MILITARY CONSTRUCTION, VETERANS AFFAIRS, AND RELATED AGENCIES APPROPRIATIONS FOR 2012

THURSDAY, APRIL 7, 2011.

AIR FORCE

WITNESSES

GENERAL NORTON A. SCHWARTZ, CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE
MAJOR GENERAL TIMOTHY A. BYERS, THE CIVIL ENGINEER, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

CULBERSON OPENING STATEMENT

Mr. CULBERSON. The Appropriation Subcommittee on Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies will come to order, and we want to welcome everybody to today's hearing on the fiscal year 2012 request for military construction and family housing for the United States Air Force. And we have a number of issues to cover today, but before we begin I would like to recognize our distinguished ranking member from Georgia, Mr. Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. It has been a busy week for the subcommittee, so I will be brief. General Schwartz, thank you for your service to our country and for being here today. Like all of the services that have already come before us, we know that your fiscal year 2011 program is up in the air and we need to finish the fiscal year 2011 budget as soon as possible to make sure you can execute the fiscal year 2011 program.

General, please know that I am very concerned about what effect the delay in the fiscal year 2011 funding is having on your construction programs and I am committed to getting the CR passed as soon as possible.

Moving on to 2012, I was pleased to see that the Air Force request makes strong investments in training and quality of life initiatives for airmen and their families. I have also some questions though regarding Guam. You see, sometimes it seems we hear more about the relocation of Marines to Guam and overlook the fact the Air Force is already there.

Finally, I would like to hear your thoughts on Strategic Command. As you know, we are making significant investment in Offutt, and I want to make sure that this project does not constitute a waste of taxpayers dollars. As I have said to the other services, our subcommittee wants to be helpful to all of your needs, and we thank you for being here and look forward to your testimony.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Bishop. I would like to now formally recognize and welcome to the committee General Norton Schwartz, who is the Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force. We are delighted to have you with us, General. You are making your third appearance I see before the subcommittee, and have been Chief of Staff of the Air Force since August 2008, Sir, and we thank you for your service to the country, thirty-six years of service. After graduating the Air Force Academy in 1973, I see here, Sir, that you previously served as Commander of U.S. Transportation Command and have had commands and assignments including Director of the Joint Staff, Commander of the 11th Air Force, the Deputy Commander in Chief of Special Operations Command, and Commander of the 16th Operations Wing, and have served as a command pilot with more than 4,400 hours of flight time in C–130s, MH–53s and MH–60s and served as well in Desert Shield and Desert Storm.

I also want to note that seated at the table with General Schwartz is Major General Timothy Byers, the Air Force Civil Engineer. We thank you both for joining us, but above all thank you for your service to our Nation. We look forward to your testimony and of course, General, your written statement will be entered into the record without objection, and we look forward to hearing you summarize your testimony this morning, sir.

Thank you.

GENERAL SCHWARTZ OPENING STATEMENT

General SCHWARTZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman Bishop, and members of the Committee. Thanks for your support of our Airmen and their families. It is my distinct privilege, along with Tim Byers, to represent them here today before you. Our Airmen continue to inspire us with their dedication and service, quietly and proudly serving alongside their joint and interagency teammates.

The President's budget request for fiscal year 2012 includes $2 billion for military construction, military family housing, and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC).

In the course of building this request, we applied asset management principles to fund our sustainment priorities, keeping our facilities well maintained, and ensuring maximum efficiency without compromising effectiveness of our installations or operations. The $1.4 billion for military construction constitutes the largest portion of this request. In fully appreciating the ongoing and extraordinary budget pressures, we will ensure that new construction is aligned with weapon system deliveries, strategic basing initiatives, and the top operational priorities of Air Force and the Combatant Commanders.

AIR SPACE

With more than 36,000 Airmen deployed around the world, including nearly 2,900 civil engineers, your Air Force remains a trusted and reliable Joint partner, providing vital air space and cyber capabilities that are respected by friends and potential foes

around the world. Also in direct support of combatant commander requirements are 57,000 total force Airmen (Active, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve) who are presently garrisoned overseas, as well as over 200,000 Airmen who from their stateside bases directly contribute to global missions.

Therefore, this budget request invests $373 million in improvement and new construction projects from Nevada to Nebraska to Guam—that enable direct Air Force contributions to today's fight. And because Airmen act every day on behalf of the American people, stewards of the Nation's trust and defender of her security, caring for our Airmen and their families remains a top service priority.

QUALITY OF LIFE

In our ongoing efforts to provide quality of life for them, nearly $500 million will be used to support housing privatization in the United States and sustain and maintain our housing overseas. Included in this request is $85 million to improve nearly 1,400 homes in Japan and in the United Kingdom and an additional $405 million to fund operations, maintenance, utilities, leases, and to provide oversight of privatized units for the family housing program.

For our unaccompanied Airmen we request $190 million, sir, to invest in seven dormitory projects, keeping us on track to meet our goal of eliminating inadequate housing for unaccompanied Airmen by 2017. We are also supporting our Joint base partners in Alaska, in Texas and Virginia with construction of 3 dormitories worth $193 million.

And, for the children of our service men and women, we continue to work toward consistent standards of care at installations around the world—from bases and major metropolitan areas to those in more remote locations and those overseas. The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act allowed us to allocate $80 million to eight new child development centers. This year, we have only one requirement for a child development center, and that is at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico—an $11 million project that will move our Airmen's children out of substandard, temporary facilities.

LEGACY BRAC ACTIONS

Finally, we request more than $126 million to continue completing our legacy BRAC actions at our 28 former bases and to perform program management, environmental restoration, and property disposal at the locations that were in fact closed in BRAC 2005. We are on track to fully implement all of the BRAC 2005 recommendations by the mandated September 2011 deadline.

Mr. Chairman and committee members, our fiscal year 2012 budget request balances, in my view, warfighter requirements, recapitalization efforts, new mission beddowns, and quality of life requirements, and it remains aligned with our most fundamental priorities. Your Air Force remains committed to providing Global Vigilance, Reach, and Power for America's requirements today and for her challenges tomorrow.

We thank you for your continued efforts on behalf of the United States Air Force for our Airmen and certainly for their families. I look forward to your questions, sir. Thank you.

[The information follows:]

United States Air Force

Presentation

Before the House Appropriations Committee, Subcommittee on Military Construction and Veterans Affairs

Air Force Fiscal Year 2012 Military Construction, Housing, and BRAC Programs

Witness Statement of
General Norton A. Schwartz
Chief of Staff, United States Air Force

April 7, 2011

BIOGRAPHY

UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

GENERAL NORTON A. SCHWARTZ

Gen. Norton A. Schwartz is Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C. As Chief, he serves as the senior uniformed Air Force officer responsible for the organization, training and equipping of 680,000 active-duty, Guard, Reserve and civilian forces serving in the United States and overseas. As a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, the general and other service chiefs function as military advisers to the Secretary of Defense, National Security Council and the President.

General Schwartz graduated from the U.S. Air Force Academy in 1973. He is an alumnus of the National War College, a member of the Council on Foreign Relations, and a 1994 Fellow of Massachusetts Institute of Technology's Seminar XXI. He has served as Commander of the Special Operations Command-Pacific, as well as Alaskan Command, Alaskan North American Aerospace Defense Command Region, and the 11th Air Force. Prior to assuming his current position, General Schwartz was Commander, U.S. Transportation Command and served as the single manager for global air, land and sea transportation for the Department of Defense.

General Schwartz is a command pilot with more than 4,400 flying hours in a variety of aircraft. He participated as a crewmember in the 1975 airlift evacuation of Saigon, and in 1991 served as Chief of Staff of the Joint Special Operations Task Force for Northern Iraq in operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. In 1997, he led the Joint Task Force that prepared for the noncombatant evacuation of U.S. citizens in Cambodia.

EDUCATION

1973 Bachelor's degree in political science and international affairs, U.S. Air Force Academy, Colorado Springs, Colo.
1977 Squadron Officer School, Maxwell AFB, Ala.
1983 Master's degree in business administration, Central Michigan University, Mount Pleasant
1984 Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.
1989 National War College, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C.
1994 Fellow, Seminar XXI, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge

ASSIGNMENTS
1. August 1973 - September 1974, student, undergraduate pilot training, Laughlin AFB, Texas
2. October 1974 - January 1975, student, C-130 initial qualification training, Little Rock AFB, Ark.
3. February 1975 - October 1977, C-130E aircraft commander, 776th and 21st tactical airlift squadrons, Clark Air Base, Philippines
4. October 1977 - December 1977, student, Squadron Officer School, Maxwell AFB, Ala.
5. December 1977 - October 1979, C-130E/H flight examiner, 61st Tactical Airlift Squadron, Little Rock AFB, Ark.
6. October 1979 - November 1980, intern, Air Staff Training Program, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, Operations and Readiness, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.
7. November 1980 - July 1983, MC-130E flight examiner, 8th Special Operations Squadron, Hurlburt Field, Fla.
8. July 1983 - January 1984, student, Armed Forces Staff College, Norfolk, Va.
9. January 1984 - April 1986, action officer, Directorate of Plans, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.
10. May 1986 - June 1988, Commander, 36th Tactical Airlift Squadron, McChord AFB, Wash.
11. August 1988 - June 1989, student, National War College, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C.
12. July 1989 - July 1991, Director of Plans and Policy, Special Operations Command Europe, Patch Barracks, Stuttgart-Vaihingen, Germany
13. August 1991 - May 1993, Deputy Commander for Operations and Commander, 1st Special Operations Group, Hurlburt Field, Fla.
14. May 1993 - May 1995, Deputy Director of Operations, later, Deputy Director of Forces, Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Operations, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.
15. June 1995 - May 1997, Commander, 16th Special Operations Wing, Hurlburt Field, Fla.
16. June 1997 - October 1998, Commander, Special Operations Command, Pacific, Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii
17. October 1998 - January 2000, Director of Strategic Planning, Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans and Programs, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.
18. January 2000 - September 2000, Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command, MacDill AFB, Fla.
19. September 2000 - October 2002, Commander, Alaskan Command, Alaskan North American Aerospace Defense Command Region and 11th Air Force, Elmendorf AFB, Alaska
20. October 2002 - October 2004, Director for Operations, the Joint Staff, Washington, D.C.
21. October 2004 - August 2005, Director, the Joint Staff, Washington, D. C.
22. September 2005 - August 2008, Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, Scott AFB, Ill.
23. August 2008 - present, Chief of Staff, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.

SUMMARY OF JOINT ASSIGNMENTS
1. July 1989 - July 1991, Director of Plans and Policy, Special Operations Command Europe, Patch Barracks, Stuttgart-Vaihingen, Germany, as a colonel
2. June 1997 - October 1998, Commander, Special Operations Command, Pacific, Camp H.M. Smith, Hawaii, as a brigadier general
3. January 2000 - September 2000, Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command, MacDill AFB, Fla., as a lieutenant general
4. September 2000 - October 2002, Commander, Alaskan Command, Alaskan North American Aerospace Defense Command Region and 11th Air Force, Elmendorf AFB, Alaska, as a lieutenant general
5. October 2002 - October 2004, Director for Operations, the Joint Staff, Washington, D.C., as a lieutenant general
6. October 2004 - August 2005, Director, the Joint Staff, Washington, D. C., as a lieutenant general
7. September 2005 - August 2008, Commander, U.S. Transportation Command, Scott AFB, Ill., as a general

FLIGHT INFORMATION
Rating: Command pilot
Flight hours: More than 4,400

Aircraft flown: C-130E/H, MC-130E/H/P, HC-130, AC-130H/U, YMC-130, MH-53 and MH-60

MAJOR AWARDS AND DECORATIONS
Defense Distinguished Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters
Distinguished Service Medal
Defense Superior Service Medal with oak leaf cluster
Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters
Defense Meritorious Service Medal
Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters
Air Force Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster
Army Commendation Medal

EFFECTIVE DATES OF PROMOTION
Second Lieutenant June 6, 1973
First Lieutenant June 6, 1975
Captain June 6, 1977
Major Nov. 1, 1982
Lieutenant Colonel March 1, 1985
Colonel Feb. 1, 1991
Brigadier General Jan. 1, 1996
Major General March 4, 1999
Lieutenant General Jan. 18, 2000
General Oct. 1, 2005

(Current as of August 2009)

Introduction

The United States faces diverse and complex security challenges that require us to respond with a range of agile and flexible capabilities. From the ongoing conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, to potential confrontation with aggressive state and non-state actors, to providing humanitarian assistance around the world, the United States Air Force continues to provide capabilities across the range of potential military operations. As part of this effort, we must ensure that we have appropriately-sized and efficient infrastructure that enables our Total Force Airmen—our most valuable resource—to perform their duties and maximize Air Force contributions to the Joint team, while ensuring responsible stewardship of materiel and financial resources. We therefore structured our resource choices by balancing them across the near- and long-term.

Over the last year, the Air Force has striven to deliver trademark effectiveness in the most efficient way possible. We are focused on five priorities, which serve as a framework for this testimony: (1) continue to strengthen the nuclear enterprise; (2) partner with the Joint and Coalition team to win today's fight; (3) develop and care for our Airmen and their families; (4) modernize our air, space, and cyber inventories, organizations, and training; and (5) recapture acquisition excellence.

Overview

Our Fiscal Year 2012 President's Budget Request contains $2 billion for military construction, military family housing, and Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). The $1.4 billion military construction request represents an increase of $97 million over Fiscal Year 2011, allowing us to invest responsibly in the top priorities of the Air Force and our combatant commanders, as we continue to contend with budgetary pressures. This request also ensures that new construction is aligned with weapon system deliveries and strategic basing initiatives. In addition, we continue our efforts to provide quality housing for Airmen and their families by dedicating nearly $500 million to sustaining and modernizing overseas housing, and supporting housing privatization in the United States. Our unaccompanied Airmen remain a top priority; correspondingly, we request $190 million to invest in dormitories, keeping us on track to meet our goal of eliminating inadequate housing for unaccompanied Airmen by 2017. Finally, we

also request $126 million to continue completing our legacy BRAC programs and environmental clean-up.

In the course of building the Fiscal Year 2012 budget request, we applied asset management principles to ensure maximum efficiency in today's fiscally constrained environment, without compromising the effectiveness of our installations, as they are the platforms from which we fly and fight. This was accomplished through the judicious funding of our sustainment priorities—for example, spending money in the right place at the right time to keep our facilities well maintained—and using military construction to recapitalize existing facilities first, as a preferred alternative to growing our footprint.

Continue to Strengthen the Nuclear Enterprise

Since its inception, the Air Force has served as a proud and disciplined steward of a large portion of the Nation's nuclear arsenal. We steadfastly secure and sustain these nuclear weapons to deter potential adversaries and to assure our partners that we are a reliable force, providing global stability. Continuing to strengthen excellence, precision, reliability, accountability, compliance, and stewardship within the nuclear enterprise remains the Air Force's number one priority. While we have made progress in this area, we will take additional necessary and appropriate steps in the Fiscal Year 2012 budget request to continue to strengthen and improve this core function.

Air Force Global Strike Command achieved full operational capability on September 30, 2010, completing the move of all Air Force nuclear-capable bombers and Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles under one major command. In addition to ensuring that our organizations and human resource plans support this mission, we are also concentrating on the infrastructure and facilities that are crucial to our success. Air Force civil engineers have conducted enterprise-wide facility assessments, and subsequently have concluded that a significant portion of the existing infrastructure will require modernization or complete replacement in the years ahead. Our Fiscal Year 2012 budget request begins to address these issues with $75.6 million in military construction for the nuclear enterprise, including a B-52 maintenance dock at Minot AFB, North Dakota, and an addition to the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center at Kirtland AFB, New Mexico. These and similar projects in the years to come will ensure maximum effectiveness for one of the Air Force's most important missions.

Partner with the Joint and Coalition Team to Win Today's Fight

Our Air Force continues to project air, space, and cyber power to great effect in our conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq, with Airmen making incredible contributions every day. We currently have more than 36,000 Airmen deployed, including nearly 2,900 Air Force civil engineers. Nearly half of these engineers are filling Joint Expeditionary Taskings, serving shoulder-to-shoulder with our Army, Marine, Navy, and Coast Guard teammates. Due to their wide array of skills, our Air Force Rapid Engineer Deployable Heavy Operational and Repair Squadron Engineers (RED HORSE) and our Prime Base Engineer Emergency Force (Prime BEEF) personnel are in high demand in several theaters of operation.

In addition to funding programs that support our Airmen, our Fiscal Year 2012 budget request invests $366 million in projects that directly contribute to today's fight. Examples include:

- *Projects supporting our combatant commanders that will greatly enhance ongoing operations.* These include the recapitalization of Headquarters, United States Strategic Command at Offutt AFB, Nebraska, and a new air freight terminal complex at Andersen AFB, Guam.
- *New facilities for operations and mission support.* A new air support operations facility at Fort Riley, Kansas, will further our efforts to support Joint Terminal Attack Control specialists as they partner with ground forces to integrate air and surface power in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere. Additionally, we are strengthening communications capabilities of combatant commanders, with a SATCOM relay in Naval Air Station Sigonella, Italy, and a communications and network control center at Nellis AFB, Nevada.
- *Improvements at Andersen AFB, Guam.* Three projects continue to support the "Guam Strike" initiative, consolidating operational capability for fighter and bomber operations at the base.

Develop and Care for Airmen and Their Families

The all-volunteer force provides the foundation for our flexibility and agility. Our Fiscal Year 2012 budget request reflects a commitment to providing first-class housing, while focusing

on training and education, and striving to improve the overall quality of life for our Airmen and their families.

The finest Airmen in the world deserve suitable facilities, and our Fiscal Year 2012 budget request supports that goal. We aim to build upon the foundation that was laid during the Year of the Air Force family, and utilize new data such as our 2010 Dormitory Master Plan, to ensure that we allocate taxpayer dollars effectively to our most pressing requirements.

Billeting

With the fourth phase of the Blatchford-Preston Complex at Al Udeid AB, Qatar, we continue our efforts to provide quality housing for our Airmen deployed to the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility. This $37 million project will build two dormitories, raising the billeting capacity there to 3,332 rooms.

Dormitories

Housing for our unaccompanied Airmen remains a top priority, and our Dormitory Master Plan provides valuable insight into how to maximize the return from our investment. Our Fiscal Year 2012 budget request includes seven dormitory projects totaling $190 million. These include dorms at Travis AFB, California; Osan AB, Korea; Eielson AFB, Alaska; Minot AFB, North Dakota; Ramstein AB, Germany; Thule AB, Greenland; and Cannon AFB, New Mexico. This investment keeps us on track to meet our 2017 goal of providing adequate housing for all unaccompanied Airmen. We are also supporting our partners at Joint Base Elmendorf, Alaska; Joint Base San Antonio, Texas; and Joint Base Langley-Eustis, Virginia, with the construction of three dormitories worth $193 million. These projects represent the last of the joint base military construction funds that were transferred to the Air Force.

Training and Education

The most professional junior enlisted Airmen in the world develop into the world's best non-commissioned officers because of the investments that we make in their education, starting from the day that they enlist. We have two projects in this year's program, totaling $78 million: (1) the fourth phase of the Basic Military Training Complex at Lackland AFB, Texas, and (2) an education center at Vandenberg AFB, California.

Military Family Housing

With continued investment to develop thriving housing communities, we maintain our commitment to caring for our Air Force family. Our Fiscal Year 2012 budget request for

military family housing is nearly $500 million. Included in this request is $85 million to improve nearly 1,400 homes in Japan and the United Kingdom, and an additional $405 million to fund operations, maintenance, utilities, and leases, and to provide oversight of privatized units for the family housing program.

Central to the success of our housing initiatives is housing privatization that leverages $423 million into $6.5 billion in private sector financing. At the start of Fiscal Year 2012, we will have 47,700 privatized units, increasing to 52,500 by January 2012, when 100 percent of our family housing in the United States will be privatized.

Child Development Centers

The final component of caring for Airmen and their families is ensuring that the children of our service men and women receive consistent standard of care at installations around the world, from bases in major metropolitan areas, to those in remote locations, to those overseas. The American Recovery and Restoration Act allowed us to allocate $80 million for eight new child development centers, to help ensure that our force has adequate child care capacity. This year, we have only one requirement for a child development center, at Holloman AFB, New Mexico. This $11 million project will get our Airmen's children out of substandard temporary facilities.

Modernize our Air, Space, and Cyberspace Inventories, Organizations, and Training

Modernizing our force to prepare for a wide range of future contingencies requires a significant investment. For Fiscal Year 2012, a key focus area is enabling the beddown of several new weapon systems. Therefore, we are requesting $233 million for a variety of military construction projects, including:

- *Five projects to bed down our newest fighter, the F-35.* This includes the F-35 development, test, and evaluation mission at Nellis AFB, Nevada; the second training location at Luke AFB, Arizona; and the first operational unit at Hill AFB, Utah.
- *Three projects supporting our HC/EC/C-130J fleet.* These projects include a joint use fuel cell at Davis-Monthan AFB, Arizona, and flight simulators at Davis-Monthan and Pope Field, North Carolina.

- *Three projects supporting the Pacific Regional Training Center at Andersen AFB, Guam.* This requirement was driven by the re-location of the 554th RED HORSE from Korea to Guam in 2007, along with an increased need for expeditionary training in the Pacific.
- *Other projects.* These will support diverse mission areas, including C-5 training, F-22 support, the F-16 beddown at Holloman AFB, New Mexico, as well as support activities at Barksdale AFB, Louisiana; Fairchild AFB, Washington; the United States Air Force Academy, Colorado; and Cannon AFB, New Mexico.

Recapture Acquisition Excellence

The Air Force continues its efforts to optimize the effective use of taxpayer resources in the acquisition of goods and services. By focusing on asset management principles, we are building a culture that supports the warfighter by delivering the right products and services on time, within budget, and in compliance with all applicable laws, policies, and regulations. Where possible, we seek strategic sourcing opportunities to maximize the use of available dollars, pursuing ways to leverage our size as we purchase common commodities and services to be used across our extended enterprise. Our engineering and contracting communities continue to partner on efforts to transform the processes that support Air Force installation-related acquisition.

Other Programs of Note

Base Realignment and Closure Actions

Completing Air Force BRAC actions remains a priority for the Air Force and Department of Defense. The Fiscal Year 2012 budget request includes $123.5 million for legacy BRAC actions at our 28 remaining former bases, and $1.97 million to perform program management, environmental restoration, and property disposal at locations that were closed in BRAC 2005. The Air Force is on track to fully implement all BRAC 2005 recommendations by the mandated September 2011 deadline.

Joint Basing

The Air Force remains committed to maximizing installation efficiency and warfighting capability, while saving taxpayer resources. The Air Force has equity in 10 of the 12 joint bases, and is the lead Service for 6 of the 12. All 12 bases achieved full operating capability on

October 1, 2010. We anticipate that the derived benefits from consolidation will yield efficiencies and cost savings.

Energy

The Air Force energy vision is to reduce demand through conservation and efficiency, increase supply through alternative energy sources, and create a culture where all Airmen make energy a consideration in everything that they do. In pursuit of this vision, the Air Force continues as a Federal energy-conscious leader by advancing energy awareness. Key components of the Air Force strategy include coordinating efforts that aim to minimize energy costs, leveraging proven technology in conservation measures and renewable energy development, while matching reliability of the national electric grid system and resilience of Air Force critical mission assets. These efforts effectively reduce dependence on commercial supply and delivery systems, and enhance energy security for the Air Force. The Air Force is committed to reducing its greenhouse gas emissions and carbon footprint by reducing its consumption of fossil fuels, both directly by vehicles and facilities, and indirectly through fossil fuel–generated electricity from the national electric grids. In Fiscal Year 2012, we will continue our energy conservation efforts, which have already reduced facility energy use nearly 15 percent from 2003 levels. In Fiscal Year 2010, we exceeded our goals and produced or procured nearly 7 percent of our total facility energy from renewable sources, and we continued to lead the Department of Defense as the number one purchaser of renewable energy for the fifth year in a row.

Conclusion

The Air Force remains a trusted and reliable Joint partner. We are "all in" to provide air, space, and cyber capabilities to our combatant commanders as they face myriad short- and long-term security challenges in their areas of responsibility. Nearly two-thirds of the men and women serving in our Air Force today, from installations all over the world, are actively supporting combatant commanders in their missions across the full spectrum of military operations.

Our Fiscal Year 2012 budget request balances warfighter requirements, recapitalization efforts, new mission beddowns, and quality of life requirements. It remains aligned with the fundamental priorities of our Air Force: (1) continue to strengthen the nuclear enterprise; (2) partner with the Joint and Coalition team to win today's fight; (3) develop and care for our

Airmen and their families; (4) modernize our air, space, and cyber inventories, organizations, and training; and (5) recapture acquisition excellence. In addition to being committed to providing and maintaining effective infrastructure—efficiently and appropriately sized to support our missions and priorities—we are also committed to ensuring that we continue to care for our Total Force Airmen and their families. This includes making good on our promise to provide attractive dormitories and housing, with a focused determination to eliminate inadequate housing for all by 2017.

Finally, we remain committed to ensuring the judicious and responsible use of taxpayer resources with every decision we make. In so doing, we remain focused on efficiencies that allow our trademark delivery of effective air, space, and cyber power, while ensuring maximum utility from every dollar spent.

QUALITY OF SCHOOLS

Mr. CULBERSON. General, thank you very much for your testimony, and there are a number of areas I want to ask you about, but one that is particularly near and dear to my heart that I want to ask you about is the quality of the schools provided to our families on bases around the country and around the world. Again, I am new to the position, but I discovered very rapidly it is pretty spotty. I mean, it depends on where you are assigned, what base you get sent to. If you are on a base in a part of the country with great neighborhood schools, you are in good shape, you have got a Department of Defense (DOD) school on base.

Could you talk to me about any concerns you have, sir, are there any bases in particular around the country that we need to be paying attention to, trying to help those servicemen and women make sure that their kids have got good schools? I am particularly interested in the ability for base commanders to create charter schools in order to give families a choice between either a DOD school, a neighborhood school operated or run by the State, or a charter school on base.

General SCHWARTZ. Mr. Chairman, there are three tiers to this question. One is that there is in fact only one Domestic Dependent Elementary and Secondary School (DDESS) operated school in the continental United States on an AirForce installation, and that is at Maxwell Air Force Base in Alabama, and that school goes back to 1963 when it was established.

The remaining schools, which are about 150 schools on some 28 installations around the United States, are community schools that happen to reside on the Air Force bases. We think that is a very important thing. It is a major factor in our ability to have thriving communities on our installations. Parents like having schools on the installation. There is greater participation by parents in those schools, which is important to educational outcomes. That is one aspect.

Mr. CULBERSON. Excuse me, sir, for interrupting but when you say community schools——

General SCHWARTZ. They are run by the local school districts, but they reside on the military installation.

Mr. CULBERSON. You say about 150 of those around the country.

General SCHWARTZ. Correct.

Mr. CULBERSON. All right, Sir.

CHARTER SCHOOL INITIATIVE

General SCHWARTZ. The next tier is the charter school initiative. We have two charter schools currently up and running, one at Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in Arizona and the other one at Vandenberg Air Force Base in California. There are two more that are standing up, one at Little Rock Air Force Base in Arkansas and now also at Joint Base Andrews just nearby in Maryland, and those are additional efforts again for us to assure that we have quality education for our military children and another avenue to work. And so there are four at the moment, and two of which are currently operating, the other two will be full up in the not too distant future, and we will see how this unfolds as we go forward. We

certainly favor charter schools where we can make the arrangements, and so on, with the supervising school districts.

Mr. CULBERSON. Are these——

DEFINITION OF CHARTER SCHOOLS

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, could I get your definition and could I get their definition of charter school because it is different in each one of the States. Some are public chartered of the public school district, some are private chartered, some are for-profit. So can I get a definition of what we are talking about so I understand the answer better?

Mr. CULBERSON. Sure. Actually, General, Ms. McCollum brings up a good point and that is that there are a lot of differences between charter schools, depending on who is operating them and we would like to know. These that you mentioned, who runs them and how are they set up and who funds them, where are they located?

General SCHWARTZ. With your permission, we will be happy to provide the actual agency that operates the schools. We have that data, I don't have that off the top of my head. I would be happy to provide that for the record.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. And Mr. Chair, General, if you please, within these charter schools I know in the public schools which collocate on bases you go with the standards in evidence that the State has selected.

General SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Because there is no Federal right now high bar that everybody achieves. Could you also let us know at these charters, I am assuming that you are following the State guidelines for Leave No Child Left Behind, but if you could include that, too, that would be helpful. Thank you.

General SCHWARTZ. Yes, ma'am, we will be happy to do that, and you are correct.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

[The information follows:]

SCHOOLS ON AIR FORCE INSTALLATIONS

The charter school on Joint Base Andrews, MD will be operated by Imagine Schools charter management organization. For school year 2011/12, it will serve grades K–4 with a new grade added each year through the 8th grade. There will be 12 classrooms for the first year with 24 classrooms in the permanent facility, and 260 students projected at full capacity. In Maryland, charter schools are operated by the local district. In this case, Prince George's County provides funding.

The charter school on Little Rock Air Force Base, AR will be operated by Lighthouse Academies, Inc., a charter school management organization. The school will serve grades 5 through 8. Current pre-enrollment stands at 160 students with capacity for 175 students. The initiative was started bya group of Jacksonville, Arkansas community leaders interested in offering expanded, more responsive educational opportunities for local community and Little Rock Air Force Base families of middle school students. Lighthouse Academies, Inc. maintains a focus on an arts-infused curriculum. The school is funded by a state per pupil allotment. Donations from the Hunt Family Foundation and Pinnacle Foundation (privatized housing corporations) were received for renovation of the school facility which was previously the base conference center.

The charter school on Davis-Monthan Air Force Base, AZ is operated by Daisy Education Corporation, Tucson, AZ, and managed by Sonoran Science Academy. The charter was signed by the State Board of Education, and the base wing commander signed a property lease to the Daisy Education Corporation. Currently the school operates grades 6–9 but plans to expand to include grades 10–12. The school serv-

ices 159 students. The educational focus is a college preparation curriculum with a liberal arts foundation that includes an emphasis on science and math. The school facility was formerly operated by the Tucson Unified School District and the charter school company is responsible for all upgrades, remodels, and maintenance of the school.

The charter school on Vandenberg Air Force Base, CA is operated by the Manzanita Education Alliance Board which consists of community members and parents of students Manzanita Charter School is a public school for students in grades K–6 with a current enrollment of 370 students and an emphasis on early literacy, Spanish immersion and gifted and talented students. It is publicly funded by the state and the federal government. The Manzanita Charter School facility was formerly a Lompoc Unified School District elementary school, and the school buildings are leased from the Lompoc Unified School District.

Mr. CULBERSON. Certainly. It is a good point. I will ask each one the services to provide it to us. Again being new to this, I was astonished to discover how difficult it was for some; for example, Fort Bliss is the one who brought it to my attention. The El Paso school districts made improvements but they have really have problems. And I have had complaints from servicemen and women who were assigned to Fort Bliss and they had to choose between going to the Secora School District, El Paso. There just are not a lot of choices. And education has sort of been near and dear to my heart when I was in the State legislature. I care a lot about it and it is so vital.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, if I could.

Mr. CULBERSON. Sure.

IMPACT AID

Ms. MCCOLLUM. And it has been a long time since I was in grade school, but my sister was born when we were at Wright-Patterson, my brother was born when we were at Wichita Falls. So I got bounced around, sometimes a couple different schools in a year. So I get this and as a former student I really appreciate your interest in this. But we should also find out what is going on with impact aid, because part of the reason why a lot of these school districts struggle and can't give the excellence in education and can't give the extra support, whether it is counseling, transportation to the bases, is because we have fallen so far behind in our impact aid support for our military children. So this means a lot to me personally to hear you talk about this.

Mr. CULBERSON. Me, too. It really matters. And if there was some other way to get at it too, the charter schools is just one of many options.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Oh, yeah.

Mr. CULBERSON. Betty, I look forward to working with you on this.

Mr. Bishop, why don't we just send a letter to each of the branches and ask for an inventory and let us know where the charters are currently operated, what any restrictions prevent you from opening charters and the standards that Ms. McCollum refers to, are they following State curriculum guidelines, testing standards, how are they funded, where are they set up. I would really like all of us to know as much as possible about the lay of the land currently and why, for example are there only—in the beginning, General, you said, I thought, one at Maxwell and then you said there are four others. There are two that are open now, Davis-Monthan air Force Base and Vandenberg Air Force Base, and two others

about to open at Little Rock Air Force Base and Joint Base Andrews.

What is the difference between the one at Maxwell and these other four?

General SCHWARTZ. The school at Maxwell Air Force Base is not a charter school. That is a DDESS school.

Mr. CULBERSON. Oh, excuse me, operated by the local school district, gotcha.

General SCHWARTZ. Actually that is a DOD school.

Mr. CULBERSON. Is the DOD school, okay.

General SCHWARTZ. There is only one on a stateside air Force installation. There are actually 50 or so outside the United States, not surprisingly. But it is the one Air Force DOD school in the Conus. And it goes back to 1963 when it was originally established.

Mr. CULBERSON. Betty, it may be worthwhile for us actually to have a whole set once we get through the initial slug of our hearings, Mr. Bishop, if it is okay with you once we kind of catch our breath to have a separate hearing just on what kind of education units are we offering our families.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I think that is great. I think we should also. I know that this is something, and I say this with great gentleness to the other side of the family—I am not going say the other side of the aisle—the other side of the family here.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is kind of nice.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. When it comes to having standards, because when you are a military brat and you shuffle around from not only school district to school district, but State to State, and everybody has a different set of standards, you are ahead in reading, then you are behind in math. You are here in science and somebody else is in science. And I tell you, it is another barrier for learning, but it is also another opportunity, I would say, because you learn how to eat lunch in the lunchroom alone.

INTERSTATE COMPACT

General SCHWARTZ. I would just mention, Ma'am, if I may, Mr. Chairman, that one of the initiatives that has come underway, it is known as the Interstate Compact and it was championed beyond by the Military Childhood Education Coalition, This includes agreements by the States to acknowledge and recognize the credentials offered by other States. So for example, if someone moved from Texas to Virginia that if a child took State history in Texas he or she would not have to take State history again in Virginia, and that the credentials, the course work, etc. that met the standards in Texas would be looked on favorably for acceptance in Virginia. That sort of reciprocity from State to State, given that we have a very mobile population, is quite important.

Mr. CULBERSON. Sure. It is the one area, Ms. McCollum, that you would actually get me as a really serious 10th amendment Jeffersonian to actually say there is a need for uniform standards for reciprocity around the country. I can't believe as a Federal Congressman I am talking about education, but this is really, really important.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. That is why I know the Texas State song.

Mr. CULBERSON. Do you? Because you were there.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Texas, our Texas. All hail the mighty State. Texas, our Texas. So wonderful, so great. I won't get into the Iowa State song.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you very much and maybe I will pass to Mr. Bishop right now. I recognize Mr. Bishop. Thank you.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Let me just, as you know, I have a significant military population in my district with the Marine Corps Logistics Base and with Fort Benning for the Army. In fact, many members on this subcommittee do, Mr. Dicks, Judge Carter, Mr. Farr all have a military presence in their districts, and we all have numerous constituents, both military and civilian, who are really concerned about the possibility of a government shutdown.

So if you are able to answer, how would a shutdown affect the military facilities over which you have responsibility?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, we hope not only that the Congress will pass a Continuing Resolution (CR), a temporary CR if that is part of a package, but more importantly that you complete an appropriations bill for defense for 2011, we need that. From the military construction point of view, for example, we currently have 44 projects which have been held in abeyance that will increase as we get closer to the end of the year to 75. But we are currently $650 million worth of work that is held in abeyance because we do not have an appropriation.

In mission-related activity, there are 34 engine overhauls we are not going to be able to do as of today. That will probably increase. There is roughly an equal number of aircraft depot maintenance cycles that will not occur.

This is not a trivial matter. The absence of an appropriation is not a small thing. And if in fact we progress to a shutdown here over the weekend, there will be very significant disruptions. There is no question about it.

Now essential functions that will be manned by uniformed military will continue, but it will be disruptive and it is certainly our recommendation that the Congress act to avoid that.

GUAM STRIKE

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, sir. Let me move to your discussion of Guam, Guam Strike. Sometimes, as I indicated in my opening statement, when it comes to Guam we only think about the Marine relocation. Where are you in military construction (MILCON) plans at Guam and to what extent do complications of working out agreements with the Japanese impact the timing of your Air Force MILCON?

The Air Force has described MILCON in Guam as late to need with an estimated remaining requirements of $2½ billion. How will your ability to stand up the Air Force capabilities on Guam to be affected by the Navy-Marine buildup on the island?

And also tell me about the labor force on Guam, whether or not it is big enough to handle both the Air Force's and the Marine Corps construction needs? Will you need to get your construction

done before construction related to the relocation of the Marines has started?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir—I am sorry, forgive me.

Mr. BISHOP. I got two more parts to that question since you are going to be responding. The QDR makes numerous references to the need for increasing the resiliency at overseas bases, including hardening of key infrastructure. What kind of construction do you think will be needed to improve resiliency? And when will you be able to give us a broader estimate of the cost and locations of where this will be required? And will the infrastructure problems on Guam affect your Air Force MILCON?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, a quick summary of the 2012 program. We have about $147 million for three major projects in Guam, specifically at Andersen Air Force Base. It is a munitions facility, an aircraft rinse and wash facility, and also a fuel maintenance facility. These are the kinds of things we need to operate a major airdrome like Andersen Air Force Base and particularly one that is in a tropical area. Those projects are independent of the Marine beddown in Guam, and in fact they will precede that, if it occurs, by a significant amount of time. And so there is no risk to those projects with respect to capacity on the island to execute construction and so on. With respect to——

Mr. BISHOP. You will be going ahead?

General SCHWARTZ. Yes. They are paced well ahead of the anticipated buildup associated with the beddown of the Marines.

Now there is a piece of the Marine relocation which does involve Guam and it is on the north side—I should say involves Andersen Air Force Base, and it is on the north side of the field which would provide the beddown for their aviation elements. That is not an Air Force project, that would be a joint project, but it would entail Andersen, but that is again decoupled, separated from the Air Force base.

Mr. BISHOP. You would finish your construction there and then they would have to come in and they would start construction there. Wouldn't that impact your operations?

General SCHWARTZ. Not on the north side of the field. We can keep the field open and maintain tempo based on the construction that would occur on the other side of the field.

HARDENING INFRASTRUCTURE

With respect to your question on hardening, we are doing two things in that respect. Certainly there is some hardening occurring at Andersen, that includes both facilities and, importantly, utilities, fuel for example, making sure that we have some redundancy and resilience in the fuel supplies for Andersen Air Force Base.

DISPERSAL INITIATIVE

In addition to hardening, there is also a dispersal initiative underway which involves moving, creating opportunities at outlying locations around Guam where we could perhaps relocate assets in time of conflict. So once again it is not all concentrated at Andersen Air Force Base.

So we have both of those efforts underway to the tune of $25 million, I think, should we get an appropriation in 2011 and a similar

amount in 2012. That is our effort with respect to Guam Strike. Clearly it is important for the country to have a place, a sovereign location where we can put Air Force assets that can reach out to deter others in the region, in the Asia Pacific region, and Guam clearly is a key location in that respect.

Mr. BISHOP. The infrastructure problems there are severe enough to cause you difficulty in executing and completing your construction program.

General SCHWARTZ. I would again say, Tim, feel free to add in. I would say, Sir, for our needs, for the Andersen Air Force Base needs, that my sense is the capacity is there. I am not prepared to address the needs for the larger construction program that would involve relocating the Marines, and I would recommend deferring that to the Marines and the Navy since they are the experts.

General BYERS. Sir, thank you for the opportunity. Looking at the infrastructure concerns related to the limitations on this small island, we really look at the power capacity, the water capacity, the availability of labor as you talked about and of course the materials and the logistics infrastructure to support that construction.

When I was the Pacific Air force civil engineer back in 2003–2005 and as we started planning Guam ISR/strike initiatives, one of the first things we did was work with private industry in Guam to see what local capabilities they had along those areas. From a construction perspective, they could execute about 500 million a year from construction and contracts perspective before we start getting into some labor issues and really start taxing the infrastructure, other concerns involved the schools as well for the other off-base infrastructure and the medical programs. But for the construction programs that we have in place, we are comfortable that the infrastructure will support all those projects. It will be a little more taxing with the larger Marine effort.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you. I yield back.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. Bishop. Let me recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Austria.

Mr. AUSTRIA. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And let me first thank you, General Schwartz, for your service and leadership to our country. It is good to see you again. Thank you for the trips you have made to my district at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. And, General Byers, thank you for your service and leadership to the Air Force as well. I appreciate you both being here.

CRS AND THE BUDGET

I think you have kind of touched on my first question, and that was the CRs and the budgets, if there was a government shutdown the impact that that was going to have on the Air Force and our men and women serving in the Air Force. As well I would like to expand that to our civilians. I know at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, the largest single site employer in the State of Ohio, for example, one of the largest Air Force Bases, that will impact our civilians tremendously, and we are hearing from our defense contractors as well. You mention that there was 44 projects already that have been delayed because of not having that new start contract authority, as many as 75 if we continue through. If you could com-

ment on that and maybe expand into directly how that is impacting our men and women serving in the Air Force as well as civilians.

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, I think the key thing is that we have the potential, it is already less than ideal, we are halfway through the fiscal year, but we are going to create a bow wave that will be difficult to digest as we go forward if we don't act now. In the case of Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is a largely civilian employee population of the Air Force, there will be high numbers of furloughs because many will not be considered essential or, in the accepted jargon, excepted during a shutdown period.

MILITARY CONSTRUCTION SIDE

On the military construction side it is about $650 million that is currently in jeopardy. If we go through the entire year, it will be a billion. So it is real money. And I think that the real concern is that the longer this continues, the larger the bow wave into 2012 gets. And we are trying to put together the 2013 program now and we are not sure what the 2011 baseline is and how it ricochets on to the 2012. This is serious business in my view, sir.

Mr. AUSTRIA. And who determines who is essential personnel? I went over and I visited the base, talked to some of the commanders over there and obviously representing that base and having it part of my district and largely civilian, they are asking me as a Congressman what happens if we shutdown government? Who determines or how do you define essential personnel?

General SCHWARTZ. Commanders and supervisors determine who is essential to maintain the minimum essential functions, either from a base protection fire security, and program point of view. For example, we are supporting operational missions in Japan, certainly in Iraq and Afghanistan and into the lesser extent and recently in Libya, those things that are directly tied with ongoing mission requirements are legitimate things to be excepted from the shutdown, whether that be military or civilian. And certainly there will be limitations on things as what might seem as trivial as communications, that the judgment is that the use of cell phones or computers during a shutdown for those who were not excepted has the potential of being an anti-deficiency event.

So again, these are serious issues and we are trying to be very meticulous and scrupulous about deciding who is truly excepted, mission essential, and who is not.

Mr. AUSTRIA. Let me ask you, General, without a defense appropriations bill and if we were to have a government shutdown tomorrow, how does that—you mentioned your 2005 BRAC and you are still meeting those requirements of 2011, future budgets, you know, those BRAC projects, is that or how is that impacted by not having a defense appropriation bill in 2011?

General SCHWARTZ. If we have a year long CR, sir, we won't be able to make payroll in September. What that will require us to do is to reprogram dollars from investment accounts to pay payroll in September. And the consequence of that again ricochets forward, and there are numerous contracts, wideband global system satellite is the case in point, we cannot scale up the production of MQ–9 Reaper aircraft. We were going to move from 24 to 48 aircraft, we are stuck at the 24 level. The point is that we are in this mode

where it is uncertain what is going to happen in 2011, as a result 2012 may result in having to do an amended budget, and then 2013, which is currently in preparation, is equally ill-defined.

So my point is if there is a way for us to attain in the very near term an appropriation, it would certainly ease the anxiety in the force, both military and civilian, and it would enable us to manage to a much better degree.

MANNING LEVELS FOR FIREFIGHTERS

Mr. AUSTRIA. Mr. Chairman, I had one last question because our firefighters ask me this and, General Byers, I would like to direct it maybe toward you, and I thank you again for joining us. It is concerning the manning levels for firefighters at Air Force installations, and I understand that Program Budget Decision (PBD) 720 significantly reduced the number of firefighters in the Air Force. The number given to me was approximately 902 firefighter positions. At the time since PBD–720 was issued further Air Force policies stipulates that if you have one structural fire vehicle, for example, and one aircraft rescues vehicle housed at the same station, you can only provide one staff for that vehicle, one staffer that will cover each vehicle is my understanding.

My concern is, number one, are we in compliance with what the Department of Defense had put in place and, more importantly, is the safety for both the structure, fires and aircraft mishaps and obviously the safety of our men and women?

General BYERS. Thanks, Mr. Congressman, I would like to address that. The Program Budget Decision 720 was to look at efficiencies and how we do operations, so as we looked at civil engineering processes and capabilities, one of the things we looked at was fire protection. When you look at the fire protection the way we were organized in the past we used a risk avoidance philosophy versus a risk management philosophy. In other words, we manned for every type of vehicle that was out there for 24/7. As we went through the data over 5 years of information and saw where the incidents happened, in more than 132,000 incidents we did not have two major incidents at one time. For example, if you respond to an aircraft crash rescue, did you have the same thing happen as an infrastructure fire. We looked at all that data.

Then we went back to the DOD instructions we also looked at the National Fire Protection Association standards. In the DOD instructions, that you have specifically referenced, we are in compliance. In paragraph 5 it talks about how you can assume manning for one incident at one time. It also stipulates that you have to put out policy to do that. And so at our installations today, at our fire departments, we have equipment sets for structural fires and for crash rescue as well as for Hazardous material (HAZMAT) response and other capabilities.

We are authorized by the DOD instructions and through National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) standards to singly man one incident, but we cross train them, and then we cross staff them, depending on the incident. And so the firefighter also as the incident commander has the authority to call in other people in the unlikely chance, as supported by historical data that you have two

incidents at once. He can call in folks who are off duty at that particular time.

So I believe we are in compliance with DOD instructions sir, and I believe we have put out the policy to ensure that we have the right men and equipment for all the type of capabilities that our firefighters have to do.

Mr. AUSTRIA. I want to make sure of that. For example, because in our case I appreciate what the firefighters do at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base. They help local communities around. They are also trying to ensure the safety of the men and women who are serving on the base. But I want to make sure that we are in compliance with the Department of Defense, with DOD. So we are talking about the same areas 6055.6 and that that is—you are confident in all areas of command that we are in that compliance?

General BYERS. Yes, Mr. Congressman.

Mr. AUSTRIA. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Our hearing is going to be a little abbreviated. I understand there is a vote at 11:15. We will be voting on the rule for the CR and then moving into debate on it and therefore we can't meet while we are debating on the floor. So I will submit a lot of my questions for the record. I want to make sure everybody on the record has plenty of time to ask questions. The gentlelady from Minnesota.

EDUCATION

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have a couple of questions about the shutdown, but first I want to talk a little bit about page 9 of your testimony, kind of going back to education. Maybe we can add this to what the chairman wants to work on into the future.

The Recovery Act allowed the Air Force to allocate $80 million for eight new child development centers. In your testimony you talked about how some of the Airmen's children are in substandard temporary facilities. Could you maybe kind of piggyback in, because we were talking about K–12, the importance of having childcare and some of the other child support systems on base, and then I have another question.

General SCHWARTZ. Sure. At the end of 2012, assuming the appropriations follow suit, we will essentially buy out the known demand for child care spaces. The last element, the last, as I mentioned, was at Holloman Air Force Base in New Mexico. We will have sufficient capacity Air Force wide to accommodate the current load of children who need childcare.

With respect to youngsters and teens, we have on our installations, Ma'am, the youth centers, and they provide a range of services from enrichment activities, academic assistance, and instructional classes to social, recreational and sports activities. That is a professionally executed task by our force support squadrons on each of the installations. The fundamental purpose again is to make sure that the youngsters have opportunities to learn life-skills and build resilience for future success and to make again these communities whole with respect to activities for families.

So I think childcare is part of that, the education is certainly part of that, after school hours enrichment activities is a big piece of that for families as well.

AVAILABLE CHILDCARE

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Well, thank you. And just a quick comment on that, anybody who has ever—and I was a stay at home full time mom, but my sister wasn't and I have some dear friends who haven't been, waiting to get into a childcare slot is next to impossible. Sometimes you have to plan your pregnancy 2 or 3 years in advance if you really want to get your child some place, I am hearing from friends, and they are really not joking about that all that much anymore. So having base available childcare is really important.

And then, you know, trying to go from Girl Scout troop to Girl Scout troop is pretty tough when you are moving around all the time, too. These after school youth programs are really important. And I just think it helps the Airman the soldier, the marine, the sailor be able to be more focused when those support systems are there.

So General, thank you for your leadership on this.

General SCHWARTZ. One addition, Ma'am, of course this is a team sport and everybody contributes here. In terms of capacity, it not only includes the dedicated childcare centers, but it also includes in-home childcare that is inspected, certified, and many in-home providers on the installation provide as well.

ENERGY

Ms. MCCOLLUM. I would like to ask a quick question about energy. You are being very visionary, I think, and part of our national strategy of reducing energy independence. Could you maybe just elaborate a little more on what we should be looking at to help you with your commitment for not only efficiency, but conservation with what you can do on base?

General SCHWARTZ. There are two pieces to this. We are the largest consumer of hydrocarbons in the Department of Defense, the Air Force. And so on the operational side of things, we have gone to some considerable lengths to test and validate the capabilities of our aircraft to operate on nontraditional fuels, blended fuels, either coal derived, or natural gas derived, or in some cases even biomass derived kinds of fuels. We know we can do this, but the Air Force, and I think this applies to the Department of Defense as well, does not wish to become a producer. We want to be a consumer, and we would be a considerable consumer, but I think it is still an issue of the business case in finding investment and commercial producers who are willing to offer alternative fuels in quantity.

That is something that I think is an important thing for the Congress to address, to look at, to facilitate if possible, to lessen our requirements for oil from other sources.

In addition, the other half of this is installations and reducing our energy consumption on installations, and we had considerable success in that regard, in the double digits since 2005, in terms of pushing down our energy consumption. Costs are increasing, but the quantity is decreasing.

One example, at Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada we have the largest solar array in the Department of Defense. It sources 25 percent of the base use of electricity on any given day. So now you might not be able to do that in Virginia what you can do in Nevada, but the bottom line is that there clearly are renewables that make sense in different parts of the country and we are pursuing that aggressively.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Mr. Chair, I think when we look at Guam and shipping everything in, that that is something that we need to be visionary on because a couple of dollars invested now in reducing energy independence and more self-sufficiency on the Guam base will save taxpayers dollars far, far out into the future.

I did have a couple questions about the shutdown, but let me just ask this. Nonessential military employees would be affected by a shutdown, essential military employees would not be affected by a shutdown; is that not correct?

General SCHWARTZ. That is correct.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. And that is true in the Department of Justice and that is true in the FAA and everything else. Thank you.

Mr. CULBERSON. I am not sure if Congressmen are considered essential or not. I don't know whether or not—I am sure that we are.

Another one of my great passions is nanotechnology and one great way to improve the efficiency immediately of solar cells is to use carbon nanotubes. And the Air Force is doing great research using not just Rice University, which I am proud to represent, they are the world leader in carbon nanotube technology, but MIT, Stanford. There are great universities around the country doing this work.

I want to recognize the gentleman from Arizona, Mr. Flake.

Mr. FLAKE. After that shameless plug for Texas schools.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. They are okay.

Mr. CULBERSON. One or two.

Mr. FLAKE. General, is the Air Force going to be finishing the 2005 BRAC round on time?

General SCHWARTZ. Yes, sir, by the September 2011 mandate.

Mr. FLAKE. Now you have asked for environmental remediation funds. Was that something that was not known initially or why is that being asked for now?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, that is part of the program. This was phased in and General Byers can elaborate, but this was in the plan and simply part of that which came late in the window as opposed to up front.

Mr. FLAKE. Okay. Go ahead.

General BYERS. That is correct. Requested funding is for the long-term cleanup at the different BRAC locations and sites. Not only is it the immediate cleanup, but it is also for the long-term monitoring that has to be done, and so all those dollars had to be programmed in for the long term.

UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE

Mr. FLAKE. There was a case I think out at the former Williams Air Force Base where there was some unexploded ordnance around they are still having issues with, and those who have purchased some of those lands have had a real hard time getting somebody

to take responsibility for it or to get some kind of resolution. I am told that they have even said we will pay for it, just let us go in and do it, and haven't even been allowed to do so. Are there issues ongoing with private land holders that have taken this that haven't been willing to go in and deal with this?

General BYERS. Congressman, if I could I would like to take that for the record and get back to you. I don't have the details on that.

[The information follows:]

UNEXPLODED ORDNANCE AT FORMER WILLIAMS AFB, AZ

The Air Force is not aware of any unexploded ordnance issues associated with transferred or private property at the former Williams Air Force Base, Arizona nor have we been contacted by any private parties. Currently, we are conducting a munitions clearance on a portion of the base which is still Air Force retained property. A very small amount of explosive material was identified and removed from this Air Force property during the clearance activity. Final clearance of this three-acre area is on-going. Showing an abundance of caution, we conducted clearance surveys on portions of adjacent private properties. The surveys showed no indication that these private properties were impacted by unexploded ordnance or related debris.

Mr. FLAKE. I would like to follow up, if I could, because it has been an issue there in my district.

With regard to the shutdown, I understand the difficulties with procurement and whatever else, and dislocations and whatever else. Will it actually add cost?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, absolutely. I mean we had pricing agreements for programs with numerous offerers and contractors, and when those pricing agreements expire you would have to renegotiate, and it is most unlikely that the price will decline, you know, when those pricing agreements expire.

Mr. FLAKE. Thank you.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. Flake. I want to recognize the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Nunnelee. We are at a little bit of an abbreviated schedule, because we are going to vote at about 11:15, and then we have got to conclude the hearing because it is on the CR.

WELL-TRAINED YOUNG AVIATORS

Mr. NUNNELEE. Thank you for being here. I represent north Mississippi, that includes Columbus Air Force Base. So obviously I have an interest in making sure we have well-trained young aviators be a part of the Air Force of the future. Just want to make sure as you deal with looking forward in terms of realignment capacity, are the existing facilities at Columbus Air Force Base what you need and are they up to speed?

General SCHWARTZ. They are, sir. And we don't foresee a reduction in the need for undergraduate pilot training capacity as we look into the future.

Mr. NUNNELEE. We have got some impressive young men and women coming through that facility.

General SCHWARTZ. More impressive than we ever were.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. Nunnelee.

Mr. Bishop.

OFFUTT AIR FORCE BASE

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you very much. General, to recapitalize the U.S. Strategic Command facilities at Offutt in Nebraska you budgeted $30 million to begin planning a design on the project in fiscal year 2011. And you expect to begin construction in fiscal year 2012.

Has the delay in the fiscal year 2011 funding caused any significant problems for this project? Given the pressures of the—that is the first question—then given the pressures on the Air Force MILCON budget and the Federal budget overall, why is it important to embark on this very costly project at this time?

And then the question is whether or not the Air Force is eating the cost of this project within the MILCON program or are you getting extra money since it is a combatant command requirement?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman, let me take the last two questions, and then General Byers will talk about the 2011 and 2012 relationship. Building 500 at Offutt Air Force Base, the former home of the Strategic Air Command, is 57 years old. In short, this is the facility that was designed in an analog age, and the missions assigned to strategic command now, which includes cyber among others, nuclear missions, and digital missions.

And so the building wasn't designed, it didn't have the infrastructure, the cooling, the electrical capacity to do the current mission. We expect that the current building population of 3,600 is going to grow to 3,900 over the next couple of years. We need more capacity; we need information that will support modern IT.

And finally, we encountered a major flooding event in Building 500 which essentially took the command down. They had to relocate to an alternate facility because the flooding in the basement knocked out generator capacity, cooling capacity and so on.

Mr. BISHOP. I would like to think it was not taken down, it was just——

General SCHWARTZ. Well, in other words, there were power and cooling issues associated with the IT and so they had to relocate. There was continuity of operations.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you.

General SCHWARTZ. But it gives you a sense of the fragility of this facility, and it is not inexpensive. It is a $564 million project which would be funded over 3 years in 2012, 2013 and 2014. It has been scrutinized by many very carefully. It does come out of Air Force Total Obligational Authority (TOA). We are not getting help from others, but the bottom line is I have come to the conclusion that General Bob Kehler out there and his team needs a facility to do its mission, and it is not Building 500 of 57 years vintage.

Mr. BISHOP. The $6 million worth of repairs since 2009 were the result of the flooding that you described.

General SCHWARTZ. Right.

Mr. BISHOP. Those are the emergency fixes?

General SCHWARTZ. Right.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay. Will you be able to recapitalize the old building? If so, how much will it cost to do that?

General SCHWARTZ. The plan is to use Building 500 in a strictly administrative capacity such that there will be no command and control requirements from the facility, no major communications

other than commercial, which is within the capacity of the building. What will happen elsewhere on Offutt Air Force Base is those administrative functions that will collapse into Building 500 will allow us to move out of older facilities and demolish those facilities and reduce the energy footprint. There is a logic to this process, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. There is a cost savings ultimately projected.

DORMITORY PROGRAM

Let me move to the dormitory master plan. Last year you said that Air Force plans to centralize management of the dormitory program which will relieve the major commands of making the decision whether to put forward the dormitories as a priority.

Did the Air Force follow through on these plans, and what has been the impact on the prioritization and funding for the dormitory program?

General BYERS. Mr. Congressman, if I could take that. Yes, we did centralize the military construction (MILCON) process as well as we also have dormitory focus funds and our own program as well. We centralized that. We have gone across the Air Force in 2008 to update our dorm master plan. We are currently executing our 2010 dormitory master plan today to make sure it is current and updated, that we have properly identified and assessed those facilities so they are adequate and we ensure that throughout the Air Force we know which is the worst and which is the very best. This year in our Fiscal Year 2012 budget request, as General Schwartz talked about, we will be funding seven of those dormitories off the top of the list, and we will do the same for 2013, and we are on track to meet our 2017 goal.

Mr. BISHOP. That will keep you on track.

General BYERS. Yes, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. Is there anything that we need to do in addition to help you meet that goal?

General BYERS. Sir, I would say appropriate the fiscal year 2011 and 2012 budget, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, that has all I have.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Bishop. I assure you we are working arm in arm to do everything we can to get this settled, done, not just a CR, but a full-year bill. I will submit most of these questions for the record regarding the dormitories, I see $190 million I think you are asking for, to build seven dormitories. Will that get you to your reach, allow you to reach your target for 2017 in getting your housing built out?

General BYERS. Yes, sir. To be accurate, from our dormitory master plan in '08, we had 65 that were inadequate. At the end of this year, assuming Fiscal Year 2011 appropriations, we will be down to 30; and that will keep us on track to meet our 2017 goal.

Mr. CULBERSON. That is for unaccompanied airmen.

Family housing, where are you on family housing, both that provided by the government or the Air Force and private housing?

General SCHWARTZ. We will have, in 2012, the entire U.S. domestic family housing population privatized. We are currently, if I am not mistaken, at around 47,000 privatized units; and that will increase when we get done to somewhat over 52,000. It is very interesting, sir. The satisfaction rates of our people who live in the

privatized homes rides around the 80 percent category, whereas the satisfactory rate of those who reside in government homes is somewhere down in the 70s. There is a sizable percentage difference in satisfaction between privatized and government, which is clearly related to modern facilities with modern accoutrements and so on.

Mr. CULBERSON. General, I will submit some of these others for the record, again because we are about to vote, and we will have to conclude the hearing as soon as that vote begins.

[Questions for the Record submitted by Chairman Culberson for General Schwartz follows:]

GUAM

The Air Force FY 2012 budget submission contains $147.2 million for three projects for requirements associated with the Air Force Strike/ISR Task Force on Guam. The Air Force is already describing Guam MILCON as "late to need", with an estimated remaining requirement of $2.5 billion.

Question 1. How will your ability to stand up the Air Force capabilities on Guam be affected by the Navy-Marine Corps buildup on the island?

Answer. We do not expect our stand up of capabilities to be significantly affected by the Navy-Marine Corps buildup on Guam. We have been in close coordination with the other Services through the Joint Guam Program Office and our Air Force construction requirements have been accounted for in the overall Guam construction planning.

GUAM

The Quadrennial Defense Review report makes numerous references to the need to increase "resiliency" at overseas bases, including the "hardening" of key infrastructure.

Question 2. What type of construction do you thing will be needed to improve "resiliency", and when will you be able to give us a broader estimate of the cost and the locations where this will be required?

Answer. Resiliency, broadly defined, could be any of a variety of measures: constructing a "thicker", more hardened facility; providing redundancy in utility lines; or even dispersing functions to other locations. At present, there are ongoing Department of Defense and U.S. Pacific Command resiliency and dispersal studies that will determine the Air Force hardening requirements on Guam. (The Air Force cannot speak to any other studies being done by the other Services.) There is $25 million in the Fiscal Year 2011 budget to study an OSD-approved new start Hardened Installation Protection for Persistent Operations Joint Capability Technology Demonstration, focusing on hardening facilities against new threats. Partly due to delays in receiving this Fiscal Year 2011 appropriated funding, it is unlikely that these studies will be complete before mid-2012, at the earliest.

STRATEGIC BASING PROCESS

Air Force developed a "Strategic Basing Process" to help it make rational decisions about where to base new aircraft and other force structure.

Question 3. Why did the Air Force determine it needed such a process? What was the problem with the previous method of making basing decisions?

Answer. Prior to 2009, Air Force basing responsibilities and authorities were spread across multiple Headquarters Air Force and Secretary of the Air Force functions, and execution was decentralized Early in 2009, work began to identify a transparent, repeatable, and defendable strategic basing process with clearly defined roles and responsibilities. The result was a centralized basing decision-making process with a governance structure. Since then, the Air Force has applied the new process to over 140 basing actions.

Mr. CULBERSON. In the fiscal year 2012 budget——

I do want to make sure Mr. Carter gets a chance to ask questions, so I am going to yield to him so he gets a chance to visit with you.

Judge, when you get settled.

Mr. CARTER. Just one second.

Mr. CULBERSON. General, I do want to explore with you—about having your folks get ready to talk to us about the schooling that is available. That is something that is really, really important.

CREATING CHARTER SCHOOLS

I understand a base commander has got authority—while the judge is getting ready, let me just clarify this—each base commander has authority on their own initiative to authorize and create a charter school on the base. I think that is true of the other services. Is that true of the Air Force?

General SCHWARTZ. It is. It requires higher level buy-in.

Mr. CULBERSON. Sure.

General SCHWARTZ. But the installation commanders certainly have authority to seek out, to posture for approval at higher levels.

Mr. CULBERSON. The reason I asked, it does not sound like it needs much statutory law change from Congress. You have got the authority you need. You might need a nudge from this committee, but you have the authority that you need.

Judge, I want to make sure that you get time to ask questions. I would be happy to recognize the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. CARTER. I apologize for being late, but great minds work the same way and all of our chairmen scheduled their hearings at the same time. I have to make two today.

Welcome. Thank you, and I am proud to have the Air Force here today.

PRIVATIZING FAMILY HOUSING

The Air Force fiscal year 2012 budget proposes to privatize existing family housing at several Air Force bases, and we have had great experience at Fort Hood on privatization. Has the Air Force encountered any problems in privatizing family housing and what will be the impact on local communities of privatizing? Have you done some examination of that?

General SCHWARTZ. Our experience has generally been positive. Some of the early efforts—we got better as we went long, and we learned about how to team with the builders and the folks that do the property management better. Some of the early projects did not succeed, and we have had to go back and change it and fix it. But those of recent vintage are, in fact, as I mentioned to the Chairman earlier, the satisfaction rate in privatized housing is higher than that which was in government homes. Not a surprise.

There is some difference in the level of satisfaction for certain of the property management firms. Some are better than others; and we are working at our level to interact with senior management as well to make sure that they have a customer-oriented focus, which is vitally important.

Go ahead, sir.

General BYERS. You also mentioned about off base. One of the first things we do is we do a housing requirements market analysis to be sure we know what type of housing is available in the community. Off base first is kind of the philosophy. And so we right-size the amount of housing that we have on the installation so that

we go to the right amount so we can complement the on-base and off-base and be part of the community.

Mr. CARTER. That is good.

RECEIVING FAIR SHARE OF MILCON FUNDING

Another question: Are the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserves receiving their fair share of MILCON funding? How do large States like Texas compare with smaller States? Are projects doled out according to assets and need or evenly spread out so that every State gets something?

General SCHWARTZ. There is not enough money to do the latter. We have to pick the priority items. But the metrics that we follow to make sure that we are not shorting any of the components is plant replacement value.

In the case of the Air National Guard, they have 9 percent of the plant replacement value; and in the 2012 proposal they will get 14 percent of the available dollars. So they are ahead of the curve.

With respect to the Air Force Reserve, they have 4 percent of the plant replacement value and get 4 percent of the available dollars.

So this was not the case last year, Congressman. The numbers were not quite as favorable, and we made an assurance to the leadership of the Subcommittee at the time that we would address that, and we feel like we have this year.

Mr. CARTER. Well, thank you. Because both of those components are very important, at least in our State. We want to make sure that they get the resources necessary.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General SCHWARTZ. It is a team sport, for sure, Congressman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Yes, sir?

Mr. BISHOP. Could I follow up on one of the questions Mr. Carter asked with regard to the privatized housing?

LESSONS LEARNED

You said that at the early starts you had some fits and starts, and I believe one of those was at Moody Air Force Base down in Georgia. Can you tell the committee what lessons were learned from that experience and how you are avoiding whatever those problems were that developed there?

General SCHWARTZ. I think assuring the financial capacity and stability of an offeror is a key factor, and we are wiser about how to go about doing that than we were in the early days.

In addition, related to what General Byers said, we overbuilt in a couple of the places. We weren't conservative enough in terms of establishing what was the right number. And so we have taken—part of the adjustments we have made is we are not overbuilding. We are probably underbuilding a little bit in order to make sure that our occupancy rates are sufficiently high that the cash flow works.

Mr. BISHOP. That wasn't the problem at Moody Air Force Base though, was it?

General SCHWARTZ. No, what happened at Moody Air Force Base was that the offeror went out of business. They couldn't deliver on the contract. At Moody Air Force Base, it was a case where this particular contractor did not have their stuff together and it turned

out did not have the financial depth to carry through. We had to let them go; and it took us a little while, as you well know, sir, to bundle another proposal in a way that would deliver homes.

Mr. BISHOP. They left a lot of subcontractors and suppliers in the area sort of without payment, and that created some hardship for a while.

But thank you for addressing those.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you, Mr. Bishop.

General, in addition to helping when we zero in on the education opportunities provided to our men and women in uniform on bases, I would also like a chance to visit with some of your folks in more detail, perhaps come by my office. I do want to get out and visit your offices at the Pentagon on this green energy stuff that we are spending a lot of money on. I really want to go over that with a fine tooth comb with you and make sure we are not wasting money.

And you mentioned a business case. You all are still searching to try to find a business case. We are living on borrowed money, so we have to make sure that we are only spending money on things that you can make a valid business case for.

F–35

I wanted to also ask, General, about the F–35. The fiscal 2012 budget request includes $55.1 million for construction associated with the bed-down of the F–35 Joint Strike Fighter which completes the requirement with five projects at Nellis, Luke, and Hill Air Force Bases. There have been delays, of course, associated with the F–35 acquisition schedule. Do you still require your full fiscal year 2012 MILCON request for the F–35?

General SCHWARTZ. Yes, sir. We are working closely with our acquisition folks to understand the exact delivery of each tail that we are going to get. With the current information that we have, we are not early to need on the MILCON projects identified in the President's budget for fiscal year 2012.

Mr. CULBERSON. As I learn more about the work that all of you do and the work of this subcommittee, it strikes me that this may be one area where we may need to throw this out as food for thought and explore this with you further and you, Mr. Bishop. MILCON may be one of those areas where we need to consider a 2-year budget cycle.

It has got to be just driving you nuts. It is just so frustrating for all of these huge projects, and particularly for everything that you have got on your plate, for you to have to worry about the CR and whether or not we get it done and some slowdown or screw up. And the Senate is so dysfunctional anyway, no matter who is in charge. They never seem to get their work done. That is something else for the longer term that I would like to explore with you.

I know NASA needs to be on longer than these—they build giant rockets. They build these big, massive engineering projects. It seems to me it is just illogical to have them on 1-year cycles.

How will the changes in the F–35 delivery schedule affect the delivery of aircraft to the three specified locations in your request for this year?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, there was a reduction in the profile from somewhere around 170 aircraft to about 120, and so there is a less

aggressive production program in order to reduce what we call concurrency in the program. That is a test program that overlaps with production to a greater degree.

So we will have airplanes at those installations. The question is whether and when we can declare initial operational capability. In other words, will we have the Block 3 software and initial testing complete to be able to certify that the airplanes can go operational? That is still not quite firm.

We thought we would be able to declare initial operational capabilities in April of 2016. It is going to be later than that, maybe late in the year in 2017, primarily because of software development issues.

The airplane itself, the airframe itself is, for us—that is, the conventional takeoff version, the A model—is performing actually quite well. But integrating all the capabilities onto the aircraft, weapon delivery capabilities and so on, is the current pacing item.

Mr. CULBERSON. One of the questions we have is why does the Air Force believe it is necessary to request your MILCON fiscal year 2011 for to-be-determined locations, as opposed to specific locations?

General SCHWARTZ. What we want to do, sir, we have a strategic basing process, and we want to make sure that we make decisions on where weapons systems go at the time that you have to do that and with the latest information. So the nuance on TBD was that we knew that we needed to have the dollars available and authorized and appropriated. But the question about which installation gets it wasn't synced with the budgetary timeline. And so in order to accommodate that we went with the to-be-determined on the budgetary timeline. And we will announce, as we have, where the aircraft goes. There will be congressional—certainly the delegations will be involved and so on and so forth.

STRATEGIC BASING PROCESS

Mr. CULBERSON. I understand, also, General, that the Air Force is going through a major review of your entire MILCON program in anticipation of your fiscal year 2012 budget submission and that you developed a strategic basing process to help the Air Force decide where to base new aircraft and build out your force structure. Can you talk about why you made those changes? What was wrong with your previous method of basing decisions? Just talk to us about the rationale for all of that.

General SCHWARTZ. What happened, sir, is that we made some decisions earlier in the decade that were early to need. And it turned out that circumstances changed, and having announced bed-downs before we were really ready to commit to those bed-downs created expectations, disappointment, turmoil that really did not serve anybody very well.

And so what we wanted to do is to make sure that when we announce a bed-down you could take it to the bank, and so this process that we have now assures that we can do that. That if we say that the F–35s are going to go to Hill Air Force Base, when we have, that the delegation from Utah can rely on that commitment forever. That is the effort that we have under way. We don't want

to decide before we can make that solemn commitment, and the new process allows us to do that.

Mr. CULBERSON. We are about to vote, General. I will submit some of the other questions for the record.

[Questions for the Record submitted by Chairman Culberson for General Schwartz follows:]

STRATEGIC BASING PROCESS

Question. What are the major basing actions that need to be decided in the near future?

Answer. The Air Force Strategic Basing process is being used to increase our remotely piloted aircraft combat air patrol number to 65 by the end of Fiscal Year 2013. The Air Force is currently conducting environmental analyses for the basing of the first two F–35 operational bases and the first F–35 pilot training center location. Additional operational and training locations will be vetted through this process at the appropriate time. We have just begun the process to base the Air Force's newest tanker aircraft, the KC–46A, a process which will take a number of years. Other major basing actions in the near future include Light Mobility Aircraft, Light Attack/Armed Reconnaissance, and the C–27J.

CURRENT MISSION MILCON

Last year you testified that the Air Force was going through a major review of your MILCON program in anticipation of this FY 2012 budget submission.

Question 5. Can you tell the Committee what substantial changes in the funding profile for MILCON are in this fiscal year's budget and FYDP?

Answer. In response to previous-year budget pressures and their effect on the military construction program, the Air Force significantly overhauled the way it built its military construction request for Fiscal Year 2012. The new strategy involves the use of a centralized model which scores projects based on factors important to the Air Force as a whole, then prioritizes new and current mission needs in a single "1–n" list of most-dear to least-dear Total Force military construction. Using this model, the Air Force worked to develop a program for Fiscal Year 2012 which would renew focus on some of the areas General Schwartz mentioned in his testimony last year—replacement of Tier 1 dorms (and other Airman and Family quality of life issues), facilities for key new mission beddowns, improved emphasis on current mission funding (after years of "risk in infrastructure"), and Component equity.

Our Fiscal Year 2012 military construction request includes a $97 million increase over the Fiscal Year 2011 President's Budget request and funds eight dormitories, a number of projects supporting new mission beddown and realignment, ten current mission/recapitalization projects, and provides plant replacement value-based Component equity. The program also provides substantial support to combatant commanders' highest priorities, maintains emphasis on Global Posture, and builds three joint base barracks. Additionally, across the Future Years Defense Program, the Air Force has preserved its intent to fund all Tier 1 and deficit dormitories by 2017; in general will continue to fund its most critical new mission military construction (preventing late-to-need beddown and/or mission stoppage); and will maintain Component equity. In the balance, however, Air Force military construction investment in current mission/recapitalization continues to be relatively low across the Future Years Defense Program (with greater funding levels seen in the out-years). A model-driven, comprehensive list of Total Force priorities ensures that when funds are available the Air Force can quickly provide additional projects on a "worst-first" basis, and the Air Force also continues to evaluate ways in which it can supplement military construction with (for instance) operations and maintenance "focus funds" for repair, sustainment, restoration and modernization to decrease "risk in infrastructure" in today's fiscal environment.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Bishop, any other questions?

Mr. BISHOP. No further, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Nunnelee.

ENERGY SAVINGS

Mr. NUNNELEE. Just a brief set of questions. I want to follow up with questions for the record.

I walked in as you were talking about energy savings. I do also serve on the Energy and Water Subcommittee of this Appropriation Committee. As our Nation is struggling with trying to find ways to become energy independent I think it is a twofold effort we have to have. One, we have to have more domestic energy exploration and, at the same time, we also have to use new technologies to deal on the consumption side. That is what you were talking about. And I may very well submit further questions for the record.

But I think that particularly domestic military construction is an excellent place for our Nation to involve, utilize, and showcase new technologies in saving energy; and I would just really like to hear your thoughts on that subject.

General SCHWARTZ. General Byers will elaborate, but we agree with you; and the Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) standards for energy efficiency in construction, we are committed to that.

Please elaborate.

General BYERS. Yes, sir. As a matter of fact, we have had several industry days to go out to leverage and see what industry had to offer, and we were teamed with several of them on a lot of new technologies, whether it is the photo voltaic (PV) side, wind, biomass, waste energy, photo voltaic roofs, and landfill gases. And so as we start looking at what is the most efficient way—return on investment of our taxpayer dollars to provide energy, that is when we are starting to make decisions. But we are definitely leveraging industry to do that.

Mr. NUNNELEE. Thank you for your interest in that.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Bishop, you are done?

Judge?

LEVEL OF FUNDING

I did want to ask about the level of funding for the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve. While we have a minute and on the record, talk to us about why the Guard and MILCON request is $116 million, which is a decrease over last year's request, but it is only about half of what was funded in fiscal year 2010, and the Reserve request is only $33.6 million and contains one project. Could you talk and assure the committee that the Guard and Reserve are receiving an adequate level of MILCON support and why the significant reductions?

General SCHWARTZ. I will ask General Byers to talk to the specific numbers, but the reality is that the numbers this year are better than the numbers last year. And if there is contention on that, we need to resolve that with you, Mr. Chairman.

The bottom line is that, again, on the metric that I depend on, which is the amount of dollars allocated versus the plant replacement value, where both the Air National Guard certainly is sound and the Air Force Reserve was equal, 4 percent versus 4 percent, I think that last year there was an underfunding scenario which

came as a result of balancing the books at the end of the budget development process. And I feel like we have fulfilled our commitment to correct that deficiency from last year; and we would be happy to work with the staff, Sir, to make sure that there is a common understanding of what we did.

Mr. CULBERSON. Thank you very much, General. I deeply appreciate your service to the Nation.

Are there any other areas that you want to make sure that you bring to the committee's attention before we conclude?

General SCHWARTZ. No, Sir. It has been a pleasure to testify today, Sir. Again, thank you and the subcommittee, for making our installations wonderful places to live and work.

Mr. CULBERSON. We thank you so much for your service and your testimony today, Sir; and the hearing is adjourned.

[Questions for the Record submitted by Congressman Austria for General Schwartz follows:]

WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB MILCON

As you know, Wright-Patterson Air Force Base—which is one of the largest, most diverse bases in the Air Force—is in my district. The airfield pavement at Wright-Patterson is over 60 years old and a 2009 Pavement Condition Index survey rated the primary runway unsatisfactory and taxiways poor. These deteriorated conditions have led to a closure and restrictions for the runway and taxiways. As a result, in October 2010, the runway at one of the largest and most diverse Air Force bases was closed to fighters and as these deteriorated conditions continue to increase, safety risks for airfield operations increase. I have been told that a $138 million runway replacement is needed as a long-term fix and that in the short term $11 million is needed for an overlay project.

My understanding is that Wright-Patterson has programmed the $11 million overlay project and that AFMC has endorsed that full $138 million replacement airfield initiative to be funded through MILCON.

Question 1. Do you know how the $11 million overlay project is being funded?

Answer. Air Force Materiel Command Civil Engineering (CE) has requested the Air Force Civil Engineer Support Agency (AFCESA) to provide funding for the $11 million overlay project from their airfield pavement focus fund set-aside at the beginning of Fiscal Year 2012. Should AFCESA not be able to obtain funding, this project will be a high funding priority for AFMC CE. AFMC CE will try and fund this from either end of Fiscal Year 2011 funding or Fiscal Year 2012 funding. Fiscal Year 2011 funding will be used if it is known prior to the end of Fiscal Year 2011 that AFCESA will not have Fiscal Year 2012 funding.

Question 2. Is the Air Force funding the $11 million overlay project, or are you requiring Wright-Patterson to find the funds out of their budget? My concern is that if the Air Force is not helping fund the project that it will be very hard to absorb the $11 million locally and the project will be further delayed.

Answer. The 88th Air Base Wing Commander has prioritized the $11 million overlay project as her number one priority for Fiscal Year 2011 year-end operations and maintenance sustainment funding from Air Force Materiel Command. Air Force Materiel Command is posturing this project to be ready for funding from one of two sources; either from the Air Force Civil Engineer Support Agency (AFCESA) airfield funding in Fiscal Year 2012 or from AFMC Fiscal Year 2011 year-end funding. At this time, it is unknown if AFCESA will be able to provide airfield focus funds in Fiscal Year 2012. In the event funding does not become available from either of these sources, this project will be a high funding priority for AFMC CE in Fiscal Year 2012.

Question 3. Can you tell me where the $138 million replacement airfield initiative is in the FYDP?

Answer. This project was not supported during the Air Force military construction program build because it is predominantly repair-class work. As such, it is not included in the President's Budget request as military construction, but instead is currently being reprogrammed into multiple operations and maintenance repair projects to be executed as funding allows. There may be a military construction requirement to extend the short runway allowing airfield operations to continue while

the center section of the main runway is being repaired, but these details are still in the planning stage.