

[H.A.S.C. No. 111-62]

HEARING
ON
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2010
AND
OVERSIGHT OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED
PROGRAMS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION

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

HEARING HELD
MAY 19, 2009



U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE
WASHINGTON : 2010

54-551

HOUSE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

ONE HUNDRED ELEVENTH CONGRESS

IKE SKELTON, Missouri, *Chairman*

JOHN SPRATT, South Carolina	JOHN M. McHUGH, New York
SOLOMON P. ORTIZ, Texas	ROSCOE G. BARTLETT, Maryland
GENE TAYLOR, Mississippi	HOWARD P. "BUCK" McKEON, California
NEIL ABERCROMBIE, Hawaii	MAC THORNBERRY, Texas
SILVESTRE REYES, Texas	WALTER B. JONES, North Carolina
VIC SNYDER, Arkansas	W. TODD AKIN, Missouri
ADAM SMITH, Washington	J. RANDY FORBES, Virginia
LORETTA SANCHEZ, California	JEFF MILLER, Florida
MIKE McINTYRE, North Carolina	JOE WILSON, South Carolina
ELLEN O. TAUSCHER, California	FRANK A. LoBIONDO, New Jersey
ROBERT A. BRADY, Pennsylvania	ROB BISHOP, Utah
ROBERT ANDREWS, New Jersey	MICHAEL TURNER, Ohio
SUSAN A. DAVIS, California	JOHN KLINE, Minnesota
JAMES R. LANGEVIN, Rhode Island	MIKE ROGERS, Alabama
RICK LARSEN, Washington	TRENT FRANKS, Arizona
JIM COOPER, Tennessee	BILL SHUSTER, Pennsylvania
JIM MARSHALL, Georgia	CATHY McMORRIS RODGERS, Washington
MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam	K. MICHAEL CONAWAY, Texas
BRAD ELLSWORTH, Indiana	DOUG LAMBORN, Colorado
PATRICK J. MURPHY, Pennsylvania	ROB WITTMAN, Virginia
HANK JOHNSON, Georgia	MARY FALLIN, Oklahoma
CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire	DUNCAN HUNTER, California
JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut	JOHN C. FLEMING, Louisiana
DAVID LOEBSACK, Iowa	MIKE COFFMAN, Colorado
JOE SESTAK, Pennsylvania	THOMAS J. ROONEY, Florida
GABRIELLE GIFFORDS, Arizona	
NIKI TSONGAS, Massachusetts	
GLENN NYE, Virginia	
CHELLIE PINGREE, Maine	
LARRY KISSELL, North Carolina	
MARTIN HEINRICH, New Mexico	
FRANK M. KRATOVIL, Jr., Maryland	
ERIC J.J. MASSA, New York	
BOBBY BRIGHT, Alabama	
SCOTT MURPHY, New York	
DAN BOREN, Oklahoma	

ERIN C. CONATON, *Staff Director*

MARK LEWIS, *Professional Staff Member*

LYNN WILLIAMS, *Professional Staff Member*

CATERINA DUTTO, *Staff Assistant*

CONTENTS

CHRONOLOGICAL LIST OF HEARINGS

2009

	Page
HEARING:	
Tuesday, May 19, 2009, Fiscal Year 2010 National Defense Authorization Act—Budget Request from the Department of the Air Force	1
APPENDIX:	
Tuesday, May 19, 2009	45

TUESDAY, MAY 19, 2009

FISCAL YEAR 2010 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT— BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

McHugh, Hon. John M., a Representative from New York, Ranking Member, Committee on Armed Services	2
Skelton, Hon. Ike, a Representative from Missouri, Chairman, Committee on Armed Services	1

WITNESSES

Donley, Hon. Michael B., Secretary of the Air Force	4
Schwartz, Gen. Norton A., USAF, Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force	6

APPENDIX

PREPARED STATEMENTS:	
Donley, Hon. Michael B., joint with Gen. Norton A. Schwartz	49
DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:	
[There were no Documents submitted.]	
WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:	
[The information was not available at the time of printing.]	
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:	
Mr. Bishop	65
Ms. Giffords	67
Mrs. McMorris Rodgers	67
Mr. Spratt	63
Mr. Thornberry	64
Mr. Wittman	67

FISCAL YEAR 2010 NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT—BUDGET REQUEST FROM THE DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC, Tuesday, May 19, 2009.

The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:03 a.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Ike Skelton (chairman of the committee) presiding.

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

The CHAIRMAN. Good morning. Today, we have the budget posture hearing for the United States Air Force for fiscal year 2010.

Appearing before us today is the honorable Michael Donley, Secretary of the Air Force; General Norton Schwartz, Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force.

Gentlemen, the committee thanks you and all those you lead, active duty, Guard, Reserve, as well as your civilian employees.

And today, the Air Force is exceptionally busy. There are over 27,000 airmen deployed in Iraq and Afghanistan, while others are flying an average of 265 sorties a day in those two wars.

There are another 7,000 deployed supporting contingencies elsewhere around the world. Twenty-four hours a day, airmen stand watch over 450 nuclear-tipped missile silos.

Now, that is a lot of work. I am glad to see that the requested budget for fiscal year 2010 recognizes how busy you are, with an increase of \$2.4 billion over last year and the request for a 2.9 percent pay raise. And increases in family programs in the areas such as childcare, spousal support, lodging, and education are all solid indicators that your people are a high priority, as they should be, something, of course, which this committee strongly supports.

I am especially pleased to note that you have rethought the decision to decrease your end strength and you may even end this year above the authorized level. That is not a bad problem to have.

I still have some concern about the Air Force's readiness. With the Air Force in continuous combat since 1990, high utilization rates of aging assets has contributed to ongoing detrimental effects on equipment, such as engine and structural fatigue, deterioration, corrosion, and increased rates of component failures.

This budget request contains a request for \$1.1 billion in military construction, which is \$100 million more than enacted last year. However, this level of funding is significantly below the historical

Air Force appropriations, and I am not sure it meets the need. We can discuss that in your comments.

You have got multiple simulators sitting idle, awaiting supporting facilities, for example, aviation assets located at sites without available supporting facilities.

Now, I understand you have a proposed plan to retire 254 fighter aircraft in the coming year; 249 of these planes are proposed to be retired on an accelerated schedule.

We are going to have to look at this very closely and understand what risks this plan might entail and whether the reinvested savings will net us an overall increase in the Air Force's ability to meet our national security requirements.

In terms of airlift, I was surprised to see the changes in the joint cargo aircraft (JCA) plan. We appear to be seeing a reduction of 40 aircraft requested, and now what is a joint Army-Air Force program has become purely Air Force, and I assume you will discuss that.

This is contrary to what the Department told us in the quadrennial roles and missions report this past January. So we would like to hear more about that analytical—about the analysis for that decision.

So thank you, welcome. We look forward to your testimony.

My friend, ranking member, Mr. McHugh.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN M. MCHUGH, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM NEW YORK, RANKING MEMBER, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. MCHUGH. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Like you, we certainly all want to welcome our distinguished guests.

Chief, General Schwartz, Mr. Secretary, Secretary Donley, as our distinguished chairman said, we appreciate your joining with us. And I want to join with him, as well, in praising this budget and for the focus I know that you and your staff brought, along, of course, with Secretary Gates and the Administration as a whole, to focus on the people part of that equation.

Nothing, in my judgment, is more important than taking care of those who take care of us so effectively, and that starts with good budgets and there are many things recommended in this budget in that regard, but, also, leadership provided by good people such as yourselves.

And we thank you and, please, on our behalf, thank those brave men and women in your charge who are such amazing patriots in defense of freedom and our liberties.

Having now gone through this process several times with Secretary Gates, Admiral Mullen, the civilian and military leadership, as posture hearings are intended to do, we are starting to get a somewhat clearer picture of what the 2010 budget request looked like, certainly, taken as a whole.

But what continues to trouble me, to a certain extent, is that it has not been made entirely clear at this point how much analysis actually went into the sweeping decisions that are carried under this request.

And as Secretary Gates and I had a discussion about that, I heard a lot about, “Oh, extensive analysis and we have been studying this and that for years and years,” but to this point, by and large, we are still without that depth of analysis that apparently exists.

And I understand the Secretary’s attempt to balance the force and I truly do applaud the effort and have a great deal of sympathy as to the difficulty and the difficult choices that are involved in this budget.

Mr. Secretary, you and I just chatted about that for a few seconds, and it is an undeniable reality.

But I still have a degree of skepticism as to how much of this rebalancing was principally driven by realistic military requirements and the analytical rigor rather than budgetary pressures, and I just don’t know the answer. But I think those are answers we need to try to clear up.

And I would say, in that regard, nowhere is my skepticism more strongly felt than it is with what I understand so far about the proposed Air Force budget.

Termination of the F–22 production, termination of the C–17 production, termination of the next generation bomber program, termination of the combat search and rescue helicopter program, as the chairman said, the accelerated retirement of some 250 legacy fighters, that builds a framework for the total reshaping of the Air Force. There is no question about that.

But we need to understand and have a discussion about the assumptions, the threat assessments or changes in combatant commander requirements that support those decisions.

And equally important, we have not as yet been provided a future years defense plan, the FYDP, and that is required under Section 221 of Title 10 of the United States Code.

Instead, when Secretary Gates was before this committee last week and was questioned by Mr. LoBiondo and Ms. Giffords about the fighter shortfall and the future of the Air National Guard, his response was that the issue will be addressed in the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR).

That confuses me. You make recommendations to terminate F–22 production and retire 250 fighters in the inventory, and yet you have framed the question as a critical issue within the QDR.

And I can’t think of a better phrase, when I ask, “Isn’t that putting the proverbial cart before the”—or “the horse in front of the cart?”

That said, that is why we are here today, to try to talk about these things, and I am grateful to have General Schwartz and Secretary Donley here to provide their views on this budget.

In our hearing last week, Secretary Gates stated that some of the service chiefs had expressed their concerns, and I think the words he used, “had been loud and clear about the budget during the internal deliberations.” And he went to say that he fully expected them to articulate those concerns to this body.

And I raise this point because I want to encourage our two distinguished guests today to—as the Secretary has said, you should engage in a dialogue with us so we can talk about these very, very important programs.

We look forward to your comments.

And, Mr. Chairman, I will submit the rest of my opening comments for the record in their entirety. And with that, I would yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so entered.

This is a very important hearing and we look forward to your testimony today.

Secretary Donley.

**STATEMENT OF HON. MICHAEL B. DONLEY, SECRETARY OF
THE AIR FORCE**

Secretary DONLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Congressman McHugh, members of the committee.

It is a privilege to talk with you—

The CHAIRMAN. Get as close as you can.

Secretary DONLEY. It is a privilege to talk with you today about America's Air Force and the tremendous contributions that its nearly 660,000 airmen and Air Force civilians make to America's national security.

It has been almost one year since General Schwartz and I took responsibility for these roles, and I can tell you this has been a great partnership. And I am very grateful to have had General Schwartz as my wingman in this effort.

He is a tremendous leader for our Air Force, and I could not have a better partner.

In recent months, Secretary Gates and Admiral Mullen have led a constructive dialogue about necessary changes in our national defense priorities and areas of emphasis.

These deliberations focused on taking care of our all volunteer force and our people first, institutionalizing and enhancing capabilities for today's fight, and the most likely scenarios in the years ahead, hedging against other risks and contingencies, and reforming how and what is procured for national defense.

The Air Force has been well-integrated into this dialogue, with several opportunities to contribute our analysis and our judgment.

To prepare for these discussions, we undertook several strategic reviews inside the Air Force and they have been instrumental in sharpening the Air Force's focus, and that of our sister services, the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) and interagency partners, who also participated, as appropriate.

Last fall, for example, we refined the Air Force's mission statement. We also articulated our five strategic priorities of reinvigorating the Air Force's nuclear enterprise, partnering with the joint and coalition team to win today's fight, developing and caring for our airmen and their families, modernizing our air and space inventories, and capturing—recapturing acquisition excellence in the Air Force.

Simultaneously, we carefully considered what the Air Force provides to the joint team. We refined our Air Force core functions to more clearly articulate our role in national defense.

In the past months, we have made important progress in areas that required new and focused attention, such as publishing our roadmap for strengthening the Air Force nuclear enterprise, establishing the way forward for our cyber numbered Air Force, articu-

lating our strategy for irregular warfare and counterinsurgency operations, consolidating our approach for global partnerships, and advancing our stewardship of the Air Force energy program.

Consistent with the national defense strategy, the concept of strategic balance has guided our reviews. To the Air Force, strategic balance has four meanings.

First, balance means prevailing in today's fight, while preparing for tomorrow's challenges. Second, it means balancing capabilities across the spectrum of conflict to respond to emerging hybrid threats.

Third, balance means allocating investment across our 12 diverse, but complementary core functions in a way that sustains and advances the United States Air Force as the world's finest airspace and cyberspace force.

Finally, it means organizing, training, and equipping our Air Force effectively across the active and Reserve components effectively and efficiently.

Our commitment to balance is reflected throughout our Air Force budget of \$165 billion, of which about \$115 billion-plus is Air Force-managed funding.

Our budget proposal recognizes the tremendous talent of our airmen and Air Force civilians and that they serve as the backbone of America's Air Force, as Mr. McHugh noted.

These volunteers are our most important asset and without them, our organizations and equipment would grind to a halt.

For fiscal year 2010, our active duty end strength will be projected at 332,000 airmen, with 69,500 airmen in the Air Force Reserve and nearly 107,000 in the Air National Guard.

This halts the previously planned reductions in Air Force active duty end strength with commensurate adjustments in the Reserve components.

We will also grow our civilian cadre to just over 179,000, which includes, 4,200 contractor-to-civilian conversions. At the same time, we will continue to reshape the skill set of our workforce, with particular emphasis on stressed career fields and mission areas that need our attention, such as intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR), acquisition, maintenance, cyber operations, and nuclear deterrence and sustainment.

In fiscal year 2010, our manpower investment will include increasing the nuclear-related personnel, for example, by about 2,500 and adding 200 acquisition professionals.

In fiscal year 2010, we have also scrutinized our force structure. The hard-won lessons of our airmen and their joint teammates in Iraq and Afghanistan deserve our institutional attention going forward.

At the same time, we must balance the forces across the entire spectrum of conflict.

In theater, the demand for ISR and special operations capabilities continues to increase. So we will increase unmanned aerial system combat air patrols from 34 today to a projected 43 in fiscal year 2010, and increase SOF (Special Operations Forces) end strength by about 550 personnel.

We will also reshape the portfolio of the fighter force by the early retirement of 250 of our oldest tactical fighters, by completing pro-

duction of the F-22 at 187 aircraft, 4 more than the previous program of record, and, in conjunction with joint and coalition partners, by accelerating the test and evaluation program for the fifth generation F-35, the joint strike fighter, by procuring 10 aircraft.

We will ensure balance in our airlift fleet by completing C-17 production, continuing the modernization of the C-5 fleet through the avionics modernization program and the reliability enhancement and re-engining program, re-initiating the C-130J production line after a one-year procurement gap, and transitioning the C-27 program, as the chairman noted, from the Army to Air Force oversight.

We will also drive balance and stability into our military satellite communication programs by terminating the Transformational Satellite (TSAT) program and extending our inventory to six advanced extremely high frequency and eight wideband global satellites, and continuing to partner with our commercial partners in this area.

For fiscal year 2010, we will also reform how we procure our war fighting capabilities. We recently published the Air Force acquisition improvement initiative. It includes improvements to revitalize the Air Force acquisition workforce, improve the requirements generation process, instill better fiscal and budget discipline, improve Air Force major systems source selection, and establish clear lines of authority and responsibility within our Air Force acquisition organizations.

Looking forward, we will continue to participate through the remainder of this year in several major reviews of defense programs, the QDR, the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), the Space Posture Review (SPR), and, also, we will keep an eye on the mobility capabilities and requirements study.

From these analyses, we will better understand the need, the requirement and the available technologies for a next generation bomber, as well as our requirements and potential joint solutions for the personnel recovery mission.

Stewardship of the United States Air Force is a responsibility that we take seriously, one underscored by our appreciation that the American people expect us to deliver global vigilance, reach and power in the most effective and efficient manner possible.

Our fiscal year 2010 budget proposal reflects our commitment to taking care of our people, balancing the force, reforming our acquisition efforts.

Mr. Chairman, we appreciate the continued support from this committee for America's airmen, and thank you for this opportunity to further discuss our proposed fiscal year 2010 program.

We look forward to your questions, sir.

[The joint statement of Secretary Donley and General Schwartz can be found in the Appendix on page 49.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, Mr. Secretary.

General Schwartz.

STATEMENT OF GEN. NORTON A. SCHWARTZ, USAF, CHIEF OF STAFF, U.S. AIR FORCE

General SCHWARTZ. Mr. Chairman, Congressman McHugh, and distinguished members of the committee, I am proud to be here with Secretary Donley representing your Air Force.

As you know, the United States Air Force is fully committed to effective stewardship of resources the American people place in our trust, a commitment founded on our core values of integrity first, service before self, and excellence in all we do.

Guided by this core values, American airmen are all in, working courageously every day with precision and reliability.

I recently had the chance to take a trip to visit with some of our airmen who are serving around the world. Approximately 36,000 are deployed, a total force representing airmen from the active, the Reserve, and the Guard components.

They are providing game-changing capabilities to the combatant commanders in conjunction with our joint and coalition partners.

America's airmen are also serving in convoys and coalition operations centers, on provincial reconstruction teams (PRTs) and personnel recovery in the air and on the ground, delivering on-call close air support for our ground forces, and by providing our combatant commanders with excellence in aero-medical evacuation, explosive ordnance disposal, and persistent intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance.

Last year, airmen conducted 61,000 sorties in Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and 37,000 sorties in Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF). That is, as the chairman noted, about 265 sorties a day. And the Air Force also delivered 2 million passengers and 700,000 tons of cargo in the Central Command (CENTCOM) area of responsibility (AOR) last year.

And our responsibilities are not solely limited or located to those in the immediate region. Every day, airmen are providing command and control of unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) from locations right here in the United States and delivering crucial effects for commanders on the ground.

And our nuclear operations professionals support the umbrella of deterrents for our Nation and allies across the globe.

And thousands of dedicated space professionals are providing capabilities ranging from early warning and detection of threats to advanced navigation, communications, and weather support for our forces engaged around the globe.

Through Secretary Donley's guidance and leadership, we have set a course to provide even greater capabilities for America. As stewards of our Nation's Air Force, we are focused on meeting priorities effectively through wise investments.

Our top line meets war fighting requirements across the spectrum of challenges and tailors programs that finance our capabilities for today's fight and in the years ahead.

And so our posture reflects our priorities as we reinvigorate the nuclear enterprise with an investment of \$4.9 billion to increase nuclear personnel strength by some 2,500 airmen and adding a fourth B-52 squadron.

These investments provide examples of a comprehensive effort expressed in our nuclear roadmap, including our back-to-basics approach for reemphasizing accountability, compliance, and precision in the nuclear enterprise.

We are also fielding capabilities that allow us to innovate partnerships with our joint and coalition teammates in today's fight by institutionalizing adaptive capabilities for irregular warfare, with

deployment of the MC-12 aircraft funded in fiscal year 2009 and scheduled for deployment this summer.

Another example is the deployment of Air Force electronic warfare officers who are now bringing their expertise in the electromagnetic spectrum to bear in Iraq and Afghanistan and saving lives in counter-improvised explosive devices (IED) and other operations.

These are examples of how we are rebalancing ourselves to operate across the full spectrum of conflict. We have expanded intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance capability, an investment of \$480 million in fiscal year 2010 for 24 MQ-9 Reaper unmanned aerial systems and an investment of \$410 million to procure special operations aircraft, like the MC-130J.

At the same time, we are committed to supporting our most precious asset, as Congressman McHugh indicated, our people.

We are focused on providing programs that develop and care for our airmen and their families with world-class quality of service. We recommend investment of \$245 million for new training facilities, child development centers, dormitories, and fitness centers.

We have proposed \$640 million for retention bonuses and recruiting in fiscal year 2010, including \$88 million for an increase in recruiting and retaining of health professionals.

One of our most solemn commitments is to our wounded warriors, and I am pleased to report that we continue to increase focus in this area, along with the rest of the Department of Defense, so that we may ease the burden on our wounded warriors and their families, as well as honor their sacrifice.

Part of ensuring support for our airmen means providing them with the tools they need to do their jobs effectively. Therefore, we are modernizing our air and space inventories, operations, and training with the right, if, certainly, difficult choices for the war fighter in the field as well as our taxpayer at home.

In addition to the programs Secretary Donley mentioned, we are committing to providing the Nation a robust air refueling capability and expect to release a request for proposal in June or July, with a mid-fiscal year 2010 contract award.

We also intend to increase efficiency by retiring aging aircraft that are becoming too costly to maintain and we will complete production of the F-22 at 187 aircraft and C-17 at 205 aircraft, subject to congressional approval.

Our programs reflect our commitment to pursuing joint multi-mission solutions, such as the procurement of eight C-27Js in fiscal year 2010, and we look forward to doing the same for the vital personnel recovery mission in the next QDR.

Our approach reflects efforts to produce the right strategic capabilities for today's commitments and tomorrow's challenges, and, as Admiral Mullen recently stated in his May 13 testimony, we are what we buy.

And following his lead, we intend to maintain stewardship of America's resources on behalf of our war fighters in the field and taxpayers at home by recapturing acquisition excellence, as Secretary Donley just outlined, and fielding the right capabilities for our Nation on time and within budget.

Mr. Chairman, with our core values guiding us, the Air Force will continue to deliver our best military advice and stewardship for the Nation, as we remain the world's finest Air Force, delivering global vigilance, reach, and power for America.

Thank you for your continued support of the United States Air Force and, particularly, our airmen and their families who are dedicated to defending our great Nation.

Sir, I look forward to your questions.

[The joint prepared statement of General Schwartz and Secretary Donley can be found in the Appendix on page 49.]

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, General.

I am not quite sure to whom I address this question, maybe to both of you.

The Secretary used the phrase "commitment to balance." In trying to be objective, let me mention a few items that you recommend: stopping the C-17 buy, retiring a substantial number of C-5As, requiring and asking for less joint cargo aircraft, retiring a substantial number of older fighters, ending the F-22 line with acquiring F-35s, the Joint Strike Fighter, which will still be in development.

So my question is: is the Air Force shortchanging itself with the missions that are required by virtue of what I just mentioned?

Secretary DONLEY. To hit a couple of the highlights for you, Mr. Chairman, I think we are in the process of reshaping the Air Force. No question, we are having to make some difficult calls.

But I do think there is analysis behind our work. These are issues that have gotten considerable strategic thought from within the Air Force and the rest of the Department.

Just to touch on one, the C-17, the proposed closure of the C-17 line is something that we have been thinking about for several years.

The Congress has been adding C-17s, but the Department has made a judgment that the 316 strategic airlift tails that we had by virtue of the program of record of the last few years is adequate to meet our needs. And so we had made previously a decision that we should go ahead and terminate the C-17 production line.

You will find nobody in the Air Force that is complaining about the capability or the value of the C-17. It is not about that. It is not about not recognizing the value of airlift.

We have the former commander of the Transportation Command (TRANSCOM) as our chief. So we know the value of this work.

We have made, in the Department, considered judgment about the requirements for the strategic airlift fleet.

We have also done some business case analysis which tell us that there are other alternatives to get marginal improvements in our current strategic airlift capability that we could pursue at less cost than buying more C-17s.

So we think there is flex in the current capability. There are additional options for increasing capability up to certain limits, if that should become necessary at some point, that are cheaper than buying C-17s.

So we have been over that ground very carefully over the past couple of years.

On the F-22 decision, we took a broader strategic look at the total combat air forces capability that we have, also, that is available to the Department, and I will tell you that there is a general view in the Department's leadership that the United States has enough tactical air capability, maybe even a little bit more than we need in relationship to future requirements.

And with that in mind, we felt like it was a prudent opportunity to accelerate the retirement of older aircraft, as we have done in this budget.

The program of record, as Secretary Gates has already articulated, the program of record for the F-22 was set in December of 2004 at 183 aircraft.

So that decision had been made previously, and so our decision was to stick with that approach. If we had our druthers, we would be moving the F-35 to the left and sort of making a decision here to focus on the success of the F-35 as the next fifth generation aircraft, and we are committed, going forward, to continuing mods for the F-22 program.

There are almost \$1 billion in modifications to the current fleet of F-22s in this year's budget and several billion more over the projected program going forward.

So we think we have made—we know we have made some tough decisions here, but we have made decisions balanced across that tactical fighter force structure.

The CHAIRMAN. General, do you have any comments? Are you shortchanging yourself?

General SCHWARTZ. Mr. Chairman, if there were many, many more dollars available for our Air Force, we might have made different choices.

But the truth of the matter is that we had to look at the array of things we are required to do in support of the combatant commanders, and it was our judgment, difficult though they were, that discontinuing production of F-22 and C-17, for example, was a way to get us to a position where we could offer the country the best possible air forces for the resources that were allocated to us.

And so I personally supported both the F-22 decision and the C-17 decision, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

John McHugh.

Mr. MCHUGH. First of all, Mr. Chairman, under the heading of holding myself responsible, I want to state that when I stumbled over the proverbial horse before the cart, it was because I read it rather than thought it.

I come from a part of the world where we know horses and we know carts, and I know the saying is "the cart before the horse."

And speaking of imperfections, let's talk about this budget. Let me just ask a quick question.

Chief, the Secretary of Defense is talking about the decision to shift the JCA program to the Air Force and cut the procurement down to 38, and he mentioned several times in his testimony, and this is a quote, that "we had an enormous amount of untapped capability in our C-130 fleet."

I have been to Iraq 10 times, Afghanistan 4 times, flown on C-130s every time.

Do you think we have got enormous untapped capability on our C-130 fleet and if so, where are you hiding it?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman McHugh, we can probably do our work better. We can make better use of the machines we have.

I wouldn't characterize it quite that way. But the Secretary's view is that—and this is really a part of a larger discussion of whether the United States Air Force can do both the general support mission, that is, sort of theater support, which tends to emphasize efficiency, as well as the direct support mission, which tends to emphasize effectiveness on behalf of dedicated support to certain elements within the joint force.

And I agree with him that we, as an Air Force, can do a better job on the direct support mission and have committed to do so.

Now, speaking of the joint cargo aircraft, I certainly supported bringing on the JCA.

As the Secretary of Defense has indicated, there will be additional analysis that will occur in the Quadrennial Defense Review that could better inform us on what the top line numbers should be. It is certainly at least 38.

Secretary DONLEY. I would agree, at least 38.

Mr. MCHUGH. There are some decisions here that have to be balanced against risk, and we talked about the strike fighter decision and the F-22 and so on and so forth.

The legacy retirements, the 250 or so planes, really don't affect the projected shortfall that was previously set of some 800 planes through 2024. These planes were always going to come out of the inventory.

But they are coming out sooner and that does raise a question. Your National Military Strategy calls for 2,250 aircraft. This accelerate retirement will take you—and I don't have the exact figure, but I believe it's more than 100 planes below the stated requirement to execute the National Military Strategy.

How do we rectify and justify that decision? And it may be the proper one, but speaking of analysis.

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman McHugh, this is a question about how to connect dots and how do we get ourselves into a configuration which is one that is primarily generation five-based, primarily with F-35s and F-22s, and how do we get on that glide path.

Our judgment was, both for reasons of fleet-aging, which you implied in your question, and for making the F-35 available more broadly, not only to the Navy and the Marine Corps, but to our overseas partners, as well, that we needed to increase production rates.

Now, that, for us, should be not less than 80 aircraft a year. Ideally, we would push production rates above that, perhaps as high as 110.

In order to do that, it was our judgment that we needed to get after this process and free up resources, take some risk, admittedly, in order to position ourselves to get on that manageable ramp for F-35 so that we, again, can manage fleet age, get F-35 into the fleet before the F-16s begin to attrit in large numbers, and get the quality kind of force that we think we need.

So the assessment was that, yes, we are on a path which is somewhat below the numbers which came out of the last QDR, remains to be seen what numbers come out of the ongoing QDR.

But we felt that the imperative was to get to F-35 at least 80 a year or higher as soon as we could, and that is our motivation, sir.

Mr. MCHUGH. And it is going to be a great aircraft, from everything I know about, but we are putting an awful lot of faith in the program delivering on time that hasn't accrued a lot of reason to give it to faith.

But that is a statement. You are welcome to respond to it.

The savings for the retirement to be applied and reinvested in upgrading of our legacy fleet and building that glide path to the F-35, if we don't do that, it is going to be disaster.

I am not greatly assuaged by recent history. In 2007, we all supported, some more reluctantly than others, some opposed, but the decision was made to reduce Air Force end strength and, in large measure, those savings were supposed to be reinvested and they didn't appear and if they did appear, they were harvested to other programs.

We don't have a Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) right now. What kind of assurances can you give and, more importantly, really, because I believe what your intents are, what kind of assurances have you received we are not going to repeat that same mistake, take the savings out of these legacy accelerated retirements and use them somewhere else? Because if that happens, the wheels are coming off the bus.

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman McHugh, it certainly is more than our intent. It is our conviction. It is our commitment to you and to our own airmen, and I don't think that that conviction can be misunderstood by anybody in the Pentagon.

Mr. MCHUGH. Mr. Secretary, do you feel as good as your chief does?

Secretary DONLEY. A couple of points, sir. First of all, the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) is an extremely important program for the Department of Defense and for our international partners. So we need to make that a success.

We need to stay on cost and schedule. It is going to be very difficult. This is not an easy program. It is very complex. It is making this difficult transition from development into early production. So it is that danger spot where we have not completed all the testing.

We are still going into the test program at the same time we would like to increase production. So there are things about the program we don't know yet until we get through the testing.

But it is an extremely important program and we can and must make it a success.

In terms of what we have done with the combat air forces reduction dollars, we have put that into modifications and upgrades for the legacy fourth generation airplanes that are going to be with us for a little bit longer.

Importantly, we have taken the manpower and we have put that against unmanned aerial systems, ISR, and the nuclear enterprise, sort of the three big pieces.

So this was thought through and we have committed those resources, not just this year, but in our planning years ahead, in those directions.

Mr. MCHUGH. I am worried about the future years more than the current.

But thank you, gentlemen.

And, Mr. Chairman, thank you. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Before I call on Mr. Spratt, let me explore just a bit further what Mr. McHugh just raised.

Does it concern you a great deal in purchasing the Joint Strike Fighter in a cylinder test and development while you are actually acquiring them?

That seems to be a serious balancing act.

Secretary DONLEY. It is a serious balancing act. It is similar to what we have gone through, I think, in every aircraft program that I am aware of.

We have done our best to reduce the risk in the Joint Strike Fighter. We have added hours. We have added airplanes to the test program, but still—and this is the most robust test and risk reduction that we have ever put into a tactical fighter program.

So we have made important investments to reduce risk. But we still are at that point in time where we are trying to do both, and there is concurrency in this respect, not different than what we have faced in the past, however. But it is a delicate time.

The CHAIRMAN. So, theoretically, you could have the Joint Strike Fighter in combat, in some unforeseen incident, while it is still undergoing tests as to whether it is fully capable to be in combat.

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, the F-15 is still in test, so is the F-16. I think just to amplify what the Secretary said, we add capabilities to these airplanes all the time.

In fact, one of the outcomes of the reduction in the legacy force that we talked about will enable us to install the infrared track system and infrared capability on those F-15s that will remain.

There will be some testing associated with that installation, but it is a proven piece of hardware and one that is certainly used on other airplanes.

But just to give you my sense of the F-35, based on my observations and study of this, is that we are going to have 20 airplanes in the test program for the F-35. That is really unprecedented.

We have an airborne simulator for the software. It is a business jet kind of platform, but it allows us to work the software in an airborne setting.

These are efforts that did not occur for the F-22 nor the prior machine and at least it gives me some level of confidence. Perhaps Congressman McHugh has somewhat less, but it gives me a level of confidence that this F-35—we may have a hiccup or two, but it won't be a major issue. I think that is much less likely.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much.

We are under the five-minute rule.

Mr. Spratt.

Mr. SPRATT. Thank you very much, Secretary Donley and General Schwartz.

General Schwartz, I thought this would be a good time for us to put on the record your response to certain questions about the relocation of U.S. Air Forces Central (AFCENT) from Shaw Air Force to Al Udeid Air Base in Qatar, a decision which appears to be fairly imminent.

Did this proposal originate with the Air Force or with Central Command (CENTCOM) or elsewhere, and what is the likely time-frame for its resolution?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman Spratt, thank you for that question.

It did originate with the Air Force and it is imminent, as you suggest. The nomination for General North, the current incumbent at 9th Air Force in Air Force Forces Central, reached the Senate last Friday. And so subject to confirmation, we will move ahead with this proposal.

What we have in mind, sir, in short, is simply this. The way we have levied responsibilities for the commander of Air Force forces in Central Command has been both the war, the war fight, the operational piece, as well as supervision of matters in the rear; that is, at Shaw, that is the wing subordinate to 9th Air Force, general court-martial authority, administrative requirements and so on.

And given the mandate that we have received both from the chairman and the Secretary of Defense to focus like a laser on the fight in Afghanistan, we made the judgment that what we needed to do was to download the rear responsibilities from that three-star commander so he could focus exclusively on the fights in Iraq and Afghanistan, predominantly Afghanistan.

In order to do that, we are suggesting that for this period of time, that the three-star commander, General North, and his successor will go forward full-time, will not have responsibilities in the rear. That will be performed by a two-star 9th Air Force commander and a one-star deputy and that when the time comes when these obligations forward subside, we will reset to the former peacetime configuration.

Mr. SPRATT. You describe this then as a wartime measure that is necessary under the circumstances, but it is temporary.

General SCHWARTZ. I do, sir.

Mr. SPRATT. And can you assure us that when the time comes, that the 9th Air Force will be reunited with AFCENT?

General SCHWARTZ. That is absolutely our intent, sir.

Mr. SPRATT. There has been a succession of three-star generals at Shaw who, at times when the ops tempo was much greater, didn't see the necessity of this.

What compelled you to this decision today, at a time when ops tempo really is a bit lower than it has been in the past?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, it is as high as it has ever been, I would argue, and, certainly, as commitments have subsided a bit in Iraq, they have accelerated in Afghanistan, and we feel that the current need for 100 percent focus on the operations currently underway require us to make this temporary change.

That is the best military judgment, Congressman Spratt, of your Air Force leadership; not just me personally, but certainly the leadership team.

Mr. SPRATT. As you know, in Base Closure and Realignment (BRAC) 2005, elements of the 3rd Army at Fort McPherson are being transferred to be collocated at Shaw.

Have you coordinated this decision with the Army and what course is the Army likely to take if AFCENT makes a decision?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman, we have certainly coordinated this with the commander of Central Command, General Petraeus. He favors this course of action.

It was coordinated with General David McKiernan, currently the commander in Afghanistan. And we have discussed this with the Army. I can tell you that the Army intends to relocate, as required by law and according to their plan, to the Shaw area with 3rd Army, Army Central, and I do not know for sure if they will follow suit with what we have proposed or not.

That isn't clear to me at the moment, but I can tell you that the Army leadership has reassured me personally that there is no, again, lack of conviction on their part to execute the relocation.

Mr. SPRATT. Could I have one additional minute, Mr. Chairman?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

Mr. SPRATT. Two final questions. There is a military construction (MILCON) request for the expansion of 9th Air Force headquarters, where AFCENT also is collocated.

Does the Air Force support this facility, a 50,000 square foot addition to the headquarter?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman Spratt, that is the wing commander's number one priority and we concur with that.

Mr. SPRATT. Then, finally, how many troops will accompany the three-star who goes forward?

General SCHWARTZ. Our expectation is that it will be less than 50, probably less than 40.

Mr. SPRATT. Thank you very much. I have some more questions, but time doesn't permit it, and I will submit those for the record. But we appreciate your responses.

General SCHWARTZ. Yes, Congressman Spratt.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Bartlett.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you very much.

Gentlemen, I would like to build on the line of questioning begun by my ranking member, Mr. McHugh.

It is my understanding that to supplement organic capability, the Department is currently using contract aircraft to move cargo in the Afghanistan area of responsibility (AOR).

It is also my understanding that a number of these missions are being performed by the CASA aircraft, an aircraft which participated in, but was not selected during the joint cargo aircraft competition.

The Department selected an aircraft to perform a mission, the joint cargo aircraft, but is contracting with the loser of the competition to perform this mission.

Can you help the committee understand the rationale for this decision, particularly in light of the fact that we have decided to buy only 38 joint cargo aircraft rather than the 78 originally anticipated?

The decision to reduce the numbers of joint cargo aircraft procured, coupled with current plans to increase U.S. presence in Afghanistan, would appear to place an increased level of stress on our organic aircraft capabilities and may force an increase in contracted aircraft.

Are you comfortable with increased reliance on contracted aircraft support in Afghanistan and if so, then why should we buy any cargo aircraft or our own?

As is true with any major procurement, there have been a number of analyses and subsequent approvals completed through the acquisition requirements process which define the joint cargo aircraft mission and resources required to perform that mission.

In this year's budget, the joint cargo aircraft program is transferred to the Air Force and we understand, from testimony provided by General Casey, that the Air Force has committed to fly the aircraft the last tactical mile when the Army needs to supply or resupply.

Have you assessed what are the additional resources that will be required to perform this mission? Are there additional manpower and flight crews required and if so, are they funded in this budget?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman Bartlett, thanks for that question.

The bottom line is the contract operation in Afghanistan predates the JCA program, at least as it is currently configured.

And this is this fundamental question I referred to earlier of the difference between general support and direct support. There was a sense in Afghanistan that the Air Force could not and, in some cases, physically could not access certain of the forward-operating bases in the country.

The C-130 simply was too much airplane either for the airstrip or the terrain or what have you.

Mr. BARTLETT. Well, sir, that being true, then why would we want to buy less joint cargo aircraft which were designed to meet just that requirement?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, as I indicated earlier, certainly, the number is not less than 38. But to go back to your original question, I think the key point is that we should be reluctant to contract out this kind of mission support.

And, yes, General Casey and I have had discussions and, yes, I have made a commitment to do the direct support mission the way the United States Army thinks they need to have it done.

And if you sustain the Department's proposal of migrating the JCA to the United States Air Force, our commitment is to do it the right way and do it the way the Army needs it done.

For example, we typically would support a mission and you might get a different crew every day. It is an efficient way to operate. But if the expectation of that brigade combat team (BCT) commander is that he will see the same crew every day for 30 days, if that means a lot to him operationally, then your Air Force should be adaptable enough to perform the mission in that fashion.

And we are adaptable and we will perform the mission as required, sir.

Mr. BARTLETT. Sir, there have been two recent hearings in which we asked witnesses from the Army and from the Guard if they

knew of any studies that had indicated that the original 78 requirement had been reduced or could be reduced to 38, but they both told us that, to their knowledge, there was no study that indicated it.

Is that true?

General SCHWARTZ. There are no studies beyond those which justified the former force structure

Mr. BARTLETT. Of 78.

General SCHWARTZ. Of 78.

Mr. BARTLETT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Dr. Snyder.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, gentlemen, for being here this morning, Secretary, General Schwartz.

Secretary Donley, it is good to see you again. You were confirmed October 2, and you must be like the luckiest guy in Washington, taking this job on before the election, didn't know the results, and I applaud you for your being available to provide this transition.

I think what has occurred with the Defense Department in the transition to the new Administration is probably a model we need to look at with other departments, such as Treasury. We have got some real issues there.

And, General Schwartz, it is good to see you again.

General Schwartz, you also came in at a difficult time as Chief of Staff of the Air Force. We appreciate your service.

When Secretary Gates was here last week, he stated that now that the budget has been submitted, that those who testify should feel free to point out where they disagree with the budget.

What are the top three ways, if you were submitting the budget document, you would have had different numbers or considerations in the document?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman Snyder, there are basically four areas that I would have adjusted.

One is to—again, we talked about the bridge strategy on the fighter force—is to emphasize the investment in those platforms so that those that remain in effect are more capable than their current status.

Second, as I suggested, is to increase the production rates of F-35 as rapidly as the program can sustain those production rates.

Third would be to acknowledge that there is a requirement for the armed forces to provide a long-range strike capability and that long-range strike capability needs to be properly defined.

It is probably a bomber of some variety and so on, but that we need, through the QDR and the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), to get our Secretary of Defense comfortable with the parameters that we propose for that platform.

As you are aware, he discontinued the next generation bomber. That is a concern to the Air Force, to be sure, and I think the larger joint team. And once we get him comfortable with the parameters, range, payload, manned, unmanned, nuclear, nonnuclear, low observable, very low observable, then we need to proceed aggressively with that program.

And, finally, there are areas in the unmanned aerial system category where additional automation would reduce manpower requirements.

At the moment, we fly one platform with one control station, with one crew. It is entirely possible to do that differently, and we need to get on with allowing one crew to operate more than one platform at one time.

Sir, those are four representative areas.

Dr. SNYDER. We spend a lot of time in this committee, as we are this morning, talking about the platforms and equipment. I wanted to talk specifically about personnel and professional military education (PME).

As you look at this budget document, what decisions did you make and how does the budget document reflect investment in people to come up with the kinds of strategists that we want and that Mr. Skelton envisioned 20 years ago when this whole process was changed?

General SCHWARTZ. I may not be a very good example, but I am a product of the chairman's efforts over the years.

Dr. SNYDER. I think you have just insulated yourself from all criticism from the chairman.

General SCHWARTZ. Hopefully, a halfway credible representative. But I think that the key thing here, sir, is that we currently have a program of about 240 international affairs strategists, as well as the kind of folks that are operationally sound, as well, which is what the chairman focused on over the years.

We currently have about 100 of those fully trained, those international affairs strategists, and have 120 in training. We are fully devoted to competing for positions, important positions in the joint world, which means we need to prepare our Air Force leadership to be bigger than where they came from.

Professional military education allows us to do that, and we do that well.

One last thing, though. I would make the point that we need to make these opportunities available to our international partners and, to an extent, that is currently somewhat limited. We would be far better off if more Indonesians and more Pakistanis and more others attended professional military education in the United States rather than less.

Dr. SNYDER. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Miller.

Mr. MILLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Can we talk tanker just a little bit?

I guess time is drawing near now where it looks like we may be putting out another request for proposals (RFP). I don't know how many more RFPs we are probably going to put out in the future.

There is some concern out there that there are rumblings in regards to how the RFP is going to be worded, obviously, and there are folks that are asking the question are we looking now specifically on lowest price, not lowest price-technically acceptable, but just the lowest price.

Has the Air Force ever in its history done a contract based solely on the lowest price?

Secretary DONLEY. Sir, I would propose that we get back to you for the record on that specific question.

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

Secretary DONLEY. In terms of the current status of our work, first, I think the Secretary has indicated that this remains a very high priority, not just—it is certainly a high priority for the Air Force. It is a high priority for the Department of Defense to get on with tanker modernization.

So in the midst of all the difficult decisions that we have made, this one stands unchanged in terms of our commitment to get this back on track and move forward.

The Secretary has been waiting for his new under secretary, Dr. Carter, to get confirmed. That has now been accomplished. So the Air Force has been in dialogue with Dr. Carter and his staff.

We are starting to engage the key issues that need to be addressed as we prepare to put that RFP later this summer. So we are in the process of doing that right now.

Mr. MILLER. General Schwartz, if you will, I am going to give you an opportunity, also, since you have been in the Air Force, your words just a minute ago, for a long time, and we all know that.

Can you remember any time in your service in the Air Force that the Air Force used lowest cost as the sole factor in deciding the contract?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman, probably not, but I don't think that is what we are talking about here. What we are talking about here is that if the offerors meet the minimum technical requirements, then the competition would be based on price. But you still have to satisfy the minimum technical requirements.

It is not just a price-based competition, sir.

Mr. MILLER. Is it fair to say that if the lowest cost bidder is picked in a competition, then eventually there are going to be additional costs, perpetual upgrades, to remain relevant as requirements in the military and environments change?

Secretary DONLEY. I would say that the history of our programs is that all of our procurements, almost all of our procurements for weapons systems and aircraft end up with modifications along the way, in the history of the programs.

Mr. MILLER. What is to prevent—I mean, we do the RFP. You award the contract. What is to prevent the person that doesn't win the contract from protesting and this thing just goes on and on?

It already has and we know that, but, I mean, this thing could go on out ad infinitum.

Secretary DONLEY. Well, there is nothing that would prevent that from happening except that we are working diligently in the Air Force and with the Office of the Secretary of Defense to make sure that the RFP we put out has measurable requirements, that we have sort of locked down the details of our work, our expectations in the RFP, what we expect to get back from offerors, so there is no ambiguity and that we are well-positioned for any protest that might come down the pike.

This is our obligation inside the Air Force and inside the government to make this successful process. And so we are all about making this as bulletproof as we can internally.

Mr. MILLER. If I can, and I am running out of time, I have some additional questions I would like to add for the record.

But is it your testimony then that the last RFP was flawed in those areas?

Secretary DONLEY. Well, I think I would let the prior statements on the Government Accountability Office (GAO) protest and our reactions to that stand for the record.

The CHAIRMAN. Mr. Marshall, please.

Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for your service and the service of those you lead.

Picking up on what Mr. Miller said, I trust that, in the process, all processes for acquisition platforms in the future, we are going to modify things, do it a little differently than we did with the C-17, get data rights, and, in the process of moving forward with the acquisition, agree with whoever the original equipment manufacturer (OEM) is on a transition process so that our depots and at least us, we are in control of the maintenance, sustainment, modernization process that we know is going to occur over a 40-, 50-, 60-year period of time and where the real cost of the platform is actually going to lie, if we don't, up front, get a deal that makes sense from the taxpayers' perspective.

I was essentially going to ask the same question Mr. Snyder did, what are your top four additional things you would like to take. I won't repeat his question. It has already been responded to.

Let me talk a little bit about JCA.

Chief, do you have plans now concerning how the deployment of these platforms that are coming in will be handled? Are they going to go to the same places?

Will it just be Air National Guard as opposed to Army National Guard? I think at least initially, they were planned for Army National Guard, folks who were going to be deployed almost immediately to Afghanistan.

And Army, with its deal, was contemplating a contractor, contractor logistics support (CLS), wasn't, as I recall correctly, since I was actively involved in trying to help the parties come together and get to a common view of this, Army wasn't particularly interested in data rights. Air Force was interested in data rights.

Air Force, again, on this platform, should be interested in what is the tail end going to look like, are we going to start developing our management team right now for sustainment, modernization, maintenance, that sort of thing.

If you could, talk about those sorts of questions with this transfer.

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, the acquisition will remain with the Army into next year. We are getting together to talk about the transition of the program piece of this and it won't happen immediately for the reasons you suggest.

We have got to figure out how to do this. What will initially occur is folks at Wright-Patterson and in our aviation systems organization will partner with their counterparts in the Army to run the procurement into 2010, when there will be a transition to Air Force oversight, and that dialogue is now underway.

We are not at the level of detail on the exact support methodologies and so on and so forth as yet, at least it hasn't come to my level.

Secondly, with respect to your other question, we are not very far along on this question of how would we organize ourselves to do this mission.

The Army, we, and the National Guard Bureau are working the questions.

There were 12 locations which had previously been identified for Army JCA and there were 6 locations in the Air Force that might have been candidates for JCA, given the prior program.

And we will have to talk about how we address both what is the right basing, what is the right footprint, how do we assure that we can support the calendar year 2010 requirement for at least four airplanes in Afghanistan, with qualified crews and so on. That is the pacing item.

And what probably will occur here is that we will worry about supporting the operational commander as the first imperative and then bring on the basing as a second order question.

Mr. MARSHALL. If I could, my time is about to run out.

We have got a model for this kind of transfer. It is the Caribou from Vietnam. And I trust that in the process of trying to work out the details of how this is going to be handled and what sort of services are going to be provided to the Army, that you will look to that model, how it broke down, to try and assure that we won't have those problems again.

General SCHWARTZ. I take your point, Congressman.

Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Wilson, the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And, General, Mr. Secretary, thank you for being here, and thank you for your service.

I particularly appreciate the Air Force. My dad served in the 14th Air Force, the Flying Tigers, during World War II. It was truly the highlight of his life and he always cherished the people he got to know, the service that he had.

I am also grateful that I have a nephew who is currently serving in the Air Force. I have previously visited him when he served in Iraq, and I am just grateful for his service and appreciate the opportunities that you provide of protecting America and then providing opportunities for young people to serve.

And I did grow up in the shadow of Charleston Air Force Base and I know how much the people of the Trident area support that base. I am happy to back up Congressman Spratt with Shaw Air Force Base. And then I am particularly, also, grateful to almost represent, geographically, McEntire Joint Air Base.

And I was very happy to be with Chairman Skelton in February. We visited Iwo Jima, and we visited the small Japanese air station that is located there. And when you come in, when you look in the window, there was one picture of an F-16 taped to the window and it is from the Swamp Fox squadron, signed by Dean Pennington.

And so what recognition for the Air National Guard and what they mean for our country.

And, General, the use of airmen to augment certain U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) requirements is not projected to be reduced in the near term.

What impact does the augmentee mission have on the Air Force's ability to perform its core mission, and, also, what is the impact on the careers of the individual air members?

General SCHWARTZ. Second question first, Congressman. I think it is absolutely positive. We currently have about 4,200 folks that are in what we now call joint expeditionary taskings. Those are somewhat nontraditional missions that our people are performing, properly trained.

At one point, it was as high as maybe 6,500. So it is a little less than the peak that we have seen in the past.

The bottom line is that I have not—in fact, I traveled, I was at Arifjan about six weeks ago, and I spent time with our folks that are supporting convoy missions in Iraq.

There is not a single young person, male or female, who thinks that the work that they are doing is not worthy. They are all in. And I am convinced, Congressman, that when these kids grow up to be chief master sergeants, it is going to be a different and better Air Force.

So the bottom line is it places demands on our people, but the Nation is at war and the Air Force is going to be available to do what is needed.

Mr. WILSON. And I have seen this actually with the Navy, too. The Sand Sailors are trained at Fort Jackson, South Carolina, and then proceed to Iraq and Afghanistan, and it has been a very positive experience for our Navy personnel.

Mr. Secretary, with the success of recruiting and retention, I am concerned that the budget has been reduced.

In the future, if we have, again, a downturn, will the reduced budget that we have now have a negative consequence if we do not have such an environment for people to want to serve as they do today and as they have for the past 10 years?

Secretary DONLEY. Well, no question, sir, that we need to have—continue to have the resources that we need, especially to focus on reenlistment and incentive bonuses, that we can target on those career fields most in need, and that tends to be a separate issue from our total end strength, if you will.

So we have, perversely, as I think we all understand, when the economy has gotten more difficult, that has helped our recruiting and retention, no question. But we still have some stressed career fields. We do need to have the resources to focus on those stressed career fields.

Medical continues to be a challenge where we have all the authority we need, we even have the resources, but it is just a very competitive environment to get those health care professionals in.

So the dollars do tend to ebb and flow as the economy goes up and down, but we need to have the dollars in there for reenlistment and incentive bonuses to target against areas of particular need.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Mr. Heinrich.

Mr. HEINRICH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary and General Schwartz, I want to thank you for joining us here today.

Mr. Secretary, I wanted to start by saying that I am deeply concerned about the aircraft cuts that are proposed across the Air Force active duty and Air Guard.

Last week, during the hearing with Secretary Gates, I questioned the rationale behind accelerating the retirement when Air Force had already predicted shortfalls in the required 2,200 aircraft fighter inventory beginning in fiscal year 2017, and I remain unconvinced that this is the right way forward.

What makes absolutely no sense to me is that despite being ranked the number one fighter base in the country during the 2005 Base Closure and Realignment Commission (BRAC) process, Kirtland Air Force Base, which is located in my district, is now slated to lose its entire fighter mission.

Equally troubling is that the combat Air Force restructuring report that your office released on May 15 lists 23 bases across the country, all having future missions declared, whereas one fighter wing has been selected to lose its entire flying force without a follow-up mission even being determined.

That wing happens to be in my district at Kirtland Air Force Base.

Now, considering the accelerated retirements of fighter aircraft, despite the predicted shortfall, that Kirtland was ranked number one in the 2005 BRAC process, and that a future mission for the base has yet to be declared, and that the Quadrennial Defense Review is still being developed, does it make sense to retire the entire 150th Fighter Wing?

Secretary DONLEY. Mr. Heinrich, just to go back to first principles, we do understand that this is a difficult decision that affects many states and communities.

First, I think it is important to recognize that this discussion in the Air Force actually preceded General Schwartz's and my arrival. So this had been under consideration for almost a year now inside the Air Force, and the Air Force proposed this reduction before we got into the more extreme budget environment that we have come into in the last four or five months.

So this was viewed as a good strategic move for the United States Air Force. The reductions proposed were carefully balanced between overseas and continental United States (CONUS) locations and were carefully balanced between the active and the Reserve, as well.

So this was not an easy process, but it was done in a balanced and thoughtful way across the combat air forces.

Mr. HEINRICH. How thoughtful is it to have a future mission to be determined for the 150th, when each of these other fighter wings has a future mission outlined?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman, I think that it is important for the 150th, a good organization, as we both know, to think more broadly about what future opportunities there are for missions.

Now, maybe they are manned aircraft, maybe not. Maybe they are associate missions with folks already at Kirtland, like the special operations wing that is there.

Mr. HEINRICH. The 58th.

General SCHWARTZ. Yes, sir, or perhaps in association with the F-22 operation at Holloman as it stands up.

So I think there are a number of opportunities here and we need to interact, naturally, with the Adjutant General (TAG) and so on to determine what is the best fit and given the needs that we have in the Air Force and so on.

Mr. HEINRICH. Well, let me express my willingness to work with you on that.

And one more quick question that is related. Basically, what were the criteria that were used to select which wings would be retired and were upgrades and refurbishment taken into account?

For example, I know half of that fighter wing had already gone through Falcon Star upgrades, extending their potential life another eight years.

General SCHWARTZ. We looked at the entire fleet and an analysis, an extensive analysis was performed, a business case, if you will, on the advantages of further extending life or accelerating retirements, and, in the end, the conclusion was that those—the birds, as I recall, block 40 class aircraft at Kirtland were the ones that we should accelerate retirement, and elsewhere.

By the way, the rough numbers are there were about 12 percent of the force structure on the active duty that would accelerate retirement, 6 percent each in the Guard and the Reserve, just to give you a sense of scale, Congressman.

Mr. HEINRICH. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman from Cool Camp.

Mr. LoBiondo.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Secretary, General, thank you for being here.

General, I was very pleased to see that the air sovereignty alert (ASA) mission was fully funded under the President's Budget. But I am confident that you are fully aware that the Air National Guard is predicting that in 8 years, 80 percent of the ASA aircraft units will begin losing their flying hours.

This, I think, has pretty much been widely accepted.

In previous hearings, I and some of my colleagues have tried mightily on this committee to try to get some answers. The committee has been assured that the Air Force is working on a plan and that everything will be fine.

We have heard repeatedly, "Everything will be fine. We just need some more time."

Well, I am not feeling so good about that answer, don't feel as good today as I did last week, and each day that goes by, I think we have a problem.

It has taken a long time and I think either the Air Force doesn't have a plan or you are not willing to share it with us. And I, along with Congresswoman Giffords, and you heard Mr. McHugh mention it and there are a number of other members who really believe that this has got to be addressed now.

The recent GAO report highlighted several issues with the ASA mission, including in its funding.

And I would like to know whether you plan to support and fund the ASA mission as a steady-state mission. And I would also be very interested to hear your thoughts and feelings on the fighter

shortfall issue, which is impacting the Air Force and the Air Guard, and when can we expect to see and hear a plan that we can understand?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman, there are 18 air sovereignty alert locations. Two of those locations will transition to F-22. Four of those locations will transition to the so-called Golden Eagle. This is one of the F-15s that have the electronically scanned radar, the infrared search and track and so on.

And the other 12 locations are not final-final yet, but it looks like they should be F-35 locations, provided we have a high enough production rate in the program.

So there are still some uncertainties. I have given you the six things that we are sure of, and there are still some uncertainties.

The bottom line is we are committed to air sovereignty alert as a requirement and we will support it either on—I should say that we are unlikely to support it in a dedicated fashion, in other words, to only have airplanes that only do air sovereignty alerts. They will have deployment missions and so on and so forth, but we will cover those 18 locations.

And you have got the lowdown on the 6 and we will give you—as soon as we have it solid, we will give it to you on the remaining 12.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Well, are you saying that you plan to support and fund the ASA mission as a steady-state mission?

General SCHWARTZ. The short answer is yes. It may be part of a multi-mission tasking, which is what we do in lots of different areas in our Air Force.

I doubt that it will be a dedicated mission for ASA only, but it will be part of the larger Air Force tapestry of capabilities, sir.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you.

General, do you agree or acknowledge that if the F-35 program slips and we find this sometime in one year or two years from now, that it is going to dramatically impact the ability to move F-35s into Air Guard units?

And at that point, with no other backups of legacy aircraft, how do Air Guard units stay alive? How do they be relevant with no ability to make up the bathtub?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman, I can't promise you that every unit that currently has a flying mission will continue to have a flying mission indefinitely into the future.

There are already Air Guard units that have transitioned to unmanned vehicles in Montana, in California, in Texas, for example.

So what I am saying is there will be future missions for those units, that I have no doubt, but they may or may not be flying missions, and this is the reality of our Air Force going forward.

Mr. LOBIONDO. So as we move forward, there is just going to be a long period of uncertainty as to how we are going to do this and which units are affected.

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, I understand your anxiety and I appreciate it and I understand the need for clarity for our family here, including the National Guard, and we will offer that clarity just as soon as we can.

Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Ms. Shea-Porter from New Hampshire.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Thank you.

Secretary Donley, a study was sponsored by the Naval Air Systems Command to identify problems of counterfeits in the avionics electronics supply chain, and they found a large number of problems.

I assume that those problems would also be reflected with the Air Force. And these companies have moved overseas. The study found that most counterfeits originated in Asia and were not discovered until the parts were returned as defective or they actually failed.

And I would like to know what plans you have to look for this. Do you plan to track the suppliers of counterfeits? And will there be any consequences for suppliers or manufacturers?

Secretary DONLEY. Ma'am, I am not familiar with the details. I do know that the results of the Navy study are available and have been exploited by Air Force personnel and Air Force Materiel Command.

We are aware of the problem and the issue. I would like to get a more complete answer for you for the record.

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Okay, I would appreciate if you would do that.

This seems to be an ongoing problem in so many areas, but this one, obviously, will have enormous impact on the wellbeing and the safety of our troops, and, in addition, ripping off the American taxpayer, again, which seems to have become a chronic condition.

General SCHWARTZ. Congresswoman, if I might just add.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Thank you.

General SCHWARTZ. I am sure you are aware that there have been several prosecutions related to this sort of activity and that certainly is—we are a part of that process, as well.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Well, then maybe I should ask you, please, do you have some system for rooting this out and are you creating or do you have a database to keep the names of the offenders and to make sure that they don't receive any contracts?

General SCHWARTZ. We will provide that for the record, ma'am.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Okay, thank you. I appreciate it.

My second question continues about contractors in theater. I just came back from Afghanistan last week. I was absolutely horrified to hear reports once again of contractors behaving badly and some of the resulting problems that they have.

And so I wanted to know, do you have enough resources in theater? Do we have enough people, actually, enough people on the ground to pay attention to these projects and to collect the information and to prosecute?

The number of prosecutions seems very, very small compared to the number of stories that we have.

Secretary DONLEY. I am aware, Congresswoman, that the Air Force has—Air Force contracting personnel, in particular, have increased their numbers in theater in the past several years and were part of, if you will, the fix-it team that came in to beef up the contracting capability in theater following some of the early problems that the Army and others had experienced.

The challenges out there are significant, but I do think we have put the resources against the problem to get it under control.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Do you feel you have enough expertise inside or do you need to get more contractors?

Secretary DONLEY. My understanding is that we have accelerated the number of Air Force contract personnel, contracting personnel, from our acquisition workforce that we deploy regularly to the theater.

In fact, this has now become a stressed career field for the Air Force because of a career field that is normally not deployed having to perform more deployments, more rotations into the theater to support this capability.

General SCHWARTZ. And, in fact, Congresswoman, they are on a one-to-one rotation scenario, one period of time at home to one period of time deployed. That is the level of effort that the Air Force is committing to this undertaking.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I guess the question I am asking is if we are sitting here in two years or four years, will we hear what we have heard for the past couple of years, which is we did not have enough people to keep track of this?

So if we need more people, if you don't have enough people on the ground and you don't feel confident that we actually can start watching out for the taxpayer and the troops, this is the time to say it.

And you are saying that you feel confident that we have enough people to catch this now.

Secretary DONLEY. Let us go back and sort of discuss this in terms of the demand signal downrange and get you an answer for the record.

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

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. Thank you very much.

Secretary DONLEY. Thank you, ma'am.

Ms. SHEA-PORTER. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

Mr. Turner, please.

Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank both of you for your leadership and, also, your effort today to answer some of our questions.

As you can tell, in many of the questions, there are issues of concern for the future of the Air Force.

When I listened to Joe Wilson about his description of his district, it reminded me not only of the fact that Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, which is in my district, has a symbolism of the Wright Brothers that were there, who tested their aircraft, and, of course, the labs that are there, but that it sort of fits into the mission of what we all expect from the Air Force.

I mean, the Air Force has always been the site of innovation, where we all wonder about what is going to be possible and what the future is going to hold.

And now, today, we listen to this budget and we are all concerned, not asking what is possible or where the innovation is going to be, but even whether or not you are going to be able to sustain what we suspect and expect of our Air Force.

We are all very concerned about the future of the direction of the Air Force.

But it is great to hear that you are going to abandon the decreases in personnel that was an effort to, I believe, cannibalize the personnel funds in order to recapitalize the Air Force.

But we are not seeing that recapitalization occur. We are not seeing the increases of spending that would really give us that vision of what is this future Air Force that we are going to have.

We see a lot of programs being ended, a lot of planes being retired.

Now, in your description, of course, in looking to the future, one of the things you look to is acquisition, because you are going to, of course, go through an acquisition process for the future, and the headline we have is recapturing acquisition excellence.

And my understanding is that, in looking at your overall budget, that you have an intent of adding positions in acquisition, which I think is so important, because there is a huge amount of expertise in the acquisition process that is not just compliance with rules and regulations. It is also an issue of trying to encourage that innovation and the attainment of what is possible.

But I would like for you to describe for me—you are going to add acquisition personnel. You also have, from what we have in our information, a statement of transitioning from contract employment to government employment.

I am a little concerned that that actually will result in a reduction in your resources.

Are you replacing people one-for-one? And many times, when you have a contractor relationship, you have additional supplemental assets that you can rely which you don't necessarily have in just an individual. So it would seem that you need to grow beyond just even a one-for-one.

What is your replacement plan and how are you looking at supporting your acquisition processes?

Secretary DONLEY. Good question, sir. I do not anticipate that we will be making conversions on a one-to-one basis. I think we will be somewhat higher than that.

We are kind of working out those details based on funding availability, but we do intend to begin to move the pendulum back toward more organic Air Force civilian, in some cases, Air Force blue suit capabilities.

As you know, and the members of this committee appreciate, over the years, the pendulum had swung the other direction very firmly in the 1990s toward contracting out more and more activity.

I think there is consensus, certainly, in the Department of Defense, and my understanding is that there is consensus also in the Congress, that that may have gone too far, that we have some organic capability that may have walked out the door that we need to get back in.

Mr. TURNER. You need some institutional knowledge.

Secretary DONLEY. To improve our institutional knowledge, to improve our oversight of contractor activity, just a variety of in-house capabilities, cost-estimating, systems engineering, a lot of important blocking and tackling capabilities that support our acquisition process at its foundation.

So we are about building that back up and—

Mr. TURNER. Now, let's pause for a second. One of the things that I think I heard you said was a recognition, though, that you don't have—you can't do a one-to-one; that for giving yourself the same level of capacity, you are going to have to—if you are adding government employees, you are going to have to do so at a higher rate than just as a one-to-one.

Is that accurate? Because it is, obviously, less than one-to-one.

Secretary DONLEY. I think it may work out to a little bit less than one-to-one, not higher, and I wouldn't want to be specific. Each contract here is unique and is on a different schedule, and we are talking about capabilities that run a very, very broad gamut of contracting support, all the way from base level things up to systems integration for major procurement programs.

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Chairman, if I could just make one comment.

I am concerned that this would be another area where you look at decreasing your workforce and end up having less capability.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

Ms. Giffords, the gentlelady from Arizona.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak after Congressman LoBiondo.

Congressman LoBiondo, for years, has highlighted the fighter gap issue, and my district is just adjacent to the 162nd Air National Guard unit.

So I am very concerned about the fact that within the next six years, it looks like they will completely be out of airplanes.

I think about the fact that the Air National Guard is the sole guarantor of our Nation's air sovereignty, yet we are not going to have enough airplanes to defend our Nation's 10 largest cities or the capital, frankly, by the year 2017.

So we are concerned. New Mexico is concerned. Minnesota is concerned. We need to see the plan and we need to see it soon, because we have a lot of Guard units, we have a lot of civilians, we have a lot of our Air Force, our Guardsmen and women that depend on this, and we need to see the plan.

So I am asking you if we could see that plan soon.

Shifting gears, I wanted to talk about an issue that is pretty broad in nature. The Department of Defense (DOD) uses 80 percent of the Federal Government's energy and the largest user of energy in DOD, of course, is the United States Air Force.

The Air Force needs to be commended for some real innovative ideas that you all have had. But when you look at a 2008 policy document, you talked about the fact that there are three pillars—reducing demand, increasing supply and changing the culture.

So I am curious, being out in the southwest, representing the state of Arizona, that has got a lot of sun, why is it that there is a solar project at Nellis, a wind power project at Warren, but to the best of my knowledge, I don't see an overall strategy in terms of a unified manner of how we are going to implement this strategy of reducing our dependency on foreign energy.

As a Nation, the fact that we are importing about 70 percent of all of our energy—and, again, a lot of this goes to what you do. We

have the ability, with the Air Force's technology and innovation, to revolutionize how we use energy and really not be dependent on these foreign regimes.

So if you could please address that, General Schwartz.

General SCHWARTZ. You make a wonderful point, ma'am, that we are the largest consumer of hydrocarbons. And so there are a number of ways to approach this.

In reality, over the last 6 or 7 years, we have actually reduced our overall consumption of hydrocarbons for air operations by over 15 percent, not even despite the global war on terror.

So we have been working the internal piece of this, the demand side of this in terms of trying to be more efficient in the way we operate, with airplanes flying routes that are less—that we take advantage of the winds, minimize the adverse effect of the winds and so on and so forth.

That is part of the sort of procedural way we can address, certainly, use of aviation fuels, where it is predominant.

In the case of installations, in this budget, we have proposed, I think, \$250 million for energy initiatives like the one you spoke at Nellis, which actually provides enough electricity to pay for a third of the year's use there, and wind at F.E. Warren Air Force Base and elsewhere.

We have a number of pilot projects, including those, and we will begin to step down the road here as we gain more experience in what the—less science projects and more taking proven technologies in order to reduce energy consumption in our facilities and on our installations.

And that is really the culture piece. Just like in your house, if our privatized homes are not metered, chances are people are less disciplined about use of power than they might otherwise be.

So we are, again, in terms of trying to change the culture, as you mentioned, using things that we know will make people more disciplined about their use of energy at large, airplanes, on the ground.

Ms. GIFFORDS. It just, General, seems to me that it is more of a base commander-by-base commander strategy. And when you look at Nellis, they figured it out. There is a pretty good model out there.

So when you look at Davis-Monthan or Luke or these other areas that are very similar in nature, it seems to me that that technology—and while we have opportunities where there are incentives, beta incentives available, obviously, the federal incentives are enormous, we really should be pushing this technology immediately.

General SCHWARTZ. We are in complete agreement.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota, Mr. Kline.

Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen, for being here, for your leadership, your service, your testimony, and your patience in dealing with our questions.

I want to identify myself with some of the remarks of my colleagues earlier. Mr. McHugh said we don't have a Future Years Defense Program (FYDP). We have been dealing with the Secretary's nondisclosure policy.

We haven't had access to analysis. We haven't had access to the discussions that we would normally have. And in the case of the Air Force, we are looking at what appears to us to be some very, very major cuts in major platforms or delays or extensions of uncertain duration and size.

So it is pretty difficult for us to get our hands around this, although we have an outstanding professional staff here that is digging as fast as they can as we try to understand the full impact of what you are doing.

I also want to identify myself with the comments that you have heard from Ms. Giffords and Mr. LoBiondo and others about the National Guard's air superiority mission, the fighters, what is going to happen.

We have a lot of people—and, General, I know you know this—these are people wearing the same sort of blue suit and they have questions.

Having said all of that, I want to shift to something else that we are seeing happen with the other services, and we are looking at in the larger budget.

We have had some pretty big vehicle cuts or extensions, which we normally associate with the Army and the Marine Corps, the expeditionary fighting vehicle (EFV) for the Marines, future combat system (FCS) for the Army.

But the Air Force operates a lot of vehicles, a lot of ground vehicles, and, specifically, right now, you have mine resistant ambush protected vehicles (MRAPs), as does the Army and the Marine Corps. You have got over 500 of them.

Is that being worked into your plans? Is that something that is going to become a part of the Air Force's inventory? Are you going to do something about the mine resistant ambush protected all-terrain vehicles (MRAP-ATVs)?

Where are you going with that program?

General SCHWARTZ. There will be a limited application of MRAP-like vehicles in the Air Force for those missions which clearly require it, like explosive ordnance disposal, those missions which are "outside the wire" kind of missions, security forces, OSI, office of special investigation, and so on.

And so we are talking about a relatively small number by comparison to the Marine Corps or the Army, to be sure, but it is really tied to specific missions.

Mr. KLINE. So in addition to those MRAPs or MRAP-ATVs, which we would be interested to know where you are going to go with that—and we trust that you would be working with the Army and the Marine Corps because of the large numbers there.

Again, you have got other vehicles, as well. It takes a lot of trucks to move a lot of the stuff you have got. And you are just going to continue with the sort of current technology and the current acquisition for those vehicles or what are you looking at there?

General SCHWARTZ. Consistent with Congresswoman Giffords' question earlier, we are looking at ways, again, to manage energy use through the purchase of the right kind of vehicles, whether they be multiple fuel vehicles or electrics, which we have a much higher number of, where they fit the requirements and so on.

So the bottom line is we are looking at managing down the number of vehicles. We are looking at making them more diverse to reduce the fuel that is associated with their use, and, again, on the culture side, frankly, trying to get folks not to use the vehicles perhaps as freely as has been the case in the past.

Mr. KLINE. Okay. So you feel like you have what you need now. You have got a plan that will reduce fuel consumption and so forth.

And specifically, in the terms of mine resistant or really protective vehicles, that absolute demand for which we have seen in Iraq and we will see going forward in Afghanistan, you feel like you are postured now.

You have budgeted for them. You have got what you need for the program.

General SCHWARTZ. We are covered, sir.

Mr. KLINE. Let me jump to something else. I see my time is getting ready to change.

But the United States Air Force is dropping a lot of ordnance that is usually outside the news and outside the visibility of most of the American people and even some on this committee, a lot of ordnance.

Are you experiencing any shortfalls now in Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAM) or anything else, either for training or for operational use?

General SCHWARTZ. We have adequate stocks. But one of the things that the reduction in the fighter force was going to support was armaments, the Advanced Medium-Range Air-to-Air Missiles (AMRAAMs), for example, the air-to-air capability, and so on.

And so the stocks are adequate. I would not say that, in every case, they are robust, and that is one of the areas where—to answer, again, Congressman Marshall and Congressman Snyder's earlier question—where I would put additional dollars if they became available.

Mr. KLINE. Well, I would hope we would never get in the position where we are not able to use ordnance when the troops on the ground have called for it because we are not robust enough.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. Taylor.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, General.

Mr. Secretary, my question involves the tanker acquisition. Over the years, the military has made me a very big believer in commonality and economies of scale, whether it is in training or in acquisition.

And I am just wondering, with that in mind, with this next acquisition, if any thought has been given to possibly settling on one tanker, holding out the opportunity that it might be built in more than one place, if that means it gets it delivered to the Air Force sooner.

That would give you, I would think, economies of scales on engines, fuselages, wings, give you economies of scale in your training pipeline.

The second thing that I am curious about is given that we have had, in the past 10 years, in particular, a series of flawed acquisition problems and, in almost every instance, since we don't have things like performance bonds, one thing that might have held the

contractors a bit more responsible is if we as a Nation had owned a detailed set of plans for whatever it was we were buying, to where, if the first contractor did not deliver on time, on budget, a quality product, we as a Nation would be in a position to say, "You know what? You either deliver or we are going to put it back out to an open bid."

Given the recent acquisition history, has any thought of that been given, again, in your next tanker acquisition?

So the question would be one tanker, possibly built in multiple locations. Second thing, how seriously is the Air Force, as a part of this acquisition, requiring a detailed set of drawings not only for acquisition, but when the time comes for maintenance at the depots?

Secretary DONLEY. To get to your first question first, Congressman, our challenge with respect to the tanker acquisition is cost and keeping cost and procurement in the same field of view.

We are 100 percent aligned with the Secretary that we do not want two sources for this buy. If we did that, it would require us to develop, fully develop a second airplane, to fully facilitate two locations instead of one.

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Secretary, you don't hear me arguing with you.

Secretary DONLEY. Got you. But the other aspect of this is that if we went down that road, we would have to have—if we had two facilities, we have to have a minimum order quantity, economic order quantity to keep annual production cost effective.

That problem applies whether it is one source or two sources.

Mr. TAYLOR. Yes, sir, and I agree with you. And I would also point out that we build identical destroyers, which are very sophisticated warships, in two locations. So it is not like it can't be done.

Secretary DONLEY. It can be done, but it is much more expensive. And our current plan for the tankers is built around an annual buy of about 15 airplanes.

If we go to two locations, the minimum is viewed as at about 12 per site, one per month. That would drive—

Mr. TAYLOR. But if we are able—

Secretary DONLEY. If I could finish—

Mr. TAYLOR. Go on to your point, sir.

Secretary DONLEY. If I could just finish the thought, sir. That would drive our annual procurement to 24 per year. There are good things about that. We get the aircraft quicker. But it drives up our annual cost significantly, by maybe 70 percent or so.

So the annual requirement for us to invest in tankers goes way up and to do that year after year after year makes a huge dent in our procurement plans going forward.

Mr. TAYLOR. I think you answered my question. But we also are literally facing a cliff on the life of the tankers that we presently have. You have made that point very well.

And if we are trying to address that in a short a period of time as possible, then I think, again, the one plane, multiple locations is something we ought to at least look at.

The other thing is if one of the contractors fails to perform, you have some leverage to go to someone else. And I will remind those of you who haven't been here that long, C-17 just turned out to be a great plane, but we had huge problems with that platform in the

beginning and there was even a time when we didn't think we would buy them at all because we had so many problems, and this might keep the contractors on their toes.

Secretary DONLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. TAYLOR. I would just ask you to consider it.

Secretary DONLEY. With respect to your second point on tech data, I am certainly hopeful that we have learned that lesson and that is a priority in our contract work going forward.

Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPRATT [presiding]. Mr. Lamborn.

Mr. LAMBORN. The decision was made last year to realign the cyber mission under Air Force Space Command and stand up a numbered Air Force, the 24th Air Force.

Last week, you identified Lackland Air Force Base as the preferred alternative and Peterson Air Force Base as the reasonable alternative for the future home of the 24th Air Force.

Two-part question. How will Air Force Space Command and the new numbered Air Force prepare to meet the challenges that DOD faces in cyber security and cyber warfare, and what role will the Air Force Space Command play in the acquisition process for cyber? Either one of you.

Secretary DONLEY. If I could start, we think we have made a good decision on the alignment of 24th Air Force with Air Force Space Command.

We do think there is important synergy between our cyber work and our space work, both with respect to the kind of technical capabilities required in the workforce and, also, the end-to-end visibility over network operations, if you will, and the extent to which cyber work depends on space and space work depends on land-based sort of cyber connections, as well.

So we think there is good synergy in the alignment of those activities. We have seen that in our recent war game, the Schriever-5 war game, out and about it.

So we think this is a good match.

General SCHWARTZ. I would just amplify by saying that in terms of acquisition, unlike the way Space Command deals with space acquisition through the space and missile center in Los Angeles, cyber acquisition would be handled in a more routine fashion perhaps through the Air Force Materiel Command acquisition process and our Air Force acquisition process.

Clearly, though, we are not the center of gravity on this. There is a center of excellence for both expertise and design talent at the National Security Agency (NSA), for example. And so we will, no doubt, piggyback to a great extent on the very, very good work that is being accomplished there.

There are two major functions that this numbered Air Force will perform. One is to defend our networks, and we all know that is a necessity.

The second thing is those offensive capabilities that apply to the Air Force mission set, for example, engaging in integrated air defense, you can take it down kinetically or you might choose to do so through cyber means, if that is possible.

That gives you some sense of the two roles, predominantly defend the Net, but there are offensive applications which we will field and improve upon in the years that go down.

Mr. LAMBORN. Thank you. And as a follow-up, what specific role do you see for Air Force Space Command to play in its interaction with the 24th Air Force?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman, it will be what our major commands do, which is they provide organized train-and-equip oversight for our operational elements.

That involves personnel management, force management, training. It involves ensuring that the youngsters have the tools they need to do their work.

They will do all those overhead kinds of things that major commands do. This was another benefit, in my view, of aligning with Space Command, in addition to the similarities of the skill set and so on, had to do with the fact that there was some capacity in Space Command to perform these organized train-and-equip functions and not have to re-create that from whole cloth.

I think that was a good stewardship way to approach the problem.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Langevin.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, thank you for your testimony here today.

I would like to begin a follow-up question as my colleague addressed just a minute ago with respect to the Cyber Command. The Air Force, obviously, has spent many years developing an Air Force Cyber Command, and the announcement just made to create the new joint Cyber Command through U.S. Strategic Command (STRATCOM).

So, specifically, I guess, how will the Air Force role now change in the Air Force Cyber Command? Would that be rolled into this joint Cyber Command or will it continue tangentially to the joint Cyber Command?

General SCHWARTZ. Congressman, fundamentally, we are a force provider. That is what the United States Air Force does. We provide forces, airspace and cyber, to the combatant commands to be employed, and we will do that in the cyber realm, as well.

We will provide well-trained individuals and units to perform cyber functions, and they will continue to align, at least for the near term, with the United States Strategic Command, the combatant command that has the responsibility for cyber operations for the Department of Defense.

Now, you have heard reported and the Secretary of Defense has indicated that he is thinking seriously about standing up a sub-unified command with a four-star leader and if that is how this turns out, then our Air Force element will provide their capability to that four-star commander subordinate to the Strategic Command.

So provide capability, people and wherewithal to do the mission according to the needs of the field commander.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Thank you.

On another topic, as other members have already mentioned, the decision to move the Joint Combat Aircraft (JCA) program away from the Army is troubling, for a number of reasons.

Currently, our Army Guard has a dual mission of serving both on the battlefield and on the home front, and I am concerned about our force's ability to meet this critical combat support mission in Iraq and Afghanistan, while also maintaining their critical homeland security mission.

So my question in this area is how did the Air Force decision to replace the aging C-23s with just 38 planes ensure that our service members will, in fact, be able to meet both the air combat and homeland security missions?

General SCHWARTZ. As I indicated earlier, Congressman, there were 42 C-23s and 38 is the number in the fiscal year 2010 budget submission to succeed those C-23s.

How we go about getting the division of labor correct for both deployment missions and support of state requirements associated with the National Guard is still under discussion.

I wish it was more mature. But we are well aware of these two needs and we will come to a conclusion on this. We have to make a presentation to the deputy secretary of defense by the 30th of May. And so the work is ongoing and we will have an answer to that question, hopefully, to the deputy secretary's satisfaction, on the 30th of May.

Mr. LANGEVIN. Well, actually, it would be appear, to me, to be very challenging, if not impossible to meet those dual missions with just the 38 planes.

But I think we will probably have to revisit that and I will certainly follow up and follow this very closely.

Before my time runs out, Secretary Gates recently announced a decision not to cut the transformational satellite program, TSAT, and instead purchase two more advanced extremely high frequency satellites as alternatives.

My question is what would that mean for our communication satellite industrial base and how will this affect other major satellite acquisition programs?

And, finally, will the fiscal year 2010 budget reflect a commitment to prioritizing space acquisition programs?

Secretary DONLEY. Sir, the TSAT decision was an important one. I think the Secretary felt, as did many around the table, that while the Air Force has put a great deal of investment into the TSAT program to reduce risk going forward, that the capabilities sought in the TSAT program were beginning to erode away for cost reasons.

And so there was a great deal of, I think, concern all around about what the TSAT would eventually give us in terms of capability, which was potentially very significant, but what the cost would be with that.

And I think that the Secretary's decision has taken risk out of the Military Satellite Communications (MILSATCOM) program. It is true that the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) capability will not give us all the things the TSAT will give us, but adding on to the end of the AEHF program, adding two satellites there, adding additional satellites in Wideband Global SATCOM Satellite (WGS) will provide additional MILSATCOM capability until we can get more confident about the future of a TSAT-like capability out in the future and our ability to afford that.

From an industrial base point of view, we are working with OSD right now on the decision memorandum which will tie up the details of the Secretary's decision and will put money against a technology development program going forward that will revisit some of the technologies and capabilities that we had been pursuing inside the TSAT program to make sure we keep abreast of those technologies as they develop and that we continue to keep teams together that will help us look at those capabilities beyond AEHF and beyond the WGS systems.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Hunter.

Mr. HUNTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony and for being here today.

First question, you have \$475 million focused in Regional Command (RC) South at Kandahar and Bastian, and then you have got 24 Reapers for \$489 million.

Does the Reaper money include the ground infrastructure money to support the Reapers? Because that is where everything is lacking right now. We have birds. We don't have the hangars, the runways, the support, the high-speed bandwidth available right now to actually use them.

So what does that include? How do you break apart the 475 and the 489?

Secretary DONLEY. Sir, let me get you a detailed break on what is included in that. We do believe we have taken care of the ground support, the infrastructure issues, not sure how that breaks in terms of appropriation accounts, but we will get you that for the detail.

Mr. HUNTER. But it is going to be in line. So when the birds are there, you are going to have the infrastructure there, too.

General SCHWARTZ. And the back end.

Mr. HUNTER. Got you.

General SCHWARTZ. For processing the data. It is the end-to-end piece.

Mr. HUNTER. How are things looking right now there?

General SCHWARTZ. We are doing very well, I think. As you are aware, we have got 35 orbits, 34 of which are Predator and Reaper, and one Global Hawk.

Our distributed common ground system, the back end that I referred to, at the moment, in Central Command, is processing about one-third of the imagery that is being produced in the country and it is processing fully a half of the full-motion video.

So it gives you a sense of the—

Mr. HUNTER. That is the analysis side of it.

General SCHWARTZ. That is right.

Mr. HUNTER. Got you. Let me ask you this. Has the Air Force had to turn down any ground commander's request for an AC-130 in the last, say, two to three years, to your knowledge?

General SCHWARTZ. For a C-130?

Mr. HUNTER. For an AC-130, for the gunship.

General SCHWARTZ. A gunship.

Mr. HUNTER. Put it this way. Do you feel like you have enough AC-130 gunships to satisfy the war fighter?

General SCHWARTZ. The gunships, this is a little bit out of my lane. This is more in the Special Operations Command (SOCOM) area.

Mr. HUNTER. I understand that they own them, but the Air Force still—

General SCHWARTZ. As you are aware, in the 2010 budget, there is a proposal to take existing C-130 capabilities within our Air Force Special Operations Command and turn them into gunship platforms, and that will satisfy, based on what Admiral Olson has told me, their need for gunship capabilities.

Mr. HUNTER. But that will just satisfy SOCOM. So that is not even regular Army or more high-speed Army or Marine Corps. That is SOCOM only.

General SCHWARTZ. That certainly is focused on the SOCOM mission, and we naturally have strike platforms to do precision targeting, not least of which is the Predators and the Reapers.

Mr. HUNTER. But nothing has the capability of the AC-130 to stay on target and hover and wraparounds.

General SCHWARTZ. Again, I would argue that 20 hours from a Reaper is more than a gunship can—

Mr. HUNTER. Payload, though, payload-wise, the gunship has got a whole lot more.

General SCHWARTZ. I can't argue that, sir.

Mr. HUNTER. Okay. Thank you, gentlemen.

I yield back the rest of my time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Coffman.

Mr. COFFMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, General Schwartz and Secretary Donley, for appearing at the committee today and for your service to our country.

The Air Force does not currently have a peer competitor. China is rapidly modernizing its capabilities.

One criticism of this budget is that it delays modernizing our own air capability.

Does this budget move us in the direction of having a peer competitor that we don't want to have?

General SCHWARTZ. Without talking about specific candidates for peer competition, I am confident that the current program can maintain our supremacy in the domains where the joint team expects us to secure the airspace and cyber effectively against that undefined peer competitor.

Mr. COFFMAN. Mr. Secretary.

Secretary DONLEY. I think this budget makes a very strong commitment to the fifth generation fighter capabilities, for example, that the United States has started to field already in the F-22 program and has on its books much more aggressive and ambitious plans for fifth generation modernization than any nation out there.

So I think we are in pretty good shape on that front. Like General Schwartz, I believe we are well positioned to take on near peer competitors.

And I think it is still important, however, to recognize that we need to be working on new aspects of our suite of capabilities which would potentially be vulnerable to asymmetric challenges from competitors, not just at the high end, the near peer, but, also, at the lower irregular end, as well.

So continued attention to our cyber domain, continued attention to the space domain are particularly important going forward.

Mr. COFFMAN. Thank you both.

As a member of this committee, I want to make sure that we never have a peer competitor.

General Schwartz, you mentioned, I guess, on the 18 facilities that have an air sovereignty alert (ASA) mission and I think you broke it down, 2 for the F-22, 4 for the F-15, 12 for the F-35, but then you said that not all those may be fulfilled in terms of having a flying mission.

Can you give me any indication of any considerations that you would deem important in terms of making a decision as to what of these 18 facilities would receive a flying mission and which ones would not?

General SCHWARTZ. Again, I think it has to do with our level of resources, how many machines we have, and so on. I mean, one of the considerations is if you have a smaller force, does it make sense to consolidate, to some degree, or not.

And so this is the long discussion that we have about unit size, for example. In a fighter squadron, is an 18-aircraft fighter squadron the optimal size or 15 or 12, in some cases, rather than, say, 24.

And the reason this is important, sir, is because it has to do with, again, trying to achieve sort of a critical mass on maintenance and aircraft sustainment and so on, where we may decide or we may propose that it makes sense to have fewer larger squadrons rather than more smaller squadrons.

If that is the debate, then that might affect how you distribute units to legacy organizations and you might suggest future missions, in other words, non-flying missions, as compensation.

So these are kind of the dialogues that we will have internally. Naturally, we will certainly interact with the Congress on this as these choices begin to solidify.

Mr. COFFMAN. Secretary Donley, any visibility on this?

Secretary DONLEY. I think the chief has been very articulate on this point, and I would just like to reinforce for the committee and all the members affected by this.

In general, we have had a number of conversations with members, House and Senate, National Guard and other communities out there concerned about the drawdown in the number of airplanes, but this is a broader trend for our Air Force.

So we do have challenges out there. We do need to have our Reserve components, as well as our active forces, of course, as well, thinking about the broader changes in the Air Force that are underway underneath this so that folks understand that, in general, with a few exceptions, we are going to have less airplanes available going forward.

The demand signals are on the cyber side. The demand signals are on the space side. And we need to think about how our forces are sort of reconfigured and how this looks going forward for the long term, as we spend just as much time on these space and cyber domains as we have spent over the last decades on our air domain.

Mr. COFFMAN. Thank you, General, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Bishop.

Mr. BISHOP. I appreciate—in fact, I have found the questions and answers very fascinating. And you two probably think this process sucks, but I have enjoyed it very much.

I appreciate what you said to Congressman Turner. Let me reiterate, though, on one question with that, because outgoing Acquisitions Secretary Young, as he was leaving, made a statement that he didn't believe that depots—he did not favor depots doing major modification work. I realize he was talking about the C-130 at Warner Robins.

I just want to know if the Air Force has that as a major policy or is that simply a throwaway line as he left?

General SCHWARTZ. I would say the latter, Congressman.

Mr. BISHOP. Okay, right answer.

Let me go on to a couple of others, if I could. And can I just follow up on what you told Congressman Coffman?

For example, in the legacy drawdown, the 388th, which is blended with the 419th Reserves, will lose 25 planes.

Have you made the decision on whether to allow them to maintain squadron levels—and I think this is what you were talking about—at a lower level, 18, for example, as opposed to cutting off a squadron?

Has that decision been made? If it is a flexibility you are still looking at, when will you probably decide that one?

General SCHWARTZ. I would say that comes in the next budget cycle. But we haven't come to closure on that question yet, but it does apply at Hill, sir.

And this is the question and there are lots of factors that affect this. How many deployable units do you need? Can you split the larger squadrons if you have to? There is some overhead efficiencies with fewer units, but does that trump, again, the operational flexibility?

These are not simple things to sort of decide on the fly, sir.

Mr. BISHOP. But we haven't walked through that, when the decision to take the legacy planes out. That is still a decision still to come. There is going to be some flexibility for the wings to help define the way they will be reduced.

General SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. BISHOP. Secretary Donley, I appreciate receiving the letter from the questions that we asked Secretary Gates last week. Last night, we even got more information.

I am talking specifically about maintaining a warm line for solid rocket motor proposals going on there.

In essence, I appreciate the fact that I think now with 2009, as well as 2010 budget money, the maintenance of that warm line will be there. We have got the information back we asked.

The problem I have is it was simply unfair for me to ask Secretary Gates those questions in the first place. The only reason we did is because the gag order simply stopped all communication.

As soon as that went into effect, there was no longer an ability of talking about what budgets would do, what is compatible there or not.

And I would simply like to ask, Secretary, about your take on the gag order.

Are there some areas in which we should loosen or shorten the time that was generated on that gag order going forth in the future? Because I think every one of the questions I asked Secretary Gates for which he had no answer could have been worked out at a lower level had not the gag order simply been in place.

Secretary DONLEY. Well, I think the Secretary has been clear that that was a very temporary management device, and I think, from his perspective, it was probably helpful to the Department's work.

Another complicating factor on the issue that you raised on solid rocket motor industrial base was that we had been working on this issue in the context of our fiscal year 2009 reprogramming, which, as we noted in the letter back to you, is not yet complete.

So not all of this was in conjunction with a gag order that was connected to fiscal year 2010, but it was also from our preparations for fiscal year 2009, which had not been completed earlier this year.

So there is a timing difference there.

Mr. BISHOP. Well, let's hope there are some adjustments later on.

General, I am going to ask an unfair question. You stated already—and I will give you an answer, so you can back out of it, if you want to.

You said if there were many more dollars, we are the best Air Force for the resources we have.

As soon as you were appointed, and correct me if I am wrong on this, you said 240 F-22s was the right number. Is that the right number or is it the right number that our resources allow us to have in this zero sum game?

General SCHWARTZ. Two forty-three is the right number and 187 is the affordable force.

Mr. BISHOP. You said it very well. Thank you, sir.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Conaway.

Mr. CONAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And, gentlemen, thank you for your endurance.

In 2008, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) provided a mandate that the Air Force conduct a pilot project on a fee-for-service concept for tankers, which seems like a spectacularly expensive financing tool, given that tanker capacities are only used by the Air Force, and we don't use it in the commercial airliners or anywhere else.

You would get perhaps some savings if you could buy that off the shelf.

General Schwartz, can you catch us up to speed on where that effort is right now?

General SCHWARTZ. Sure. We put out, I think last October, a request for information on that to industry. We got replies back in March.

We are continuing to digest that information. The bottom line is there are both some statutory and some practical obstacles to this. For example, a multiyear services contract would be needed to make this work, which currently is not authorized.

There are some issues with regard to Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) certification that would have to be dealt with, and so on. It is not simple. And we will complete the process of sort of di-

gesting the industry proposals and report back on the viability of this pilot program.

Mr. CONAWAY. I think this thing authorized \$10 million to do all this work. Is there a better place to spend \$10 million? Should the Air Force really even finish this study?

Do you know enough now to know that this is so much more expensive than any other alternative, that we can save whatever is left of the \$10 million and buy something else with it?

General SCHWARTZ. Sir, we currently have guidance to wrap this up. Frankly, I think it is probably the right thing to do to come to closure on this, not to leave this sort of an open question, but let us come to a compelling position on it so we can—if it is not a good idea, we put it behind us, and if it is viable, we will press on according to the Congress's wishes.

Mr. CONAWAY. And that is reasonably soon, in your mind?

General SCHWARTZ. Yes.

Mr. CONAWAY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

Secretary DONLEY. If I could add just one thing on that, Mr. Conaway.

Mr. CONAWAY. Sure.

Secretary DONLEY. Just to reiterate. The costs are significant and those are not part of our plan going forward.

So the estimate is roughly, for an eight-year period, somewhere between \$500 million and \$900 million.

Mr. CONAWAY. All right. Thank you. Appreciate you.

Secretary DONLEY. This is not part of our plan.

Mr. SPRATT. Ms. Fallin.

Ms. FALLIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And thank you, gentlemen, for being here today and we appreciate your service to our Nation.

The fiscal year 2010 budget request contains more than \$1 billion for military construction (MILCON), and the Army has more construction funding at one installation than the entire Air Force, Air National Guard, and the Air Reserve military construction combined.

This decline in infrastructure investment is causing significant inefficiencies locally and accelerating degradation of assigned aviation assets.

For an example, in my home state, in Oklahoma, Vance Air Force Base, and Tinker Air Force Base are both in need of new air traffic control towers and don't have the funding to make those upgrades to support their flying and training missions.

Can you tell us why the Air Force did not program infrastructure in a time when we need to support these valuable assets? And what problems could this lack of MILCON funding have in the future for the Air Force?

Secretary DONLEY. At the strategic level, we have been taking additional risk in infrastructure support and in MILCON. So we are aware of that. It is a financially constrained area.

I am not familiar with exactly the status of the projects you mentioned, where they rank in the Air Force's MILCON priorities, but we know internally that this is a constrained area.

General SCHWARTZ. And I would just amplify that we undoubtedly came to the conclusion that Vance and Tinker were not as pressing as other requirements.

For example, those that are supporting the fight forward is a case in point.

So what we have tried to do, ma'am, is prioritize to the best of our ability, and there will be places we will have to defer action.

Ms. FALLIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you, gentlemen.

Mr. SPRATT. Secretary Donley, General Schwartz, thank you for your testimony, for your time, and, most of all, for your splendid service to our Nation. We appreciate it.

[Whereupon, at 12:31 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

MAY 19, 2009

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

MAY 19, 2009

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
PRESENTATION TO THE HOUSE ARMED SERVICES COMMITTEE
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
FISCAL YEAR 2010 AIR FORCE POSTURE STATEMENT

STATEMENT OF: **THE HONORABLE MICHAEL B. DONLEY**
 SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE

GENERAL NORTON A. SCHWARTZ
 CHIEF OF STAFF, UNITED STATES AIR FORCE

19 MAY 2009

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

The 2009 Air Force Posture Statement articulates our vision of an Air Force ready to fulfill the commitments of today and face the challenges of tomorrow through strong stewardship, continued precision and reliability, and dedication to persistent Global Vigilance, Reach and Power for the Nation.

1. INTRODUCTION

Today, the United States faces a spectrum of challenges to our national security and global interests. As an integral member of the Joint team, America's Air Force provides the critical capabilities of *Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power*. The United States Air Force is "*All In*" today's Joint fight. At the same time, our investments in new capabilities will ensure we are ready for tomorrow's challenges. The mission of the United States Air Force is to "*fly, fight, and win...in air, space and cyberspace*"—as an integral member of the Joint team that ensures our Nation's freedom and security.

2. A BALANCED APPROACH

Today's uncertain international security environment requires a balance-driven approach to prevail in today's operations, and prepare for tomorrow's challenges by identifying and investing in new capabilities and force structure. This balanced approach postures the Air Force to provide an array of capabilities to Combatant Commanders across the spectrum of conflict—from building partnership capacity to ensuring the readiness of strategic deterrence forces.

3. AIR FORCE CORE FUNCTIONS

Our Air Force's foremost responsibility is to organize, train, and equip Airmen to meet the needs of our National leadership and Combatant Commanders. Our Fiscal Year 2010 budget proposal reflects a commitment to the twelve Air Force Core Functions, which provide the framework for investment and training.

AIR FORCE CORE FUNCTIONS

- | | |
|---|----------------------------------|
| <i>1. Nuclear Deterrence Operations</i> | <i>7. Special Operations</i> |
| <i>2. Air Superiority</i> | <i>8. Global Integrated ISR</i> |
| <i>3. Space Superiority</i> | <i>9. Command and Control</i> |
| <i>4. Cyberspace Superiority</i> | <i>10. Personnel Recovery</i> |
| <i>5. Global Precision Attack</i> | <i>11. Building Partnerships</i> |
| <i>6. Rapid Global Mobility</i> | <i>12. Agile Combat Support</i> |

The Air Force FY10 budget proposal reflects a commitment to our Core Functions that will be informed by numerous reviews of the overall defense-planning construct. Through the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR), the Nuclear Posture Review (NPR), the Space Posture Review (SPR) and internal mid-term reviews, we will continue to sharpen and institutionalize our Core Functions. These capabilities, combined with the extraordinary commitment and dedication of our Airmen, provide our Nation with truly exceptional air, space and cyber power.

NUCLEAR DETERRENCE OPERATIONS

For more than 60 years, the Air Force has proudly served as stewards of a large portion of our Nation's nuclear arsenal. We operate, maintain and secure these nuclear forces to deter potential adversaries and to prevail if deterrence fails. Recent incidents and assessments have highlighted performance shortfalls, and we are diligently working to ensure the safety, security and reliability demanded for this vital capability.

Our FY10 budget proposal addresses many of the recommendations provided by the various assessments of the Air Force nuclear enterprise, which includes increasing nuclear related personnel by 2,500 and adding a fourth B-52 squadron. The FY10 budget proposal also places additional emphasis on strengthening the physical integrity of our Weapon Storage Areas.

Through a back-to-basics approach, the Air Force is re-emphasizing accountability, compliance and precision in the nuclear enterprise. We are reorganizing our nuclear forces in a manner that reduces fragmentation of authority and establishes clear chains of supervision for nuclear sustainment, surety and operations. These changes include: 1) consolidating all nuclear sustainment matters under the Air Force Nuclear Weapons Center; 2) establishing a new Air Staff nuclear directorate responsible for policy oversight and integration of our nuclear enterprise activities; and 3) standing up Air Force Global Strike Command, which is already operating in a provisional status at an interim location. Global Strike Command will consolidate Air Force Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles and nuclear-capable bombers under a single command, and is on track to activate later this year.

AIR SUPERIORITY and GLOBAL PRECISION ATTACK

Air Superiority and Global Precision Attack remain the foundations of our ability to deliver *Global Power*. In FY10, we are investing \$21B into these Core Functions.

New and unprecedented challenges to our Nation's Air Superiority continue to emerge, and threaten to remove the technological advantage enjoyed by our Air Force. Our adversaries continue to invest in highly capable surface-to-air missile technology, which threatens even our most advanced combat aircraft. Likewise, emerging adversaries may now pose a significant air threat by leveraging inexpensive technology to modify existing airframes with improved radars, sensors, jammers and weapons.

To meet these challenges and assure freedom of movement for the Joint team, the Air Force continues to invest in weapons and platforms for Global Precision Attack. The Joint Air Surface Standoff Missile—Extended Range, will enable our aircrews to attack targets precisely while negating or avoiding surface threats. Similarly, the Laser Joint Direct Attack Munition will enhance our capability to strike moving or static targets efficiently and precisely.

The F-22 and F-35 are key components of the Air Force's future Air Superiority and Global Precision Attack Core Functions. Given their low-observable characteristics and ability to fuse information from multiple sensors – key components of their 5th Generation designs – these aircraft are far more survivable and lethal than our current 4th Generation force. While the F-35 is optimal for Global Precision Attack, it also serves as a complementary capability to the F-22, which is optimal for Air Superiority. Together, they form the backbone of a fighter force that will ensure the United States maintains a decisive edge in an increasingly lethal threat environment. We support the current investment strategy that ends F-22 production at 187 aircraft. The Air Force will invest \$4.1B in FY10 to procure 10 F-35s as part of the Department of Defense's strategy to ramp up

production. By accelerating the procurement ramp, we can lower unit procurement costs while also making the platform more cost competitive for our Coalition partners.

Our FY10 budget proposal accelerates the integration of our Guard and Reserve components into new and emerging mission sets, including unmanned aerial systems, F-22 and F-35 missions. By considering Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve Command for inclusion in emerging mission areas and basing strategies, we capitalize on the experience and unique skill sets that our Air Reserve Components contribute to the Total Force.

We are also modernizing our existing bomber force to increase its effectiveness and survivability against emerging threats, while meeting the requirements of today's Joint Force Commanders. We have fielded a state-of-the-art infrared, electro-optical targeting pod on the B-1 to provide an additional, persistent sensor on the battlefield to self-target weapons, or provide real-time streaming video to ground forces. We are also modernizing our B-2 fleet by improving the radar, integrating the Link-16 data link and adding extremely high frequency satellite communication capabilities for nuclear command and control. In addition, investments in low observable maintenance improvements will decrease sustainment costs and reduce aircraft downtime. In accordance with the Secretary of Defense's budget guidance, we will not pursue the development of the Next Generation Bomber until we have a better understanding of the requirements, technologies, and concept of operations for this capability – all of which are expected to be addressed in the QDR.

Restructuring Our Combat Air Forces

This year, the Department of Defense provided guidance for the military to eliminate excessive overmatch in our tactical fighter force and consider alternatives in our capabilities. Acting on this guidance, the Air Force examined emerging, advanced threats and then analyzed our Combat Air Forces' capabilities against them. Our intent was to ensure the proper mix of platforms that meet requirements while minimizing excess inventory and deriving the most capability from our limited resources.

After a comprehensive review of alternatives, the Air Force saw an opportunity to reshape our aging fighter force via an accelerated retirement of our oldest legacy fighters. The review weighed the benefits of retiring aircraft nearing their expected service life, against near-term risk. The analysis also considered the "game-changing" capabilities of low observable platforms like the B-2, F-22 and F-35 that possess the ability to access areas defended by advanced surface-to-air missile systems.

Once the size and scope of the reduction was determined, the Air Force presented its implementation plan to the Combatant Commanders, Joint Staff and the Office of the Secretary of Defense. Accelerating the retirement of roughly 250 legacy F-15s, F-16s and A-10s enables us to redistribute over \$3.5B in the next six years to modernize our Combat Air Forces into a smaller, but more capable force – one that is balanced across our Active and Reserve Components and meets our commitments at home and abroad. This restructuring also facilitates the movement of approximately 4,000 manpower positions that will be realigned to support growth in priority missions such as manned and unmanned aerial surveillance systems, ISR support and the nuclear enterprise.

Our current fleet of legacy and 5th Generation aircraft represent our readiness to fulfill today's commitments, while our FY10 budget proposal invests in a future force mix to meet tomorrow's challenges.

RAPID GLOBAL MOBILITY

Global Reach ensures our Joint team can deploy, maneuver and sustain large forces on a global scale. In Iraq and Afghanistan, Air Force air mobility assets are central to sustaining the Joint and Coalition team. On any given day, Air Force C-5s deliver life-saving Mine Resistant Ambush Protected vehicles into theater; C-17s airdrop critical supplies to forward-based ground forces via the revolutionary GPS-aided Joint Precision Airdrop System; and C-130s provide tactical airlift to move theater-based personnel and equipment. Highly skilled aeromedical transport teams swiftly evacuate combat casualties, ensuring our wounded warriors receive the best possible medical care. And Air Force air refueling aircraft continue to play a vital, daily role in extending the range and persistence of almost all other aircraft of the Joint force. The FY10 budget proposal reflects our commitment to sustaining and modernizing these critical national capabilities.

Replacing the aging KC-135 fleet remains the Air Force's top acquisition priority. The FY10 budget proposal supports the release of a request for proposal in summer 2009 with a contract award early in FY10.

The FY10 budget proposal continues efforts for modernization and includes funding to begin the shut down of the C-17 production with a fleet of 205 aircraft. Modernization of our C-5 fleet continues through the Avionics Modernization Program and Reliability Enhancement and Re-engining Programs, and during FY10 we will continue recapitalizing our intra-theater airlift capability by re-initiating the C-130J production line following one year procurement gap and procuring 3 C-130J aircraft for \$394M.

The Air Force will also begin procuring C-27J in FY10 to provide mission-critical/time-sensitive airlift in direct support of our Joint partners. The FY10 budget proposal procures eight C-27Js, as the first step toward a total procurement of 38 C-27Js. The Air Force continues to work closely with the United States Army to accept full management of the Joint Cargo Aircraft (JCA) program and the direct support airlift mission.

SPECIAL OPERATIONS

Air Force special operations capabilities are playing an increasingly vital role in supporting US Special Operations Command (USSOCOM) and geographical Combatant Commanders. We are also responding to significant growth in the requirements for Irregular Warfare (IW) capabilities with major investments in special operations airlift, close air support and Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR).

We are committed to enhancing our special operations capabilities. For example, we will procure additional MC-130Js and CV-22s. AFSOC will expand its special operations ISR force structure by activating a squadron of MQ-9 Reapers, in addition to the already operational MQ-1 Predator squadron. Additionally, we are recapitalizing our MC-130E/P fleet with newer, more capable MC-130Js for low-level air refueling, infiltration, exfiltration and resupply of special operations forces.

GLOBAL INTEGRATED ISR

Operations in Iraq and Afghanistan have highlighted the increasing need for timely, fused data from all available sources. To meet this need, we are greatly expanding our airborne ISR force structure of manned and unmanned ISR assets. In FY09, we will field the MC-12W to provide increased full-motion video and signals intelligence. Additionally, our FY10 budget proposal continues major investments in unmanned aircraft, transitioning from the MQ-1 Predator to the MQ-9 Reaper, with

\$489M for 24 additional MQ-9s to increase our total UAS combat air patrols from 34 CAPs today to our goal of 50 CAPs by the end of FY11. We are also investing \$84M to integrate the Wide Area Airborne Surveillance (WAAS) onto existing and new MQ-9s, providing 12 times the number of streaming video spots per aircraft. Our FY10 budget proposal also contains funding for five RQ-4 Global Hawk UAVs, which provide persistent ISR from high-altitude orbits. We are also balancing our ISR personnel requirements by re-examining our training programs for intelligence professionals, creating new duty specialty codes, and establishing trial programs to develop ISR operators.

COMMAND AND CONTROL

The Air Force has established Air and Space Operations Centers (AOCs) aligned with each geographical Combatant Commander to integrate air, space, cyber and missile defense capabilities into Joint operations. We have also improved our Tactical Air Control System (TACS) to account for increasingly distributed air-ground operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. Our restructured Air Liaison Officer program offers these Airmen a viable career path. We are also training additional terminal air controllers and equipping them with increasingly capable, portable and flexible air strike control systems like Remote Operated Video Receiver (ROVER) version 5.

SPACE SUPERIORITY

America's ability to operate effectively across the spectrum of conflict rests heavily on our space capabilities. Recognizing this importance, our FY10 budget proposal includes investment in space and space-related support systems.

The Joint force depends upon space capabilities provided by the Air Force, which fall into five key areas: *Early Warning; Space Situational Awareness; Military Satellite Communications; Positioning, Navigation and Timing; and Weather* capabilities. We will field several new satellites, including the Global Positioning System Block IIF, Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF), Space Based Surveillance System (SBSS), and the Space Based Infrared System-Geostationary (SBIRS-Geo) – recapitalization programs that are important to both the United States and its Allies. The FY10 budget proposal discontinues the Transformational Satellite (TSAT) program and supports procurement of additional AEHF and Wideband Global SATCOM (WGS) satellites.

CYBERSPACE SUPERIORITY

Operating within the cyber domain has become an increasingly critical requirement for our networked force. In order to develop and institutionalize cyberspace capabilities, and to better integrate them into the Joint cyberspace structure, we are consolidating many Air Force cyberspace operations into a new 24th Air Force under Air Force Space Command. The Air Force is firmly committed to developing the necessary capabilities to defend the cyber domain, and our FY10 budget proposal includes \$2.3B to grow this important Core Function.

PERSONNEL RECOVERY

Personnel Recovery (PR) remains an imperative, fulfilling our promise to never leave an American behind. Air Force PR forces are fully engaged in Iraq and Afghanistan, accomplishing crucial missions that include command and control, intelligence, CSAR, convoy support, hostage recovery and reintegration.

The FY10 budget proposal terminates the current CSAR-X program to allow for additional discussion on platform requirements and quantities across the Joint force. We will continue to sustain our HH-60 helicopter fleet, while exploring Joint solutions to ensure sufficient PR capabilities in the coming years. We are continuing to extend our current capabilities by

recapitalizing our HC-130P/N fleet with newer, more capable HC-130Js to provide low-level air refueling, infiltration, exfiltration and resupply of CSAR forces. In FY10, we will invest \$605M to procure an additional five HC-130Js.

BUILDING PARTNERSHIPS

The Air Force continues to seek opportunities to develop our partnerships around the world, and to enhance our long-term capabilities through security cooperation. For example, in the Central Command AOR, deployed Airmen are working with our Afghan and Iraqi partners to build a new Afghan National Army Air Corps and the Iraqi Air Force. We are also working to further partnerships with more established allies, with programs like the Joint Strike Fighter, where our allies have committed \$4.5B in research and development funding. Australia's commitment to fund a communications satellite in the WGS constellation is another example of the value and synergy of lasting partnerships.

In the recently released *Global Partnership Strategy*, we outlined a path to cultivate these key partnerships, nurturing the global relations, fortifying our geographic access, safety and security around the world. The strategy seeks to develop partners who are able to defend their respective territories while ensuring the interoperability and integration necessary for Coalition operations.

AGILE COMBAT SUPPORT

Underpinning the work of all Air Force Core Functions are the capabilities included in Agile Combat Support. As part of our FY10 budget proposal initiatives, Agile Combat Support accounts for efforts affecting our entire Air Force, from the development and training of our Airmen to revitalizing our processes in the acquisition enterprise. Agile Combat Support reflects a large portion of the Air Force budget proposal, totaling approximately \$42B.

Developing and Caring for Airmen and Their Families

The Air Force remains committed to recruiting and retaining the world's highest quality force, while meeting the needs of their families. Our FY10 budget proposal enables us to recruit, train, educate and retain the right number and mix of personnel, and to provide Quality of Service worthy of our Airmen's commitment to serve in the Armed Forces of the United States and supports an end strength of 331,700 active duty personnel.

Sharpening Our Skills

Our FY10 budget proposal enables us to train Airmen to fulfill both our Core Functions and the Combatant Commander's requirements. These changes span the vast array of skill sets, from improving language and cultural instruction to accelerated training for network operators. In FY10, we will also enhance foundational training received by all enlisted personnel entering the Air Force by constructing a \$32M state-of-the-art training facility at Lackland Air Force Base.

Quality of Service

The Air Force leadership is committed not only to the quality of life of our Airmen and families, but also to their *Quality of Service*—ensuring each Airman is able to perform consistently meaningful work and make a daily impact on the Air Force mission.

We also understand the burdens placed on the families of our Airmen. To meet the needs of our Airmen and their families, our FY10 budget proposal funds a range of needed Quality of Life initiatives, including expanded legal assistance, advanced educational opportunities and new family housing. For example, our FY10 budget proposal invests \$20M to build two new Child

Development Centers, as well as \$66M to improve and modernize military family housing overseas. The Air Force is also continuing to execute its Family Housing Master Plan, which synchronizes the military construction, operations and maintenance, and privatization efforts necessary to improve our family housing. By FY10, we will have all the funds necessary to award the privatization and MILCON projects needed to eliminate all of our inadequate homes, both in the U.S. and abroad – with all projects scheduled to be completed by FY15. To this end, we are on track to award contracts to privatize 100% of Military Family Housing in the CONUS, Hawaii, Alaska and Guam by the end of FY10. For Airmen concerned about foreclosure, we provide assistance at the Airmen and Family Readiness Center at each Air Force installation. Additionally, we are working with the Department of Defense as it expands the Homeowners Assistance Program to wounded warriors/civilians, surviving spouses and eligible military members affected by permanent changes of station.

Shaping the Force

America's Air Force draws its strength from its outstanding Airmen, with over 660,000 members of our Regular, Reserve, Guard and Civilian personnel dedicated to the mission of the Air Force. In accordance with the Secretary of Defense's guidance, we will halt active duty manpower reductions at 331,700 for FY10. We will also make commensurate adjustments in the Reserve Components, with 69,500 Airmen in the Air Force Reserve and 106,700 Airmen in the Air National Guard. We will also grow our Civilian cadre to 179,152, which includes 4,200 contractor-to-civilian conversions.

Retaining quality Airmen with critical skill sets remains a top priority. For FY10, we have proposed \$641.4M for retention bonuses and recruiting, which includes a \$88.3M increase for recruiting and retaining health professionals. In addition, we will retrain Airmen to fill undermanned career fields to balance and shape our force in accordance with emerging requirements. Further efforts to shape our force will also include diversity initiatives designed to leverage the unique qualities of all Airmen to achieve mission excellence.

Warrior Care

As part of our commitment to Airmen, we, in collaboration with the rest of the Department of Defense, are strengthening our focus on wounded warrior care. The importance of ensuring that our wounded warriors receive the service and support they need throughout the recovery process cannot be overstated. Through specific budget proposal items, such as increased funding to bolster the size of our Recovery Care Coordinators cadre, our wounded care programs will continue to provide our Airmen the best medical and professional support possible.

Other advances in wounded warrior care are also underway including work with Interagency and local partners to create the necessary support networks to ensure success in continued military service or in the transition to civilian life. We are also reinforcing our commitment to our Air Force wounded warrior families through support programs specifically designed to help allay their burdens and honor their sacrifices.

Recapturing Acquisition Excellence

To most effectively meet the demands of our warfighters, the Air Force has made Recapturing Acquisition Excellence a top priority. We recognize the profound importance of this capability, which enables us to acquire and recapitalize platforms that provide Global Vigilance, Reach and Power. As stewards of the taxpayer's resources, the Air Force will solidify an Acquisition system that delivers the right capabilities to the warfighter in the field – on-time and within budget.

To accomplish this we have published an Acquisition Improvement Plan (AIP) that outlines the steps we will take to improve Air Force Acquisition, informed by a series of internal and external reviews. This plan focuses on five initiatives that: revitalize the Air Force acquisition workforce; improve the requirements generation process; instill budget and financial discipline; improve Air Force major systems source selection; and establish clear lines of authority and accountability within acquisition organizations.

Through this plan, the Air Force will focus on better developing our acquisition workforce to ensure that it is appropriately sized to perform essential, inherently governmental functions and flexible enough to meet continuously evolving demands. We will also work to develop requirements that meet the users' needs while, at the same time, ensuring that they can be incorporated into effective acquisition strategies that maximize competition and allow for a fair and open source selection process.

Our reviews also emphasized that establishing adequate and stable budgets continues to be critical for program success. Therefore, the AIP emphasizes realistic budgeting based on comprehensive program cost estimates. Once budget baselines are established, achieving program stability and cost control will be given the same priority as technical performance and schedule.

We also found some weaknesses in our procedures for large system acquisition source selections and shortages in the skill sets required to conduct major source selections. So we are going back to the basics; building processes to ensure that our personnel have the experience and training required to conduct source selections and, where necessary, revising our processes and policies and increasing our use of multi-functional independent review teams (MIRTs). We are also reassessing our Program Executive Officer (PEO) and wing/group/squadron organizations to determine if they are properly structured, and identifying specific actions that could be taken to improve them.

4. READINESS AND RESOURCING

In the past year, we have continued to see stresses on our Air Force, both in our people and in our platforms. The Air force has conducted nearly 61,000 sorties in Operation IRAQI FREEDOM and over 37,000 sorties supporting Operation ENDURING FREEDOM, delivering over 2 million passengers and 700,000 tons of cargo. In doing so, airmen averaged nearly 265 sorties per day. Tens of thousands of America's Airmen are deployed to locations across the globe, including 63 locations in the Middle East. To support the efforts of our Airmen and provide for the recruiting and retention of the highest quality Air Force, our FY10 budget proposal includes \$28.6B in Military Personnel funding. It provides for an across the board 2.9 percent pay increase, a Basic Allowance for Housing increase of 5.6 percent--resulting in zero out-of-pocket housing expenses for our Airmen--and a Basic Allowance for Subsistence increase of 5.0 percent. Additionally it halts the end strength drawdown which allows for rebalancing of the total force to cover new and emerging missions and stabilizes the active component end strength at 331,700; Reserve Component end strength at 69,500 Airmen and Air National Guard end strength at 106,700 Airmen. It also funds recruiting and retention bonuses targeted at critical wartime skills, including key specialties such as command and control, public affairs, contracting, pararescue, security forces, civil engineering, explosive ordnance disposal, and special investigations.

This high operations tempo requires focused attention on readiness. We use aircraft availability as our enterprise-level metric for monitoring fleet health, and the FY10 budget proposal provides \$43.4B in Operations and Maintenance funding, a \$1.3B increase over our FY09 appropriation, to

mitigate the stresses of continuous combat operations on our aircraft. The FY10 Operations and Maintenance appropriation funds pay and benefits for 179,000 civilian personnel, including 4,200 contractor to civilian conversions, an increase of 200 civilian acquisition professionals and a 2.0 percent pay raise. It fully funds 1.4 million flying hours, produces 1,200 pilots and sustains over 5,400 aircraft while accelerating the retirement of roughly 250 aged aircraft, producing a smaller, more capable fighting force.

Our aging air and space fleet requires focused attention. For example, we have grounded our F-15, F-16, A-10, C-130, and T-6 fleets for limited periods during the past two years. The skill and determination of our maintainers have ensured that we return aircraft to service as quickly as possible, but 2% of the fleet remains grounded and many aircraft fly restricted profiles. To ensure stable aircraft availability and mission capable rates, we continue to integrate Fleet Viability Boards into our normal life-cycle sustainment processes and strengthen centralized asset management.

Additionally, in FY10 O&M funds will be used to rebuild the nuclear infrastructure by fortifying operations, developing people and sustaining 76 B-52s for global strike capability. The AF is also increasing MQ-1 and MQ-9 ISR capability to 43 unmanned Command Air Patrols. The O&M budget request honors the AF commitment to our Airmen and their families by increasing child care availability and special programs for children of deployed parents, providing for both legal assistance and advanced educational opportunities. Dollars are also committed to dormitory initiatives, unaccompanied housing, active Warfighter/Family Support Centers and Fitness Centers while still providing for the operating expenses of 83 major installations including two space lift ranges.

Our \$19.4B FY10 Budget proposal for Research, Development, Test and Evaluation (RDT&E) is an increase of \$600M from FY 09. This request funds requirements for next generation weapons and platforms by maturing technologies essential to equipping our Nation to defeat near-term and forecasted threats. We continue to develop and invest in future systems such as the KC-X Tanker program, F-35 Joint Strike Fighter, and the next enhancement of the Global Positioning System. Science and technology efforts advance propulsion, space based airborne and ground sensors, directed energy and command and control for both air and space. Modernizing our current fleet initiatives will provide upgrades to legacy fighters, bombers, strategic radar and mobility requirements. Systems and technologies designed to improve space situational awareness are also critical elements of this Budget Request. Additionally we are rebalancing the portfolio towards procurement of proven and multi-role platforms.

We are committed to supporting today's warfighter while building tomorrow's weapon systems capability. The FY10 procurement budget request provides \$21.7B dollars to deliver immediate and future capabilities through investments made across four specific procurement appropriations: aircraft, missiles, ammunition and other. The FY10 Budget Request supports the Irregular Warfare Mission by increasing ISR platforms while modifying the existing fleet, provides joint warfighter support funding and balances investment in advanced aircraft platforms and legacy aircraft modifications. These funds will allow for the acquisition and modification of manned and unmanned aircraft, missiles, munitions, vehicles, electronic and telecommunications equipment, satellites and launch vehicles, and support equipment.

Funding critical infrastructure projects while meeting the needs of the Air Family are critical to our mission. The \$2.4B budget request for military construction, military family housing and base realignment and closure supports a \$300M increase in military construction from FY09. Projects will be focused on supporting the rebalance of AF and DoD priorities. Additionally the budget

request continues our emphasis on providing quality housing for Airmen and their families. Finally, the AF is on target to deliver 17 BRAC 2005 projects on time while continuing the environmental clean-up of legacy BRAC locations.

To ensure proper stewardship of our resourcing, we have designated a Deputy, Chief Management Officer (DCMO) in line with the Department of Defense Strategic Management Plan. The DCMO is responsible for continuing our momentum in refining internal processes for reducing workloads or eliminating unnecessary work. Through a culture of continuous improvement, we are further improving warfighter effectiveness through integrated processes and systems, process improvement and technology investments aligned with our priorities.

5. SUMMARY

We believe the Air Force's total proposed FY10 budget of \$160.5B – which includes \$115.6B for Air Force managed programs, \$28.9B in other funded programs such as the National Foreign Intelligence, Special Operation Forces, and the Defense Health Programs, and \$16B in Overseas Contingency Operations provides the balance necessary to ensure support of today's commitments, while posturing the Air Force for success against tomorrow's challenges.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING

MAY 19, 2009

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. SPRATT

Mr. SPRATT. The Air Force is close to deciding the relocation of AFCENT from Shaw Air Force Base to Al Udeid Air Base in Qatar. Did this proposal originate with the Air Force or with Central Command or the Department of Defense? What is the remaining path and likely time-frame for this decision?

General SCHWARTZ. In March, 2009, the Air Force made the decision to temporarily move no more than 30–50 AFCENT personnel to southwest Asia, specifically the Commander and his support staff.

While the previous configuration of 9th Air Force (AFCENT) successfully sustained operations in central and southwest Asia, current operations would benefit from the dedicated forward presence of a senior Airman. The temporary separation between the stateside numbered Air Force and its warfighting component to USCENTCOM allows the USAFCENT commander to focus solely on USAFCENT duties, and the 9th Air Force commander to focus on oversight of its six stateside wings and one direct reporting unit. When contingency operations subside, the Air Force will reset to the peacetime configuration of 9th Air Force (AFCENT) at Shaw AFB.

Mr. SPRATT. A succession of three-star generals retained their headquarters at Shaw AFB during the first and second Persian Gulf wars, as well as the war in Afghanistan, at times when ops tempo was much higher than now. Why make this decision now when ops tempo is lower?

General SCHWARTZ. As we have learned lessons from the first and second Persian Gulf wars, we have made substantive changes to our command structures, including providing significantly improved support to our Combatant Commanders. The current configuration of 9th Air Force (AFCENT) is a reorganization following the first Persian Gulf War and has successfully sustained operations in central and southwest Asia. However, we feel current operations would benefit from the dedicated forward presence of a senior Airman. This temporary separation between the stateside numbered air force, 9th AF, and its warfighting component, USAFCENT, will allow the USAFCENT commander to focus solely on USAFCENT duties, and the 9th AF commander to focus on oversight of the six stateside wings and one direct reporting unit. When contingency operations subside, the Air Force will reset to the peacetime configuration of 9th AF (AFCENT).

Mr. SPRATT. You have described the proposed reconfiguration and forward deployment of the CENTAF commander as a necessary but temporary wartime measure. You have also indicated that it would be your intent to return to the status quo when the situation in southwest Asia permits. What assurances can the Air Force give that the reunification of CENTAF and 9th Air Force will in fact occur at Shaw AFB?

General SCHWARTZ. Our intent is to temporarily restructure these organizations to better serve the needs of the Air Force and the Department of Defense. Once no longer needed, 9th Air Force and USAFCENT will return to its previous status as a single command, 9th Air Force (AFCENT). We have designed the temporary split to be easily reversible by retaining existing unit designations for subordinate units and moving the minimum required number of personnel forward.

Mr. SPRATT. How many Air Force personnel would be relocated from Shaw to Qatar?

General SCHWARTZ. The current proposal is no more than 30–50 personnel will move to southwest Asia.

Mr. SPRATT. Pursuant to BRAC 2005, elements of Third Army are preparing to relocate from Fort McPherson to Shaw Air Force Base. Have you ascertained the Army's intentions for ARCENT/Third Army in response to your restructuring plan? Does this move represent a deviation from the BRAC 2005 recommendations? What is the risk of adverse reaction on ARCENT/Third Army's part? Is ARCENT headquarters likely to follow suit and also forward deploy?

General SCHWARTZ. The Air Force cannot answer questions with regard to the intentions, risk or implications of any possible move of the ARCENT headquarters. We would respectfully ask that those questions be directed to the Army.

Mr. SPRATT. The Air Force intends to budget \$19 million to expand and modernize the existing USAFCENT/Ninth Air Force Headquarters at Shaw, consolidating operations from five or six different buildings. The wing commander at Shaw has identified this expansion as Shaw's number one military construction project. Does the Air Force support funding of this expanded and modernized headquarters facility, which would help ensure USAFCENT's eventual return to Shaw?

General SCHWARTZ. The Air Force supports the headquarters project. The current working estimate for this project is \$21.18M.

Mr. SPRATT. Has the Air Force considered the utility of retaining the designation of the headquarters facility at Shaw as the Ninth Air Force-USAFCENT (Rear) Headquarters if it proceeds with the restructuring proposal and forward deployment of USAFCENT?

General SCHWARTZ. We are considering several options to achieve our primary goal of providing dedicated Air Force support to the USCENTCOM commander. Our intent is to temporarily restructure these organizations to better serve the needs of the Air Force and the Department of Defense. The temporary separation between the stateside numbered air force and its warfighting component to USCENTCOM will allow the USAFCENT commander to focus solely on USAFCENT duties, and the 9th Air Force commander to focus on oversight of stateside wings. When contingency operations subside, the Air Force will reset to the peacetime configuration of a single command, 9th Air Force/AFCENT.

Mr. SPRATT. How many USAFCENT personnel are likely to PCS transfer from Shaw to Qatar? Would all of these assignments be unaccompanied?

General SCHWARTZ. The current proposal is no more than 30-50 personnel on unaccompanied tours.

Mr. SPRATT. What are the Military Construction requirements in Qatar that will be necessary to accommodate the deployment of the USAFCENT headquarters?

General SCHWARTZ. Military Construction requirements have not yet been determined. The Air Force is still working the final details of the deployment, to include determining the most efficient team, timing of deploying from Shaw, and supporting infrastructure requirements.

Mr. SPRATT. What are the state-side Military Construction implications of moving the USAFCENT and/or ARCENT headquarters forward into the CENTCOM Area of Responsibility? If Shaw loses one or both of its three-star commands, will this affect the funding of Military Construction priorities?

General SCHWARTZ. The Air Force does not expect any impact to state-side Military Construction priorities associated with the moving of USAFCENT headquarters forward into the CENTCOM AOR. The Air Force makes military construction decisions based on the needs of the Air Force and the urgency of the requirement, not the rank of the Command.

The Air Force cannot answer questions with regard to the implications of moving the ARCENT headquarters forward into the CENTCOM Area of Responsibility. Those questions are best directed to the Army.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. THORNBERRY

Mr. THORNBERRY. Recently Secretary Gates advocated for quadrupling the numbers of trained DoD cyber professionals. The mission of the U.S. Air Force is "to fly, fight and win . . . in air, space and cyberspace." Therefore, please define the cyber warfighter of today and describe what you see as the cyber warfighter of the future. Discuss whether cyber will be a new and separate career path with the potential for flag rank? Will these professionals be uniformed servicemembers or civilians? Officer, or enlisted? Joint, or service separate?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. Cyber warfighters are skilled professionals working to deter and prevent cyberspace attacks against vital US interests, they ensure our freedom of action in cyberspace and respond to attacks and reconstitute operations. Cyber warfighters develop persistent cyberspace situational awareness and defeat adversaries operating throughout cyberspace.

Today, Air Force cyber professionals are drawn primarily from communications, intelligence and engineering specialties, often returning after a single assignment. While this model is adequate, the Air Force recognizes that cyberspace is a dynamic and technically demanding warfighting domain of strategic national importance. The Air Force is committed to establishing dedicated officer, enlisted and civilian career fields to meet emerging demand and address recruiting, training, retention and force development challenges. Career paths, rank structure and flag officers are expected to reflect Air Force career field norms.

All Air Force cyber operators and specialists will receive initial technical skills training at Keesler AFB via Undergraduate Cyber Training or initial cyber support training, to be followed by more advanced specialized training as dictated by their assigned unit mission. An undergraduate or graduate education with emphasis in computer science or engineering is highly desired for officers. Additionally, continuing cyber education requirements and solutions will also be necessary due to the rapid pace of technology change. Recognizing cyberspace is a Joint warfighting domain, this may include sister-Service or Joint/Interagency training when appropriate.

Growing and developing cyber forces is a challenge DoD-wide. The Air Force is establishing dedicated officer, enlisted and civilian cyber operations career fields to meet Joint and Service cyber missions. Additionally, we continue to participate in robust inter-Service dialogue and OSD efforts to develop DoD-wide cyber career force guidance.

Mr. THORNBERRY. I applaud your recent decision to base the 24th Air Force at Lackland AFB in Texas. Nearby Sheppard AFB in Wichita Falls, TX has core competency in training missions and enjoys excellent community support for increased missions. Have you and will you consider Sheppard AFB for the Air Force cyber training mission?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. We agree that Sheppard AFB is an outstanding training base and has always enjoyed great support from its local community. As we seek a location for our cyber training mission, we will consider Sheppard AFB, and intend on selecting the most favorable training location based on availability of facilities, cost, and relative proximity to other Joint cyber training venues.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. BISHOP

Mr. BISHOP. The Air Force Restructuring Plan (“the Plan”) released with the Air Force FY10 proposed budget shows that the Primary Aircraft Assigned (PAA) for the 388th Fighter Wing at Hill AFB, Utah, would be reduced by 24 F-16s, leaving 48 PAA after the restructuring. This is equivalent to a squadron. Did the plan envision disestablishing a full squadron by design?

General SCHWARTZ. Yes. The FY10 CAF Restructuring Plan offers your Air Force an opportunity to reap significant savings in funds and manpower by accelerating the retirement of 254 of our oldest fighters, reinvesting in critical modifications to our combat forces fleet, procuring preferred air-to-air and air-to-ground munitions and critical Air Force and Joint enabling technologies, and redistributing manpower to other emerging national priority missions.

These actions will provide the United States with a smaller, but more flexible, capable, and lethal force as we bridge to our ultimate goal of a 5th generation-enabled force. The proposed Hill AFB changes are part of a global resource allocation process that meets strategic objectives.

Mr. BISHOP. How did the Air Force arrive at this number of PAA reductions for the 388th and what written analysis led to that conclusion?

General SCHWARTZ. The Air Force Combat Forces Assessment Model (CFAM), which is part of the Air Force approved analysis tool kit, was used to analyze the existing combat air force structure as part of developing the FY10 CAF Restructure proposal. Several CFAM iterations were run to find the optimum force mix in a resource constrained environment. Using the analysis results, we developed a force mix to meet national military objectives and identified the need for key enablers and advanced weapons for both the bomber and fighter forces. The resultant force mix presented less warfighting risk in FY15 and beyond than any course of action that maintained the status quo in legacy fighter numbers. This analysis assumed key investments are made in modernization, preferred weapons, and key enablers.

As we developed this plan over the last year, we were successful in balancing planned force reductions across our active duty, Guard, and Reserve components, as well as in the States and overseas locations. We carefully analyzed the missions across our units in all the Air Force components to achieve the force mix that met strategic objectives. The changes in this plan were closely coordinated with our Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve partners, as well as our Major Commands and affected Regional Combatant Commanders.

Mr. BISHOP. Does the plan allow for flexibility for Air Combat Command to meet the aircraft reductions by alternatively reducing the number of planes in each of the 3 existing squadrons in order to preserve greater deployment and training capability?

General SCHWARTZ. The proposed FY10 CAF Restructure plan provides maximum flexibility for global fleet management of Air Force F-16s. The reduction proposed at Hill AFB also represents part of Air Combat Command's fair share of fighter force reductions. We considered all options in order to achieve the desired 24 primary authorized aircraft reduction at Hill, but removing eight aircraft from each squadron would have resulted in an inefficient and nonstandard unit configuration of just 16 aircraft. Our analysis shows that after the reduction action, even with one Hill AFB squadron deployed, there are sufficient resources remaining at home station to provide required unit training.

Mr. BISHOP. The Total Force Integration of the 388th Fighter Wing and the 419th Fighter Wing has been a model for the Air Force. If a full squadron is disestablished as outlined under the plan, it could result in having one of the remaining two squadrons deployed in support of Wartime Operations, and the other squadron being tasked at home, and no ability for training left at home station since the 3rd squadron planes will be gone. Was this negative impact on training considered during the formulation of the plan?

General SCHWARTZ. The partnership between the active duty and Air Force Reserve components at Hill AFB was one of the first Total Force Integration (TFI) initiatives. The Classic Association of the Air Force Reserve with Air Combat Command in the F-16 mission at Hill Air Force Base has a proven record of success and has yielded valuable lessons learned for other TFI associations.

As we developed this plan over the last year, we were successful in balancing planned force reductions across our active duty, Guard, and Reserve components, as well as in the States and overseas locations. We carefully analyzed the missions across our units in all the Air Force components to achieve the force mix that met strategic objectives. Our analysis shows that after the reduction action, even with one Hill AFB squadron deployed, there are sufficient resources remaining at home station to provide required unit training.

Mr. BISHOP. Did the Air Force consider the probable negative impacts of the plan on the 388th and 419th integration efforts under the Total Force Integration effort?

General SCHWARTZ. As we developed this plan over the last year, we were successful in balancing planned force reductions across our active duty, Guard, and Reserve components, as well as in the States and overseas locations. We carefully analyzed the missions across our units in all the Air Force components to achieve the force mix that met strategic objectives. Our analysis of the Total Force Integration efforts at Hill AFB shows that after the reduction action there will be sufficient resources remaining to enable successful integration.

Mr. BISHOP. The plan indicates "future "F-35 ops" in the "outlook" section listed for Hill AFB. The Air Force has indicated previously that the first operational squadrons of F-35s will be assigned to the 388th Fighter Wing. When may we expect an official announcement to that effect?

General SCHWARTZ. While the commander of Air Combat Command has previously announced his preference of Hill AFB as the first operational F-35 location, the Air Force has not officially announced any F-35 locations beyond the initial training location at Eglin AFB, Florida. The Air Force is developing selection criteria for F-35 candidate bases, and is completing an enterprise-wide look with a goal of developing a repeatable, systematic process that can be applied to all bases across the Air Force to provide equity for decisions about future basing of the Joint Strike Fighter. The Air Force expects to make the first F-35 operational basing announcement in FY11.

Mr. BISHOP. When can we expect a timeline with regard to the F-16 reductions recommended under the plan for Hill AFB along with a subsequent stand-up of F-35s?

General SCHWARTZ. The proposed F-16 reductions for Hill AFB begin with six aircraft departing in the first quarter of FY10, followed by six more in the second quarter, and the remaining 12 departing in the third quarter of FY10. Any stand-up of F-35s, if Hill is officially selected as an F-35 base, would occur in conjunction with an official basing announcement.

Mr. BISHOP. The Air Force's planned reduction of 24 F-16 aircraft at the 388th Fighter Wing at Hill AFB, Utah, ("Hill") along with the Air Force announcement of "full-support" of the F-35 program in conjunction with the release of the Department's FY10 budget proposal, has left some confusion regarding the future of F-35 fighter basing at Hill. Does the Air Force plan to eventually station 2 or 3 squadrons of F-35s at Hill AFB as replacements for the 3 F-16 squadrons currently in place?

General SCHWARTZ. While the commander of Air Combat Command has previously announced his preference of Hill AFB as the first operational F-35 location,

the Air Force has not officially announced any F-35 locations beyond the initial training location at Eglin AFB, Florida.

The Air Force is developing selection criteria for F-35 candidate bases, and is completing an enterprise-wide look with a goal of developing a repeatable, systematic process that can be applied to all bases across the Air Force to provide equity for decisions about future basing of the Joint Strike Fighter. These selection criteria, along with operational warfighting requirements, will result in determining the number of aircraft to be stationed at the selected F-35 basing locations.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MRS. MCMORRIS RODGERS

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Secretary Donley and General Schwartz, thank you again for the time you took a few weeks ago to meet with me and the civic leaders from Spokane, Washington. As you could see, Eastern Washington takes great pride in our military and follow the Air Force closely. Fairchild Air Force Base is the largest employer in Spokane. And not only are the men and women who serve important, but it is important to our community that we replace the KC-135 with a new refueling plane.

Can you tell us where you are at in the bid process with the KC-X program?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. [The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. Last year I had the opportunity to visit the KC-135 depot at Tinker Air Force Base. I was amazed by the amount of time, effort and cost required to keep these planes flying. At what point does the Operation and Maintenance cost out weigh the cost of acquiring new tankers? Is the Air Force doing enough to relay this aspect of the tanker story?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. [The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS. The C-17 is also an important platform in Mobility Airlift. It is my understanding that the Mobility Airlift Requirement Capability study will come out late this summer or fall.

How can we close down the C-17 production line before we have the Mobility Airlift Requirements Capability study completed? Just from a pure process standpoint; how do you shut down production when you do not even know what your own report will say?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. [The information referred to was not available at the time of printing.]

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. WITTMAN

Mr. WITTMAN. On Monday, May 18th, 2009, the Air Force provided information to my office detailing the evaluation criteria used in determining the most appropriate location for the US Air Force Cyber Command. The information is quite comprehensive and is useful in helping me understand exactly how the Air Force made a detailed and informed decision. However, I do have one remaining concern. Is there any situation that you can foresee resulting from the decision to base Cyber Command at a location other than Langley that would result in a shift of employment from Langley to another location?

Secretary DONLEY. There is no plan in the foreseeable future to move any units located at Langley AFB as a result of locating 24 AF at Lackland AFB, TX.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MS. GIFFORDS

Ms. GIFFORDS. Is the Air Force taking into account the current realities of the F-35 program as detailed in this year's GAO report in planning recapitalization and modernization efforts in the Air Guard?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. Yes. However, the Air Force will await reconciliation of the various F-35 program cost estimates by the F-35 Program Executive Officer; the Joint Estimating Team; and Government Accountability Office prior to making programmatic decisions concerning future Air Force F-35 procurement.

Ms. GIFFORDS. As Initial Operating Capability slides out past 2013, is it feasible under any scenario that the contractor can produce or the Air Force can procure enough F-35s to fill the needs of the Guard by 2017?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. Secretary Gates has stated that his objective continues to be to equip the first Joint Strike Fighter training squadron at

Eglin Air Force Base in 2011, and achieve initial operating capability for the Marines and Air Force in 2012 and 2013, respectively. Our FY10 budget fully supports that objective for the Air Force F-35 Initial Operating Capability declaration. We have invested heavily in this program and expect that the Joint Program Office will ensure that it stays on track. We have stated on many occasions the foundation to Air Force fighter recapitalization lies with the F-35, and any delay in procurement could increase the cost and further delay these aircraft for all the Services, to include the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve.

As the Air Force continues to adapt to emerging new missions and focuses on supporting the warfighters in our current contingency operations, every Air National Guard unit that currently has a flying mission or fighter mission may not migrate to the F-35. They may migrate to an unmanned flying mission, or perhaps a non-flying mission. We will continue to work closely with our Air Reserve Component partners as we develop future plans for properly balancing capabilities and defining requirements between the active and reserve components.

Ms. GIFFORDS. The Department announced in April that they would cancel the CSAR (X) program. At Davis-Monthan Air Force Base in my district, they have long awaited the final selection and delivery of a new aircraft for this crucial mission. Secretary Gates said last week that he questioned buying an aircraft with a single mission for a single service. Do you share his view on CSAR?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. When Secretary Gates cancelled the CSAR-X program, he directed an evaluation of combat search and rescue requirements in the context of joint force capabilities. The Air Force continues to support OSD and the Joint Staff as they conduct this evaluation. Once the study is complete, we believe that it will illustrate how our CSAR assets provide capability to all the services by supporting the Ground Component Commander, Special Operations Forces, and the Joint Forces Air Component Commander.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Secretary Gates said that buying an aircraft with only a 250 mile range represented an operational flaw. Was his information on the capabilities of the aircraft competing for the CSAR(X) contract accurate?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. The Request for Proposal (RFP) released to industry stipulated an unrefueled range of 275nm as a threshold requirement. In addition, the RFP included a requirement for aerial refueling to enhance the range capacity of the helicopter. Given this capability, the range of the helicopter is only limited by regulatory guidance or crew endurance.

Ms. GIFFORDS. When the Air Force was designated the lead service for Combat Search and Rescue, who made that determination?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. No single service is designated the "lead service" for Combat Search and Rescue. In accordance with DODD 3002.01E "Personnel Recovery (PR) in the Department of Defense" and Joint Publication 3.50 "Personnel Recovery", each Service/SOCOM shall provide personnel recovery capability in support of their own operations. However, given the demanding environment involved in deep combat search and rescue operations, the Air Force is the only Service with assets dedicated solely to this PR mission.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Why did the Air Force decide to move the CSAR mission out of AFSOC and back into ACC?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. We decided to move the Combat Search and Rescue (CSAR) mission out of AFSOC and back into ACC to ensure the Air Force core competency of CSAR was directly linked to the preponderance of the Combat Air Forces (CAF) and the personnel they support. Additionally, the move allows us to consolidate and better manage the limited supply/high demand CSAR resources with other CAF assets.

Collectively, CSAR is a team effort which involves numerous ACC assets—from the A-10s that locate and secure the rescue area, the Guardian Angel pararescuemen who physically provide the critical care and security required to save the lives of isolated personnel, the F-16s and F-15s that conduct associated strike missions, to the AWACS professionals who coordinate command and control of the rescue—from beginning to end, the process is now under a single designated command and commander.

Ms. GIFFORDS. Are you considering moving the mission back to AFSOC given its specialty nature and that of its operators?

Secretary DONLEY and General SCHWARTZ. There is currently no discussion within the Department of the Air Force to move the CSAR mission or assets back to AFSOC.