructure correctly, you have to have a time lead for planning. That is what drove the reduction.

I can tell you if we stay on plan now, we are fairly confident that we have stretched out the money. You will see some base realignment and closure in the 2012, 2013 timeframe. But I think we will be all right.

Mr. TURNER. It is my understanding that there has been a shift in the modernization program for the C-5As limiting it to Avionics Modernization Program (AMP), not a full modernization. And it is also my understanding that the Air Force is not looking currently for C-17s, additional. How is that going to affect our capability? And can you talk a moment about the C-5A?

Secretary WYNNE. The C-5ADM that came down certified for the C-5B program to make sure that the C-5B program was worked and AMP'd. We are looking at the A models to determine which of the A models—and we are going to start with the best A model because we always have thought that we needed some of those. And we are going to try to bring those up to international standards, which is essentially the Avionics Modernization Program, or AMP.

I think that is going to take us some time to plan for, but that is where the program is now. There is a law that prohibits retirement. And so, we cannot have a plan to retire these airplanes. We have, as you know, asked this committee, and this committee has been exceptionally responsive to that, allowing Air Force to manage.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Marshall for five minutes.

Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for your service. You do a great job for us.

And, Chief, I compliment you on your opening statement. Very well done.

I have a number of questions that I could have, just a legion. I only have five minutes. I am going to try and be real quick about this. I would love to talk about Global Logistic Support Center (GLSC) and executive agency. And that is something that we need to continue to dialogue on. But I am going to focus on three specific issues, and I will ask three questions.

And, Chief, I think they are going to be principally be directed to you. And hopefully you will be able to give us some good answers here on the record.

First, C-5, C-17—I think everybody agrees, GAO certainly does, that the air mobility study given to us a year or so ago is faulty. And I know we are updating that. And I understand that the projected date to have the updated air mobility study is first quarter, 2009. And what I would like is maybe something for the record, not an answer right now: what would keep us—what would be inappropriate about us directing that that air mobility study, the updated air mobility study be given to us sooner than that?

What are the hurdles in providing that to us? I think we need that in order to get to the inquiry that Ms. Tauscher mentioned, pretty important stuff. So I won't put that in the form of a question, I would just ask that for the record you would detail why it is going to take so long and how quickly could this effectively be done and should we direct it.

Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA)—I would like some comments about the Air Force's current view with regard to that platform, how the Air Force intends to participate. And I will just make an observation. No matter what the Air Force does as far as acquiring platforms is concerned, in this joint world, thinking about future tax-

payer resources, it seems to me contractor maintenance, C-17-type approach to this is inappropriate, and that is the direction the Army seems to be headed in at the moment.

And we need to be thinking about depot maintenance core loads, you know, those sorts of things, which in the long run will be better for the services, better for the taxpayer, better for our military. And we all know that. And I am afraid that with the separation between the Army and the Air Force that continues to exist—and if a different approach is taken by the Air Force where JCA is concerned and acquisition of the platform is concerned, somehow maintenance is going to get lost altogether. And I would like you to comment on that, if you could.

And the final thing near and dear to my heart and yours, sir, is personnel management, reorganization and the large civilian centers. I think people are misinterpreting the BRAC language.

I have already said this once before. BRAC commissioners clearly contemplated that on-site management, I think, under center commanders' control will continue to exist to meet the needs of those civilian centers. The Tinker tests—I mean, that is an utter failure. You know, they have had a hiring freeze. And so, you just don't have the statistics.

And I have heard that there is a move afoot to start moving authorities from the center commanders, personnel perhaps, slots perhaps, but moving authorities, command direction, that sort of thing, to Tinker—pardon me, to San Antonio to Air Force personnel center. That makes no sense.

We don't have a test. You move the command authority. You have moved a major part of the deal, major part of the management team. And so, I would like a comment on all three of those. Thank you for your service.

General MOSELEY. Sir, the mobility capability study (MCS)—please let us do take that for the record and see what obstacles there are to move that quickly. But back to Congresswoman Tauscher's comments about strat lift. From the previous MCS study, look what has happened to us as far as the change in the environment that we are operating in.

[The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

General MOSELEY. The Army is 100,000 people bigger. Brigade combat teams either represent force generation backfill or forward teams deployed in combat. So that piece has changed.

The future combat systems (FCS) vehicle I am told now won't fit in a C-130. We have now also began to look at U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) as an operating medium, which will be humanitarian relief and be disaster relief and a requirement to move things around a huge continent. So when you think about what has changed from the MCS 2005 to now, the Army is much bigger.

The vehicle that the Army and the Air Force is working on to support their future concept of operations now won't fit in a C-130. AFRICOM is now bigger. The C-5 question—we are now looking at wurping the Bs and the 2Cs and beginning to AMP the As to get as much capability as we can. The C-17 is being used like a C-130 in-theater to move up to 10,000 people a month.

Mr. MARSHALL. I am going to interrupt and say that I expect we will see all that in the updated study—real quickly.

General MOSELEY. I guess I would say that is the river we are swimming in when we look at another mobility capability study, that we have a different world now than we had then.

Mr. MARSHALL. Well, and we are all hoping that the supplemental will produce some more C-17s right away.

General MOSELEY. And, sir, the C-27—George Casey and I have spent a lot of time personally on this together. In fact, we have just signed a letter together that outlines how we will progress on this. And we are still committed, both of us, to the program and being able to field the program for a variety of reasons, to include international partnering, homeland security, et cetera.

And, sir, you know where I am on the personnel management. I believe that we need to have elements of that work at the depots to be specifically competent with that particular challenge.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Gingrey, five minutes?

Dr. GINGREY. Secretary Wynne, Chief Moseley, thank you very much for being with us today. I don't have a lot of time, but I have got a lot of questions regarding the F-22A situation. So let me begin.

In a nutshell, the situation is that the base budget for fiscal year 2009 contains no funds for line shutdown or for advanced procurement of the F-22. And there seems to be a discrepancy between where that will leave us in terms of the size of the F-22 fleet and where the Air Force and most independent experts believe that number should be. That will leave us at 183 and possibly 187 if, as Secretary Gates has indicated, there are four additional F-22s in the supplemental request.

General Moseley, in your professional opinion as the senior uniformed leader of the Air Force, what is the Air Force's validated requirement of F-22A Raptors?

General MOSELEY. Sir, as you know, I do support the budget. I do support the President's budget. And I am grateful that in that budget the termination language has been removed and the line will continue. So the numbers discussion will be given—will be allowed to continue into the next Administration.

And so, the balance of F-35 and F-22s and legacy airplanes is where we are working now. But if you are asking my personal opinion, with what we know right now, the number is still 381.

Dr. GINGREY. Three hundred and eighty-one? Thank you. Thank you, Chief.

Secretary Wynne, as the civilian leader of the Air Force, where do you put the requirement? Has anything happened to make that requirement change?

Secretary WYNNE. I am not a uniformed officer, and so I have to be very supportive of the President's budget. But I also am grateful that the secretary has allowed the program to not be closed and that it has allowed the debate to continue into next year, giving, I think, the military authorities the right to argue for continued extension.

Where I come down is, frankly, I worry very much about how we are going to manage across this globe to make sure we have air superiority, which has been the predicate for victory ever since World

War II. I also worry about the integrated air defense systems because the last time we had a balanced survivability between us and them, we lost 2,000 airplanes, one of which was my brother.

Dr. GINGREY. Mr. Secretary, if you could give me that number, I would appreciate it, the number of F-22As that you think we need.

Secretary WYNNE. Sir, I have to tell you that, not being a professional airman, but being a Secretary of the Air Force, I am sort of stuck on that. I can only tell you that where Air Combat Command (ACC) currently is is the 381.

Dr. GINGREY. Thank you. And I assume that requirement is based, among other things, on the fact that China and Russia are developing fifth generation Raptor-like technology, safety concerns pertaining to our F-15 fleet, and our Nation's desire, of course, as you just said, Mr. Secretary, to maintain air superiority. I assume that requirement is driven in part that over the last 10 years multiple independent studies and over 20 Air Force studies have all recommended that the Air Force requires far, far more than 187 F-22 Raptors to do the job previously done, by the way, by 800 F-15A through Ds.

With a fleet of 187 Raptors, after accounting for training, tests, and maintenance requirements, fewer than 110 of those F-22s will be operational. Without a change in procurement plans, I believe this small number of F-22s will make it extremely difficult for the Air Force to provide air dominance to our combatant commanders for the next several decades. So let me ask both of you.

First of all, Secretary Wynne, in your professional opinion as secretary and, General Moseley, as chief of staff of the Air Force, are 187 F-22 Raptors enough to carry out the Air Force's air dominance mission for the next 30 years without taking on substantial risk?

Mr. Secretary.

Secretary WYNNE. Sir, I think it is the measure of risk that we are debating. And it is the measure of risk as to where the resources could go other than to this program. I believe that we need a little bit of presence. And I think the way that the 381 units are currently sited was to make sure that there was a robust squadron in each of the 10 AEFs. I have not seen anything that would dissuade from that aspiration.

Dr. GINGREY. Chief Moseley.

General MOSELEY. Congressman, we are grateful that the line has not been closed down in this budget. And we are grateful that Secretary Gates in the President's budget defers the decision on shutdown and numbers to the next Administration. So we have an opportunity within the Department to have these very discussions.

The affordability of the program is—and the measure of risk—is the debate that we are going through now. With the affordability of the 183 plus four airplanes is the real question. So as I support the President's budget and I am grateful that the line is not shut down, this is an affordability issue, and this is a measure of risk issue.

And so, I agree with air combat command on the bigger numbers. But, sir, the discussion will continue.

Dr. GINGREY. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

Thank you, Chief Moseley.

The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

Mr. Secretary, could you maybe pull the microphone just a little away from you?

Secretary WYNNE. Away from me?

The CHAIRMAN. Yes, sir. There is some feedback.

Secretary WYNNE. Yes, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Ms. Bordallo?

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Wynne and General Moseley, thank you for your testimony this morning. I want to begin by expressing my relief that the two pilots involved in this weekend's crash of a B-2 bomber at Andersen Air Force Base on Guam are in good condition. I wish the one pilot that was sent to Tripler Army Medical Center in Hawaii a speedy recovery from his injuries.

The events of Saturday morning is a reminder to all of us that our men and women in uniform are constantly putting themselves in harm's way to protect our way of life. And for that sacrifice, we say thank you. I know that the Air Force has commenced a thorough investigation of the circumstances surrounding the crash, and I remain committed to working with you and this committee to ensure that all safety issues are appropriately addressed.

And now for my question. During the DOD fiscal year 2009 posture hearing earlier this month, I expressed concern about the 32 percent across the board cut in military construction for the Air Force in fiscal year 2009. The case in point, nearly \$700 million has been identified and validated by the Air Force construction for Guam. The construction is related to the realignment of Air Force units from Osan, Korea and the development of a fighter town at Andersen Air Force Base. However, the fiscal year 2009 budget only contains \$5.2 million in construction.

The Air Force, I know, is willing to take strategic risks in its construction programs, reducing the construction budget by 20 percent over the next 15 years.

Secretary Wynne, there are numerous instances where construction to support F-22s and C-17s and other related training devices are delivered well after the arrival of these aviation assets. For example, Elmendorf Air Force Base—two F-22 squadrons will be ready to respond in September of 2008, but the construction to support these planes is not programmed to be completed until two years later.

I may be from sunny, warm Guam, but having these F-22s sit on the runway in Alaska does not make the best sense. Is this approach, in your mind, in the best interest of the Air Force?

Secretary WYNNE. Well, Ms. Bordallo, thank you very much for that question. The construction of our budget across the board is balanced between actual military construction (MILCON) and the money required for base realignment and closure. In that regard, we have tried—we recognize that it has gone down, but it is balanced across the spectrum.

We think we are taking the appropriate risk, given where the status of plans are for even the movement of consolidation from

Korea and potentially where we are going on the F-22. All of these things are sort of in flux.

And I would agree with Congresswoman Tauscher's comment that, boy, it would be good if we actually had the foresight to know where this conundrum would come down. We think we have a balanced program and that we have accepted the risk that we may not do things all right. But I think in this case we have got it, the MILCON, about right between MILCON basic and base realignment and closure.

Ms. BORDALLO. General Moseley, I have a question for you. I would like to follow up on some comments that you made at the October 24th hearing last year on the Air Force's strategic initiatives. During the hearing you stated that you and General Casey were in discussion about how to proceed with the procurement of C-27s or joint cargo aircraft programs.

Can we assume that you and General Casey will continue to adhere to the—is it a memorandum of understanding—MOU that was signed on June 20th? And would the committee be able to see this MOU?

General MOSELEY. Yes, ma'am. Please allow us. We will provide that for the record, the previous MOU. But, ma'am, also rest assured that General Casey and I are taking this program very seriously. And we have met several times, just the two of us, to talk about this and how to proceed on the original schedule with the original bed-down and how to work these issues that Congressman Marshall talks about about the differences in depot maintenance and contract logistic support and how to sustain a program like this over the long-term, which may, in fact, be a major capability with strategic partnering in foreign military sales.

How would we do all of that in one package? And those are the discussions that we have been having.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, I am requesting that we see a copy of the MOU.

[The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Franks, five minutes.

Mr. FRANKS. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And I want to thank both of you and your entire entourage for being here. You know, I am always reminded that apart from those who wear the uniform, none of us could be sitting here. And you keep us safe, and we are very grateful to you and honor your service.

You know, I have to apologize that I didn't get to hear all the testimony today. I think there is deliberate collusion among the chairmen of this body to make all their committees at exactly the same time. And there is nothing we can do about that.

But I have read most of your testimony, General Moseley. And I wanted to tell you one of the things that is becoming very obvious to me—and some of the colleagues have already mentioned the valid concerns about tankers and fighters—is it just seems like there is a bigger issue here. And that is you have got unfunded requirements in fiscal year 2009 of at least \$20 billion. Now, maybe that has already been articulated here today.

And none of these are trivial items that make up that loss. And I think we owe it to the American people to provide you with the resources to field worldclass air, space, and cyberspace force. And with the defense budget representing less than four percent, slightly less than four percent of Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and slightly more when the supplementals are factored in, I guess I just ask both of you, in the long run, will defense spending at a minimum of four percent GDP be enough to satisfy and to fund all the things that you must do to modernize and maintain the Air Force.

Secretary WYNNE. Sir, I know that the debate is very robust over whether or not the base funding has been adequate over the years. I would say since we went into the procurement holiday, we built up quite a backlog of procurement actions to be done, hence, the growth in age of my fleet.

We have stipulated, I think, that we would love to see an increase. You have heard that. You have seen it in the unfunded requirements.

I know that the chairman of the Joint Chiefs has talked about the four percent being an appropriate and likely area and a good one for starting the debate. I think I come down on that same bank.

Mr. FRANKS. General Moseley, do you have any—

General MOSELEY. Congressman, I, too, believe that four percent is a reasonable departure point to have a discussion about the strategic imparities and about long-term capital reinvestment. Whether that is shipbuilding, whether that is aerospace, whether that is reset from Iraq and Afghanistan. But I think a four percent mark on the wall is a good place to start to have that discussion.

Mr. FRANKS. Well, in your white paper and in your testimony you made reference to cross-domain dominance.

And first of all, Mr. Chairman, with your permission and with the agreement with the rest of the committee, I would like to put that white paper into the record here and then ask General Moseley to just elaborate more on the subject.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

[The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

General MOSELEY. Congressman, thank you for that. The secretary also has a strategy paper that is outstanding. And I would offer that as a companion piece to the white paper.

Mr. FRANKS. Mr. Chairman, without objection—

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

[The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

General MOSELEY. Congressman, I believe in the future for the terms that we have used cross-domain dominance for an Air Force that is airspace and cyberspace. I believe those domains are inextricably linked as we operate through and from space and we operate through that domain that our senior noncommissioned officer (NCO) back here lives with every day. And that is cyberspace.

I believe that is a domain that we don't well understand. And it is a domain that we have to better understand and better understand the impacts of operating through that or operations against us in that domain.

Air is much easier to understand because we can touch it and see it. Space is a bit easier because you can see the satellite launch, and you can see the effect. Cyber is something different. And I believe that those domains represent operating mediums that we have to better understand and we have to better merge. Hence, the term cross-domain dominance. I believe that is something that the United States Air Force must be prepared to take on for the future and understand those things better.

Mr. FRANKS. Secretary, Wynne, do you have any comments?

Secretary WYNNE. In a simple term to do Global Hawks, you need space. To do Global Hawks, you need cyber. I want to take a minute or seconds here to compliment the chairman, who asked us to please take a hard look at strategies.

Sir, we have done that. That is the paperwork that Congressman Franks has asked for. But I will tell you on behalf of all of us, thank you for pushing us in that direction. And I think the committee will benefit from the output.

Mr. FRANKS. Mr. Chairman, thank you. I just want to add my own perspective here. It occurs to me that given the challenges that are coming straight at America and certainly the Air Force, that for us to fail to have clear dominance in any one of those three categories, whether it be space, cyberspace or air is to jeopardize the other two.

The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. Courtney.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, Secretary Wynne, General Moseley, and your guests particularly. I just wanted to follow up with a subject that sort of is becoming an annual back and forth with the Pentagon, which is the alternate engine dispute over joint strike fighter. Again, I just want to be clear. Your budget, again, does not include any funding for the alternate engine.

Is that correct, Secretary?

Secretary WYNNE. Yes, in support of the President's budget, yes, sir, that is right.

Mr. COURTNEY. And is it listed as an unfunded priority at all as well?

Secretary WYNNE. I don't believe it is because the business case cannot be made. I would say it this way, though, that the business case is about cost versus reliability. The reliability of the ongoing engine is pretty good. That having been said, and you might want to say to yourself, okay, but what can you do to increase the fleet reliability?

Well, first you can have two airplanes. That increases fleet reliability. If you intend to have one airplane for eight partner countries and for three service components, then maybe you need to look at the business case a little bit differently. But right now, it cannot be made.

Mr. COURTNEY. Because it seems that we have got an awful long list here of unfunded priorities that you have identified outside of the program budget that, you know, this is going to be a tough year obviously listening to the prior questions. I mean, this issue, though, it doesn't seem that you have even included it as an unfunded priority, which to me that is a little bit of a statement from

the Air Force about whether or not this is something we can afford, given all the other hard choices we have to make.

Secretary WYNNE. We have put it up for the past several years and have always been turned down. And I think that has probably talked to us about the—effectively of the business case. We thought the business case would mature out. It has not.

Mr. COURTNEY. Okay. Thank you. And I just appreciate you restating that for the record.

General Moseley, Congresswoman Bordallo referred to the October hearing. Again, I want to thank you for clarifying the issue, which was going back and forth between the Senate and House on the issue of the joint cargo aircraft. I was a little confused by the question and answer that she just had with you.

The conversations that you have had with General Casey, which you indicated resulted in a letter—is that letter a substitute of the prior memorandum of agreement?

General MOSELEY. No, sir. The memorandum of agreement was between the Air Force and the Army on proceeding with a program. And that we will provide for the record.

[The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

General MOSELEY. The conversations that General Casey and I are having is how best to field the airplane and how best to get it into the squadrons as fast as we possibly can and then look at the issues of intra-theater lift and look at the motions of how to deliver capability across a theater and how best to incorporate that into the competencies of the Air Force, which is what we do for a living.

Mr. COURTNEY. Okay. So that at least as of where we sit today there really has been no change to the memorandum of agreement that was executed between the two branches?

General MOSELEY. Correct, correct. Which is a program decision, sir. It is to get on with buying flying machines and to be able to get the program through the legal issues and be able to get on contract to be able to have a competition and to be able to begin to deliver aircraft.

Mr. COURTNEY. And so, the request that she made about submitting follow up, that is the letter, I believe that—

General MOSELEY. That is right, sir. That is the memorandum.

Mr. COURTNEY. And your intention is to submit that to the committee?

General MOSELEY. Correct, sir.

Mr. COURTNEY. Okay, appreciate that. And again, as far as the existing sort of schedule for JCAs in terms of their procurement and delivery, I mean, we are basically operating under the rules of the road of the memorandum of agreement.

General MOSELEY. Correct.

Mr. COURTNEY. Is that correct?

General MOSELEY. Sir, we are operating under the rules of the agreed-to deliveries to try to get the airplanes to the squadrons in the schedule that we have agreed to originally.

Mr. COURTNEY. All right. Thank you.

I have no further questions, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ORTIZ [presiding]. Mr. Jones.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, Secretary Wynne, General Moseley, I have great respect for both of you and, excuse me, delighted—let me repeat that. I have great respect for both you gentlemen and the service you have given this Nation. And thank you for being here today.

Recently, in a North Carolina paper under the section nation and world—I know you can't see that—it says Air Force warns of delay and decline. You know that I have Seymour Johnson Air Force Base in my district. I have Camp Lejeune, Cherry Point, active duty as well as many, many retired military in my district.

The success and the future of our services is important to many of those people as it is myself and many Americans who, like myself, never served. A couple points in this I want to read to you, and then I want to get to my one question.

The subtitle says, "Service leaders say aging aircraft must be replaced. Critics cite spiraling costs." I am going to quote Major General Paul Selva, the Air Force director of strategic planning. He said in an interview with Associated Press. And this is his quote.

"What we have done is put the requirements on the table. If we are going to do the missions you are going to ask us to do, it will require this kind of investment," says Major General Selva. The point is this. I have sat here for 14 years. I have tried to make as many hearings as I could. I try to listen very intently.

Our Nation right now owes China \$440 billion in debt. Many of your problems—I am not getting into the specifics of procurement and this and that as needs to be asked and has been asked by colleagues. But the point is this. At what point does the Air Force get to the point of no return?

I am not talking about giving up and closing down the Air Force. But you get to a point of no return that you can't recover what you have lost because of having to make adjustments because of not having adequate budgeting.

Where and when do we get to a point that there is no catch up, that China—primarily China—and these other countries have spent, invested while America is borrowing money from other governments to pay its bills, which in the book by Pat Buchanan, *Day of Reckoning*, his point is here. And then I am going to let you answer my question. A great nation that has to borrow money to pay its bills from other governments will not long be a great nation. And that statement will impact on our military.

And after reading many articles and hearing testimonies from professionals and experts like yourself, my concern as a taxpayer of this Nation is when we get to a point that there is no catch up. Is that a possibility?

Secretary WYNNE. Well, sir, I would start this way. One of the definitions of freedom is having all the options to operate. America has enjoyed that freedom of operation anywhere in the world primarily due to the strategic strike capability of the United States Air Force as well as those hardworking diplomats in our State Department.

I think, if you will, the first indication that we have passed the point of no return is when America's options get shaped by another nation. And that is not here yet. We believe right now we have the finest Air Force in the world. Somebody said it is the role of the

Air Force to put a silver cloud anywhere in the world that we chose to.

And another indication, therefore, is when we want to put a silver cloud anywhere in the world and we can't, that is another indication. I would tell you that is not where we are today. The only thing that General Moseley and I can say is that at some point in the future we have got to fund the defense at the right level and buy the defense that America deserves.

Mr. JONES. General Moseley.

General MOSELEY. Congressman, I would say simplistically that unless you buy ships, it is hard to field the combatant Navy. And unless you buy airplanes and satellites, it is hard to field a combatant Air Force. In the economic order of quantities of the new systems that we are attempting to acquire, both maritime and air, it takes us to smaller numbers, which takes the cost up, which then generates a set of questions about affordability.

Sir, I would say in the 2009 budget that we are here to testify today our major programs are intact. The economic order of quantities are down, but the programs are intact. And so, we have the baseline from which to build for the new Air Force.

And I will speak for the Navy and the Army and the Marine Corps also with their new systems, whether they are B-22s or anything else. The programs are there. The economic order of quantities are not there.

We are buying at lower levels. So this is about an affordability question, which, I think, is a different answer to your question. But unless you buy airplanes and satellites, it is hard to field an Air Force.

Mr. JONES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN [presiding]. Ms. Davis, please.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Thank you.

Thank you very much. And thank you, certainly, for being here and for your service as well.

I wanted to follow up a little bit on Chairman Skelton's question. And it is also a follow up in many ways to our personnel hearing the other day because one of the concerns is whether or not we are being realistic in the way that we are shifting over in our requests on the supplemental versus the base budget. And, certainly, in personnel, I think that issue was raised earlier.

How do you expect to sustain the increase in our end strength, your end strength really, if Congress was to increase the end strength for fiscal year 2009? How would that occur?

Secretary WYNNE. Well, how would we recover to that level? We have no problem right now with recruiting. Our standards are at the highest levels. And some in our Air Force have said we have actually let go all the C students. We now only have B or better and because we have been coming down on a fairly dramatic way.

We have actually people that are trying not to get out of our Air Force, even though we have asked them to leave. It is one of those things, I think, that General Moseley and I did not come to this decision lightly. It was strictly a matter of if you want to have an Air Force, you have got to buy airplanes and you have got to buy satellites. But I don't think we will have a problem, ma'am, recovering.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Would you say the same thing about the mid-career retention rate? I understand that you are struggling with those.

Secretary WYNNE. We are struggling with those just a little bit. I think it has more to do with the fact that we have been on a structural decline and they are wondering about the future. I think when the future is actually settled, that also will be settled.

General MOSELEY. But, Congresswoman Davis, the mid-level NCOs that we worry about in that 6 to 10 and 10 to 14-year group in there—we are targeting those specific Air Force Specialty Codes (AFSCs) with bonuses to incentivize people to stay. When you look at the overall end strength, though, the decision on trying to level out the end strength, which hopefully you guys had a good discussion in the Personnel Committee hearing—is an attempt to relieve the stress on our families, attempt to relieve the stress on our people while still meeting the tasking that we have.

The in-lieu-of tasking we have over 20,000 people tied up in that on any given day. The Army growth and the Marine growth takes us to higher numbers of our folks that live inside the Army like our member sitting behind me here. The new missions that we are looking at with cyber and with the joint task force and with the joint commands takes us to a place where perhaps that number of 316,000 is truly too small.

And so, our discussion now is can we level this off at somewhere around 322 to 328 so that we can relieve the stress on those mid-level NCOs, our families and still meet this mission task. And so, that is the discussion we are having internal to the Department.

And the Secretary of Defense's staff has been most receptive to us having this discussion to say what does it look like if we level off, what is the resourcing required, and where do the people go. And so, ma'am, we are in that swirl right now having that very discussion.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Have you been restrained in any way in providing those bonuses? Do you feel that by trying to—

General MOSELEY. No, no, ma'am, not at all, no, no.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA [continuing]. Shoehorn that in in some way?

General MOSELEY. But you want to be able to target the bonus at the right member, though, under the right circumstances so that it has the impact of actually being an incentive to stay.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. You know, earlier you said something to the effect—I think Chief said that we would be deferring the discussion. And you were talking about airlift, I think, at that time—to the next Administration. And in some ways it feels as if—and I think the discussion that we had in personnel as well is that is the issue that by 2010 we might be bringing that supplemental into the base budget when we are talking about personnel issues, especially when we are talking about bonuses and retention.

And that suggests to me that we are hoping to have more realistic budgets in the future. Is that a fair assessment to what is happening now?

General MOSELEY. Ma'am, I think every one of these issues that we are talking about today comes down to an affordability issue and a prioritization. Our unfunded requirements list is big because

we agreed that we would put everything on the table so that there would be complete visibility over everything, that where would the next dollar go or the next dollar go after that.

So this is really about prioritizing within the baseline budget and trying to make the hard choices without breaking our people and our families and without breaking the mission and still looking to reset and recapitalize.

Mrs. DAVIS OF CALIFORNIA. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Along that line, at what point do you say we can't do it?

General MOSELEY. Mr. Chairman, we are not there yet. I won't say we can't do it, but I will tell you that I am more concerned that 316,000 may be too small. And that discussion about where can we plateau out and where can we look at not putting stress on our families or our members or on those key Utilization Review (UR) groups or on those key Family Support Centers (FSCs) and how do we mitigate the high-demand, low-density pieces of the Air Force while we are still doing the other things outside the normal AFSCs and competencies. That is the nature of the discussion right now.

The CHAIRMAN. You were kind enough to introduce the young men and young women behind you. They are not just the best Americans. They are the best in the world.

And they deserve the best that Congress can give them. And that is why a hearing such as this is so important. And that is why the discussion of the unfunded list, the unfunded requirements list is extremely important to us. And we thank you for your candor.

Mr. Hayes.

Mr. HAYES. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I certainly agree wholeheartedly with your remarks about the men and women in blue. Thank you all for keeping the air in airborne and your service.

We have talked about a whole host of things, and we need to keep stressing we need more airplanes, we need more platforms.

Secretary WYNNE, you talk about the silver cloud everywhere. But unfortunately we have got another kind of cloud that is kind of lingering out there with our acquisition process.

On the issue of tankers, F-15s, F-22s, we need more. We also need more helicopters. So my question is about the Combat Search and Rescue (CSAR) program. We had the Inspector General (IG) announce on Friday that he was going to do an investigation. Would you use a little bit of our time to tell us where we are? Are we about to clear up that issue on the acquisition of the search and rescue helicopter?

And, of course, General Moseley, I would appreciate any comments you might have. Just update us where we are on that.

Secretary WYNNE. Yes, sir. We are right now to the point where we are trying to satisfy all the critics. And we have got all of the data in, and we are now in an open and transparent way trying to make sure that we do not leave a critic unsatisfied.

If the DOD inspector general would like to investigate, we are open and transparent. Come on in, let us reprove why we are doing what we are doing. I think they will be satisfied.

Frankly, one of the things that I think we have not done well in the past is not being open and communicative to the critics. And

by the way, some of those critics are, in fact, the supplier network, especially pre and post the award.

And so, I would tell you that where we are going with transparency and governance should effectively help us by rationalizing our choices and our decisions and with the critics that are out there. We think the program is in great shape, frankly. And we think that by mid to late summer we should be in a conclusive state on that.

Mr. HAYES. So are you going to wait on his report for the next move? Or what is the plan there? And he seems to be questioning documentation specifically on the key program parameters.

Secretary WYNNE. And I think we can satisfy the DOD IG, who took a listing from a program on government oversight, you know. I believe we can sustain our rationale and logic. And so, I invite him in. Become part of the team and support it. I would rather have that than I would rather have it be after the fact telling us that we didn't do something right.

General MOSELEY. Congressman Hayes, if I could parallel that, though, on the operational side. I still believe, and you have heard me say this repeatedly, that I believe it is a moral and an ethical imperative that we go pick people up in a combat situation. So combat search and rescue to me, having commanded that theater out there on the air side, is a big deal.

The helicopter that our combat and search and rescue pilot here flies doesn't have the characteristics to operate at those pressure altitudes or the range or the pay load. And so, that is why we have been pretty aggressive on trying to field a helicopter that does combat search and rescue for the entire joint team, regardless of who the airmen or the air crew, the Marine, the sailor, the soldier that requires to be picked up.

That is what we do, and we do that for all of the uniformed military. And so, this is a big deal for us to be able to field this system, to put this young man in an airplane that has got the capability to survive in the world of tomorrow and be able to do this for the entire joint team.

Mr. HAYES. And would you comment on the documentation issue? Do you think that has been satisfied going forward?

General MOSELEY. Congressman Hayes, I don't know. I am not in the acquisition business, so I don't know. I can only trust our acquisition folks and say I don't think there is a rock unturned or a leaf unturned that we won't turn over to anybody and let them look because I trust them.

Mr. HAYES. You have got technical issues, and you have got actual issues. The technical issue is the documentation. And it is about whether the requirement for flight-ready or mission-ready. So that is one issue.

And then you have got the other issue of—and you and I talk on the same page. You have got to have the high-altitude capability. All the aircraft that were submitted or all the rotorcraft were certainly very capable. You have got high altitude, but you have also got a much larger radar signature and a slower.

And I am not saying anything other than these complex issues are somewhat difficult to document, so people not familiar with the

terms are able to do that. So anything you can do to clear that up so that we can get more platforms?

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much. We have three votes. Let us do our best to get the remaining folks to ask questions, Mr. Sestak, Dr. Snyder, Mr. Johnson in that order. And we will proceed as quickly as possible.

Mr. Sestak.

Mr. SESTAK. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, I will be real quick and try to ask three questions, if I could. The \$450 million or so that was there for the F-22 shutdown that you said was needed for fixing the langerons on the F-18 C and Ds and all—that only needed \$50 million. What happened to the other 400?

Secretary WYNNE. I believe it still sits there in that designated account, sir.

Mr. SESTAK. It didn't come across over here that way. There is nothing in that line right now for shutdown.

Secretary WYNNE. No, I mean it is still sitting in the F-15 depot.

Mr. SESTAK. Okay. Were you able to sit back and do an assessment—SLEP, service life extension program whatever some of these F-15 Cs and Ds since we put the money over there and it only cost—langerons \$11,000 or something to fix?

Secretary WYNNE. Our intention is to save about 177 F-15Cs.

Mr. SESTAK. Yes, sir, but I mean have we looked at now service life extension like you do with the F-16s. Do we want to look at that for the F-15s? Because we may not be able. We may shut down the F-22 line. Does it look at how much it costs and the operational efficiency of extending the life? I think you have taken the F-16s from 5,000 to 8,000 hours.

Secretary WYNNE. We are already demanding the F-15 live through 2025.

Mr. SESTAK. Have we looked at it, Mr. Secretary?

Secretary WYNNE. We have decided that we are going to fund the F-35 program to the max extent possible.

Mr. SESTAK. But, Mr. Secretary, have we looked at it, made an assessment of it, a study?

Secretary WYNNE. No, sir, I don't think we have.

Mr. SESTAK. I just didn't know whether the cost efficiency and operational effectiveness, if we studied it, may be worth it. My second question has to do with the number of F-22s, which I think I understand why we would probably want to have so many. Headquarters Air Expeditionary Forces (HAEF) then would have 24 per squadron. It works out very well.

My question is, General, we are doing this at a time where we have the tanker, the bomber, the CSAR. Two-thirds of our space assets need to be replaced as they go over the next decade. My question is what can't we do if we don't get the F-22. Because everybody doesn't have the T-50 or, you know, the 29 or the double digit surface-to-air missiles (SAMs), China, maybe Russia. What can't we do if we don't get enough of those?

General MOSELEY. Sir, let me go back to your F-15 question. We have our fleet viability board looking at the F-15 inventory to see

how we do best to keep the 177 around, which is not a true SLEP program. But it is, I think, what you are asking.

Mr. SESTAK. Yes, sir.

General MOSELEY. So we have asked that question.

Mr. SESTAK. Yes, sir.

General MOSELEY. I would offer to you that in the world that we live in now the availability of fifth generation surface-to-air missiles—

Mr. SESTAK. Yes, sir, but we don't have those everywhere, just China and Russia. What can't we do?

General MOSELEY. But, sir, the market is available. It is only a matter of money to buy those. You don't have a fight a nation state to fight those systems.

Mr. SESTAK. All right.

General MOSELEY. And so, the proliferation and exporting of fourth plus generation fighters plus radars, target-tracking radars, early-warning radars, and surface-to-air missiles—

Mr. SESTAK. So they could proliferate in Iran or—

General MOSELEY [continuing]. Are proliferating at extremely high rates.

Mr. SESTAK. Yes, sir. Could I ask another question? Your \$20 billion gap—that is a number they can catch and start taking traction. Just to make sure I understand your baseline for determining that, you took the fiscal year 2013 program, fiscal year 2013 for every war and straight lined it out. Correct?

General MOSELEY. [OFF MIKE]

Mr. SESTAK. And then in that when I went through it you didn't go up or down to figure the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) comes off at a certain time, some ads come out. You took a straight line.

General MOSELEY. Yes, sir, we—

Mr. SESTAK. And then you said this is what we desire as far as— you even included in there the A-10, the operational response satellite, things that aren't even in the program yet. Is that correct?

General MOSELEY. Sir, we took an average. The average is \$20 billion. In the early years it is 16 or 17, which is the unfunded list we presented last year. And this year it is consistent with that same number.

In the outer years it goes above \$20 billion. But we just—

Mr. SESTAK. Yes, sir, but, I mean, those are the baselines, correct?

General MOSELEY. Just a—

Mr. SESTAK. The fiscal year 2013, straight lined out, regardless if programs stop or come in the plan? And up here it is what we desire as a service.

General MOSELEY. But, of course, sir, you know we don't know what we don't know until we get there. So you would have to plan—

Mr. SESTAK. Should we have worked this through on the joint to see, well, wait a minute, this is what the Air Force wants? But is that what the joint staff, the joint warfare, when you say what the Navy can do, the Marines can do and all that?

General MOSELEY. Sir, I would offer we have done that. We have done that based on the—

Mr. SESTAK. On the \$20 billion?

General MOSELEY [continuing]. Combatant commanders' requirements, on the national military strategy, on our ability to partner with carrier battle groups. We have done that.

Mr. SESTAK. One last question, General. And this is on personnel because it is very important. I noticed in some of the information that these great airmen and women sitting here—the operational and maintenance costs for them per airman is about \$160,000 in 2008 dollars. The other services are only \$100,000 to \$110,000. Why is there that difference? I know they are better than the other services, you are going to say.

General MOSELEY. Sir, I wouldn't say that. I might believe that, but I wouldn't say that. I would offer that every single one—

The CHAIRMAN. Answer it quickly, then Dr. Snyder.

General MOSELEY. Every single one of our airmen goes through basic military training and through a tech school. And we hold them at very high standards for competencies in schools all the way through. So a part of that is because the investment we make in training and schools is a bit higher than the others.

The CHAIRMAN. Dr. Snyder.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Secretary Wynne, I appreciated your comments at the very beginning of the hearing in response to Mr. Skelton that your personal opinion was that you needed to go with a higher personnel number. This is consistent with other things that have happened so far in the budget process.

When Secretary Gates testified a couple of weeks ago, Mr. Spratt, the brightest mind in the Congress on budget issues, pointed out that the President's budget over the next several years is actually a decrease each year in the real dollars for the defense budget, which will be unsustainable. I mean, if we are increasing numbers in the Army, Marine Corps—you all want to increase—and then we are projecting a decrease in dollars. That is not going to work. And we all know that is not going to work.

Mrs. Davis referred to the Personnel Committee hearing we had yesterday in which the Army, you know, in response to when are you going to put in your regular baseline budget your increasing personnel needs. And they said we are aiming for fiscal year 2010.

Well, what is happening—all these things are pushing this, in my opinion—I don't expect you to comment on this—pushing it into the next Administration, the next presidency. All these decisions are being kicked down the road.

You know, we are all going to have to account for why is this deficit looking so big. Well, it is because the previous Administration, you know, gamed this thing in a way that is not helpful to our national fest nor helpful to transparency.

I appreciate your unfunded requirements list here. I wish it had been titled request for earmarks because that is what it is. It is a request for earmarks in which in your letter you very specifically say our unfunded list is a reflection of the delta between where we are and where we need to be. And we will do some of these things, both in this committee and in the appropriations process.

And I hope when our President goes on the radio show and press conferences saying I am drawing a line stop these earmarks that you will step forward and say we requested those earmarks. Those

earmarks are part of what we think is necessary for the national security of this country. Because that is the game that is going to be played this year.

I wanted to ask specifically in you all's statement, page 16 you state our MILCON plan supports these priorities by focusing on new mission bed-downs, training, and depot transformation as well as dormitory and childcare center upgrades, childcare center upgrades. It came out yesterday. I attended the ribbon-cutting for a new childcare center at Little Rock Air Force Base, wonderful facility, great toys. I got to play with little trucks.

The capacity now at the air base will be for 335 children. They are being able to service 237. Why? Because there is not staffing. The caps on personnel means we have spent \$4.2 million. I assume this is going to other places in the Air Force. Four-point-two million dollars for a new childcare center, but because of the reductions in force, it will be unstaffed, even though we have 100 kids on the waiting list and this childcare center could handle it.

I don't know who wants to respond to that. That is a huge problem for our personnel. How is that going to get resolved?

Secretary WYNNE. Well, sir, in fact, we are reexamining the quality of life across our Air Force to make sure that we find little pockets like that that we can actually restore. And I think that is one that we are really looking hard at to find a way to restore that.

Dr. SNYDER. My concern is—

Secretary WYNNE. We are being inundated in other places, by the way, by our other colleagues in service coming and using our facilities. But in the case of Little Rock, it seems to be us on us.

Dr. SNYDER. Well, I don't want a Little Rock fix. I want a system-wide fix.

Secretary WYNNE. No, no, I understand. Right.

Dr. SNYDER. I mean, you have got kids that—

Secretary WYNNE. We are looking across.

Dr. SNYDER. We build a new facility, and we don't have staffing for it. That is very, very poor management.

My final question, General Moseley, is this issue of old aircraft. In the defense bill that was just recently signed we did put some language in there trying to give you some relief on the old E model C-130's. It is not at all what I would have liked. It is not what you would have liked. You mention that on page 23 of your statement about old aircraft. I hope you all will keep pushing on this.

The House, I think, got the gospel this time. It was the Senate that resisted the changes we need. I hope you will keep pushing on that issue so that you can have the flexibility to stop wasting money on old aircraft. Do you have any comment on that issue?

General MOSELEY. No, sir, we just are very appreciative of the Congress to provide us more and more flexibility to manage our own inventory and to be able to do the things that you have just described. The E models have been wonderful airplanes over the last 20 or 30 years, but it is time to move to something different, more reliable, more effective with the survivability and the defensive systems inherent to the airplane off the line. And so, we appreciate the help with that.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. JOHNSON, wrap it up.

Mr. JOHNSON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, ladies and gentlemen, for serving your country. Thank you for bringing the young airmen and women on the back row. They serve as an example to our youth. And I can guarantee them and you that there are many young people in Georgia's 4th district who want to be just like you. Thank you.

And I appreciate the fact that the freedom of operation for our naval and land forces around the world is guaranteed by our air superiority. And that is something that is certainly easier to maintain and prudent to maintain as opposed to having to play catch-up at some point.

And I certainly wouldn't take it for granted that that would not occur if we don't continue to move forward with our procurement, particularly in the tactical fighter area. And so, wishing to associate myself with the questions and comments of Congressman Gingrey, I would like to ask these questions.

During the Department of Defense posture hearing, Secretary Gates indicated that he was concerned with acquiring or procuring additional F-22 Raptors, but he was concerned that procuring these F-22 Raptors now would equate to less F-35 Joint Strike Fighters later.

And, General Moseley, I fully support both the F-22 and the F-35. And I understand that you have some fighter jet time in twin engine Mach 2.5 F-15 Eagles. Can you explain to the committee why the F-22 and not the F-35 was designed from the get-go to replace the F-15 A through Ds? And then please explain why the F-35 is simply not capable of doing all of the high-altitude, high-Mach things that Air Force air dominance fighters must do.

General MOSELEY. Sir, if you will allow me first for a request. All of those folks in your district that would like to be like these folks behind me—if you will give us their names, we will contact them.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, I will tell you we had our service academy nominations.

General MOSELEY. We welcome that.

Mr. JOHNSON. We had a robust group of individuals who—

General MOSELEY. Yes, sir. Sir, also we are in full support of the F-35 program as a partner to the F-22 program. And we have in our program 1,765 of those aircraft to be able to replace the bulk of our fighter inventory. And so, we are looking very hard to marry the capabilities of these two airplanes, not as substitutes for each other and not in lieu of additional F-35s because we need that number of F-35s also.

Sir, I will tell you the F-22 is designed to operate at high altitude and higher g, at higher speeds to be able to deliver the ordnance. The two airplanes are compatible just like the F-16 and the F-15 are today. The F-35 is going to be a great airplane.

In fact, our first A model comes off the line in June or July this year, and we have got about 12 of them, Navy, Air Force, and Marine coming down the line now to be able to fly those. But they are designed for roughly two different environments. One is a striking airplane with inherent self-defense capability. And one is an inher-

ent air superiority airplane with inherent striking capability. That is why they marry with each other so well.

And the characteristics of the two airplanes are ideal matches. So, sir, our desire is to be able to field both sets of these aircraft in the numbers that we need. And that is why we are grateful for the 2009 budget and for the Secretary of Defense (SECDEF) to keep the line open on the F-22. And the numbers will work out.

Mr. JOHNSON. Certainly, concerned about advance procurement monies for the F-22. And have you, either, General Moseley or Secretary Wynne, have you ever offered up F-35 development or procurement funds to use for buying more F-22A?

Secretary WYNNE. No, sir.

General MOSELEY. No, sir. And we need to field that airplane on time as well. That is the backfill and the insurance policy against having to spend billions of dollars on service life extension of older aircraft.

Mr. JOHNSON. Well, certainly, I can appreciate that. And let me close by saying that we have heard today that we are dramatically short of the number of F-22s needed for meeting the Air Force's requirement. Roughly, we have about half of what we need. And as widespread procurement of the joint strike fighter is not expected until at least 2013, I think we need to bridge the gap by procuring additional F-22s. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you. I wish we had time for a second round. I thank Secretary Wynne, Secretary Moseley for your testimony, for your straightforwardness. And a special thanks, not just those that are seated behind you, but to all that you represent. We are very proud of them. And thank you again.

Secretary WYNNE. Thank you, sir.

General MOSELEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 12:35 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

FEBRUARY 27, 2008

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

FEBRUARY 27, 2008

**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
PRESENTATION TO THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
FISCAL YEAR 2009 AIR FORCE POSTURE STATEMENT**

**STATEMENT OF: THE HONORABLE MICHAEL W. WYNNE
SECRETARY OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
GENERAL T. MICHAEL MOSELEY
CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE UNITED STATES AIR FORCE**

27 February 2008

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED
BY THE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

The Nation's Guardians

1.0 Executive Summary

The United States Air Force provides the Nation with a powerful deterrent force in times of peace, and it sets the conditions for Joint and Coalition victory in times of war. For over seventeen years, since Operation DESERT SHIELD, the United States Air Force has been engaged in continuous combat operations. Our Airmen have maintained constant watch, deployed continuously, engaged America's adversaries directly, responded to human crises around the world, and provided the **Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power** to secure our Nation.

Global Vigilance: The ability to gain and maintain awareness – to keep an unblinking eye on any entity – anywhere in the world; to provide warning and to determine intent, opportunity, capability, or vulnerability; then to fuse this information with data received from other Services or agencies and use and share relevant information with the Joint Force Commander.

Global Reach: The ability to project military capability responsively – with unrivaled velocity and precision – to any point on or above the earth, and provide mobility to rapidly supply, position, or reposition Joint forces.

Global Power: The ability to hold at risk or strike any target anywhere in the world, assert national sovereignty, safeguard Joint freedom of action, and achieve swift, decisive, precise effects.

Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power constitute America's edge – America's asymmetric advantage that shapes the global security environment. Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power are vital to our National Security Strategy, as conveyed through the decision superiority they allow, the military options they provide, and the influence they command. However, in a world of increasing uncertainty, volatility, and accelerating technology, America's edge will become a fleeting advantage if we fail to maintain and hone it.

The United States Air Force executes its missions globally. Its warfighting domains cover the entire planet, offering a unique perspective. Every day, America's Airmen demonstrate a non-negotiable commitment to offer and deliver sovereign options for the United States in, through and from air, space, and cyberspace.

Our Air Force strategic imperatives articulate why these sovereign options are necessary to maintain and strengthen our national security and global stability. The Air Force is redefining air, space, and cyber power through cross-domain dominance – our effort to integrate all of our capabilities to exploit the natural synergies across these warfighting domains.

This Statement articulates the major elements of our Air Force Posture – our strategy for fulfilling our role in defending the Nation and its interests; our contributions to winning the Global War on Terrorism; our most critical efforts and concerns; and our top priority programs. We will



continue to pursue specific programs and initiatives to safeguard and strengthen America's military advantages and to address major concerns and risks.

Three overarching Service priorities serve as the organizing principles for all of our efforts: Winning Today's Fight; Taking Care of Our People; and Preparing for Tomorrow's Challenges. The Air Force's top acquisition priorities specifically begin to address our critical recapitalization and modernization needs – the new Tanker (KC-X); the new Combat Search and Rescue Helicopter (CSAR-X); modern space systems to provide capabilities vital to our Joint warfighters; the F-35A Lightning II; and a new Bomber we intend to field by 2018.

We will continue our efforts to modernize and protect America's vital air, space, and cyberspace capabilities. We strongly recommend extending the existing C-130J production line. We are also concerned with preserving America's aerospace industrial base. Additionally, we seek relief from restrictions on the retirement of aging, worn-out aircraft which are increasingly unsafe, unreliable, and obsolete. The Air Force is highly engaged in national efforts to assure sustainable energy, and we will continue to push the performance envelope on fuel efficiency and renewable energy technologies. We are committed to the Joint Basing initiative and want to work through the transfer of total obligation authority and real property control without impacting command authorities, reducing installation service support, or negatively affecting quality of life. Finally, we will continue our practice of recruiting and retaining the world's highest quality Airmen. We will build upon our successes in achieving Total Force Integration of our Regular, Guard, Reserve, and Civilian Airmen.

America looks to its Airmen to provide dominance that spans the air, space, and cyberspace warfighting domains. They need your support today to defend the Homeland and to prepare for tomorrow's threats and challenges. Full funding and support for America's Airmen will ensure America's continued freedom of action; reassure our allies; strengthen our partnerships; reinforce our sovereign Homeland defenses; dissuade and deter adversaries; and set conditions for Joint and Coalition success across the entire spectrum of conflict and crisis.

We guard the Nation – providing the Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power that underwrite the security and sovereignty of our Nation.

1.0 Executive Summary.....	2
2.0 Strategic Imperative.....	5
2.1 Challenges.....	5
2.2 The Role of the U.S. Military.....	6
2.3 Sovereign Options.....	6
2.4 Cross-Domain Dominance.....	7
2.5 Implementing the Strategy.....	8
3.0 Win Today's Fight.....	10
3.1 Maintain Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power for America.....	10
3.1.1 Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance.....	11
3.1.2 Strike.....	11
3.1.3 Space.....	12
3.1.4 Airlift.....	12
3.1.5 Aeromedical Evacuation.....	12
3.1.6 Joint Force Land Component Tasks.....	13
3.2 Strengthen Global Partnerships.....	13
4.0 Take Care of our People.....	15
4.1 Shape the Force.....	15
4.2 Ensure Highest Quality of Life Standards.....	16
4.2.1 Housing and Military Construction.....	16
4.2.2 Joint Basing.....	16
4.3 Recruit, Train, and Retain Highest Quality Airmen.....	17
5.0 Prepare for Tomorrow's Challenges.....	19
5.1 Top Acquisition Priorities.....	19
5.1.1 New Tanker (KC-X).....	19
5.1.2 New Combat Search and Rescue Helicopter (CSAR-X).....	19
5.1.3 Space Systems.....	20
5.1.4 F-35A Lightning II (Joint Strike Fighter).....	20
5.1.5 New Bomber.....	21
5.2 Improve our Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power.....	21
5.2.1 Broaden Global Vigilance.....	21
5.2.2 Extend Global Reach.....	22
5.2.3 Strengthen Global Power.....	22
5.3 Retire Aging, Worn-Out Aircraft.....	22
5.4 Preserve America's Aerospace Industrial Base.....	23
5.5 Extend C-130J Production Line.....	23
5.6 Strengthen Total Force Integration.....	24
5.6.1 Total Force Roadmap.....	24
5.7 Secure the Future.....	25
5.7.1 Strengthen Joint Air Dominance.....	25
5.7.2 Lead Joint Unmanned Aircraft System Operational Development.....	26
5.7.3 Lead the National Security Space Enterprise.....	26
5.7.4 Lead Cyberspace Operational Development.....	27
5.7.5 Assure Sustainable Energy.....	27
5.7.6 Maintain Science and Technology Leadership.....	28
6.0 America's Airmen.....	30

2.0 Strategic Imperative

The mission of the United States Air Force is to deliver sovereign options for the defense of the United States of America and its global interests – to fly and fight in Air, Space, and Cyberspace.

Today the United States stands at a strategic crossroads. This junction is characterized by a global economy accompanied by a diffusion of technology, new and increasingly complex economic and international relationships, competition for resources and influence, and the changing conduct of warfare. From the early days of the 20th Century, the United States has played a leading role in preserving and protecting international stability, particularly as the number of democratic nations grew. This leadership led in large part to the current world order and provided the backdrop against which countries like Japan, India, and China initiated their unprecedented economic growth. We cannot abdicate our position of political and military leadership without grave consequences.

2.1 Challenges

Today's confluence of global trends already foreshadows significant challenges to our organization, systems, concepts, and doctrine. We are at an historic turning point demanding an equally comprehensive redefinition of American air power. The future strategic environment will be shaped by the interaction of globalization, economic disparities, and competition for resources; diffusion of technology and information networks whose very nature allows unprecedented ability to harm and, potentially, paralyze advanced nations; and systemic upheavals impacting state and non-state actors and, thereby, international institutions and the world order. The following are salient features of this increasingly complex, dynamic, lethal, and uncertain environment:

- Violent extremism and ethnic strife – a global, generational, ideological struggle
- Proliferation of weapons of mass destruction and empowering technologies
- Predatory and unpredictable regional actors
- Increasing lethality and risk of intrusion by terrorist and criminal organizations
- Systemic instability in key regions (political, economic, social, ideological)
- Unprecedented velocity of technological change and military adaptation
- Availability of advanced weapons in a burgeoning global marketplace
- Exponential growth in volume, exchange, and access to information
- Surging globalization, interconnectivity, and competition for scarce resources
- Dislocating climate, environmental, and demographic trends

The consequences of not being adequately prepared for a conflict should a military peer arise would be severe and potentially catastrophic. We must maintain our focus on deterring potential peer adversaries from using military threats to narrow our diplomatic options, or from embarking on militarily risky courses of action. The rapid development and proliferation of high-technology weapons, combined with innovative operational concepts, is likely to make these global and regional engagements particularly challenging, since power balances will be dynamic and the risks of miscalculation and misperception high. Therefore, maintaining deterrence will require a sophisticated, competitive strategy that assures we maintain required military capabilities for today and make sustainable, affordable investments for tomorrow.

Even if we continue to successfully dissuade and deter major competitors, their advanced equipment is proliferating worldwide. We are bound to confront these weapons systems wherever America engages to promote and defend its interests. We must also vigilantly monitor adversary breakthroughs and maintain leading edge research and capabilities in fields such as cybernetics, nanotechnology, biotechnology, electromagnetism, robotics, energy conversion technology, and advanced propulsion. We cannot assume the next military revolution will originate in the West. Indeed, the hub of innovation in science and engineering education has shifted eastward. Therefore, we must anticipate innovative combinations of traditional and new concepts, doctrines, weapons systems, and disruptive technologies.

Given this spectrum of threats, the United States must field an Air Force capable of assuring our allies, dissuading and deterring potential adversaries, and, if necessary, defeating those who choose to become our enemies.

2.2 The Role of the U.S. Military

It is always better to deter hostile intent or win without having to fight. Today, the U.S. military does this by shaping the international environment with the potent tools of assurance, dissuasion, and deterrence. The principal role of the U.S. military is to defend our Nation and our national interests. Rooted in overwhelming capabilities and plainly linked to the national will, two powerful tools we exercise in this role are our assurance to allies that they need not bow to violent threats and our deterrence of potential adversaries. Our armed Services accomplish this role by providing a solid foundation of military strength to complement the tools of peaceful diplomacy. None of these tools alone can sustain our position of international political and economic influence. However, we must be prepared to provide our leaders with critical elements of U.S. military power to use in proper combination and in an integrated manner to address potential threats to our Nation and our interests.

2.3 Sovereign Options

In response to current and emerging threats, the Air Force has implemented a strategy based on providing policy makers with sovereign options for our defense, covering the spectrum of choices that air, space, and cyberspace capabilities offer for solving problems. We use this strategy for sovereign options to guide how we organize, train, and equip our forces. In peacetime, these options include such expedients as: supporting the containment of aggressive states or usurping elements of their sovereignty as a means short of war to compel positive behavior; signaling opponents of our commitment by moving forces into contested regions; and providing humanitarian aid – to both our allies and potentially hostile populations – to assure them of friendly U.S. intentions. In war, Air Force capabilities provide decision makers with a range of options, from supporting Joint and Coalition actions in conjunction with allied land and sea forces to direct strikes against enemy centers of gravity to accomplish strategic and tactical objectives. These options provide the country with credible and scalable counters to the full range of potential enemy actions and support our goals of assurance, dissuasion, and deterrence. These sovereign options are enabled by the asymmetric advantage the U.S. possesses in air and space technology and the way our preeminence in air, space, and cyberspace increases the power of all U.S. and Coalition forces.

Through aggressive development of technology and operational concepts, the U.S. enjoys leadership in space, and in recent decades has achieved the ability to gain air supremacy against enemy air forces and air defense systems. The history of warfare, however,

shows such advantages to be fleeting and fragile. Air and space preeminence is the key to the ability to accurately strike targets within enemy states or enable friendly ground or maritime forces to rapidly dominate their respective domains. While U.S. air and space preeminence has transformed the way the U.S. fights, allowing Joint and Coalition forces unprecedented freedom of action in all domains, the nation cannot rest on its laurels. Future preeminence is not guaranteed; instead, it must be planned, paid for, developed, and fielded.

More than the ability to win wars, sovereign options increase the nation's strategic flexibility in determining when, how, and where to engage an enemy. War is not a matter of convenience. When war is thrust upon us, we must have the strategic depth to shape the conditions of conflict. From 1991 to 2003, the use of no-fly zones allowed the U.S. to contain the aggressive actions of Saddam Hussein. When his aggressive acts drew us into open conflict, the determined use of air power as part of a Joint force crushed Iraq's conventional armies. A similar fate met the forces of Al Qaeda in Afghanistan. When the Taliban were removed from power in 2001 by a combination of air power working with Special Forces and indigenous Northern Alliance troops, we disrupted Osama bin Laden's plan to operate his global terrorist network from the relative sanctuary of the Afghan frontier. In the insurgencies that followed these operations, air, space and cyberspace power continued to prevent insurgents from massing into guerrilla armies, thus diminishing their power and providing friendly forces time and territory to establish stability.

The Air Force's ability to be simultaneously dominant in air, space, and cyberspace, has formed the foundation from which we provide sovereign options to policy makers. Our ability to operate across these domains and defeat our adversaries in each allows the Air Force the ability to multiply the power of Joint and Coalition forces or to act alone to achieve national objectives. Our Air Force combines capabilities in the domains of air, space, and cyberspace to deliver Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power to the Joint force.

2.4 Cross-Domain Dominance

No future war will be won without air, space, and cyberspace superiority. Accordingly, the Air Force must be better postured to contend with both today's and tomorrow's challenges. To promote and defend America's interests through Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power, the Air Force must attain cross-domain dominance.

Airmen appreciate the interdependence of the air, space, and cyberspace domains – actions in one domain can lead to decisive effects in any and all domains. Cross-domain dominance is the ability to maintain freedom of action in and through the air, space, and cyberspace despite adversary actions. It permits rapid and simultaneous application of lethal and non-lethal capabilities in these three domains to attain strategic, operational, and tactical objectives in all warfighting domains: land, sea, air, space, and cyberspace.

Through cross-domain dominance, the Air Force contributes to Joint freedom of maneuver in all warfighting domains. This, in turn, allows the Joint Force Commander to achieve desired outcomes across the full range of military operations, from humanitarian relief to preventing war via dissuasion and deterrence to inflicting strategic paralysis on implacable opponents. Without the Air Force's ability to present this spectrum of capabilities to the Joint Team in peace, crisis, and war, U.S. national security would be at risk.

2.5 Implementing the Strategy

The Air Force currently provides Joint and Coalition forces with an air bridge to the rest of the world and dominance on the battlefield. This hard-won capability to dominate air and space will only persist in coming decades if carefully nurtured.

The technology race continues. Today, opponents are studying our operations in Iraq and Afghanistan and are rapidly developing counters to aging U.S. air and space superiority technology. These adaptive competitors are translating lessons from recent conflicts into new warfighting concepts, capabilities, and doctrines specifically designed to counter U.S. strengths and exploit vulnerabilities. They are advancing in all domains. For example:

- “Generation 4-plus” fighter aircraft that challenge America’s existing “4th Generation” inventory – and, thus, air superiority – with overwhelming numbers and advanced weaponry; sophisticated integration of electronic attack and advanced avionics; emerging low-observable technologies; and progressive, realistic, networked training
- Increasingly lethal integrated air defense systems (IADS) that threaten both our Airmen and aircraft, and could negate weapons used to suppress or destroy these systems
- Proliferation of surface-to-surface missiles with growing range, precision, mobility, and maneuverability that are capable of delivering both conventional and non-conventional warheads
- Proliferation of unmanned aerial systems (UAS) capable of conducting low observable, persistent, intrusive missions in both lethal and non-lethal modes
- Resurgence of offensive counterspace capabilities, including anti-satellite (ASAT) weapons, jamming, and blinding
- Increasing ability of even marginal actors to surveil the disposition of U.S. and allied assets through widely-accessible, commercially-available means

In the coming years our advantage will significantly diminish if we do not keep pace by fielding new 5th Generation fighters, modern bombers, and modern satellites in sufficient numbers to counter the development of advanced anti-air and anti-space technologies and the inevitable export of those capabilities to potentially hostile states and non-state actors. We must provide our Airmen with the most exceptional tools for battle in order to sustain a durable and credible deterrent against our adversaries.

Equally worrisome is the rapidly shrinking aerospace industrial base. Historically, America’s strength and ability to capitalize on advances in air and space technologies hinged largely on its vibrant and diverse aerospace industry. This advantage has deteriorated over the last decade.

Beyond advantages in technology and operational concepts, America’s commitments abroad require an expeditionary Air Force that can engage forward in peacetime and fight forward in wartime. While long-range bombers and missiles are the ultimate guarantor of U.S. security and power, expeditionary presence reflects U.S. power and is the indispensable source of local and regional assurance, dissuasion, deterrence, and, ultimately, sovereign options. Engaging forward in times of peace and fighting forward in times of war are hallmarks of U.S. national security strategy. Therefore, the Air Force must have sufficient resources and capability to continue to maintain a sustainable, rotational base. We must retain sufficient manpower and force structure to project influence.

The mechanism to accomplish this is the Air and Space Expeditionary Force (AEF) that provides Joint Force Commanders with a trained and ready air, space, and cyberspace force to execute their plans. U.S. influence flows from permanent and expeditionary basing and serves to assure allies of U.S. commitment while deterring our adversaries from threatening U.S. national interests. The Air Force works with Combatant Commanders and partner air forces to secure basing and counter potential anti-access strategies. We continue to develop new ways of projecting power without exposing vulnerabilities, and we design systems that facilitate reach-back, thus maximizing forward capability while minimizing forward footprint.

The Air Force can provide Global Vigilance, Global Reach and Global Power only so long as it possesses robust capabilities in such areas as air dominance; global strike; space superiority; intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR); missile defense; special operations; air mobility, and cyberspace superiority. Today, electronic communications constitute and connect all Joint and Coalition capabilities. In an information age, this network allows us to find our opponents, process the information, route it to where it is needed, and guide our munitions to their targets. Cyberspace vastly increases our capabilities but also presents a potential vulnerability our adversaries could exploit. Our enemies also increasingly use and depend on cyberspace systems. Safeguarding our own capabilities while engaging and disrupting the use and purpose of our opponents' capabilities is thus increasingly critical to modern warfare.

If the Air Force is to fulfill its crucial role, we must develop and maintain technological leads in the areas of air-superiority, anti-access penetration, and long-range reconnaissance and strike capabilities to hold at risk targets around the world. We must also field sufficient strike and full-spectrum mobility assets to assure dominance for the Joint Team. We must continue treating space as an operational domain by creating architectures and systems that allow us to provide the appropriate situational awareness and communications capability, giving strategic and tactical advantage to leadership at all levels. We must design and develop a force structure to operate in cyberspace to our benefit while holding adversaries at risk. While doing so, we will continue our series of cross-Service initiatives to enhance interoperability and avoid unnecessary duplication of acquisition, manning and operations.

3.0 Win Today's Fight

We remain committed, first and foremost, to fighting and winning the long Global War on Terror (GWOT), sustaining our current operations, and providing strategic defense of our Nation. We also continue to adapt our ability to deter adversary activities, detect enemy locations, and defeat them through direct or indirect actions when required – anywhere and at any time.

America's Airmen are key to Joint success and have proven their capabilities applicable and adaptable across the entire spectrum of conflict. They are the most battle-tested force in our history. Today's GWOT missions are only the latest in a succession of over seventeen years of continuous combat and expeditionary operations, beginning with our initial Operation DESERT SHIELD deployments in August 1990; continuing with years of persistent conflict in Southwest Asia, Somalia, the Balkans, and Haiti; and through ongoing operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and around the world. The past seventeen years have clearly demonstrated success at any point along the spectrum of conflict requires air, space, and cyberspace superiority.

3.1 Maintain Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power for America

We are the Nation's premier multi-dimensional maneuver force, with the agility, reach, speed, stealth, payload, firepower, precision, and persistence to achieve global effects. Dominance of air, space, and cyberspace provides the essential bedrock for effective Joint operations.

Today's Air Force provides the Joint Force Commander a range of capabilities that set conditions for success. Our Airmen currently fly an average of over 300 sorties daily as part of Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and ENDURING FREEDOM (OIF/OEF). These sorties include Intertheater and Intratheater Airlift; Aeromedical Evacuation (AE); Aerial Refueling; Command and Control (C2); Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (ISR); Close Air Support (CAS); and pre-planned Strike.

Our Airmen operate on a global scale every day; Air Force engagement in the Central Command (CENTCOM) area of responsibility (AOR) is only the "tip of the iceberg." The complete picture of Air Force engagement includes Airmen deployed to contingencies outside of the Continental United States (OCONUS), forward deployed in Europe and the Pacific, and employed from their home stations as they execute global missions.

Furthermore, the Air Force is the only Service flying Operation NOBLE EAGLE (ONE) missions, which have been continuous since September 2001. America's Airmen fly fighters, tankers, and Airborne Warning and Control aircraft during daily Air Sovereignty Alert operations. America's Airmen also command and control these aircraft, maintaining vigilance and protection of America's air corridors and maritime approaches in defense of our Homeland.

Since 2001 the Active Duty Air Force has reduced its end-strength by almost 6%, but our deployments have increased over 30% – primarily in support of GWOT. Approximately 26,000 Airmen are deployed to over 100 locations around the world to fight in the GWOT at any given

moment – fighting our enemies in their own backyard so they cannot come to ours. In addition, approximately 208,000 Airmen – 178,000 Regular Air Force Airmen plus 30,000 Guard and Reserve Airmen – fulfill additional Combatant Commander (CCDR) requirements, missions and tasks 24 hours a day, seven days a week. In other words, approximately 41% of our Total Force Airmen – including 54% of the Regular force – are globally contributing to winning today's fight and are directly fulfilling CCDR requirements everyday.

Whether controlling satellites, flying unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs), standing strategic missile alert, or analyzing intelligence information, Airmen directly engage America's adversaries and affect events worldwide every day.

3.1.1 Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance

Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) is the foundation of Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power. It cuts across all domains and affects almost every mission area. Today, ISR efforts make up the majority of the operations required to achieve our security objectives. These operations range from finding the enemy, to deconstructing its network and intentions, to making it possible to deliver weapons or other effects on target, to subsequently assessing the results of those efforts.

Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance is the linchpin of our Effects-Based Approach to Operations (EBAO). It is impossible to accurately predict the effect of operations on an enemy system without good intelligence; nor can one assess the outcome of delivered effects without detailed surveillance and reconnaissance. Intelligence requirements for an effects-based approach to operations and effects-based assessment (EBA) are much more demanding than the old attrition-based model. The increased intelligence detail necessary for EBAO/EBA makes focused reconnaissance and persistent surveillance operations ever-more crucial.

The Air Force has demonstrated its commitment to the importance of ISR by establishing a 3-star Deputy Chief of Staff for ISR, the Air Force ISR Agency, and formed a global organization for the processing of ISR data from a variety of sources. These initiatives demonstrate the Air Force has shifted the way it manages ISR capabilities from a Cold-War platform perspective to a 21st Century holistic capability-based approach.

3.1.2 Strike

In addition to our ONE missions over the Homeland, America's Airmen fly daily OIF and OEF missions, keeping a watchful eye on America's adversaries and providing lethal combat capabilities that take the fight to our enemies. In 2007, America's Airmen conducted nearly 1,600 strikes in Iraq and Afghanistan. In Iraq alone, Air Force strikes increased by 171% over the previous year, while in Afghanistan strikes increased by 22%. These increases clearly demonstrate the applicability, flexibility, and prevalence of Air Force combat options in ongoing OIF and OEF counterinsurgency operations.

Engaging directly is only a small portion of what the Air Force provides. To meet current and future challenges, we must maintain a credible deterrent that convinces potential adversaries of our unwavering commitment to defend our Nation, its allies and friends. One prominent example is our ICBM force – the U.S. nuclear arsenal continues to serve as the

ultimate backstop of our security, dissuading opponents and reassuring allies through extended deterrence. Besides continuing the re-capitalization of our fighter force, we must also modernize our bomber and ICBM forces.

3.1.3 Space

Space superiority, like air superiority, has become a fundamental predicate to Joint warfighting. Indeed, America's space superiority has completely transformed the way America fights. America's Airmen currently operate 67 satellites and provide command and control infrastructure for over 140 satellites in total, providing the nation persistent global communications; weather coverage; strategic early warning; global Positioning, Navigation and Timing (PNT); signals and ISR capabilities – all vital to Joint success.

Space superiority relies on assured access to space, and Air Force launch programs continue to provide this capability. In 2007, we extended our record to 56 straight launch successes, including deployment of two new Global Positioning System (GPS) satellites. Also in 2007, we successfully launched the first operational Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) heavy lift rocket. This rocket deployed the final satellite in the Defense Support Program (DSP) constellation of ballistic missile warning satellites.

3.1.4 Airlift

Airlift is an Air Force core competency, and our Airmen prove it everyday. Air Force airlifters – both Intertheater and Intratheater – have become absolutely indispensable to Joint Forces in Iraq and Afghanistan as well as to crisis response planners and responders in the wake of natural disasters both at home and abroad. The Air Force gives America an air bridge – a strategic asset providing operational reach – making possible the deployment and employment of Joint combat power and humanitarian relief.

Airmen provide the Nation's ground forces with the tactical, operational, strategic, and logistical reach to rapidly deploy, deliver, supply, re-supply, egress, and evacuate via air anywhere in the world. In Iraq, Air Force airlift delivers approximately 3,500 equivalent truckloads of cargo in an average month, taking more than 8,600 people off dangerous roads and providing the Army and Marine Corps the flexibility to re-assign those vehicles and associated support troops to alternate missions and safer routes.

3.1.5 Aeromedical Evacuation

Air Force Aeromedical Evacuation (AE) is a Total Force, combat-proven system contributing a unique, vital capability to the Joint fight. AE and enroute care are built on teamwork, synergy, and Joint execution, providing Soldiers, Sailors, Marines, Coast Guardsmen, and Airmen the highest casualty survival rates in the history of warfare. Casualties treated in our deployed and Joint theater hospitals have an incredible 97% survival rate.

Since late 2001, we have transported more than 48,500 patients from the CENTCOM AOR to higher levels of care. We continue to refine this remarkable capability and the enroute care system built upon our expeditionary medical system.

3.1.6 Joint Force Land Component Tasks

Of the approximately 26,000 Airmen currently deployed in the CENTCOM AOR, over 6,200 are performing tasks and missions normally assigned to the Land Component – also known as “In Lieu Of” (ILO) tasks. Airmen currently fill other Services’ billets in some of their stressed skill areas and are taking on tasks outside Air Force core competencies. Since 2004 we have deployed approximately 24,000 Airmen in support of such ILO tasks, and we expect a steady increase in that total.

In addition to the 6,200 Airmen currently deployed supporting ILO taskings, over 1,000 Airmen are “in the pipeline” for ILO Task training at any given time. Within the Joint Team, Airmen provide the Joint Force Commander distinctive skills. While complementary, these skills are not interchangeable amongst the team, thus Airmen require ground-centric combat training to accomplish ILO taskings. This training increases personnel tempo (PERSTEMPO) for our Airmen, but, more importantly, ILO tasks and training consumes critical training time, resources, manpower, and in some cases reduces overall proficiency in Air Force core mission areas. In many cases, Air Force career fields already at critical manning levels are further affected by unit deployment rates of as high as 40%, primarily filling ILO taskings. Such high deployment rates from units cannot be absorbed without putting at risk the critical missions and capabilities the Air Force provides our Nation. This situation creates additional risk to the critical missions the Air Force performs and capabilities the Air Force provides our Nation.

3.2 Strengthen Global Partnerships

Fighting and winning the GWOT requires commitment, capability, and cooperation from our allies and partners around the world. We depend on them to secure their territory, support regional stability, provide base access and overflight rights, and contribute a host of air, space, and cyber power capabilities as interoperable Coalition partners.

So America’s strategic partnerships are more important than ever. Our Air Force will strengthen and broaden international relationships, capitalizing on the global community of like-minded Airmen while attending to interoperability between allies and partners. Building these relationships not only expands, extends, and strengthens Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power, but also leverages the Air Force’s value as an engine of progress and, thus, as a potent instrument of America’s diplomacy in an increasingly interconnected world.

The Air Force strives to develop synergistic, interoperable air forces utilizing a capabilities-based approach. Foreign Military Sales and Direct Commercial Sales allow our partners to operate common systems with the Air Force while providing a vehicle to expand relationships with our international partners. Some recent examples of mutually beneficial agreements include Australian, Canadian, and British selection of C-17 Globemaster III airlifters; international participation in the F-35A Lightning II Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program and the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellite communications program; British Royal Air Force procurement of MQ-9 Reaper UAVs; and Australian participation in the Wideband Global SATCOM (WGS) system. Future opportunities for partnerships – with platforms such as UAVs, C-17s, C-130Js, and the new C-27 – can open doors for greater interoperability, personnel exchanges, common doctrine, and training.

In addition to integrating international partners into the most robust combat training scenarios, we maintain our commitment to the pursuit of partnerships for greater global

cooperation, security, and stability. We recently held the 3rd Global Air Chiefs Conference in Washington, DC, which gave over 90 international Air Chiefs the opportunity to learn, understand, and share concerns and issues with fellow Airmen from around the world. We are also making strides to improve language expertise and cultural understanding through deliberate development of Airmen in the International Affairs Specialist program, expanding Military Personnel Exchange Program, and cultivating skilled and knowledgeable attachés.

The Air Force's approach to operations, interoperability and training exemplify our global, international, and expeditionary perspective – built on the shared traditions of airmanship that transcend geographic boundaries.

4.0 Take Care of our People

Any organizational renaissance begins with people. We must prepare our Airmen for a future fraught with challenges, fostering their intellectual curiosity and ability to learn, anticipate, and adapt. Because our expeditionary Airmen must be prepared to deploy and ready to fight, we are revitalizing the world's most advanced training system and expanding their educational opportunities. While we enrich our Airmen's culture, leadership, training, education, and heritage, we will also continue to care for their families and provide for their future.

Our Airmen are our most precious resource. They must be well-trained and ready for expeditionary warfighting responsibilities. Fiscal constraints dictate that we continue to carefully shape the force. Additionally, within the context of rising costs, we remain committed to providing the highest possible quality of life standards and charting out a career full of education and training for each Airman. We will continue our emphasis on recruiting and retaining the world's highest quality Airmen. Additional Air Force high priority efforts serve to reinforce a warrior ethos throughout our Service, provide proactive force health protection, and encourage Air Reserve Component (ARC) volunteerism.

Spanning six decades of Air Force history, particularly over the past seventeen years, our Airmen have proven themselves as the global first responders in times of crisis – taking action anytime, anywhere. The foundations for this well-deserved reputation are the quality and frequency of the training and education we provide and our commitment to the highest possible safety and quality of life standards.

4.1 Shape the Force

Ultimately, we must produce a Total Force that is sized and shaped to consistently meet current and future requirements – balanced against the compelling need to maintain high quality of life standards – to meet the global challenges of today and tomorrow.

During the 1990s, while engaged in continuous combat, the Air Force suffered a seven year "procurement holiday." Today, fiscal constraints have tightened as energy and health care costs have continued to increase dramatically.

In late 2005, the Air Force reduced its end strength by 40,000 Active Duty, Guard, Reserve and civilian Full-time Equivalent (FTEs) in order to self-finance the vital re-capitalization and modernization of our aircraft, space, and missile inventories. End strength reduction by 40,000 FTEs over a 3-year period was our only viable alternative to preserve the required investment capital.

Our Force Shaping efforts have placed us on a path to meet our end strength targets. However, personnel changes of this magnitude come with a degree of uncertainty and difficulty for our Airmen and their families. We are making every effort to use voluntary measures to shape the force with the right skills mix, increase manning in stressed career fields, leverage new technologies, and refine our internal processes to reduce workload and reduce or eliminate unnecessary work through Air Force Smart Operations 21 (AFSO21).

We have reduced our Air Force end strength using a methodology that has preserved a strong expeditionary capability. Our AEF construct provides an enterprise view of Service risk

that synchronizes our resources and assets to support our global requirements. However, reducing Air Force end strength further, coupled with ILO taskings for the foreseeable future, carries considerable risks of “burning out” our Airmen in several critical expeditionary career fields as well as limiting our future national options to meet global mission requirements in an increasingly volatile world.

4.2 Ensure Highest Quality of Life Standards

Our “People” priority demands we ensure the quality of life we offer our Airmen meets the highest possible standards. Because the nature of our Air Force mission demands a highly educated, trained, and experienced force, we recognize the direct linkages between quality of life issues and their impact on our recruiting, retention, and, ultimately, our mission capability.

4.2.1 Housing and Military Construction

Air Force investments in housing underscore our emphasis on developing and caring for Airmen. Through Military Construction (MILCON) and housing privatization, we are providing higher quality homes faster than ever. With the FY09 funding, we will revitalize more than 2,100 homes through improvement or replacement. We are on track to meet our FY09 goal of eliminating inadequate housing at overseas locations.

MILCON is an essential enabler of Air Force missions; however, due to fiscal constraints, we must reduce funding and accept greater risk in facilities and infrastructure in order to continue our efforts to recapitalize and modernize our aging aircraft and equipment. However, our new construction projects are state of the art, incorporating energy efficient features and sustainable designs. We have prioritized the most critical requirements to support the Air Force and DoD requirements. Our MILCON plan supports these priorities by focusing on new mission beddowns, training, and depot transformation, as well as dormitory and child care center upgrades.

4.2.2 Joint Basing

The Air Force has a long and successful history of working toward common goals in a Joint environment without compromising Air Force principles and the well-being of our people. Joint Basing initiatives are no exception. To guarantee success, each Joint Base should be required to provide a suitable setting to all of its assigned personnel, their families, and other customers within the local communities our bases support.

To accomplish this, we advocate establishment of a common Joint Base quality of life standard. Our Airmen, Soldiers, Sailors, Marines, DoD Civilians and their families will benefit from efficient, consistent installation support services. Such standards will ensure the Air Force and our sister Services continue to provide all personnel with the level of installation support services they deserve. As we work with the Office of the Secretary of Defense and our sister Services, we will ensure all Joint Basing initiatives contribute to the DoD’s ability to perform its mission. We will also safeguard against potential negative impacts to the Joint and Air Force approach to mission performance.

To do this, we will have to work through the transfer of TOA and real property without eroding the local installation commander’s prerogatives relative to satisfying mission and training requirements, optimizing installation resources, tailoring installation services to local

needs, and prioritizing MILCON funding. We will also have to work through the transfer without reducing the combat capability our bases generate, installation service support standards, or the quality of life for Service members, their families, and other customers of these services.

We look forward to establishing a BRAC-envisioned executive agency agreement involving local leaders and the local unit commander. Such an agency, combined with elimination of duplicate offices and administration of centrally agreed standards, would improve efficiency while safeguarding mission requirements and quality of life for families and Service members. We believe the natural, direct feedback and tension between a service provider and a paying customer is the best model to drive efficiency and cost savings.

The Air Force remains committed to ensuring that all bases, Joint or otherwise, maintain their capability to perform their missions and meet our quality of life standards. We want Joint Bases to be so efficient and effective that an assignment to a Joint base would be a highlight for every Service member.

4.3 Recruit, Train, and Retain Highest Quality Airmen

The Air Force is the "Retention Service" – we recruit, train, develop, and retain the best America has to offer. Our emphasis on retention stems from the high technical and operational expertise required of our personnel. The high morale, cohesiveness, and capability of the Air Force are due to our efforts to retain a highly experienced, educated, and skilled force.

The Air Force has never lowered its recruiting standards. We continue to recruit and choose the best America has to offer from our diverse population. Our recruiting and retention figures remain impressive, clearly indicating our success to date and the effectiveness of the Air Force's holistic approach to quality of life, recruiting, and retention. This success reaffirms our commitment to long-term family support efforts, education, and training.

While we recruit Airmen, we retain families. We believe our Airmen should never have to choose between serving their country and providing for their families. Quality of life and family support are critical elements of our overall effort to retain high quality Airmen. As part of our efforts to maintain high quality of life standards, we are concerned with the hardships facing our Air Force families resulting from the frequent moves our Airmen and other Service members make throughout their careers. We applaud ongoing Congressional and interstate efforts addressing such issues as transfer of educational credits for military members and dependents, professional certifications for military spouses, and economic support for military families coping with spousal income disadvantages.

Additionally, Air Force training initiatives continue to evolve, improving our ability to develop and retain the world's best air, space, and cyberspace warriors. We are concentrating our efforts to reprioritize Air Force professional education opportunities to reflect a balance between winning today's fight and preparing for tomorrow's challenges.

Tuition assistance continues to be a strong incentive that helps ensure we meet our recruiting and retention goals. We believe voluntary education, facilitated with tuition assistance, not only aids in recruiting and retention, but further reinforces national strength and richness by producing more effective professional Airmen and more productive American citizens for the Nation, both during their enlistment and their eventual return to civilian life.

Within the last two years we have taken several initiatives to “intellectually and professionally recapitalize” our Airmen. We are developing leaders with the management acumen, cultural sophistication, international expertise, and language skills to successfully lead a diverse, globally engaged force. Air Education and Training Command and Air University are leading our efforts to reinvigorate the world’s most advanced educational system for Airmen by expanding our full-spectrum educational opportunities.

Finally, we optimized and expanded our training regimes to take advantage of more modern methods and broader scope in our live exercises. RED FLAG exercises now offer two venues, Nevada and Alaska, with varied environments; take advantage of Distributed Mission Operations technologies; include Total Force Airmen from the Regular and Reserve Components; and offer the full range of integrated operations, offering realistic training for warriors from across the Services, Components, and our international partners.

5.0 Prepare for Tomorrow's Challenges

In addition to taking care of our Airmen and training them for the full-spectrum challenges we expect this Century, it is also our responsibility to ensure our Airmen have the weapons and equipment necessary to provide for our Nation's defense.

The U.S. cannot take advantages in air, space, and cyberspace for granted. Today, we are already being challenged in every warfighting domain. The Air Force is actively formulating innovative operational concepts to anticipate, adapt to, and overcome future challenges. We are transforming our thinking from considering the space and cyber domains as mere enablers of air operations to a holistic approach that recognizes their interdependence and leverages their unique characteristics. We will continue to push this conceptual envelope and expand the boundaries of existing tactics, techniques, and procedures to fully exploit the synergies of cross-domain dominance.

But we cannot hone America's edge without modernizing the Air Force's air, space, and cyberspace capabilities. We are therefore pursuing the biggest, most complex, and most important recapitalization and modernization effort in Air Force history. These programs will gain and maintain militarily important advantages for our Nation for the coming decades.

5.1 Top Acquisition Priorities

The Air Force's top acquisition priorities begin to address our critical recapitalization and modernization needs – the new Tanker (KC-X); the new Combat Search and Rescue helicopter (CSAR-X); modern space systems to provide capabilities vital to our Joint warfighters; the F-35A Joint Strike Fighter; and a new Bomber we plan to field by 2018.

Additional high-priority acquisition programs include F-22 5th Generation fighter production; C-17 production; continued production of the C-130J and introduction of the C-27 intratheater airlifter; and expansion of the MQ-1 Predator, MQ-9 Reaper, and RQ-4 Global Hawk UAV inventories.

5.1.1 New Tanker (KC-X)

The KC-X is our highest procurement priority. It is critical to the entire Joint and Coalition military team's ability to project combat power around the world, and gives America and our allies' unparalleled rapid response to combat and humanitarian relief operations alike. KC-X tankers will provide increased aircraft availability, more adaptable technology, more flexible employment options, and greater overall capability than the current inventory of KC-135E and KC-135R tankers they will replace. It is imperative we begin a program of smart, steady reinvestment in a new tanker – coupled with measured, timely retirements of the oldest, least capable KC-135E tankers – to ensure future viability of this unique and vital U.S. national capability.

5.1.2 New Combat Search and Rescue Helicopter (CSAR-X)

The Air Force organizes, trains, and equips dedicated forces for the Combat Search and Rescue (CSAR) mission. The Air Force must recapitalize our CSAR forces to maintain this

indispensable capability for the Nation and the Joint Team. Purchasing the entire complement of programmed CSAR-X aircraft will relieve the high-tempo operational strain placed on the current inventory of aging HH-60G Pave Hawk helicopters.

The CSAR mission is a moral and ethical imperative. Airmen are responsible for safely securing and returning our Airmen and members of the Joint and Coalition team. The CSAR-X helicopter will provide a more reliable, more responsive capability for rapid recovery of downed, injured, or isolated personnel in day or night, all weather and adverse conditions, as well as support non-combatant evacuation and disaster relief operations.

5.1.3 Space Systems

Air Force communications, ISR, and geo-positioning satellites are the bedrock of the Joint Team's ability to find, fix, target, assess, communicate, and navigate. While many of our satellites have outlived their designed endurance, they are generally less durable than other platforms and sensors. Over the next ten years we must recapitalize all of these systems, replacing them with new ones that enhance our capabilities and provide mission continuity, maintaining the asymmetric advantages our space forces provide our Nation.

The WGS system, AEHF, and the Transformational Satellite Communications (TSAT) program will assure a more robust and reliable communications capability designed to counter emerging threats and meet expanding Joint communications requirements.

The GPS II-F and III programs will add a more robust PNT capability to America's established GPS constellation. GPS III will utilize a block approach to acquisition and will deliver enhanced civil and military PNT capabilities to worldwide users.

The Space Based Infrared System will enhance the Air Force's early warning missile defense, technical intelligence, and battlespace awareness capabilities through improved infrared sensing, missile warning, and data processing.

The Air Force will continue to develop space situation awareness (SSA) capabilities to help protect space assets from future threats. We are also pursuing more robust space protection measures to warn of attacks, provide redundant command and control, harden electronics, and defend against direct attacks. The Space Based Space Surveillance (SBSS) system will be the first orbital sensor with a primary mission of SSA. This system, along with other developments such as the Rapid Attack Identification Detection and Reporting System will improve our ability to characterize the space environment – the friends and foes operating in it, and the objects traversing it.

5.1.4 F-35A Lightning II (Joint Strike Fighter)

The F-35A Lightning II will be the mainstay of America's future fighter force, providing an affordable, multi-role complement to the F-22 Raptor. In addition to fielding advanced combat capabilities, the Lightning II will also strengthen integration of our Total Force and will enhance interoperability with global partners.

The F-35A Lightning II boasts 5th Generation, precision engagement, low-observable (stealth), and attack capabilities that will benefit not only the Air Force, but also the Navy, Marines, and our international partners involved in the program. The F-35A is the Conventional

Take-off and Landing (CTOL) variant, and it will replace, recapitalize, and extend Air Force F-117, F-16, and A-10 combat capabilities. The F-35A also serves as the recapitalization program for our international partners' aging F-16s, F-18s, and other 4th Generation fighter aircraft.

Complete dominance of the air and freedom of maneuver for the entire Joint force demand the complementary capabilities of the F-22 and F-35A 5th Generation of fighters. Together, they promise the ability to sweep the skies, take down the enemy's air defenses, and provide persistent, lethal air cover of the battlefield. The leading edge capabilities of the F-35A, in development and low rate production now, will provide an affordable, Joint Service, international complement to the F-22.

5.1.5 New Bomber

Range and payload are the soul of an Air Force. These capabilities, along with precision, lethality, survivability, and responsiveness are fundamental to modern strategic military deterrence, and apply across the full range of military operations – from tactical to strategic, kinetic to non-kinetic. And yet our nation has just twenty-one bombers currently capable of penetrating modern air defenses. Even these B-2 Spirit stealth bombers have limitations and will become relatively less capable and less survivable against advanced anti-access technologies being developed and fielded around the world. Furthermore, our current bomber inventory is becoming more costly to operate and maintain. Indeed, some suppliers for spare parts no longer exist.

The Air Force is therefore pursuing acquisition of a new Bomber by 2018 and in accordance with Quadrennial Defense Review goals for long range strike capability. This next generation bomber will feature stealth, payload, and improved avionics/sensors suites, and will incorporate highly advanced technologies. It will also bring America's bomber forces up to the same high standard we are setting with our F-22 and F-35A 5th Generation fighters, and ensure our bomber force's ability to fulfill our Nation's and the Combatant Commanders' global requirements.

5.2 Improve our Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power

Because Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power constitute America's edge, we must continually hone our ability to provide them. Our acquisition programs aim to broaden Global Vigilance, extend Global Reach, and strengthen Global Power advantages for America.

5.2.1 Broaden Global Vigilance

The Air Force provides the global eyes and ears of the Joint Team and our Nation. Using a vast array of terrestrial, airborne, and spaceborne sensors, we monitor and characterize the earth's sea, air, space, land, and cyberspace domains around the clock and around the world. The information collected through surveillance and reconnaissance, and converted into intelligence by exploitation and analysis, is used to formulate strategy, policy, and military plans; to develop and conduct campaigns; guide acquisition of future capabilities; and to protect, prevent, and prevail against threats and aggression aimed at the U.S. and its interests. It is relied upon at levels ranging from the President and senior decision makers to commanders in

air operations centers to ground units engaged with the enemy to pilots dropping precision-guided munitions.

The future vision of all the U.S. military Services is information-driven. Success will hinge on America's integrated air, space, and cyberspace advantages. Air Force assets like the E-8C Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System, E-3 Airborne Warning and Control System, RC-135 Rivet Joint, RQ-4 Global Hawk, MQ-1 Predator, and our constellations of satellites contribute vital ISR capabilities and networking services that are integral to every aspect of every Joint operation. Our recapitalization and modernization plan aims to dramatically increase the quantity and quality of ISR capabilities, products, and services available to the Joint Team and the Nation. Our recapitalization efforts are focused on extending the lifespans and capability sets of our workhorse platforms, such as the RC-135 Rivet Joint and several space-based assets. We are also working to find and leverage previously untapped ISR capabilities such as those on fighters carrying targeting pods. Finally, we have made a concerted effort to ensure the viability of Air Force space communications, PNT, early warning missions, and SSA capabilities to provide uninterrupted mission continuity for America and our allies.

5.2.2 Extend Global Reach

America's Airmen provide the long legs and lift for Joint warfighters' rapid global mobility as well as the long arms for global strike and high endurance for global persistence and presence. On a daily basis, Air Force intertheater and intratheater airlift and mobility forces support all DoD branches as well as other government agency operations all over the world. Yet the increased demand for their capabilities and their decreased availability underscore the critical need for tanker recapitalization and investment to ensure the long-term viability of this vital national capability.

5.2.3 Strengthen Global Power

The U.S. Air Force provides the ability to achieve precise, tailored effects whenever, wherever, and however needed – kinetic and non-kinetic, lethal and non-lethal, at the speed of sound and soon at the speed of light. It is an integrated cross-domain capability that rests on our ability to dominate the air, space, and cyberspace domains.

The Global Power advantages the Air Force provides the Joint Team ensure freedom of maneuver, freedom from attack, and freedom to attack for the Joint Team. However, failure to invest in sufficient quantities of modern capabilities seriously jeopardizes these advantages and risks the lives of our Soldiers, Sailors, Airmen, and Marines.

5.3 Retire Aging, Worn-Out Aircraft

The Air Force has been in continuous combat since 1990 – 17 years and counting – taking a toll on our people and rapidly aging equipment. While we remain globally engaged, we recognize the imperative of investing in the future through recapitalization and modernization. Beyond fielding new aircraft, we must also retire significant portions of our oldest, most obsolete aircraft if we are to build a modern, 21st Century Air Force. Our aircraft inventories are the oldest in our history, and are more difficult and expensive to maintain than ever. They require a larger footprint when deployed, and are significantly less combat-capable in today's increasingly

advanced and lethal environment. In the years ahead they will be less and less capable of responding to or surviving the threats and crises that may emerge.

Since 2005, we have attempted to divest significant numbers of old, worn out aircraft. However, legislative restrictions on aircraft retirements remain an obstacle to efficient divestiture of our oldest, least capable, and most costly to maintain aircraft. Lifting these restrictions will alleviate considerable pressure on our already constrained resources that continue to erode our overall capabilities.

5.4 Preserve America's Aerospace Industrial Base

America's public and private aerospace industrial base, workforce, and capabilities are vital to the Air Force and national defense. The aerospace industry produced the brainpower, innovations, technology, and vehicles that propelled the U.S. to global leadership in the 20th Century. The aerospace sector gave birth to the technologies and minds that have made the information age a reality. This key industrial sector continues to lead and produce the technologies and capabilities America needs to safeguard our future.

Yet this vital industry has deteriorated over the last decade. We have witnessed an industry consolidation and contraction – from more than ten domestic U.S. aircraft manufacturers in the early 1990s to only three prime domestic aircraft manufacturers today. Without funding, in the coming decade production lines will irreversibly close, skilled workforces will age or retire, and companies will shut their doors. The U.S. aerospace industry is rapidly approaching a point of no return. As Air Force assets wear out, the U.S. is losing the ability to build new ones. We must reverse this erosion through increased investment.

We must find ways to maintain and preserve our aerospace industrial capabilities. We must maintain national options for keeping production lines open. Complex 21st Century weapons systems cannot be produced without long lead development and procurement actions. Additionally, we must continue our investment in a modern, industrial sustainment base. Air Force depots and private sector maintenance centers have played vital roles in sustaining our capabilities and have become models of modern industrial transformation. We are fully committed to sustaining a healthy, modern depot level maintenance and repair capability.

Furthermore, we must recognize that these industry capabilities represent our national ability to research, innovate, develop, produce, and sustain the advanced technologies and systems we will continue to need in the future. This vital industrial sector represents a center of gravity and single point vulnerability for our national defense.

5.5 Extend C-130J Production Line

Acquisition programs set the stage to field future capabilities. So we must make prudent decisions to maintain current production of advanced systems in order to reach required force structure goals and provide a hedge against future uncertainty. We must maintain and extend the existing production lines for C-130J intratheater airlifters. This aircraft represent America's best technology and capability.

We strongly recommend taking action to ensure these vital production lines remain open. Maintaining current production lines will be critical to revitalizing our force structure, setting conditions for future success, and providing America with the option – should conditions dictate

– to produce additional modern, advanced technology aircraft without having to start from square one.

5.6 Strengthen Total Force Integration

The Air Force is dedicated to ensuring our States and Nation get the most combat effective, most efficient force possible to accomplish our mission faster and with greater capacity, around the world and at home. We believe integrating our Total Force is the best way to do that.

America's Airmen set the DoD standard for Reserve Component integration. The Air Reserve Component (ARC) – comprised of the Air National Guard (ANG) and the Air Force Reserve Command (AFRC) – is an operational reserve and an essential element of the U.S. Air Force. We are developing concepts, strategies, force management policies and practices, and legal authorities to access sufficient ARC forces without the need for involuntary mobilization. Though the Air Force is already the model for melding its Guard, Reserve, and civilians with its Regular Air Force elements, we can and will push this synergy to new levels.

A distinguishing hallmark of the Air Force is the ease with which Total Force Airmen work seamlessly together at home and abroad. From the first Reserve Associate unit in 1968 to the full integration of Guard and Reserve units into the AEF in the 1990s, the Air Force has a well-established history of employing Airmen from all components in innovative and effective ways.

Total Force Integration (TFI) represents a long-term Air Force commitment to transformation. TFI maximizes the Air Force's overall Joint combat capability, forming a more cohesive force and capitalizing on the strengths inherent within Regular, Guard and Reserve elements. Including the ARC in emerging mission areas increases the Air Force's ability to retain critical skills should Airmen decide to transition from the Regular Air Force to the ARC. We will continue to review policies and practices – through our Continuum of Service initiative – to optimize sustainment support to the warfighting force and further integrate personnel management across the Total Force. TFI will be critical to meeting the challenges of competing resource demands, an aging aircraft inventory, and organizing, training, and equipping for emerging missions.

We are leveraging our Total Force to the greatest extent ever. We expect the Total Force to produce the vanguard elements we will need as we expand our leading role in cyberspace and explore new cyber technologies. Many of our most experienced cyber warriors, having attained the high level of expertise required to excel in this domain, are found in our Guard, Reserve, and Civilian ranks.

5.6.1 Total Force Roadmap

As an integral element of our procurement efforts, we have built a global Total Force Roadmap for acquiring and basing new aircraft and equipment. Just as our AEF construct seamlessly draws upon all of the Total Force components, the beddown of future Air Force aircraft and equipment integrates Regular, Guard and Reserve Airmen beginning with the first phases of production and basing through Full Operational Capability.

The Roadmap represents a more efficient and flexible force structure. Although the Air Force will have a smaller total aircraft inventory compared to our current inventory of aircraft,

overall Air Force capabilities will increase with each next-generation weapons system. In numerous instances, the potential locations will capitalize on Total Force Integration efforts, creating innovative organizational arrangements among Regular, Guard, and Reserve components. This effort takes advantage of the inherent strengths of each component.

The Air Force Roadmap provides a planning construct for the future which, if adequately resourced, will result in the required force structure that will give our Nation the best capability for Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power across the globe; to reassure allies, to dissuade, deter, and defeat adversaries; and to protect the Homeland.

5.7 Secure the Future

To maximize the potential advantages of our programs in the future, the Air Force is engaging in multiple initiatives to better organize, train, and equip our forces. Whether harnessing the complementary capabilities of the F-22 and F-35A programs to provide Air Dominance for the Joint Team; strengthening our National Security Space Enterprise; leading efforts to acquire interoperable Unmanned Aerial Systems (UAS); developing Cyber Warriors; or pursuing alternative energy solutions with environmentally safe production processes, the Air Force continues to investigate and embrace opportunities to secure Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power for our Nation's future.

5.7.1 Strengthen Joint Air Dominance

America's Airmen are understandably proud of their contributions to the Joint fight. Airmen have prevented enemy aircraft from inflicting any U.S. ground force casualties for over 50 years, and our Nation must maintain the required capability advantages to continue this record in the future. With advancing technology and proliferating threats, the Nation also needs the right equipment for the Homeland Defense mission to protect civilians on American soil.

The F-22 Raptor and the F-35A Lightning II JSF are leading-edge, modern, 5th Generation fighters. They are not modernized versions of old designs. These aircraft reap the benefits of decades of advanced research, technology development, open architecture design, and operational experience. These fighters are furthermore designed to be complementary – the F-22 being superior in speed and maneuverability, and the F-35A being optimized for ground attack and multi-role capabilities. These fighters will provide the advanced warfighting capabilities, aircraft system synergies, and the flexibility and versatility required in future environments and engagements.

Currently in production and fully operational with Total Force units in Virginia and Alaska, and with units planned for New Mexico and Hawaii, the F-22 is the newest member of the Air, Space, and Cyber Expeditionary Force. Airmen are putting the Raptor through its paces – flying and deploying the world's first and only operational 5th Generation fighter. Its attributes of speed, stealth, maneuverability, internal weapons carriage, advanced sensors, and adaptable, integrated avionics will meet our Nation's enduring national security requirements to gain and maintain Joint air dominance in anti-access environments; provide powerful sensing capabilities and battlespace situational awareness; and precisely engage a broad range of surface targets.

It is vital to our national interests that 5th Generation fighter production capability be preserved. This year the F-35A will continue development and begin its ramp-up to full rate production in 2014. Continuing production ensures the aerospace industry keeps its technical

edge, maintains an able workforce to respond to uncertainties, and preserves critical skills and production suppliers. Uninterrupted production in sufficient numbers of 5th Generation fighters remains the lowest risk strategy and best future guarantee for homeland air sovereignty and Joint air dominance.

5.7.2 Lead Joint Unmanned Aircraft System Operational Development

The Air Force is the world leader for successful, innovative, and effective development, acquisition, and operation of Unmanned Aircraft (UA) and the UAS that incorporate UAs and the command and control (C2) networks and equipment to employ them. Future successful Joint UAS acquisitions and operations hinge upon execution of three critical elements, which align cohesively with Joint doctrine:

Develop Joint UA CONOPS. UA operators serve the global Joint mission through interoperability and interdependence. Globally- and Jointly-integrated UAS operations and capabilities – from strategic to tactical – are necessary for Joint success. CONOPS development must focus on accomplishing the Joint mission as opposed to serving functional components.

Standardize and Streamline UAS Acquisitions. We must develop an affordable Joint acquisition strategy for future UAS development, organization, and employment. Air Force acquirers and operators pioneered UAS development and application in Joint warfare, and have established best practices for organizing, training, standardizing, and equipping the world's most effective UAS operations squadrons.

Ensure Airspace Control and Awareness. Presentation of UA forces and capabilities must meet Joint Commander requirements and objectives. "Organic ownership" of UAS capabilities is irrelevant in the context of the Joint fight and the Joint Forces Air Component Commander's authority and responsibility to control Joint airspace. Homeland operations are also becoming increasingly important. We are working with all the Services and the Department of Transportation to establish Federal Aviation Administration Certifications for UA operations within approved civil airspace.

5.7.3 Lead the National Security Space Enterprise

Our Nation depends on its space capabilities as an integral part of its military strength, industrial capability, and economic vitality. As DoD Executive Agency for Space, the Air Force will continue to ensure mission continuity in critical areas of communications, PNT, early warning, SSA, and ISR. We will also continue efforts to strengthen National Space integration and collaboration across DoD, with the intelligence community, our interagency partners and our international partners.

Of particular note are our efforts to strengthen America's space professionals and science and engineering workforce. These professionals will form the fundamental corps who will lead our space efforts to success in the future by integrating enterprise level architectures; designing, developing, acquiring, and fielding new systems; and operating in a dynamic and potentially contested environment.

Additionally, the Air Force is developing capabilities to quickly respond to the urgent needs of Combatant Commanders. Operationally Responsive Space (ORS) is a tiered capability consisting of spacecraft, launch vehicles, and terrestrial infrastructure employed in concert to deliver a range of space capabilities to responsively meet Combatant Commander requirements in times of war, conflict, or crisis.

Finally, the Air Force is committed to improving its space acquisitions, focusing on flexibility and affordability. Success in this endeavor depends on achievable requirements, appropriate resources, disciplined systems engineering, and effective program management. We focus all of these efforts through a disciplined block delivery approach tying together basic Science and Technology (S&T), technology development, systems development, and system production efforts so concepts first evaluated in S&T will enable a systematic transition from development to operations.

5.7.4 Lead Cyberspace Operational Development

Current and potential adversaries already operate in cyberspace, exploiting the low entry costs and minimal technological investment needed to inflict serious harm in and through cyberspace. State and non-state actors are already operating within cyberspace to gain asymmetric advantage.

In April 2007, Estonia was the victim of a barrage of cyber attacks which brought its technologically sophisticated government to a virtual standstill. Insurgents in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere exploit electronics and the electromagnetic spectrum to kill and maim through improvised explosive devices (IEDs) and propagate their message of hate to the world. Thus, the ability to inflict damage and cause strategic dislocation no longer requires significant capital investment, superior motivation and training, or technological prowess.

We seek to deny our adversaries sanctuary in cyberspace while assuring our access to and freedom to operate in this domain. Our Nation's ability to achieve effects in air, in space, on land, and at sea depends on control of and freedom of maneuver in the cyber domain.

As part of a larger effort to address this need, the Air Force stood up a Provisional Air Force Cyberspace Command (AFCYBER) on 18 September 2007. Our current plan is to activate the AFCYBER MAJCOM on 1 October 2008. The newly designated AFCYBER will consolidate and integrate Air Force cyber capabilities to prepare them to function across the spectrum of conflict. These capabilities will include, but are not limited to: electronic warfare; network warfare; global command and control (C2) integration, and ISR enhancement.

We will continue to develop and implement plans for maturing cyber operations as an Air Force core competency. Our objective is to provide flexible options to national decision-makers to deter, deny, disrupt, deceive, dissuade, and defeat adversaries through destructive and non-destructive, lethal and non-lethal means.

5.7.5 Assure Sustainable Energy

We are pursuing an aggressive energy strategy and are committed to meeting and surpassing the energy goals mandated by the Energy Policy Act of 2005 (EPAct 05) and other national policies. We continue to pursue a variety of programs aimed at reducing our use of fossil fuels and controlling cost growth. Our vision emphasizes a culture in which all Airmen

make energy conscious decisions. We aim to implement our vision with solutions that include alternate sources of domestic energy as well as an aggressive drive for greater efficiency in our facilities, vehicles, and aircraft.

Following Presidential direction to reduce dependence on foreign oil, the Air Force is aggressively pursuing a broad range of energy alternatives. As the DoD's leading consumer of jet fuel, we are currently engaged in evaluating alternative fuels and engine technologies leading to greater fuel efficiency. We have certified the B-52 to fly on a synthetic fuel blend, and are on track to certify the C-17 and B-1 in 2008, the F-22 in 2009, and the remainder of all of our aircraft expected to be certified by early 2011. In fact, on December 17, 2007 -- the 104th anniversary of the Wright Brothers' first flight at Kitty Hawk, NC -- a McChord AFB, Washington-based C-17 flew the first transcontinental flight on synthetic fuel (a 50/50 blend). The Air Force goal is to acquire 50% of its CONUS aviation fuel via a synthetic fuel blend utilizing domestic sources. Our intent is to require synthetic fuel purchases be sourced from environmentally-friendly suppliers with manufacturing facilities that engage in carbon dioxide capture and effective reuse. In addition, the Air Force is testing renewable fuel resources that will lower CO₂ emissions significantly compared to petroleum. Other Air Force technology efforts continue to explore high-efficiency aerodynamic concepts, advanced gas turbines, and variable cycle engines providing higher performance and greater fuel efficiency.

The Air Force is the renewable energy leader, and we seek to expand our portfolio through innovative public-private partnerships and evaluations of a wide range of energy proposals at several bases. Last year, the Air Force received the Presidential Award for Leadership in Federal Energy Management. The Air Force also continued to lead the Federal Government in green power purchases, with 37 bases meeting some portion of their base-wide electrical requirements from commercial sources of wind, solar, geothermal, or biomass. We reached full operating capacity -- 14.5 megawatts -- of the largest solar photovoltaic array in the Americas at Nellis AFB, Nevada. At Edwards AFB, California, Kirtland AFB, New Mexico, and Luke AFB, Arizona, we are exploring additional commercial-scale opportunities for solar power. On under-utilized land at Malstrom AFB, Montana, we are exploring the potential for a privately financed and operated coal-to-liquid plant. Finally, as a result of Congressional interest, we have begun considering the potential for small-scale nuclear power production on Air Force property. As energy leaders, the Air Force is engaging with allied and Coalition air force partners to share best practices, identify common issues and concerns, and ensure future, sustainable energy interoperability.

5.7.6 Maintain Science and Technology Leadership

True to our heritage over the past century of powered flight, the Air Force continues to maintain the most complex, diverse, and ambitious S&T portfolio of all the Services. History clearly demonstrates the broad benefits to America of our S&T efforts, in terms of military power, industrial capability, economic growth, educational richness, cultural wealth, and national prestige. Examples of these efforts include aerospace technology and propulsion, materials science, advanced computing and communications, atmospheric science, remote sensing, medicine, precision timing, weather forecasting, and satellite navigation. What has been good for the Air Force has been great for America. We are committed to building upon this heritage.

The Air Force S&T program develops, demonstrates, and tests technologies and advanced warfighting capabilities against the spectrum of 21st Century threats. As we continue to adapt to a volatile and uncertain world, today's focused investment in our S&T program will

produce the future warfighting capabilities needed to ensure America's continued technological preeminence and military flexibility. Major Air Force S&T efforts include hypersonics, composites, propulsion, nanotechnology, small satellite technology, directed energy, and cybertechnology

Additionally, Air Force S&T organizations work closely with the other Services, the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency, Intelligence Community, and other Federal agencies, such as the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, as well as partner nations. Through these partnerships we leverage efforts, share information, and advance state-of-the-art technologies.

The Air Force S&T Program provides the necessary leadership and foundation for future Joint warfighting capabilities, focusing on dominance of the air, space, and cyberspace warfighting domains. Continued Air Force S&T leadership will be critical to maintaining the asymmetric military advantages and broad national benefits our Joint Team and the Nation have come to expect and enjoy.

6.0 America's Airmen

U.S. security and prosperity are best assured when all the instruments of national power are orchestrated to work with other states to promote a stable and prosperous international system. The Air Force directly contributes to U.S. security by providing a unique array of sovereign options for decision makers. These options maximize our ability to assure friends and to dissuade and deter threats, large and small, across the spectrum of conflict. When opponents cannot be deterred, these options magnify the combat capability of Joint and Coalition forces and provide a variety of alternatives for our political leaders to choose from in pursuit of national objectives. We provide the Nation with its most lethal and proven force for defeating enemies across the broad range of threats we face.

By exploiting the synergies of air, space, and cyberspace, the Air Force provides our Nation with the capability to dominate across domains and expand the options available for our sister Services to dominate their respective domains. Implementing our strategy requires fielding a force of highly trained Airmen with a commanding edge in technology and a force structure with sufficient capacity to provide the assurance of U.S. presence. So long as Airmen maintain a global presence and hold significant advantages over potential opponents, we will continue to provide our Nation with the means to lead the fight for global stability and prosperity.

Our emphasis on assurance, dissuasion, and deterrence reflects our conviction that it is far better to convince potential adversaries to refrain from the use of military force than to have to defeat them in battle. Our success will be measured by conflicts averted as well as conflicts fought and won. But we must never forget that our ability to assure and deter ultimately flows directly from our unambiguous ability to overwhelm swiftly and decisively any adversary who elects to test us.

We are today honing America's edge. Our Airmen have sworn an oath to serve their country, and they are meeting and exceeding their wartime commitments. We remain focused on our Air Force priorities of winning today's fight, caring for our people, and preparing for tomorrow's challenges. We are assessing threats in an uncertain world, balancing our requirements within fiscal constraints, and managing risks as we endeavor to strengthen the asymmetric advantages our Nation and the Joint Team currently enjoy.

We will have neither the buffer of time nor the barrier of oceans in future conflicts. The Air Force's Regular component is smaller in February 2008 than the United States Army Air Forces was in December 1941. The character, tempo, and velocity of modern warfare already severely test our ability to adapt. Therefore, redefining the Air Force for the 21st Century is an urgent national security requirement – not a luxury we can defer.

America looks to Airmen to provide dominance that spans the air, space, and cyberspace warfighting domains. Our Airmen are fighting today's fight, while standing watch across the frontiers of technology and the future. They need your support today to defend the Nation from tomorrow's threats. Full funding and support for America's Airmen will ensure America's continued freedom of action; increase global awareness; reassure America's allies and strengthen our partnerships; reinforce our sovereign homeland defenses; and set conditions for Joint and Coalition success across the entire spectrum of human conflict and crisis.

We imperil our security, our people, and our way of life if we fail to maintain and sharpen America's Edge – the Air Force-provided Global Vigilance, Global Reach and Global Power advantages which underwrite the defense and sovereignty of our Nation.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING

FEBRUARY 27, 2008

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. HAYES

Mr. HAYES. As you are aware, last Friday, the DoD Inspector General announced plans to investigate issues raised by a Program on Government Oversight (POGO) report citing inadequate documentation of changes to the Combat Search and Rescue helicopter program's Key Program Parameters (KPPs). In detail, why was the decision made to perform this audit?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. Since this is an on-going DoD Inspector General audit, it is inappropriate for the Air Force to comment at this time.

Mr. HAYES. For the first major AF acquisition since the troubles with the tanker acquisition scandal, Combat Search and Rescue (CSAR) was intended to showcase and represent a reformed AF acquisition process. Why were basics like the proper documentation of KPP changes not being handled correctly?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. Under the Joint Capabilities Integration Development System (JCIDS), "JROC Interest" documents are draft and subject to change until approved by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council (JROC). No changes were made to the CSAR-X Capability Development Document (CDD) after JROC approval.

Mr. HAYES. What is the Air Force doing to make sure that companies who compete for Air Force-contracts are participating in a fair process, and that the American taxpayer is getting the best value for their tax dollar?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. The Air Force follows the Federal Acquisition Regulations, as supplemented by the DoD and Air Force, and ensures that all competitive procurements are conducted with integrity, fairness, and transparency to deliver best value products and services. Further, the Air Force recently revised our source selection policy and procedures to ensure we have an efficient, effective, and transparent selection process. The recent revisions include standardized policy, guidance, tools, and training for our workforce. These policies, procedures and practices ensure the taxpayers are getting the best value for their tax dollar. Companies that bid on DoD contracts self-certify that they are in compliance with US laws and procurement regulations and unless we have evidence to the contrary, they are considered compliant.

Mr. HAYES. Does the AF plan to award the contract before the IG investigation is complete? This would be irresponsible—if you do award it and the DOD IG finds error, then the AF would have to redo the contract completely. If the Air Force waits, they may be able to salvage the competition.

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. The Air Force will award the contract at the completion of the source selection process. The audit being conducted by the DOD IG is a separate activity. Should the DoD IG audit recommend any changes, the Air Force would consider its recommendations.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. FORBES

Mr. FORBES. The 2005 Air Force decision to reduce its force structure by 40,000 people by all accounts appears to have affected readiness. Both of you (Secretary Wynne and Gen. Moseley) have admitted that the drawdown had not met expectations. Now, in its Unfunded Requirements List, you are seeking to enlarge its ranks. This request is after \$244 million was requested last year to substantially increase officer separations in Fiscal Year 2008. What is frustrating from my perspective is that this growth behind the reductions could have been forecasted. Last year, when this funding to reduce the size of the force could have been directed to other critical national security needs, I asked the Air Force the following questions, and I quote: "Question: Does the AF plan to put on hold VSP or other force shaping programs pending the analysis of the impact of the Army's Grow-the-Force initiative on AF resource requirements?" And the answer I received was: "the Air Force does not expect to put any programs on hold for FY08. However, future programs will be subject to any changes to requirements." I also asked the question: "Has force shaping created any unintended shortfall in any career field in any year group? If so, what are the year groups and shortfall?" And the answer I received was: "Air Force vol-

untary and involuntary force shaping programs are structured to target specific year groups and career fields excess to required sustainment levels.”

With that in mind, what are the year groups and AFSC shortfalls that lead you to request additional personnel in your unfunded requirements list? Were personnel in these year groups or AFSCs reduced in previous force shaping rounds? If these personnel additions are critical to readiness to accomplish Air Force missions, why is the request to enlarge its ranks in its Unfunded Requirement List, rather than being included in the actual budget request?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. Our nation’s demand for emerging Air Force capabilities drives our request for end strength, and is not simply a remediation of the “year groups or career fields” within previous cuts. The unfunded growth we request is by nature a different overall mix of skills, to include some evolving ones, such as cyber professionals, Predator and Global Hawk capabilities. Also, as the Army end strength grew by 65,000, the Air Force needs a commensurate growth to provide essential weather operations and Tactical Air Control party capabilities. However, such growth is not achievable without additional end strength and funding. There may be some limited overlaps in losses experienced through the 40,000 reduction and the unfunded manpower requirements set forth to achieve the 86 combat wing, but difficult tradeoffs were necessary to free up resources for modernization in the interim. House Report 110-434, Review of Air Force End Strength, dated February 2008, provides more insight into these emerging growth areas and the skills required.

The Air Force’s request for additional end strength is included in the unfunded list rather than the actual budget request because we do not have the top-line obligation authority to recapitalize and grow the required force. In late 2005, the Air Force reduced its end strength by 40,000 Active Duty, Guard, Reserve and civilian Full-time Equivalents (FTE) to pay for vital recapitalization and modernization of aircraft, space and missile inventories. End strength reduction by 40,000 FTEs over a 3-year period was the only viable alternative to preserve required investment capital. In order to stay within a constrained total obligation authority, we’re faced with significant challenges in striking a balance between purchasing weapons for tomorrow’s Air Force to replace an aging fleet, paying for operations and maintenance of today’s force, and preserving and developing our men and women of the total force.

Mr. FORBES. Declining readiness rates are a function of aging aircraft, op tempo and maintenance funding. Would any reduction in flying hours be sufficient to stop the fall in aircraft readiness? What actions is the Air Force taking to reverse this readiness trend?

General MOSELEY. Flying hour reductions of 10% through the FYDP are forecasted to provide limited impact on aircraft readiness. The decrease in readiness over 17 years of continuous combat can be attributed by a period of chronic under-resourcing during the 1990’s and an aging fleet. Only through significant sustainment investments and innovation in the field and in Air Logistics Centers has the Air Force been able to ‘hold the line’ on aircraft readiness rates since FY00.

Mr. FORBES. What impact has the groundings of the F-15s had on our Air Sovereignty Alert System? And what steps are being taken to ensure the National Guard has the equipment its needs to perform this mission?

General MOSELEY. The USAF decision to temporarily ground F-15 aircraft did not impact the North American Aerospace Defense Command (NORAD) air sovereignty alert mission. Quick reactions by US Joint Forces Command, US Pacific Command and US Northern Command along with adjustments instituted by the Air Combat Command and Pacific Air Forces mitigated the situation and the entire NORAD mission requirements were met during the duration of the F-15 groundings.

The organizing, training, and equipping of Total Force air forces remains not only a legal obligation, but the Air Force strives to optimize expenditures across the force to ensure that the best mix of resources comes out of the execution of programmed dollars. To that end, the USAF has instituted an annual capabilities review and risk assessment to meld requirements for several mission areas into an integrated program objective memorandum recommendation. We are attempting to find ways to accelerate acquisition, production, delivery and payment for the advanced fighter airframes, F-22 and F-35, to ensure incorporation into the ANG inventories.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. MILLER

Mr. MILLER. Secretary Wynne, as you know, for more than 40 years B-52 Stratofortresses have been the backbone of the manned nuclear and conventional strategic bomber force and are capable of dropping or launching the widest array of weapons in the U.S. inventory. Modern technology has enabled the B-52 to be

capable in delivering the full complement of joint developed weapons (most of which were developed and tested at Eglin AFB) and the aircraft will continue into the 21st century as an important element of our nation's defense. In addition, current engineering analyses show the B-52's life span to extend beyond the year 2040. As a testament to her resilience, the B-52 continues to serve as a workhorse and has once again proven to be venerable in the Global War on Terrorism, as demonstrated in OIF and OEF. However, with all this said, the AF has submitted a budget for 2009 that does not provide funding or equipment for its fleet of 76 aircraft, contrary to the Congressional mandate in the FY08 NDAA. It does, however, provide \$80.4M for modernization of only 56 of 76 aircraft. Further confusing, the AF included \$183.1M on its Unfunded Requirements List to comply with last years' Congressional mandate. Could you explain your intent with putting a higher prioritization for modernization of 56 B-52 aircraft, while the basic O&M care and feeding requirements for the fleet aren't being met within your budget and there is no clear indication the Next Generation Bomber is attainable in the near future?

Secretary WYNNE. Thank you for the opportunity to address the issue of B-52 funding in the FY09 President's Budget. As you point out, the B-52 has performed extremely well in the Global War on Terror and continues to be an integral part of our bomber force. However, your Air Force has been in the fight for 17 years, and yet over the same 17 years has seen under-funded modernization.

Clearly, beyond the global war on terror we must not lose America's asymmetric advantage in the strategic forces. When General Moseley and I came to our posts we set about a strategy to restructure our Air Force, truly develop a lean and efficient Air Force in order to husband the resources for investment. We have talked about being under-funded, but here have worked to offer a balanced budget prioritized to best defend America. And we will continue to do that over the FYDP.

The FY09 budget submission reflects the Air Force position that a fleet of 56 B-52s is sufficient to successfully meet wartime and contingency operations with an acceptably low level of assumed risk. However, we are committed to restoring the funding, beginning in FY08, for a 76 total active inventory in compliance with the FY08 NDAA. The FY09 URL request would continue that funding for 76 B-52s, including modifications, through FY09. I expect our FY10 budget to provide full funding for 76 B-52s across the FYDP.

This also addresses recommendations from the recent nuclear surety Blue Ribbon Review. Soon I will submit the congressionally mandated Institute for Defense Analyses Bomber Force Structure Study so we can begin the process of drawing the B-52 fleet down to 76. Thank you for your support to our improved readiness via retirement and recapitalization.

Mr. MILLER. With regard to the Air Force Special Operations Command ... in particular, the AC-130 Gunship, in the GWOT these aircraft are being utilized at 3 times their programmed rate. That said, the current fleet is on pace to run into major Maintenance issues and may have to come off the battlefield for major repairs (especially for the center wing box). This will create a "gap" of Close Air Support platforms for our soldiers on the ground (The Gunship is the premier CAS platform in the USAF inventory). Hasn't the C-27 has been vetted as the aircraft to make into an AC-27 gunship and will be able to fill the gap and increase the AF's Close Air Support Capability? I also see USSOCOM and the AF have identified and listed this requirement in their top ten of unfunded requests (#2 and #7, respectively). Would you please speak to the necessity of this aircraft and how you and SOCOM are working together to make this happen sooner rather than later? The need for this gunship is now, isn't it?

General MOSELEY. A gap in gunship capability already exists and has historically been a Limited Supply/High Demand (LS/HD) asset with an extreme operational tempo. The legacy fleet is accruing flying hours at four times the rate they were originally programmed. In an effort to fill the urgent need for additional Special Operations close air support (CAS) capability, USSOCOM initiated the AC-XX effort with the Air Force in lock step. AC-XX is a USSOCOM/CC priority and the Air Force fully supports additional gunship capability. Currently USSOCOM, with Air Force assistance, is conducting an Analysis of Alternatives (AoA) to determine the best solution to fill the sufficiency gap. Many material solutions are being analyzed for mission and cost effectiveness, one of which is the C-27. The AoA will be complete in early June 2008. Upon completion it will be vetted through USSOCOM and Air Force leadership to inform a potential acquisition decision in FY10. The AoA will provide a recommendation on a cost effective attack modification package and appropriate "donor" aircraft. While the C-27 is yet to be chosen as the "donor" platform for AC-XX, the Air Force is moving forward to request a congressional new start approval to purchase one C-27 in FY08. This aircraft will be used to perform Research and Development with the focus on the gunship attack modification pack-

age. If approved by Congress, the new start effort will reduce program risk by performing a major portion of R&D ahead of time.

Mr. MILLER. What is your opinion of utilizing the F-22 for Operation NOBLE EAGLE Homeland Security missions as proposed by some leadership responsible for that mission? Can our current F-15 and F-16 fleets meet the current threat to US airspace sovereignty?

General MOSELEY. The F-22 has already flown Operation NOBLE EAGLE missions. Planned modernization programs will ensure F-15s and F-16s assigned to the Air Sovereignty Alert mission are fully capable of protecting US airspace against current threats for the foreseeable future.

Mr. MILLER. AF Special Operations will continue to be integral in the GWOT and its certain these aircraft will continue to be in high demand for the foreseeable future. The 08 Supplemental has 2 MC-130Js requested, the 09 NDAA has 3 aircraft budgeted and there is already a request for a fourth aircraft on the unfunded list. But, in light of the aging fleet of LD/HD MC-130J aircraft, an increase in demand, and the intent of AFSOC/SOCOM leadership to convert as many C-130Js the Air Force will dedicate to Special Operations, why aren't all the requirements consolidated, increased, and dedicated more clearly to the AFSOC mission? Are the AF's "last tactical mile" intra-theater airlift requirements more critical to need than the aging fleet requirements of the LD/HD AF Special Operations MC-130J fleet?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. The Air Force recognizes the need to recapitalize its combat delivery tactical airlifters and special operations tankers. Both mission areas are critical and fully engaged in the Global War on Terror. The FY08 Supplemental requests serve to address the stresses on both fleets due to the ongoing GWOT, and the FY09 PB request initiated additional recapitalization for aging C-130Es and MC-130s. Recently, OSD (AT&L) approved the sole source procurement of C-130J aircraft for modification to Special Operations configuration. The Air Force will continue to address the prioritization of recapitalization within the limits of the Service's current fiscal resources.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. LOBIONDO

Mr. LOBIONDO. President Bush has said that Operation Noble Eagle, which began in the wake of 9/11 to provide for the security of the air space of the United States of America and is flown almost exclusively by the National Guard (aka Air Sovereignty Alert), is the number one defense priority of this nation. More recently, the Commission on the National Guard and the Reserves recommended the National Guard and Reserves be the backbone of Homeland Defense. Does this budget fully fund the Air Sovereignty Alert mission? Will this end the uncertainty caused by 90 day budgeting cycles for the ASA mission and the National Guardsmen who man that mission? Will the ASA mission ever become part of the baseline budget for the Air Force? What procurement steps are being taken address the rapidly aging ASA fleet of aircraft in Air National Guard?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. The United States Air Force remains 100 percent committed to protecting the nation from all threats as directed by the President and the Secretary of Defense. This support has been provided without reliance on other Services' air assets since the inception of this steady state activity following 9/11.

As part of the USAF Total Force solution to the Air Sovereignty Alert (ASA) mission, the Air National Guard (ANG) units tasked to participate have also provided 100 per cent commitment to the NORAD operations. In FY2006, the ANG flew 1,365 sorties and 4,021 hours defending the nation's skies, including the tens of thousands of hours Air Guard members spend watching radarscopes, or sitting alert waiting for the call, or maintaining alert aircraft and facilities. This commitment to defend the United States homeland does not begin and end at our national boundaries, but the USAF Total Force solution to the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT) guarantees that America is protected both within the US and abroad.

MPA days are resourced and executed throughout the fiscal year. To sustain maximum flexibility, the Air Force's Major Commands balance the needs of the Combatant Commanders with the requirements on a quarterly basis. We continue to search for solutions funding ASA just as we do with the full spectrum of missions as we seek to achieve total force victory in the GWOT against the asymmetric threat we face as a sovereign nation.

The organizing, training, and equipping of total force air forces remains not only a legal obligation, but the Air Force strives to optimize expenditures across the force to ensure that the best mix of resources comes out of the execution of programmed dollars. To that end, the USAF has instituted an annual capabilities review and risk

assessment to meld requirements for several mission areas into an integrated program objective memorandum recommendation. We are attempting to find ways to accelerate acquisition, production, delivery and payment for the advanced fighter airframes, F-22 and F-35, for incorporation into the ANG inventories.

Mr. LOBIONDO. With respect to the "Golden Eagles"—the 177 F-15s which the USAF plans to upgrade and operate until 2025—Why is this unfunded in the USAF budget? Given the high priority of the ASA mission and the extremely low tolerance for mistakes in the environment in which the mission will be executed, ie. over major metropolitan areas, why is the current radar planned for the Golden Eagles the APG-163 and not the more advanced AESA (Active Electronically Scanned Array) radar system?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. All of the upgrades originally planned for the 177 "Golden Eagles" are fully funded in the FY09 President's Budget. The APG-63v(3) is an AESA radar that has previously been funded through Congressional adds for installation on the F-15C. The Air Force recognizes the large improvement in capability provided by this radar and has programmed funding beginning in FY10 that will continue the program with the goal of equipping all 177 Golden Eagles with an AESA. The unfunded request we have submitted to Congress for 24 APG-63v(3) radars would accelerate that program to begin in FY09 and allow us to reach our goal faster than we could otherwise afford. We thank you for your support of this vital initiative to improve the homeland defense capabilities of our primary air superiority weapon system.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Has the Air Force made any decisions, preliminary or final, on the so-called Four Corners plan? Will the plan remain a fifth-generation fighter plan or will it also incorporate the Golden Eagles?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. The FY09 President's Budget funds 183 total F-22s which is not enough to implement the Four Corners plan. The strategic basing of fifth-generation fighters at various CONUS locations, supporting both the homeland defense mission as well as rotational and emerging worldwide wartime commitments requires procurement of additional F-22s beyond the level currently programmed. Although the proposed Four Corners plan only involves the F-22 at this time, this plan is not the only pillar of our strategy to recapitalize legacy aircraft that are performing the Air Sovereignty mission. The Air Force is committed to fulfill both homeland and overseas combatant commander requirements. The Air Force considers our entire inventory of fighters, including Golden Eagles, when assessing future strategic basing options and recapitalization of existing inventory.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. KLINE

Mr. KLINE. This question concerns the 148th Fighter Wing stationed in Duluth, Minnesota. This unit was recently awarded the Air Force Outstanding Unit Award (AFOUA) for exceptional meritorious service during the period November 1, 2005 to October 31, 2007. In addition, the unit was the winner of the Air Force Association 2006 Outstanding Air National Guard Flying Unit award. The 148th Fighter Wing was the largest contributing ANG F-16C+ fighter unit during 2007 Air Expeditionary Force (AEF) rotations to Iraq. Due to a lack of readiness of a follow-on unit, the 148th Fighter Wing volunteered for a last minute extension to its planned rotation in Iraq from February 28 to April 16, 2007. On November 9, 2007, the 148th Fighter Wing was called again to stand alert in Hawaii (over Thanksgiving, Christmas, and New Years) due to the structural issues that grounded the F-15 fleet. The 148th Fighter Wing was again extended in its alert mission at this location until January 29, 2008. On February 4, 2008, the 148th Fighter Wing was called again, for a third time in 9 months, and is currently standing alert in Alaska due to the structural issues that grounded the F-15 fleet. Upon completion of this current alert mission, the 148th Fighter Wing will return to Duluth to prepare for an upcoming AEF deployment early this fall. Upon completion of this next AEF rotation in January of 2009, 148th personnel will have deployed personnel and aircraft in support of 5 different Combat Commanders in numerous locations throughout the world. They will continue to be one of the most heavily utilized units in the Air Force. The 148th Fighter Wing currently flies F-16C+ Block 25 aircraft, the oldest Combat Coded aircraft flown by the Air Force. The 148th Fighter Wing will soon be the only Active Duty, Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve Wing flying these older aircraft. This will severely limit the 148th Fighter Wing's ability to partner with other Air National Guard F-16C+ units and to support Air Force Air Expeditionary Force (AEF) rotations. In 1996, 2002, and 2007, scheduled/proposed conversions to Block 30 aircraft were overturned or diverted to other locations. Most recently (2007), Block 30 aircraft were sent from Korea to Alaska to serve as aggressor aircraft,

rather than to Minnesota where they could have been utilized to support the Global War on Terrorism. Do you intend to upgrade the airframe used by the 148th Fighter Wing to a Block 50/52 version of the F-16C? If so, when do you anticipate this conversion taking place. If not, please explain the rationale behind this decision especially in light of the following reliance on the 148th Fighter Wing during the past 12 months.

General MOSELEY. The proud airmen of the 148th Fighter Wing without question continue to make outstanding contributions to our national defense. While having among the oldest of our combat fleet of F-16s, the Block 25s are highly capable and the Minnesota Air National Guard has answered the call with honor and distinction. Accordingly, the Air Force will continue to upgrade the assigned aircraft of 148th Fighter Wing as an integral part of the comprehensive force structure plan. The 148 FW is currently not programmed to transition to Block 50/52 F-16 due to the availability and distribution of these aircraft. The 148 FW is currently programmed to transition to Block 40 F-16s in FY13, though this plan is reviewed annually and could feasibly change. We will look for every opportunity to equip the 148 FW with the best aircraft available in a manner that optimizes the combat capability across the US Air Force.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY DR. GINGREY

Dr. GINGREY. Secretary Wynne, some have implied that because F-22As have not flown in OIF or OEF they are not all that useful, and so we should stop buying them. I understand that ICBMs haven't been used in OIF or OEF either. Nor have the Navy's Ballistic Missile Subs been used in OIF or OEF. Mr. Secretary, have you heard anyone in the Department suggest we should eliminate funding for ICBMs or Navy subs or any other programs simply because they haven't been used in OIF or OEF?

Secretary WYNNE. To your question, no. As to the F-22, it has not been deployed to OIF/OEF because it has not been requested by COCOM commanders for operations in Iraq or Afghanistan. The F-22's mission is to gain air dominance and, due to Air Force operations over the skies of Iraq for the last 18 years, Air Dominance has been achieved allowing the joint forces to operate freely.

Dr. GINGREY. Both of you stated at the Air Force Posture Hearing that you were pleased that an F-22 supplemental request would keep the F-22 line open upon completion of the current multi-year contract. The Lockheed/Boeing/Pratt production line is jointly building about 2 F-22As every month. That means that line shutdown, which IS going to commence this fall under the current scenario, would be staved off for 2 months. Further, even if we build 4 additional Raptors, by the time we get through another budget cycle, that line—and its long lead suppliers—could be without activity for nearly a year, with no assurance future orders will be placed. The math simply DOES NOT add up—both of you stated that the Air Force requirement for F-22s is 381. Four additional Raptors in a supplemental request, which will increase the size of the Air Force's fleet to 187, is a long way from 381. How exactly does a supplemental request of 4 Raptors hedge against the possibility that we will need more F-22s in the future? And does it provide the necessary assurances to long-lead suppliers to continue with their end of the bargain?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. The four F-22s added in the FY09 supplemental are to replace legacy fighter losses and do not significantly extend production line activities, as production line shutdown will still begin in early FY09. These aircraft are to be added to the end of the current production line at the same rate of delivery, thereby only keeping the production line open an additional 2-3 months. This additional limited production run will have minimal impact on supplier confidence. Without indications for future F-22 work, the long-lead suppliers will produce the parts for the 4 aircraft following approval of the supplemental request and subsequent contract award. Once deliveries are complete, F-22 activities will cease without additional orders.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MRS. BOYDA

Mrs. BOYDA. Secretary Wynne, in light of the Chairman's question regarding force levels, the "In Lieu Of" mission becomes even more important. Would the increase in personnel referenced on your Unfunded Priorities List be as great if the Air Force did not have to perform "In Lieu Of" missions?

Secretary WYNNE. Yes, requirements on our unfunded priorities list would remain the same even if Air Force participation in "In Lieu Of" (ILO) missions decreased. The requested growth is associated with new and/or emerging missions and is not

targeted towards easing stress on Air Force functions performing In-Lieu-Of missions. Instead, growth is focused on operating, maintaining, and supporting an 86 Combat Wing envisioned in the last QDR.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. LAMBORN

Mr. LAMBORN. The USAF has invested funding in incremental improvements to the ACES ejection seat, the common ejection seat on almost all Air Force combat aircraft. Can you describe the safety benefits and any other additional advantages of an enhanced ACES 5 ejection seat? Are there cost savings associated with using a modular improved ejection seat in the F-35 and in retrofitting the B-2 and F-22 aircraft? I understand that the FY11 POM includes funding to retrofit the ACES modular ejection seat into the B-2, however, there is no current money programmed to qualify and test the seat. Would the USAF support additional funds to qualify and test the seat this year? In 1997 the Department of Commerce issued a study titled "National Security Assessment of the Emergency Aircraft Ejection Seat Sector" which warned about the impact of forfeiting this critical technology to foreign concerns. Does the USAF have concerns about the lack of a future domestic industrial base for ejection seat capability?

Secretary WYNNE and General MOSELEY. Part 1—If funds were made available for the ACES Modular Seat development program, the Air Force could execute \$10.0M to complete qualification and testing of the ACES Modular Seat configuration for the B-2. Completion of this ACES Modular Seat qualification and testing requires research, development, test, and evaluation (RDT&E) funds.

Part 2—The Air Force is concerned, in general, with industrial base issues. As a result, an Air Force Industrial Base Council (AFIBC) has recently been established to address industrial base issues. The AFIBC is intended to provide greater corporate visibility into the industrial base, as it has become increasingly difficult to identify and understand the risks imparted by a rapidly evolving industrial base. The Air Force, through the AFIBC, has initiated an assessment of the ejection seat industrial base—this effort is on-going. The results of this assessment will ultimately be presented to and evaluated by an Executive Level Steering Group; which will subsequently make recommendations to the AFIBC on any potential courses of action.

