

1 FEDERAL DOCUMENT CLEARING HOUSE

2 HAS201000

3 HEARING ON THE AIR FORCE'S

4 FUTURE TOTAL FORCE PLAN

5 Wednesday, July 20, 2005

6 House of Representatives,

7 Committee on Armed Services,

8 Washington, D.C.

9           The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:02 a.m., in  
10 Room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Duncan Hunter  
11 [chairman of the committee] presiding.

12           The CHAIRMAN. [Presiding.] The hearing will come to  
13 order.

14           Today, the full committee meets to receive testimony  
15 from the Air Force, the National Guard Bureau, the Air  
16 National Guard, the Air Force Reserve and two adjutants  
17 general.

18           Our purpose is to understand and assess the Air Force's  
19 Future Total Force plan, including its associated  
20 implications for future missions, force structure  
21 procurement, manning, funding and basing.

22           At the outset, let me extend the committee's  
23 appreciation for all Air Force components who are represented  
24 here today--the active, Air National Guard and Air Force  
25 Reserve--for their continuing service in the global war on  
26 terrorism.

27           As of yesterday, 26,386 airmen are deployed. This total  
28 includes 20,068 active duty Air Force; 4,301 Air National  
29 Guardsmen; and 2,017 Air Force Reservists. The Air Force  
30 also has 383 aircraft deployed. Of that total number of  
31 aircraft deployed, over 40 percent are from the Air Reserve  
32 component, or ARC, the Air National Guard and Air Force  
33 Reserve.

34           There is no question that now and in the future, both  
35 the Air Force's active and ARC together--called the Total  
36 Force--will be needed to meet national security requirements.

37           The Future Total Force plan is an effort to create a  
38 smaller, more capable and more affordable Air Force comprised  
39 of active Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve airmen.  
40 The Air Force plan is to retire legacy aircraft, so that the  
41 end state will be 25 percent fewer fighters and 10 percent  
42 fewer total aircraft.

43           The Future Total Force plan would also make changes in  
44 key personnel areas. Active Air Force end strength is  
45 planned to be reduced from 359,700 to 349,800 by 2011, a  
46 reduction of approximately 10,000 active Air Force personnel.

47           No substantial personnel changes are planned for the Air  
48 National Guard and Air Force Reserve, which are currently at  
49 106,800 and 76,100, respectively.

50           The retirement of legacy aircraft is likely to cause the  
51 most impact to the ARC, because it flies the oldest aircraft  
52 in the Air Force's inventory. If these aircraft are retired,  
53 some installations could lose a flying mission, but be  
54 retained as so-called "enclaves," which are units with an  
55 expeditionary combat support element to provide medical,  
56 logistical, communications or security support to deployed  
57 units.

58           To begin to understand potential impacts of Future Total  
59 Force, I would like to show two charts provided to me by the  
60 Air Force Chief of Staff.

61           The first chart shows a historical look at the Air

62 National Guard. And I thought this was a great chart.

63 Let's get that other chart up.

64 Note that after the Korean War, the number of Air  
65 National Guard aircraft drops from about 2,200 to about  
66 1,500, then remains constant until the 1990s, when the Air  
67 National Guard inventory dropped to about 1,200 aircraft.

68 During this time, fighter and reconnaissance aircraft  
69 were downsized, as more airlift and refueling aircraft  
70 entered the Air National Guard inventory.

71 Now, the second chart--which is really my favorite  
72 chart, the one that we had up there first--I think really  
73 goes to our problem. That chart shows a history of Air Force  
74 fighter procurement. And you will note that after World War  
75 II, the inventory of fighter aircraft falls from about 63,000  
76 to about 3,400 today in the post-Cold War period.

77 And if you look at the little bitty bump on the right  
78 side of that chart, that is the future force of F/A-22 and  
79 F-35 joint strike fighter aircraft that could well be below  
80 2,000 birds.

81 Now that is--as a guy who is not a pilot and was never  
82 in that part of our armed forces, but has great respect for  
83 air power--when I saw this chart and I thought about this  
84 great depth that we have in terms of our--of air--American  
85 air power and the people that can man airplanes--it carried  
86 this country in our fight for freedom over this last century,

87 and carried the battle in so many conflicts and secured  
88 victory in so many conflicts.

89 The idea that we are going to take down this depth that  
90 we have, or that we have had in the past, to the point where  
91 we have just a few aircraft to supply our--to carry our  
92 active component as well as our Reserve component and our  
93 Guard component, is very troubling.

94 And that great depth that we have always enjoyed, that  
95 has allowed us to support operations like the ones in  
96 Afghanistan and Iraq today, that depth is disappearing, and  
97 we do not have--we do not have, obviously, a good answer for  
98 it.

99 There is no question that the individual fighter  
100 aircraft planned for the future are much more capable, with a  
101 combination of stealth, speed and precision-guided munitions.

102 But if we have further reductions in active Air National  
103 Guard and Air Force Reserve aircraft, especially in fighters,  
104 it is not yet clear how we can still meet the number of  
105 aircraft needed for homeland defense, while continuing to  
106 provide the force structure necessary for the Air Force's 10  
107 air expeditionary forces.

108 I believe our nation can and must afford both the  
109 numbers and the capabilities needed for the future total  
110 force.

111 To help members understand and assess the Air Force's

112 | Future Total Force plan, we have invited a distinguished  
113 | panel to testify before us today.

114 |       As our first witness, we will welcome Lieutenant General  
115 | Stephan G. Wood, Air Force deputy chief of staff for plans  
116 | and programs.

117 |       Our next witness is Lieutenant General H. Steven Blum,  
118 | chief of the National Guard Bureau.

119 |       Our third witness is Lieutenant General Daniel James  
120 | III, director of the Air National Guard.

121 |       Next is Lieutenant General John A. Bradley, chief of the  
122 | Air Force Reserve.

123 |       And we are very pleased to have with us two adjutants  
124 | general to share their views on the Air Force's Future Total  
125 | Force plan at the state level. And they are Major General  
126 | Roger P. Lemke, the adjutant general of Nebraska and  
127 | president of the Adjutants General Association of the United  
128 | States, and Major General Mason C. Whitney, the adjutant  
129 | general of Colorado.

130 |       Gentlemen, thank you all for being with us. We look  
131 | forward to your testimony. I think we have laid out the  
132 | problem fairly robustly here, and we look forward to your  
133 | testimony.

134 |       Before we go to your testimony, let me turn to my  
135 | distinguished partner on this committee, the ranking member,  
136 | the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Skelton, for any remarks he

137 | would like to make.

138 |       [The opening statement of Mr. Hunter follows:]

139 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

140 Mr. SKELTON. Mr. Chairman, thank you. And I think this  
141 is a very, very appropriate and important hearing.

142 And let me welcome our distinguished witnesses.

143 The gentleman to my far left and the audience's far  
144 right seems like an old friend--General Wood. Actually, 2  
145 weeks ago he was a colonel in the United States Air Force.  
146 And today, 2 weeks later, he appears before us as a  
147 lieutenant general.

148 And we welcome you. It is so good to see you again.  
149 General, we look forward to hearing you--without singling you  
150 out, General--among the others.

151 The Air Force has historically treated its Reservists  
152 and National Guardsmen as full partners in accomplishing its  
153 mission. In my view, the Air Force has served as a model for  
154 other services in the implementation of the total force  
155 concept and the seamless integration of its reserve  
156 components in its operation.

157 This has proved true in recent conflicts. And I  
158 compliment the Air Force for that.

159 Now, because that is particularly troubling to me, to  
160 learn that the Air Force has planned to reorganize the  
161 Reserve aircraft and personnel--and I will be interested to  
162 hear particularly from General Wood--as I understand the Air  
163 Force proposal, the reorganization of the Air Force Reserve  
164 and Air National Guard units and equipment does not

165 | adequately take into consideration the unique status of the  
166 | reserve components, and may ultimately result in less  
167 | efficient use of the Reserve and the Air National Guard  
168 | personnel, if not at a diminution of operational capability.

169 |         These are serious questions.

170 |         Based on what I know at this point, I think the Air  
171 | Force runs a real risk of damaging the historically good  
172 | relations it has enjoyed with its Reserve partners. And I  
173 | will underline the word "partners."

174 |         I appreciate the problems that have driven the Air Force  
175 | to propose these changes--increasing budgetary pressures,  
176 | aging aircraft, operational maintenance efficiencies gained  
177 | by consolidation. We know all those.

178 |         These issues are complex and must be addressed if the  
179 | Air Force is to maintain its edge and remain the finest in  
180 | the world--and it is.

181 |         However, I question whether equipment relocation and  
182 | personnel judgments are best handled within the framework of  
183 | the Base Realignment and Closure process. Their inclusion in  
184 | the Department of Defense's base closure recommendation has  
185 | made an already difficult process more complex, I think, than  
186 | it need be.

187 |         Some of the recommendations may not even be supported by  
188 | the Base Closings statute--the federal statute. One of the  
189 | lawyers working for the BRAC Commission's own General Counsel

190 | has expressed his opinion that the rebasing of aircraft and  
191 | moving personnel are outside the scope of the BRAC statute.  
192 | BRAC was meant to cover installations and infrastructure, not  
193 | people and aircraft.

194 |         Some argue that the Air Force already has the authority  
195 | under section 20687 of Title 10 to make changes to personnel  
196 | and equipment or a headquarters.

197 |         There is also second and third tier consequences of the  
198 | Air Force's plan that need to be thought through. For  
199 | example, relocating flying units can directly impact the  
200 | ability of the state National Guard units to recruit and  
201 | retain personnel at a time when we are at war.

202 |         We need to understand how the Air Force intends to  
203 | manage that kind of problem. And finally, I suspect, we will  
204 | hear this morning proposed changes of this magnitude and  
205 | state political sensitivity, and how they need to be  
206 | coordinated with the affected units.

207 |         In the case of the Air National Guard, it is imperative  
208 | that governors and adjutants be consulted, because the  
209 | National Guard units and state as well as federal missions  
210 | responding to natural disasters and emergencies providing for  
211 | homeland security among others.

212 |         My sense is that there have been deficiencies in the  
213 | consultative process. We will ask about that today.

214 |         And I hope the testimony of our witnesses will address

215 | the Air Force's plan also, that we can better understand why  
216 | it has been designed the way it is, and how it improves  
217 | operational effectiveness without degrading the Air Force's  
218 | reserve components to perform their all-important missions,  
219 | and why it is necessary that they plan be implemented as part  
220 | of the base closure process, which I am convinced at some  
221 | point it is going to end up in court through one of the  
222 | states. I think two states have already made the announcement  
223 | that they are going to formally challenge it in court.

224 | Mr. Chairman, thanks.

225 | The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

226 | So, gentlemen, thank you for being with us. It is, I  
227 | think, a very important hearing.

228 | I would like you to think about something as we are  
229 | going through your testimony today, just something I would  
230 | like to throw out. And that is--and I started to think about  
231 | this when I was down with Mr. LoBiondo, looking at F-16  
232 | aircraft with Jimmy Saxton, down in his district, and  
233 | contemplating this drawdown.

234 | But I did not see it so starkly manifested until we got  
235 | this presentation by the Air Force, that shows us this very  
236 | large number of planes that were available for the active and  
237 | Reserve component, and Guard component, moving down to the  
238 | point where in the future we are going to have a very few  
239 | aircraft available.

240 And so, let me throw this out, because this is what I  
241 started to think about. And I would like at the end of the  
242 testimony maybe to get your take on this, because it is a  
243 little different aspect of this thing.

244 F-22 is going to be very expensive. We know that.  
245 Joint strike fighters are going to be more expensive than we  
246 expected, and we are going to have probably a later delivery  
247 date than we expected.

248 We are not getting the buys back on F-22, as you all  
249 know. There is only one alternative, and that is to try to  
250 bridge that gap between that little bitty inventory of  
251 aircraft that we are going to have in the future of F-22s and  
252 joint strike fighters. And that would be to produce more  
253 F-15s, F-16s, to handle the force and to handle this equipage  
254 problem until we get into this high performance--and even  
255 after we get into the high performance inventory, the  
256 so-called high performance inventory of F-22 and joint strike  
257 fighter--because of the numbers and because of coverage  
258 problems.

259 Would we not need to maintain production on one of those  
260 two aircraft, F-15Es, or F-16s, well into the future, even as  
261 those lines, at least with F-15, are going cold here shortly?

262 I do not see--just trying to kind of think about this--I  
263 do not see another answer. So, I would like you to think  
264 about that.

265 I realize that is a little bit--that is not the total  
266 problem or question we have asked you to look at. But we are  
267 going to have--if this was analogous to the cavalry days--we  
268 are going to have lots of cavalry personnel with no horses.

269 And that is going to accrue to the detriment of this  
270 great country, which has always had such a strong reliance on  
271 air power and the air power in the Guard and Reserve  
272 component. And I think we are in real danger of losing that  
273 depth that the United States has enjoyed ever since World War  
274 I. So, please think about that.

275 And having said that, thank you, folks, for being with  
276 us.

277 And, General Wood, the floor is yours, sir.

278 | STATEMENTS OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL STEPHEN WOOD, USAF, DEPUTY  
279 | CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PLANS AND PROGRAMS; LIEUTENANT GENERAL H.  
280 | STEVEN BLUM, USA, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU; LIEUTENANT  
281 | GENERAL DANIEL JAMES III, USAF, DIRECTOR, AIR NATIONAL GUARD;  
282 | LIEUTENANT GENERAL JOHN A. BRADLEY, USAF, CHIEF OF AIR FORCE  
283 | RESERVE; MAJOR GENERAL ROGER P. LEMPKE, USAF, THE ADJUTANT  
284 | GENERAL OF NEBRASKA; AND MAJOR GENERAL MASON C. WHITNEY,  
285 | USAF, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF COLORADO

286 | STATEMENT OF STEPHEN WOOD

287 | Lieutenant General WOOD. Good morning, sir. I have  
288 | oral testimony, and then I have a statement for the record as  
289 | well.

290 | The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, all written statements  
291 | will be taken into the record.

292 | Lieutenant General WOOD. Thank you, sir.

293 | Good morning, Chairman, Mr. Skelton and members of the  
294 | committee. I am glad, in fact I am honored, to be here with  
295 | you to discuss the Air Force Future Total Force initiative.

296 | And I would just make one clarification for the record,  
297 | Mr. Skelton, sir. It was 10 years ago that I had the honor  
298 | to work here within--for the House at the Air Force's  
299 | representative liaison office. So, it is an honor to be back  
300 | here in front of you.

301 | Sir, I am also proud this morning and really, deeply  
302 | proud to be with my partners in this endeavor as we prepare  
303 | for the future: General Steve Blum, the chief of the Air  
304 | National Guard Bureau; General Daniel James, director of the  
305 | Air National Guard; and General John Bradley, chief of the  
306 | Air Force Reserve and commander of the Air Force Reserve  
307 | Command.

308 | In fact, countless members of both the Guard and the  
309 | Reserves have served as integral members of our Future Total  
310 | Force team, providing an invaluable citizen airman  
311 | perspective that is critical to the future and to building  
312 | this team that we are discussing.

313 | I have met with many members of the Congress  
314 | individually, as well as countless staff members, so I am  
315 | excited now to have the opportunity to discuss this in detail  
316 | in front of the committee.

317 | Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contributions  
318 | of three state adjutant generals: Major General Mason  
319 | Whitney from Colorado, Major General Bruce Tuxill from  
320 | Maryland, and Major General Mike Haugen from North Dakota.  
321 | These gentlemen serve on our Future Total Force General  
322 | Officer Steering Committee and ably represented the TAGs'  
323 | perspective and interests in this process.

324 | In addition, these TAGs have served as a vital link to  
325 | the Adjutant Generals' Strategic Planning Committee since

326 September of 2004. I know they will continue to give us sage  
327 counsel and input.

328 Mr. Chairman, I think one of the best reasons for us to  
329 be here today is to talk about the exciting issues associated  
330 with the Future Total Force plan and process. Yes, it  
331 involves change, and we all know change is not easy.

332 Recently, the former guardsman from Nevada, Congressman  
333 Jim Gibbons, reminded me of the challenges the total force  
334 endured the implementation of the Goldwater-Nichols Act  
335 several years ago. I am reminded that there was much  
336 goodness on the other side of Goldwater-Nichols, just as  
337 there will be with the future total force.

338 Change then was a necessary part of moving forward, just  
339 as it is today. The Air Force is facing incredible  
340 challenges today, and the path we take now, active Guard and  
341 Reserve will shape our collective shared future.

342 This future--the Future Total Force plan--includes two  
343 major aspects. First, a threat-based, well-analyzed force  
344 structure that takes us out to 2025. And second, a set of  
345 innovative organizational constructs that synergizes  
346 strengths of our active duty, our Guard and our Reserve.

347 We have a financially responsible plan to divest older  
348 weapons systems that more expensive to operate, and cannot  
349 provide the capabilities that combatant commanders are  
350 demanding. We are at a point where we must shift our

351 | investments into newer, more capable systems to deliver the  
352 | maximum war-fighting and homeland defense capabilities our  
353 | nation needs.

354 |         As an airman and a citizen of this great country, both  
355 | of these--homeland defense and our war-fighting capability  
356 | overseas--are extremely important to this nation, but again,  
357 | none more than the protection and defense of our country.

358 |         The other critical part of the Future Total Force plan  
359 | defines innovative organizational constructs. The Air Force  
360 | has always operated as a seamless total force. In fact, the  
361 | Air Force Reserve and active duty have utilized the associate  
362 | model since 1968. Under our plan, we will take this  
363 | integration to the next level by expanding both the scope and  
364 | the number of associate units, using the lessons learned over  
365 | the past 40 years.

366 |         In the fighter business, we want to apply the same  
367 | business and total force team processes we learned on the  
368 | mobility side. We will see the experience of our young,  
369 | active-duty airmen, like Airman 1st Class Kershell Lacroix, a  
370 | first-term airman directly out of basic and tech school  
371 | becoming the first community-based maintainer to ride in  
372 | Burlington, Vermont, which happened last month. She will  
373 | grow significantly under the mentoring of highly skilled Air  
374 | National Guard maintenance experts.

375 |         We will bring the Air National Guard into the front-line

376 fighters at the same time as our active duty. When  
377 Lieutenant Colonel Phil Guy, the first of many Virginia Air  
378 National Guard pilots and maintainers, completes F/A-22  
379 training and arrives at Langley Air Force Base to associate  
380 with the 1st Fighter Wing.

381 One of the most exciting things we are doing is  
382 increasing the number of active associate units. This means  
383 the active duty now will move to work with the Guard and  
384 Reserve at their locations, to leverage the tremendous  
385 experience levels we have in the Guard and Reserve.

386 Active associate units also demonstrate the tremendous  
387 respect and trust the Air Force has for its reserve component  
388 and their connections to the communities across America.

389 When we send our young active duty pilots to associate  
390 with the Air National Guard unit in Colorado, Lieutenant  
391 Colonel Curt Hughes of the 140th Fighter Wing will share his  
392 many years of war-fighting and homeland defense, as well as  
393 expertise as a commercial pilot. The payback to Lieutenant  
394 Colonel Hughes will be an active duty pilot, ready to provide  
395 the experience and deployability that reduces the number and  
396 frequencies of mobilization deployments on both him and other  
397 pilots in this highly demanding Air National Guard unit. The  
398 payback to the nation is a more experienced and effective Air  
399 Force.

400 Ladies and gentlemen, I want to be very clear. Future

401 Total Force is not an attempt to marginalize the  
402 contributions of the Air Guard and Reserve components. Under  
403 Future Total Force, our plan is to include all components in  
404 every Air Force mission.

405 By retiring legacy systems that have traditionally  
406 flowed into the Guard and Reserve, we can ensure they are  
407 full participants in more relevant flying missions, and as  
408 well as non-flying missions, including but not limited to  
409 unmanned aerial vehicles, space systems and processing of  
410 battlefield intelligence that directly supports the joint war  
411 fighter.

412 One of the most exciting emerging missions in the Future  
413 Total Force plan is the growth of the Predator mission.  
414 Persistence, intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance  
415 capability is one of the most critical requirements of every  
416 combatant commander.

417 It is a mission I personally led and observed, and  
418 several of you have seen, when I was commander of the Air  
419 Warfare Center at Nellis Air Force Base. Men and women  
420 arrive daily at Nellis and set down in a console with a  
421 screen and a joystick, and they actually flew a Predator with  
422 kinetic kill capability that was flying over Iraq and  
423 Afghanistan, supporting our Marines, soldiers and sailors on  
424 the ground. They provided critical and timely eyes, ears and  
425 often, again, weapons delivery to the joint force.

426 This is a perfect emerging mission that we want to  
427 incorporate across the total force. The Air Force Reserve  
428 command is leading the way in this mission area, and I would  
429 ask you to check with the Air Force Reserve operators and  
430 leaders like Lieutenant Colonel John Breeden, an Air Force  
431 reservist commanding an active duty reconnaissance squadron  
432 at Nellis Air Force Base. I would tell you, I think he has  
433 some very positive and interesting experiences to share with  
434 you. He has also done a tremendous job.

435 We have and will pay close attention to ensuring  
436 existing and new mission areas are distributed proportionally  
437 across the total force--a condition we believe is important  
438 to a viable total Air Force future. There would not be a new  
439 mission brought into the Air Force that would not have  
440 Reserve and Guardsmen as well as active duty airmen sharing  
441 the load.

442 Some have stated that the Future Total Force plan takes  
443 the Guard and Reserve out of the flying business. To the  
444 contrary. The Guard and Reserve are full partners in  
445 assuring joint air dominance within the next generation of  
446 fighters--the F/A-22s, F-35s, our tankers, bombers,  
447 surveillance and reconnaissance, as well as mobility  
448 aircraft.

449 We are committed to preparing for this force--the force  
450 that is positioned to maximize all capabilities we provide to

451 | the nation. That includes increases in crews and crew ratios  
452 | assigned to current and future aircraft across the total  
453 | force inventory.

454 |       I am not here today--I am here today, but not to discuss  
455 | BRAC. But it is important to point out that the BRAC law  
456 | required the Air Force to submit to Congress its 2025 force  
457 | structure. We conducted a 2-year detailed analysis, closely  
458 | following guidelines to meet the requirements in the national  
459 | defense strategy and the national military strategies, and  
460 | also used accepted threat analysis of the intelligence  
461 | agencies, such as the CIA, the NSA and DIA, to help us with  
462 | that task.

463 |       I would like to address quickly another prevalent myth  
464 | head-on. The Future Total Force plan in no way will  
465 | negatively impact the capability assigned to protect the  
466 | skies over America, nor will with plan take away the  
467 | capabilities required by the states during times of emergency  
468 | or natural disaster. The Air Force considers homeland  
469 | defense its most important mission, and was the first of many  
470 | requirements to be accounted for and protected and addressed.

471 |       This Future Total Force concept was established in 1997.

472 |       Since that date, the discussions of future total force have  
473 | truly been an iterative total force process. We built this  
474 | plan with the inputs and guidance of the National Guard  
475 | Bureau, the Air National Guard Directorate leaders and their

476 | staffs for the past 8 years. We will continue to work with  
477 | them to seek total force solutions, the requirements for both  
478 | homeland defense and war-fighting capabilities, and adjust  
479 | the plan as necessary as we go along, to ensure we provide  
480 | America the best Air Force possible.

481 |         We all know changes of this magnitude are tough. But we  
482 | are forging ahead because this is the right thing to do to  
483 | provide America with the most capable air space and cyber  
484 | force ever. We are confident we will take our total force to  
485 | the next level, because the Air National Guard, the Air Force  
486 | Reserve and the active duty are in lockstep together as we  
487 | move forward.

488 |         With that, again, it is an honor to be with you this  
489 | morning.

490 |         I would like to offer General Blum the opportunity.

491 |         [The statement of Lieutenant General Wood follows:]

492 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

493

The CHAIRMAN. General Wood, thank you.

494

General Blum, thank you for being with us.

495 | STATEMENT OF STEVEN BLUM

496 |       Lieutenant General BLUM. Chairman Hunter,  
497 | Representative Skelton and other distinguished members of  
498 | this committee, thanks for the opportunity, sincerely, to  
499 | have an opportunity to appear here this morning before you.

500 |       As your National Guard supports the transformation of  
501 | America's military to meet the 21st century challenges,  
502 | frankly, the National Guard has been a leader in the joint  
503 | transformation process for the last several years.

504 |       Homeland defense is, and always must be, mission number  
505 | one for the National Guard. To accomplish this, it means  
506 | that we must ensure that the president of the United States  
507 | and all 50 governors of our states and our four territories  
508 | have the right joint capabilities, both in the Army Guard and  
509 | their Air Guard, to perform homeland defense here at home,  
510 | support the homeland security operations--here, right in your  
511 | district where your constituents vote for you.

512 |       And at the same time, we have to simultaneously provide  
513 | trained and ready forces for the combatant commanders  
514 | overseas to execute the joint and expeditionary war-fight  
515 | overseas.

516 |       In order to do this, I have the assurances of the  
517 | secretary, the acting secretary of the Air Force, the current  
518 | chief of staff of the Air Force, the announced chief of staff

519 | of the Air Force, the current vice chief of staff of the Air  
520 | Force, and General Wood beside me that the Air National Guard  
521 | will be a full spectrum force in a modular configuration that  
522 | will have the right capabilities, that we will distribute  
523 | across the landscape of America, to ensure that every  
524 | governor has the right joint capabilities to leverage between  
525 | our Army and Air Guard to do the homeland defense mission,  
526 | support the homeland security mission and still provide the  
527 | United States Air Force the forces, the airmen that they need  
528 | to send on an air expeditionary force rotations for the  
529 | war-fight overseas.

530 |         That means that we will be in every single mission set.  
531 | The Air Guard will be an integral part, proportionately  
532 | distributed, roughly on the same percentages as they are  
533 | today and have been historically, in every mission set the  
534 | Air Force performs. That means we will fly every airplane  
535 | type that the Air Force has in its inventory. It will be  
536 | excluded from no cockpits of any type of aircraft.

537 |         We will do that in several different ways--traditional  
538 | ways, where we have Guard units, the standalone Guard units.  
539 | And then we will have units where we use the human capital  
540 | and leverage each other's strengths and actually mitigate our  
541 | weaknesses, and that we will flow Air Guardsmen into active  
542 | units, and active Air Force members into Guard units, to  
543 | include the flow of the airplanes both ways as well.

544 This is what is necessary to provide the president of  
545 the United States and the governors the right capabilities in  
546 the future that the Air Force must deliver for this nation.

547 While transforming the Air National Guard, as chief of  
548 the National Guard Bureau, I am personally committed to  
549 stationing a flying unit in every state and territory--bar  
550 none. It is necessary for homeland defense, to support the  
551 homeland security, and it gives us the depth, chairman, that  
552 you talk about. And it allows us to continue to call up the  
553 Guard, to call up the whole country.

554 So when you call up the Air Guard, you call up America.  
555 And the reason for that is, we are distributed in every part  
556 of America, and that community and that state and that  
557 territory goes to the fight. And that is a very, very  
558 powerful combat multiplier for our airmen and soldiers when  
559 we deploy them overseas and is absolutely necessary for the  
560 American people to support an all volunteer, recruited force  
561 in the future.

562 At the same time, I am equally committed to getting out  
563 of old legacy aircraft that are expensive and not really  
564 relevant for the future. The Air National Guard must divest  
565 of these aircraft. But they must have a bridge that gets  
566 them from their current mission to the new aircraft and the  
567 new missions that are envisioned in Future Total Force.

568 And these new emerging missions are exciting and

569 necessary and absolutely essential, if we are going to keep  
570 our Air Force and our Air National Guard and our Air Force  
571 Reserve the very best air force in the world. But we must  
572 have a way to get from where we are now to where we need to  
573 be in the future.

574 You can not have a unit sitting at home waiting for 2  
575 years, 3 years, 7 years for that new platform to arrive, or  
576 otherwise it rolls in on an airfield that is devoid of  
577 people, and we would have to regenerate that unit all over  
578 again. And that would be terribly expensive in time, and I  
579 am not even sure if it is doable.

580 So, I am committed to providing a bridge from the  
581 current mission to the future mission.

582 And lastly, I want to ensure that we have a full  
583 spectrum force that is both capable of doing the homeland  
584 defense mission, support the homeland security mission and  
585 simultaneously being a full partner, as we are today, in the  
586 air expeditionary force rotations overseas.

587 Thank you again, sir, for the opportunity to appear here  
588 today, and I await your questions.

589 [The statement of Lieutenant General Blum follows:]

590 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

591 |           The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, General Blum.

592 |           General James, welcome, and we look forward to your

593 | remarks.

594 STATEMENT OF DANIEL JAMES

595 Lieutenant General JAMES. Mr. Chairman, Representative  
596 Skelton, members of this distinguished committee, thank you  
597 for the opportunity to speak with you here today, to share  
598 some knowledge and entertain questions.

599 The bulk of my remarks were coordinated with my boss, to  
600 my right here, General Blum, the chief of the Guard Bureau.

601 I would just like to say, first of all, thank you for  
602 your support. I would also like to say how proud I am to be  
603 leading our Air National Guard at this very, very critical  
604 time. The Air National Guard is currently deployed to 24  
605 different countries around the world. We perform 90 percent  
606 of the air sovereignty mission. We truly do guard America's  
607 skies.

608 But the Air National Guard must also transform, and in  
609 doing so, will be faced with many challenges. I look forward  
610 to working with Congress, with the Air Force leadership and  
611 the National Guard leadership to make sure that we have the  
612 right force at the right time for this great nation.

613 Thank you.

614 The CHAIRMAN. Thank you, General James.

615 General Bradley?

616 STATEMENT OF JOHN BRADLEY

617 Lieutenant General BRADLEY. Chairman Hunter, Mr.  
618 Skelton, other distinguished members of this committee, it is  
619 a pleasure to be here to talk about this very important  
620 subject.

621 This partnership that we have in our Air Force has been  
622 going on for many years. I think many people recognize that  
623 the Air Force has worked on its total force in a very  
624 positive way for over 30 years, making our Air National Guard  
625 and Air Force Reserve a very operational force for the Air  
626 Force.

627 And it demonstrates itself very well every day, and has,  
628 particularly in the last 15 years much more than it did when  
629 General James and I first became guardsmen and reservists.

630 As General Wood said, the partnership in the associate  
631 business in our Air Force has gone back 35 to 40 years, and  
632 been very successful. Those early movements into that world  
633 later were seen so successful that most of the Air Force has  
634 gone into an associate model in many parts, with the Air  
635 Force Reserve, in special operations and tankers and with  
636 fighter associate and our training associate units. It has  
637 been a very successful model. It will be good for the future  
638 as well.

639 All of us at this table who invested most of our adult

640 | lives in our Air Force, and none of us would ever do anything  
641 | that would not try to be a positive influence on making our  
642 | Air Force better in the future.

643 | I am excited about the future. Some of the things that  
644 | we are going to do are different. Change frequently is  
645 | painful and hard for people. But I would tell you, sir, I am  
646 | very positive about our future.

647 | And the Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard  
648 | actually began this Future Total Force effort in 1997. The  
649 | active was not a part of it. They are now, and we have been  
650 | equal partners in this effort since.

651 | So, we have all worked together on it. We are going to  
652 | continue working together on it. And I am extremely proud to  
653 | be a part of this group that works it. General James and me,  
654 | General Blum and General Wood.

655 | If we had to have a person in General Wood's position  
656 | that we could create from scratch, we could not find a better  
657 | total force partner than General Steve Wood, I promise you  
658 | that.

659 | I have been in this business a long time. I came to the  
660 | Pentagon in 1993 for 5.5 years from Missouri. And I will  
661 | tell you, sir, things are better today than they have ever  
662 | been. We are looked at as equal partners in the Air Force.  
663 | We have got a great Air Force plans and programs man here.  
664 | We have a great chief of staff and vice chief of staff, who

665 are fully committed to the future total force that we are  
666 building, and we are proud to be part of that effort.

667 I look forward to your questions, sir. Thank you.

668 [The statement of Lieutenant General Bradley follows:]

669 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

670 | The CHAIRMAN. General Bradley, thank you.

671 | General Lempke, we look forward to your perspective,

672 | sir.

673 STATEMENT OF ROGER LEMPKE

674 Major General LEMPKE. Thank you very much, Chairman  
675 Hunter.

676 I am Major General Roger Lempke, adjutant general of  
677 Nebraska and president of the Adjutants General Association  
678 of the United States.

679 The subject of today's hearing is future total force,  
680 but allow me a few minutes to discuss the role of the  
681 adjutant general and the Adjutants General Association.

682 The adjutant general in each state and territory is  
683 responsible for the readiness of their respective Army and  
684 Air Guard units. A state employee who is called to duty  
685 under Title 32, the adjutant general may be responsible also  
686 for emergency management and homeland security. In fact, 23  
687 adjutants general currently have this responsibility.

688 Each adjutant general works for the state or territorial  
689 governor and speaks to issues that affect the National Guard  
690 in this capacity.

691 By point of reference, Lieutenant General Steve Blum,  
692 our chief, is a Title 10 officer charged with administering  
693 the National Guard and providing a link of communications  
694 between the states and the Department of Defense.

695 The Adjutants General Association brings together the  
696 adjutants general of the several states to deal collectively

697 with issues and speak with one voice to the chief, and indeed  
698 the nation. We are part of a--we are part of and work  
699 closely with the National Guard Association of the United  
700 States, also.

701 The Air Force will undergo many significant long-term  
702 changes in the upcoming years as it transforms to become a  
703 more lethal force, capable of commanding air space in future  
704 battle spaces.

705 The role of the adjutants general is to work with the  
706 National Guard Bureau and the Air Force, to ensure the  
707 National Guard--the Air National Guard--transforms in such a  
708 way to be relevant and ready to respond to our nation's  
709 needs, both overseas, as General Blum has often described as  
710 the "away game," and domestically, the "home game."

711 We train and fight with what the Air Force provides to  
712 us through the National Guard Bureau.

713 To guide us through this time of change, we developed  
714 five core principles. These principles serve as guideposts  
715 for us when dealing with important issues. They also provide  
716 others with an open look at what influences our thoughts and  
717 actions.

718 To summarize, these principles are, first, retaining our  
719 militia basing concept, i.e., being dispersed throughout  
720 communities in the United States.

721 Second, working with the Air Force to build on the cost

722 efficiencies and capability unique to the Air National Guard  
723 that we bring to the Air Force and supporting the Air Force  
724 expeditionary force capabilities.

725 Number three, that each state be assigned a baseline  
726 homeland defense force, that at a minimum includes some form  
727 of civil engineering, medical, security forces, that are  
728 there to provide the governor, in addition to the Army  
729 National Guard, the supports he needs in times of natural  
730 disaster or other emergencies.

731 Number four, that the National Guard maintain essential  
732 and proportional shares of flying missions in fighters,  
733 tanker, airlift and others.

734 And finally, that we work with the Air Force and the Air  
735 National Guard Bureau through our Adjutants General  
736 Association together in working toward defining new and  
737 emerging missions.

738 Many years ago, the Air National Guard operated second  
739 and third line aircraft, and developed, perhaps, a reputation  
740 described by some as being a flying club. But over the past  
741 two decades, we have demonstrated that when provided a  
742 top-of-the-line aircraft and equipment, and then integrated  
743 with the active component in training and combat operations,  
744 we are equal--and in some areas superior--in capability and  
745 responsiveness.

746 A commonly documented statistic is that the Air National

747 Guard provides 34 percent of the flying capability in the Air  
748 Force for about 77 percent of the Air Force budget. I point  
749 this out just to highlight the unique quality that the  
750 citizen soldier or militia concept brings, that has been so  
751 prominent in our American history.

752 The nation sustains a reserve force with operational  
753 capabilities for a fraction of the cost of a large standing  
754 force.

755 Key to the Air National Guard is a community-based  
756 philosophy. Indeed, this is our first principle. Our  
757 servicemembers are citizen first and National Guard members  
758 second.

759 Important to recruiting and retaining National Guard  
760 servicemembers is stability of mission opportunities in  
761 communities. Guard personnel do not just pack up and go to  
762 the next location to simply serve in the National Guard.  
763 Therefore, we adjutants general are very observant of Air  
764 Force plans to consolidate Air Force future operations.

765 We understand the need to seek efficiencies by combining  
766 and consolidating operations. Where the Air National Guard  
767 is involved, this must be done in ways that do not destroy  
768 the fabric of our existence, indeed, the community-based  
769 philosophy.

770 We operate most effectively when missions across the  
771 spectrum of operation are generally proportional between the

772 active component and the Air National Guard, especially  
773 flying missions.

774 We attribute our success in supporting the splendid Air  
775 Force air expeditionary force management concept to this  
776 proportionality. We fly the same aircraft the Air Force  
777 does. The stability offered by our community-based  
778 philosophy provides levels of flying and maintenance  
779 experience unattainable in the active component.

780 This combination of Air National Guard experience and  
781 Air Force savvy makes the United States Air Force the envy of  
782 the world.

783 However, as was also pointed out earlier, as more  
784 expensive aircraft, though more capable, enter the inventory,  
785 it will become ever more difficult to sustain operational  
786 proportionality.

787 For our fourth principle, we believe it is vital that  
788 the Air National Guard fly the same modern aircraft as the  
789 active component in at least the same approximate proportions  
790 as now. If the future points to different proportions, our  
791 strong desire is that the Air Force work closely with  
792 National Guard Bureau and the adjutants general to ensure our  
793 participation in the broad expanse of air force missions.

794 Our chief, Lieutenant General Blum, has stated many  
795 times that the modern National Guard is no longer a strategic  
796 reserve, but, indeed, an operational force. Nowhere is this

797 | more true than in how the Air National Guard supports the air  
798 | expeditionary force rotation schedule through volunteerism.

799 |       Major General Whitney, next to me, will discuss this  
800 | further in a few moments. For now, though, I simply want to  
801 | point out that there will always be limits to what can be  
802 | accomplished with the militia force. The commitment of the  
803 | entire National Guard to Operation Iraqi Freedom and  
804 | Operation Noble Eagle is considerable.

805 |       At some point, the militia must return to being citizens  
806 | first. This is another area where the adjutants general are  
807 | watching closely. The global war on terrorism is an extended  
808 | fight. We want to be sure that our National Guard  
809 | servicemembers will be available to support future  
810 | operations.

811 |       Finally, we were asked in the letter that was sent to  
812 | testify about enclaves. This is a term and a concept that  
813 | recently emerged from the BRAC recommendations presented by  
814 | DOD to the BRAC Commission. To my knowledge, it had not been  
815 | part of previous discussions regarding future total force.  
816 | However, there are aspects that do apply, I believe, to the  
817 | future total force, so I will address enclaves in that  
818 | context.

819 |       Our Adjutants General Association principle number three  
820 | articulates the need for homeland defense force that includes  
821 | key air force specialties important to the governors. The

822 | enclave concept seems to provide this. Certainly, the  
823 | adjutants general are interested in exploring new  
824 | opportunities to enhance our capability to support the  
825 | governors in times of crisis.

826 |       As currently proposed, the enclave concept does lack  
827 | sufficient detail to determine if it is a viable concept or  
828 | not. First, it currently lacks, as far as we understand, a  
829 | doctrinal basis. And you are certainly well aware that  
830 | organizational operations without a doctrinal basis will not  
831 | last long when tight funding necessitates difficult budget  
832 | decisions.

833 |       The BRAC recommends around 30 enclaves. How many of  
834 | these will survive more than 5 years out is uncertain. So it  
835 | is important that this concept become part of the Air Force  
836 | and the Air Force future total force doctrinally and through  
837 | concepts of operation.

838 |       Currently, we have enclaves, if you will, that exist  
839 | with flying units. Indirectly, their missions coincide with  
840 | flying missions. The idea of enclaves on their own has not  
841 | been tested to any great extent to my knowledge.

842 |       Therefore, before charging down a path that could  
843 | possibly harm the fabric of the Air National Guard and its  
844 | ability to meet our state missions, we would strongly  
845 | recommend that a test program be implemented to determine  
846 | just how recruiting, retention and training are affected by a

847 | concept of enclaves. Unfortunately, the BRAC timeline does  
848 | not properly permit this, but in looking at future total  
849 | force, it is certainly an idea worth looking at.

850 |         In conclusion, we focus today on the Air Force Future  
851 | Total Force plan and avoided a discussion of BRAC. However,  
852 | we do have, as adjutants general, two major concerns that  
853 | relate to both.

854 |         One was explained a few moments ago. A serious gap  
855 | exists between when legacy aircraft are retired under the  
856 | BRAC plan, and when new missions--and the new missions that  
857 | are taking shape. We stand to lose many local and  
858 | experienced militia members due to this gap.

859 |         However, legacy aircraft retirement needs to be slowed,  
860 | perhaps, and the effort to enter new missions intensified and  
861 | quickened. There needs to be a hand-off, not a dropped  
862 | baton, between now and the future.

863 |         Second, from the adjutants general perspective, the Air  
864 | National Guard is not yet written in sufficiently to much of  
865 | the Air Force's plan for future total force. Our involvement  
866 | with new aircraft certainly seems limited at this time, and  
867 | most new mission opportunities are in the discussion stage,  
868 | but not much farther.

869 |         Our commitment to future total force will be greatly  
870 | strengthened as Air Force documents and other items indicate  
871 | the way ahead for the Air National Guard being included as a

872 full and active partner in fielding new missions and new  
873 opportunities.

874 On behalf of over nearly 107,000 dedicated air militia  
875 members, I want to express our gratitude for your interest in  
876 America's greatest treasure. Thank you.

877 [The statement of Major General Lempke follows:]

878 \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

879

The CHAIRMAN. Thank you very much, General Lempke.

880

General Whitney, look forward to your testimony.

881 STATEMENT OF MASON WHITNEY

882 Major General WHITNEY. Good morning, Mr. Chairman,  
883 Representative Skelton, distinguished members of the  
884 committee.

885 I am testifying this morning in my status as the  
886 adjutant general of Colorado, a member of the governor's  
887 cabinet, as well as a state employee, and also in my position  
888 as the Air National Guard modernization, chairman of the  
889 Adjutants General Association as well. And as a result, I am  
890 a member of the Future Total Force General Officers Steering  
891 Committee that General Wood sponsors.

892 Just to give you some--what I would like to do this  
893 morning is just paraphrase my written testimony so we can get  
894 through it fairly quickly--but just to give you some  
895 background as to what the state's perspective is in terms of  
896 how we have been included in the Future Total Force planning,  
897 and then to kind of give you an idea of what we are involved  
898 with right now, so we can kind of see where we have been and  
899 where we are going to.

900 First of all, the Air National Guard has been involved  
901 in a vanguard initiative, which is a future total force  
902 planning that General James initiated, with a vision toward  
903 integrating active Guard and Reserve units wherever possible.  
904 Obviously, modernizing where we can, consolidating where we

905 | can, essentially moving us forward, as you saw into the  
906 | future of smaller numbers of aircraft, more capable aircraft.  
907 | And so, therefore, we have to share those resources.

908 |         The Vanguard Initiative started about 2002. We worked  
909 | hard on trying to develop initiatives out of the Vanguard  
910 | proposals, looking at some of the blended units, community  
911 | basing at Vermont, as Predator missions, new emerging  
912 | missions, those kinds of things. And the states were all  
913 | involved with that, with the Air National Guard.

914 |         In fact, the Air National Guard sent a task force out to  
915 | all the states to develop their own state plan that said,  
916 | where would you like to be in missions in the future? What  
917 | would you like to be doing with those units you have in  
918 | current missions, and how are you going to evolve into the  
919 | future missions?

920 |         As a result of some of the planning processes that went  
921 | on, some of the states were pretty well satisfied with the  
922 | direction that Vanguard was moving, and some states were very  
923 | concerned that, not only did they move them out of missions  
924 | that they felt were the best for their state, but they also  
925 | had no bridge that moved from the current mission to future  
926 | missions. And as a result, there was a--as General Lempke  
927 | just talked about--a dropped baton.

928 |         And so, those concerns, I think, were voiced to members  
929 | of Congress, and then members of Congress starting asking

930 | questions to the Air Force of how much involved the adjutants  
931 | generals were in the future total force planning processes.

932 |         As a result, General Wood leading forward and taking the  
933 | initiative to invite National Guard adjutant generals to be  
934 | part of the future total force planning processes, by  
935 | inviting us not only to participate with our representatives  
936 | into the Future Total Force working group, but also to be  
937 | part--the three adjutants generals--to be part of the Future  
938 | Total Force General Officers Steering Committee that was  
939 | stood up.

940 |         And we were involved at the very front end of the  
941 | process--not quite the very front end, but we were in the  
942 | second general officers steering committee policy meeting  
943 | they had that actually developed a policy for the future  
944 | total force, and we are able to make our inputs into that  
945 | committee.

946 |         And we have been involved in the Future Total Force  
947 | implementation process right now, which is where all the  
948 | tough work comes. It is pretty easy to establish guidelines,  
949 | but it is even tougher to start working all the issues as we  
950 | go into this process, and to figure out exactly how do you  
951 | blend, how do you integrate units to successfully move to the  
952 | future total force equipment that we are going to be  
953 | receiving, and also the emerging missions.

954 |         You know, what are those emerging missions? What kind

955 | of a manpower does it take? What kind of expertise does it  
956 | take to move into those positions? What does the Guard have  
957 | to offer to that? How can the Air Force Reserve play in  
958 | that?

959 |         And then, how do we make all that happen with some of  
960 | the legal obstacles we have, such as the Title 10 versus  
961 | Title 32 issues? And we are probably going to be coming back  
962 | to you all to ask for your help in maybe resolving some of  
963 | those issues with those Title 10, Title 32 legal issues.

964 |         Those are not insurmountable. But what I want to make  
965 | clear to the committee is that, by virtue of General Wood's  
966 | initiatives, we are working these issues together. The  
967 | Adjutants General Association, through our three  
968 | representatives, involvement in the Future Total Force  
969 | General Officers Steering Committee, are working all of these  
970 | issues together to ensure that we do what is right for the  
971 | Air Force--for the total Air Force.

972 |         Sir, I am open to any questions.

973 |         [The statement of Major General Whitney follows:]

974 | \*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

975 |           The CHAIRMAN.   General, thank you very much.

976 |           Thank you all for your statements.

977 |           And we have got a number of members who have quite a bit  
978 | of interest in this issue.  So, I am going to reserve my  
979 | questions to the end, and we are going to go to the--and  
980 | after the ranking member asks his questions, we are going to  
981 | go to the 5-minute clock.

982 |           And I would just ask all my colleagues to make your  
983 | questions concise, and to our panel.  Because we have got a  
984 | distinguished panel--lots of panelists.  Try to make your  
985 | answers concise, too, so we can make sure that all members  
986 | have an opportunity to ask a question.

987 |           The gentleman from Missouri?

988 |           Mr. SKELTON.  Thank you, Mr. Chairman.  Just a few  
989 | questions.

990 |           General Blum, homeland defense must always be mission  
991 | number one of the National Guard.  Is that correct?

992 |           Lieutenant General BLUM.  Yes, sir.

993 |           Mr. SKELTON.  Is it not true that the governor of each  
994 | state has the legal power over any National Guard unit within  
995 | his or her state, in non-warlike activities?

996 |           Lieutenant General BLUM.  It is true, sir.  The  
997 | governor, he is the commander--he or she is the commander in  
998 | chief of that organization when not in service to the--

999 |           Mr. SKELTON.  This relates to natural disasters?

1000 Lieutenant General BLUM. Yes, sir.

1001 Mr. SKELTON. And relates to terrorism response?

1002 Lieutenant General BLUM. Yes, sir.

1003 Mr. SKELTON. This applies to the Army National Guard in  
1004 each state?

1005 Lieutenant General BLUM. Absolutely.

1006 Mr. SKELTON. It applies to the Air National Guard in  
1007 each state?

1008 Lieutenant General BLUM. Yes, sir, it does.

1009 Mr. SKELTON. Let me ask the two adjutants general,  
1010 General Lempke first.

1011 In your professional and personal opinion, were the  
1012 adjutants general fully consulted in the proposals of the Air  
1013 Force regarding the Base Relocation Commission activities?  
1014 In your personal professional opinion.

1015 Major General LEMPKE. Congressman--

1016 Mr. SKELTON. Just a yes or no would be fine.

1017 Major General LEMPKE. With regard to BRAC, no.

1018 Mr. SKELTON. General Whitney, may I ask the same  
1019 question of you? In your personal and professional opinion,  
1020 were the adjutants general of the states fully consulted  
1021 regarding the BRAC Commission recommendations?

1022 Major General WHITNEY. No, sir.

1023 Mr. SKELTON. Thank you.

1024 The CHAIRMAN. I thank the gentleman.

1025 The gentleman from Colorado, Mr. Hefley?

1026 Mr. HEFLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1027 The Air Force has indicated that the enclave locations  
1028 may retain expeditionary combat support roles or take on new  
1029 missions.

1030 What process will the Air Force follow to determine the  
1031 future roles of the enclave locations? And what involvement  
1032 does the Air Force envision for the state governors, adjutant  
1033 generals--and Congress, for that matter--in the process of  
1034 determining the roles for these enclave locations? I do not  
1035 know who is best to answer it.

1036 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, if I could start and then  
1037 pass it to my colleagues here.

1038 First, obviously, the enclaves--to determine which ones  
1039 those are going to be, obviously, is part of the BRAC process  
1040 as that goes forward to you with it.

1041 In the meantime, what we are all doing--in fact, we are  
1042 all working together to define those capabilities we want  
1043 within the enclaves. In fact, we really have learned, and as  
1044 we have evolved it, that is really a poor word for it. It is  
1045 really evolving into expeditionary combat support.

1046 The capabilities that a governor could use and the  
1047 adjutant general could use for homeland defense, whether it  
1048 is issues with natural disasters or manmade disasters, the  
1049 same capabilities that also have applicability to deploy

1050 forward to support our bases overseas.

1051 Sir, at the height of Iraqi Freedom as well--in  
1052 Afghanistan--and as well as in Iraq, the Air Force stood up  
1053 over 50 bases. And in large degree, those were expeditionary  
1054 support outfits and units, much of like we are going to have  
1055 available in this.

1056 But even more exciting in my view is the idea that some  
1057 of these units now that we are going to transition missions,  
1058 will be able to, working with the adjutant generals and  
1059 governors, into new missions.

1060 For examples, maybe some governors want Red Horse or  
1061 construction teams, large civil engineering teams in their  
1062 states. Others that may want Predators, so that we can use  
1063 those in day-to-day operations overseas fighting the war on  
1064 terrorism, but also for homeland defense needs and other  
1065 issues here in the States or in the regions.

1066 So, sir, I still think it is an open book. We are  
1067 working this together with the inputs in from each of the  
1068 governors and each of the adjutant generals through General  
1069 Blum and General James.

1070 Mr. HEFLEY. Anyone else?

1071 Well, let me ask you--and, Mr. Chairman, cut me off  
1072 here. I do not think you turned the clock on, so cut me off.

1073 But let me ask one more question.

1074 Military construction and other facility-related funding

1075 | is a constant challenge for the Air National Guard. We have  
1076 | struggled with that for some time.

1077 |         What steps does the Air Force plan to take to ensure  
1078 | that bases without flying missions are sufficiently supported  
1079 | in their military construction, sustainment and base  
1080 | operating requirements?

1081 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, I would answer that from  
1082 | two levels. First of all, the changes that come about due to  
1083 | BRAC--if and when it is passed--will be part of a BRAC wedge  
1084 | of monies to help transition units through that process.

1085 |         The other part of that is the normal course of doing  
1086 | business here, that they will compete just like our other  
1087 | units do for MILCON, and have an equal seat at the table as  
1088 | we go through that process.

1089 |         Mr. HEFLEY. The Guard does not compete like normal  
1090 | units, ordinarily--Air or Army Guard. What happens is that  
1091 | the Air Force does not give them what they need many times.  
1092 | And because they think, well, Congress loves the Guard. And  
1093 | they are going to do the adds to bring that in. Have you  
1094 | seen that before occur?

1095 |         And, you know, this is something that, as we do these,  
1096 | this transformation, this is something I wish you would look  
1097 | at. It is a very frustrating type of a way to do business  
1098 | for those of us that are responsible for making sure you have  
1099 | the resources to do your job.

1100 Thank you very much.

1101 The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

1102 The gentleman from Arkansas, Dr. Snyder?

1103 Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1104 Mr. Chairman, I want to recognize the presence of our  
1105 colleague, Congressman John Boozman from northwest Arkansas,  
1106 who has been following these issues very closely.

1107 The CHAIRMAN. I want to thank the gentleman for  
1108 bringing John to my attention, and just offer my colleague  
1109 that we would love to have you sit up here on the dais. And  
1110 without objection, you could come on up and ask questions  
1111 also of our witnesses.

1112 Mr. SNYDER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1113 General Blum, you caught my attention when you, in your  
1114 opening statement, when you made a commitment that you want  
1115 to have a flying unit in every state. And I know that we are  
1116 all committed to having efficiency and the best national  
1117 security force that we can have.

1118 And I am not sure how I see that fits into following  
1119 political boundary lines. Some states are dramatically  
1120 larger in size than others.

1121 Some states are quite tiny. We have places where we  
1122 have bases right on a border. I mean, why would we say that  
1123 we have to have--because there was a political boundary right  
1124 there--we would have to have--that adjoining state has some

1125 | kind of a commitment to a flying unit. That seems to be more  
1126 | of a--I mean, it does not seem to me that that was a national  
1127 | security commitment, as much as a commitment to political  
1128 | boundaries.

1129 |         Would you amplify on your statement, if you would?

1130 |         Lieutenant General BLUM. Sure. Thank you. It is a  
1131 | great question and a fair question.

1132 |         And the reason I said it is pretty straightforward and  
1133 | simple. If you take the flying unit out of the National  
1134 | Guard, you have taken the Air out of the word Air National  
1135 | Guard. Pretty soon you do not have an Air National Guard.

1136 |         So, if I do not have a flying unit in a state or  
1137 | territory, very shortly thereafter I will have no Air  
1138 | National Guard in that state or territory.

1139 |         The flying unit brings with it all of the complementary  
1140 | pieces--engineers, base facility operations, security,  
1141 | communications, command and control, engineers, firefighting,  
1142 | medical facilities, logistics facilities. The airplane is  
1143 | the least--the least important part for the governor of the  
1144 | state.

1145 |         What is important for the governor of the state is all  
1146 | of those enablers, all of those combat support specialties  
1147 | that are necessary to sustain and generate that air unit when  
1148 | it is needed in federal service, or when it is called upon,  
1149 | if it is an appropriate kind of aircraft, into state mission

1150 | for homeland defense or homeland security.

1151 |         So, that is why I am dedicated and still committed to  
1152 | putting a flying unit in every state. Because if you do not,  
1153 | soon I will have a state without an Air National Guard.

1154 |         And that means that I will not be able to give a joint,  
1155 | capable, balanced, modular, full spectrum force available to  
1156 | that governor. And we have disenfranchised somebody's state  
1157 | or territory for young men and women to serve in the Air  
1158 | National Guard. And then, that is one place, when we call  
1159 | out the Guard, we will not call America out of that place.

1160 |         Sir, I hope that answers your question.

1161 |         Mr. SNYDER. Well, I appreciate that answer. I am not  
1162 | sure it is a satisfactory answer. I mean, we have an Air  
1163 | Force Reserve outfit at Little Rock Air Force Base. The  
1164 | Little Rock Air Force Base has both an active component and  
1165 | an Air Guard component. They work very closely together, but  
1166 | there is also a small Air Force Reserve outfit that--I forget  
1167 | what you call them, but they are experts in putting together  
1168 | the--

1169 |         Lieutenant General BLUM. Well, with all due respect,  
1170 | sir, that--

1171 |         Mr. SNYDER. But they do not--but they do not--

1172 |         Lieutenant General BLUM. The only force that is  
1173 | available to the commander in chief of the Army and Air  
1174 | National Guard when they are not in federal service of this

1175 nation--the governor of that state--the only force they can  
1176 call is their Air or Army National Guard.

1177 And so, it is very, very--I just addressed the National  
1178 Governors Association--

1179 Mr. SNYDER. No, I understand that.

1180 Lieutenant General BLUM. They are adamant that they  
1181 want to have an Air National Guard with a flying unit in  
1182 their states.

1183 Mr. SNYDER. My point was, you can not have standalone  
1184 units without having the actual planes on the ground. That  
1185 was my point with Air Force--

1186 Lieutenant General BLUM. Absolutely.

1187 Mr. SNYDER. --Air Force Reserve.

1188 So I, in terms of looking for the kinds of efficiencies  
1189 that we want, I mean, certainly members can join an Air Guard  
1190 unit and drive from Oklahoma to Fort Smith to work with the  
1191 F-16s. It is still not clear to me that--why they have to be  
1192 sprinkled in every state and territory, but that is an  
1193 ongoing discussion that you all are having.

1194 Would you amplify--I forget, I think it was General  
1195 Bradley, talked about the--I notice the light is not on for  
1196 me, either, Mr. Chairman.

1197 The CHAIRMAN. Go right ahead. I will ask the general  
1198 to answer concisely, and I will try to do what I said I was  
1199 going to do. Let's turn that old light on.

1200 Go ahead.

1201 Mr. SNYDER. General Bradley, you mentioned that the  
1202 Title 10, Title 32 issues--wasn't it you that mentioned that?

1203 Or who was that? General--

1204 Lieutenant General BRADLEY. No, sir.

1205 Mr. SNYDER. General Whitney.

1206 Well, maybe General Wood, I would ask you. I think that  
1207 is a complexity in all this. Would are you all at in your  
1208 thinking of that? And when can the Congress expect something  
1209 from you? Do you anticipate we will have to have something  
1210 to deal with those complications?

1211 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, in regards to the  
1212 emerging missions? Is that what you are getting at?

1213 Mr. SNYDER. As you are going through this future total  
1214 force changes, one of the generals from the Air Guard made  
1215 reference that there would probably have to be Title 32 and  
1216 Title 10 statutory changes.

1217 Are you all looking at that as this moves along, in  
1218 terms of what statutory changes we will have to have?

1219 Lieutenant General WOOD. Yes, sir, we are. We are  
1220 working right now through the Department of Defense staff to  
1221 get that to make sure that it is applicable, so that we do it  
1222 once, because it has impact on the Air Force Reserve and the  
1223 Army National Guard as well.

1224 So, that is how we are working through the process now.

1225 | And on the secretary of defense's staff, there are senior  
1226 | leaders working that very issue as we speak.

1227 |         Mr. SNYDER. And that was my--

1228 |         Lieutenant General BRADLEY. If I might, there are three  
1229 | very specific areas we are going to need the congressman's  
1230 | help. One is on the training relationship.

1231 |         We are going to have to have Title 32 people to be able  
1232 | to train Title 10 airmen, if we are going to move forward in  
1233 | a future total force. We are going to need some help in that  
1234 | regard.

1235 |         We are going to need some help with the operational use,  
1236 | so that we do not have all these impediments when the nation  
1237 | needs us the most. We do not need the law to be our  
1238 | adversary. We need it to be our enabler at that point.

1239 |         And we need to work on this piece, because as we move  
1240 | more to these associate units where we put Guard people and  
1241 | Air Force Reserve airmen in active formations, and vice  
1242 | versa, we need to be able to do that seamlessly, so that the  
1243 | commander has to be able to be able to handle Title 21 and  
1244 | Title 10 people, both within that unit formation much more  
1245 | effectively than we do today.

1246 |         Sorry, but I--

1247 |         Mr. SNYDER. And my last question, General. What would  
1248 | happen if we did nothing? If this Future Total Force plan  
1249 | was just rejected, where would that leave us?

1250 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1251 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, my view is that, in the  
1252 past, what the active duty did historically was, we took down  
1253 flags to keep the numbers of aircraft up in squadrons.

1254 Whereas, in the Air National Guard and in the Air Force  
1255 Reserve, we kept the same number of flags--squadrons across  
1256 states and others--but lowered the number of aircraft.

1257 So, part of it is an efficiency with it, by having more  
1258 aircraft available in squadrons, so that we gain efficiency  
1259 from that both from a military standpoint, that is, a use for  
1260 defense or for overseas for war-fighting, but also in  
1261 manpower.

1262 Sir, then the other part of that, I believe, is  
1263 that--and it alludes to what the chairman said as we opened  
1264 up here. The Air Force is on a glide slope, because of the  
1265 hours on our fighters and our other aircraft, that if we do  
1266 not continue with transformation in regards to procuring new  
1267 aircraft, we are going to run out of aircraft.

1268 And I know that is a hard one to do, but, ladies and  
1269 gentlemen, we are in the process of extending the lifecycle  
1270 hours on our airplanes. And that is one of the things we use  
1271 to determine how long the aircraft, if we can maintain it  
1272 efficiently, will pass any other of the fighters that we have  
1273 ever had.

1274 So, that is the issue. We can continue to lower the

1275 numbers, become more inefficient with it, or we plus them up,  
1276 to get a representative number that we have, that we have  
1277 determined over time is the most effective war-fighting  
1278 element or squadron.

1279 The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

1280 The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Weldon?

1281 Mr. WELDON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1282 Thank you all for coming in today. And we want you to  
1283 know how proud we are of the work being done by our guard and  
1284 reservists.

1285 Most of us--I think all of us--have been over in theater  
1286 more than one time. And it is just amazing what a great job  
1287 they are doing and working in concert with our active duty  
1288 forces. They are just very impressive.

1289 I was here during the 1990s when we made significant  
1290 cutbacks to our end strength and came up with this concept  
1291 called Total Force concept, where the Guard and Reserve would  
1292 have to become an integrated part of our efforts for any of  
1293 our deployments.

1294 And unfortunately, while I supported that, I would have  
1295 to agree with my good friend, Mr. Hefley, that the active  
1296 duty leadership has not properly given consideration to the  
1297 needs of our Guard and Reserve in terms of modernization and  
1298 support.

1299 They left it to the Congress. That is wrong. Because

1300 | then we have to go find the extra money to do the plus-ups to  
1301 | give you all the kinds of resources that you need to be ready  
1302 | when you are called upon to serve this nation, as the  
1303 | commander in chief determines that you are needed.

1304 |         I also have been a strong supporter of the BRAC process,  
1305 | which is not a position shared by many of my colleagues on  
1306 | this committee. But I can tell you, I am incensed at the  
1307 | lack of consideration of the Guard and Reserve and adjutant  
1308 | generals and the governors in the process of closing down and  
1309 | realigning Guard and Reserve installations.

1310 |         And I do believe that the Army and the Army National  
1311 | Guard did a good job in coordinating BRAC recommendations  
1312 | with the states. I think the Air Force totally ignored the  
1313 | states. It totally ignored the process of what the states'  
1314 | needs are.

1315 |         And so, General Blum, I have a series of questions that  
1316 | I want to ask the chairman to put in the record.

1317 |         The CHAIRMAN. Without objection.

1318 |         Mr. WELDON. But I have a couple of questions in regard  
1319 | to the actual legal opinion ordered by the--provided by the  
1320 | BRAC Commission Office of the General Counsel on July 14th of  
1321 | 2005. I am sure you are familiar with that legal opinion.

1322 |         And I want to cite two provisions in there. And this is  
1323 | not a base in my district. In fact, the closing of bases in  
1324 | my district I support, because I understand the need for

1325 BRAC. This is a facility in Pennsylvania that is one of only  
1326 three joint Guard and Reserve centers in the entire country,  
1327 the others being in Texas and Louisiana.

1328 In my opinion, there was a serious flaw on the part of  
1329 the Department of Defense in recommending the closure of the  
1330 Willow Grove joint Reserve and Guard facility.

1331 According to this memo, which you have a copy of, "No  
1332 change in the branch, organization or allotment of a unit  
1333 located entirely within a state may be made without the  
1334 approval of its governor."

1335 The clear intent of these statutes of Title 32 is to  
1336 recognize the dual nature of the units of the Guard, and to  
1337 ensure that the rights and responsibilities of both  
1338 sovereigns, the state and federal governments, are protected.

1339 Now, we are proud in Pennsylvania to have the largest  
1340 Guard in the country. We are very proud of its operation and  
1341 the fact that we have the only Reserve--the plan for a  
1342 Stryker brigade that is going to be located within the state.

1343 According to the Department of Defense--and this is  
1344 their own documentation--"No governor has consented to any of  
1345 the recommended Air National Guard actions." Furthermore, a  
1346 provision of Title 10 United States Code says, "A unit of the  
1347 Air National Guard of the United States may not be relocated  
1348 or withdrawn under this chapter without the consent of the  
1349 governor of the state, or in the case of the District of

1350 Columbia, the commanding general of the National Guard of the  
1351 District of Columbia."

1352 Now, clearly, Governor Rendell, on the record, has said  
1353 he was not consulted. The adjutant general said she was not  
1354 consulted. There was no approval.

1355 So, I guess the point is, do you think DOD will change  
1356 its position? I am not going to ask you to think they  
1357 should, because that, perhaps, would cause you some undue  
1358 stress. But I would ask for your response to the items that  
1359 I just quoted from federal regulations.

1360 Lieutenant General BLUM. The short answer is, I do not  
1361 know what DOD will do on this. Their position so far is  
1362 pretty clear. They think that the BRAC law, the way it  
1363 was--the list was formulated, was done in a legal fashion.

1364 Having said that, you are entirely correct, that Title  
1365 10 section 18238, I think, and Title 32 section 104, are  
1366 clear and unambiguous, in that the governors must be  
1367 consulted.

1368 The BRAC law leaves some ambiguity there. I am not a  
1369 lawyer. I am not a judge. I am not really skilled in this  
1370 area. But if you want to take away the ambiguity, perhaps  
1371 the language of the current BRAC law may need to be addressed  
1372 by this body, so it is clear and unambiguous what the intent  
1373 of Congress may be.

1374 Mr. WELDON. Thank you.

1375           And, Mr. Chairman, this is a serious issue that we  
1376 unfortunately are not caught responding to, as opposed to  
1377 proactively dealing with.

1378           But it really frustrates and bothers me that this has  
1379 happened, that clearly the Guard and Reserve have not been  
1380 given proper consideration and recommendations that will  
1381 impact them.

1382           We have 7,200 guard and reservists that operate out of  
1383 Willow Grove. If, in fact, Willow Grove shuts down, we are  
1384 going to further cause problems with our existing Guard and  
1385 Reserve end strengths. We are going to cause problems with  
1386 those families that are not going to relocate.

1387           And yet, no consideration was given to that. No  
1388 consultation with the state adjutant general or the governor  
1389 in that process. That is clearly wrong.

1390           And I would also say that it is amazing to me in this  
1391 BRAC process, which I have supported, the services went their  
1392 own way. They looked out for what was best for each of them,  
1393 and did not look at the very context that Don Rumsfeld talks  
1394 about all the time--of jointness, of looking at the total  
1395 picture, of the integration of the services.

1396           In effect, we allowed the services to make decisions  
1397 that were in each individual service's best interest, not in  
1398 the collective best interest of having a unified, joint  
1399 capability. And I think we are going to pay the price for

1400 that down the road.

1401 Thank you.

1402 The CHAIRMAN. Thank the gentleman.

1403 The gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Cooper?

1404 Mr. COOPER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1405 We have a remarkable situation here today, because, in  
1406 answer to my colleague's questions from Missouri, both of our  
1407 TAGs basically said that they were not properly consulted in  
1408 this process.

1409 I know some folks in the Pentagon may feel differently,  
1410 but we also have a memo from the deputy general counsel of  
1411 the BRAC Commission itself that points out a number of very  
1412 serious legal issues having to do with this process,  
1413 especially the closure of some Air Guard facilities.

1414 You would think--the Pentagon had, what, almost 10 years  
1415 to do this--we would get it right and that governors would be  
1416 consulted, since there does seem to be a legal requirement  
1417 that governors be talked to. And whether it is Governor  
1418 Rendell in Pennsylvania or governors in other states, it  
1419 seems to be a massive and perhaps crippling oversight that  
1420 this was apparently not done.

1421 And to have unanimous TAG opposition also seems to be,  
1422 at the very best, another massive failure to communicate.  
1423 And I know General Wood and General Blum probably feel that  
1424 adequate communication was done, certainly on future total

1425 force, but clearly does not seem to have been done on the  
1426 BRAC process.

1427 I know these issues are contentious, but you would think  
1428 we would get this right.

1429 General?

1430 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir--and this goes back to Mr.  
1431 Weldon's comments, too--I would just tell you that there is,  
1432 in law, in Title 10, that the active duty--our channels of  
1433 communication that we have on all correspondence with the  
1434 TAGs, and then the governor in military matters, is through  
1435 the National Guard Bureau, as well as the Air National Guard  
1436 Bureau. And I think, from watching this process and being  
1437 part of this process, certainly that that is being done.

1438 So, I understand the dilemma here. And I see what is  
1439 happening here. But there, again, from the active duty  
1440 standpoint, representing the Air Force, that we believe we  
1441 are handling through the mechanism that we were given to do  
1442 it.

1443 And, sir, and I think that is in full compliance with  
1444 the Department of Defense.

1445 Mr. COOPER. General, with all due respect--and I know  
1446 you are on the Joint Staff--when we are confronted with the  
1447 question of who to believe, we are more likely to believe our  
1448 own TAGs. And we are also likely to believe the lawyer for  
1449 the BRAC Commission itself, who points out a number of very

1450 worrisome impediments here.

1451 I am worried about a couple of specific issues. We have  
1452 had trouble with recruiting in the Guard and Reserve,  
1453 probably less so in the Air Guard, because it has certain  
1454 inherent appeals.

1455 But I am worried, if we move all the planes away from  
1456 some of these bases, it is going to be literally impossible  
1457 to recruit new folks for that empty unit without an aircraft.

1458 And we will also lose a lot of our most experienced, most  
1459 valuable, and in some cases combat-hardened personnel, who  
1460 are simply unable to move to the new enclave location, due to  
1461 the fact that they would lose their jobs, their civilian  
1462 employment.

1463 So, were these factors given adequate consideration in  
1464 the recommendations?

1465 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, I believe that you--you  
1466 said here is articulated very well. Part of the tough job  
1467 that we have ahead of us, establishing new missions for these  
1468 areas, now, that will be uncovered with no flying units.

1469 However, let me tell you. The Air Force is more than  
1470 flying aircraft. I mean, we are a space force. We are a  
1471 cyber force. And there are new, engaging missions out there  
1472 that we need to prepare for the future.

1473 So, I hope that these outstanding airmen, whatever they  
1474 do as some of these units now change or become available, is

1475 | that they transition to these new jobs. And that is one of  
1476 | the things that was saying earlier, is that we are committed  
1477 | not to gap between our areas.

1478 |         If we have a unit that is going to lose its aircraft and  
1479 | transition new missions, is that we bring those aircraft down  
1480 | at the same rate as we want to train for the new missions.  
1481 | And that is the commitment that we are making with the TAGs  
1482 | here, and the things we are working on the future total  
1483 | force.

1484 |         Mr. COOPER. General, with all due respect, I think you  
1485 | are giving the recruiters a very tough assignment here. Are  
1486 | we going to have pretend airplanes that they can mock up, or  
1487 | pretend space vehicles, or a joystick for a Predator  
1488 | somewhere, so they can pretend to be doing these things?

1489 |         People want real missions, real action. And we have had  
1490 | that at a number of these facilities across the country, and  
1491 | now we are going to have many fewer of those with the  
1492 | indoctrinal enclave concept, apparently.

1493 |         We are also worried about completely stale data, at  
1494 | least for the national unit. And I am prejudiced. I  
1495 | represent national. We seem to have been using data that is  
1496 | woefully out of date.

1497 |         We have a brand new hangar that is about to open that  
1498 | cost \$25 million of MILCON money. And apparently, it is  
1499 | going to be empty forever. It is about to win an Air Force

1500 design award next week, because it is one of the best hangars  
1501 in America. And apparently it was not considered in the data  
1502 for the BRAC process.

1503 We were also told that the four magnificent we have in  
1504 national were not allowed to be considered, because they are  
1505 only leased. The Air Force does not own them. The Guard  
1506 does not own them.

1507 And even though the lease payment is absolutely  
1508 minimal--it is almost free rent--we got no credit for that in  
1509 the value analysis. And we are told it is something that is  
1510 never defined anywhere called military judgment, or military  
1511 value, somehow displaces all the recent, hard fact data that  
1512 we have.

1513 And that is very frustrating for one of the best flying  
1514 units in America. The guys from Nashville and the 118th have  
1515 done about the best job of any C-130 unit in the country.  
1516 Rumsfeld can tell you that.

1517 And yet, when we are rated, it looks like we are sending  
1518 all our planes to Peoria and Louisville--units which are much  
1519 lower rated. It just does not seem fair.

1520 So, folks back home want answers to these questions.  
1521 And I see that my time has expired, so perhaps we can return  
1522 for another round of questions.

1523 The CHAIRMAN. And, gentlemen, if you could respond to  
1524 some of the specific questions that Mr. Cooper asked about

1525 | the runways not being considered, if you could do that for  
1526 | the record, we would appreciate that.

1527 |         Would the gentleman want to get the answers to those  
1528 | questions? Okay. If you could get those for the record,  
1529 | that would be good.

1530 |         The gentleman from New York, Mr. McHugh?

1531 |         Mr. MCHUGH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1532 |         I am going to yield my time.

1533 |         I would just say before I do that, I certainly associate  
1534 | myself with a lot of the comments that have been made here  
1535 | today. The lack of consultation that we are hearing about,  
1536 | regardless of what the ultimate reality may be, is for most,  
1537 | if not all of us, very, very troubling.

1538 |         This is an important, critical relationship that I think  
1539 | consultation on all things and on all levels could only  
1540 | further.

1541 |         The other thing, General James was kind enough to take  
1542 | part in a rather large, two-part panel yesterday with the  
1543 | Subcommittee on Personnel that we convened on the issues of  
1544 | recruiting and retention. Obviously, the Air National Guard  
1545 | has some real challenges there that need to be addressed.

1546 |         But having said all of that, I would like to yield to  
1547 | the gentleman from Michigan, Mr. Schwarz, any time I may have  
1548 | remaining.

1549 |         The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, go ahead.

1550 Mr. SCHWARZ. Thank you, the gentleman from New York.

1551 And thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1552 I have a similar problem in my district from Mr. Cooper.

1553 So, do I have a vested interest? In the interest of full  
1554 disclosure, I do have a vested interest.

1555 I have what I think is the best A-10 outfit in the Air  
1556 Guard in my district, in my hometown of Battle Creek,  
1557 Michigan. On that base, the Air Force has spent in the last  
1558 decade almost \$50 million--they voted it on themselves--to  
1559 extend that runway to a 10,000-foot runway with 1,000-foot  
1560 overruns on either end.

1561 From any standpoint, if you look at the A-10 group, the  
1562 110th in Battle Creek, Michigan, it is one of the best and  
1563 has been recognized as such. It has been deployed 10 times  
1564 in the last 7 years, one time deployed to Sicily to then five  
1565 missions in the Balkans. From the time the order came down  
1566 until the time the first bomb was on target in the Balkans  
1567 was 4 days--4 days.

1568 This unit, if the BRAC goes through, and if the Air  
1569 Force continues to ask to ask the Guard to retire aircraft,  
1570 this unit will have its iron shipped to another base, but its  
1571 people are gone forever, because they will be competing for  
1572 jobs with the people at the other base, who will have jobs  
1573 available to them, because their F-16 block 30s and C-130s  
1574 are gone.

1575 |       So, what has been done in the Air Force, the joint force  
1576 | sort of plan, at least in Michigan--and I notice a lot of  
1577 | members are using this word now, but I can use it because I  
1578 | am a surgeon--eviscerate the Air Guard in Michigan. It  
1579 | literally is not going to exist anymore other than some A-10s  
1580 | at Southbridge. C-130s gone. A-10s gone from Battle Creek.  
1581 | Battle Creek closed. Physically the best Air Guard base I  
1582 | have ever seen--and I have seen many of them. C-130s gone.  
1583 | This, gentlemen, is senseless.

1584 |       I liked very much General Lempke's statement that a  
1585 | community documented statistic is that the Air National Guard  
1586 | provides about 34 percent of the flying capability in the Air  
1587 | Force, or seven percent of the Air Force budget. This fact  
1588 | highlights the unique quality of the citizen soldier, or  
1589 | militia concept, so prominent in American history.

1590 |       I am going to ask you, as you go back, as a member of  
1591 | Congress representing, I believe, a number of members who  
1592 | have Air Guard units in their states, which have been taken  
1593 | down--to re-evaluate this situation.

1594 |       The situation with A-10s, as you know, is that the Army  
1595 | and the Marine Corps love them. And that is why you are  
1596 | keeping them in the inventory, after they had been planned  
1597 | for retirement. You are going to go from 90 to 78 A-10s in  
1598 | the Guard.

1599 |       By any standard or any statistic, Battle Creek, Michigan

1600 | is one of the two best bases for those A-10s--uncrowded  
1601 | airspace, 25-mile perimeter reserved for no dense  
1602 | construction. I can go on and on, but you get my drift.

1603 |         What I am asking you to do, gentlemen, is to go back to  
1604 | the drawing board on this. This does not work. And numbers  
1605 | of this committee, numbers of members of the Congress do not  
1606 | think it works. And they think the Air Force has got to go  
1607 | back to the drawing board.

1608 |         That was a statement, Mr. Chairman, and not a question.  
1609 | And I do not know that any of the distinguished gentleman  
1610 | there would want to jump on that right now anyhow.

1611 |         But I feel so very strongly that you really have got to  
1612 | go back and re-evaluate and reassess what you have done,  
1613 | because you have, indeed, taken down Air Guard groups in  
1614 | many, many states that should not be taken down. One of them  
1615 | is in my hometown that I am very proud of, and those people  
1616 | will not be going with the airplanes for a number of reasons.

1617 |         Up to 90 percent of them will not be going with the  
1618 | airplanes.

1619 |         Could I have 15 seconds more, Mr. Chairman?

1620 |         Those are pilots who have an average of 2,300 hours in  
1621 | A-10s, an average of 200 combat hours in A-10s. Something is  
1622 | not right in this plan, and I would ask you to go back and  
1623 | check your whole card, if you do not mind. Thank you.

1624 |         Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1625 Mr. LOBIONDO. [Presiding.] Thank you, Mr. Schwarz.

1626 Mr. Marshall?

1627 Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate  
1628 the opportunity to ask some questions.

1629 Let me start out with--I am going to make an  
1630 observation, and that is that I would find a chart that  
1631 showed capabilities as they evolve over time more helpful  
1632 than simply numbers. I mean, gosh, you know, at one point we  
1633 humans fought with stones and thought that was a big  
1634 improvement over fists.

1635 And then when we got the Gatling guns, we did not need  
1636 as many Gatling guns as we had stones in the inventory, and  
1637 my guess is the small number over on the right-hand side  
1638 could probably engage all of the ones on the left-hand side  
1639 without a single loss.

1640 The real question here is capabilities and what our  
1641 future threat is, and are we prepared to meet that future  
1642 threat. And this generation is not going to fail to supply  
1643 the Air Force with what it needs to meet future threats. I  
1644 mean, that is the fact of the matter. We are going to be  
1645 efficient, but we are not going to fail to do that.

1646 I have been over in theater six or seven times now,  
1647 flown in a lot of C-130s, flown with Air Force pilots, active  
1648 duty and with Guard and Reserve pilots, and I have got to  
1649 tell you, my best flights are with Guard and Reserve pilots,

1650 no disrespect intended to the Air Force, the active duty Air  
1651 Force folks here, and I do not know that my sample size is  
1652 all that large.

1653 We decommissioned one of four squadrons in the Navy  
1654 Reserve recently, and that was shortly after one of those  
1655 squadrons had been deployed to the Roosevelt and was graded  
1656 time and again far superior to the active duty squadrons both  
1657 in mission completion, landing, and in every category.

1658 No question but that experienced pilots and crews  
1659 outperform younger, less experienced pilots and crews. And  
1660 to the extent that in reorganizing ourselves we can take  
1661 advantage of the experience--you know, many of the hours of  
1662 which are provided in the civilian sector, the experience  
1663 that Guard and Reserve pilots and crews bring to the  
1664 table--we ought to be doing that.

1665 I represent middle Georgia. We have got the JSTARS  
1666 116th blended wing. All of you are familiar with the blended  
1667 wing. It is a new experiment that is being tried. I have  
1668 been with those guys a lot, men and women. They report that  
1669 this is working quite well. Their uniforms are dissimilar.  
1670 Their tasks are similar.

1671 And when I talk with them about what kind of issues are  
1672 getting in the way of their effectiveness, efficiency  
1673 militarily, they say none, that this is really working.

1674 And then when we go a little bit beyond that, you know,

1675 | what are the issues that pop up from time to time, those  
1676 | issues have more to do with benefits, rank, access to health  
1677 | care, retirement, you know, when does retirement kick in, all  
1678 | these--the TRICARE, the retirement, all these issues that you  
1679 | hear popping up from time to time.

1680 |         And as I think about this total force future where the  
1681 | Air Force is concerned, where everything hopefully is going  
1682 | to be blended and blended and working efficiently, I guess  
1683 | with a panel like this in front of me I would like to know  
1684 | what each of you sees as the major problems associated with  
1685 | trying to accomplish this.

1686 |         Is it that you are dealing with 52 different states and  
1687 | some territories and the politics and the polities that vary  
1688 | from place to place? Is that the biggest challenge? Is it  
1689 | benefits? What are the real challenges that you are going to  
1690 | have to overcome in order to make this work?

1691 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, I echo what we said  
1692 | earlier. From an active duty standpoint, the biggest thing  
1693 | we need to work through is the Title 10 and 32 issue. When  
1694 | you get these magnificent airmen, whether they are Guard,  
1695 | Reserve or active duty, out in the field, they do great. And  
1696 | at the unit level, they are--you know, they have been our  
1697 | template as we have looked at how we--

1698 |         Mr. MARSHALL. I am not going to have much time here,  
1699 | General. When you say the Title 10, Title 32, I understand

1700 | that there are two different regimes here.

1701 | Lieutenant General WOOD. Yes, sir.

1702 | Mr. MARSHALL. What specifically in there do you  
1703 | anticipate to be the biggest problems?

1704 | Lieutenant General WOOD. Well, some of the things that  
1705 | require--in regards to training, when we have full time or  
1706 | part time training the active duty, or in command positions.  
1707 | Those are the things that we need to work through so we make  
1708 | it not only fairer with it but give better chain of command  
1709 | for it.

1710 | Mr. MARSHALL. General Lempke?

1711 | Major General LEMPKE. You bring up the example of the  
1712 | 116th and--it has been mentioned this morning--the gap. All  
1713 | 54 adjutants general realize that we need to modernize and we  
1714 | need to move ahead.

1715 | The issue is the bridge of that gap that we cross to get  
1716 | from now to the future. The 116th has shown us a way to do  
1717 | that. At Offutt we also have an associate squadron that has  
1718 | done the same thing. So it is that in between that we think  
1719 | is probably going to be a major issue.

1720 | Lieutenant General BLUM. And if I could say it in the  
1721 | most simple terms, I am the one who is stuck in the middle  
1722 | here. I act as the channel of communication between the  
1723 | Department of Air Force and these 54 adjutants general that  
1724 | represents their governors for the states and territories.

1725 That my job. It is a big part of my job.

1726 And we all see the need to move to a more efficient and  
1727 capable Air Force, and see the need to move from where we are  
1728 to where we need to go. And we need, as Roger Lempke, a  
1729 bridge to get there. We need a plan that shows how do you  
1730 get from where you are to where you are going.

1731 But I can not ask these guys, even though I know where  
1732 they need to go, to take a leap of faith. I need to see  
1733 where are the programmatic, where is the funding stream that  
1734 gets those aircraft, when do they arrive, what do we do in  
1735 the time where you tell us to divest of an airplane in 2007,  
1736 yet we are not going to get the new mission till 2011? What  
1737 do I do for that 4 years?

1738 What is that bridge? What is the mission? What  
1739 aircraft do they fly during that time? What tasks do they  
1740 perform? What equipment will they have to operate with? In  
1741 the most simple terms, the Title 32 issue I think this body  
1742 can straighten out, honestly. The other part the Air Force  
1743 and we have got to straighten out.

1744 Mr. MARSHALL. Thank you.

1745 Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Gibbons?

1746 Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1747 And to each of you sitting here, I want to thank you for  
1748 your service to our country and your individual states as  
1749 well. I can tell the great pride we have and you have in

1750 | each of your services.

1751 |         And for someone who has been on active duty, served in  
1752 | the Guard, served in the Air Force Reserve as well, I can  
1753 | tell you that I could not be more proud of the gentlemen  
1754 | sitting here in front of us today for what you have done for  
1755 | our country.

1756 |         General Wood, the Future Total Force program for the Air  
1757 | Force makes a commitment to the Guard that it is going to be  
1758 | involved and engaged and provided access and new mission  
1759 | roles in every mission, as you say, for the Air Force.

1760 |         Yet details are not available on what those new missions  
1761 | may be or how the Guard is going to be involved in those  
1762 | roles. We have now National Guard, Air National Guard  
1763 | members who are in quasi-transition to a new role. We have  
1764 | made commitments to abandoning old missions, removing legacy  
1765 | aircraft. We have set time lines and established time lines  
1766 | for this to take place.

1767 |         But one of my concerns is there is not only very little  
1768 | clarity, I have yet to see where the funding is going to be  
1769 | established, what the proposals for this funding will be.  
1770 | When will we see clarity? When are you going to let us know  
1771 | what the funding is going to be and how that will flow to  
1772 | these new missions and to establish the new training and what  
1773 | our National Guard is going to be expected to receive?

1774 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, thank you for that

1775 question. I would tell you that the clarity is coming about  
1776 as we work this together now. What we have done is we have  
1777 been in lockstep, framing this right, identifying the  
1778 magnitude of the requirement for change and new missions.

1779 And in fact, I will tell you it has been overwhelming,  
1780 the new missions that we have developed together that are out  
1781 there in the field. And one of those things is that the  
1782 active duty has come such forward here about the idea of  
1783 putting active duty air crew and maintainers and support  
1784 personnel with the Reserve and the Guard units.

1785 So the clarity and the detail--we are working together  
1786 with the men at this panel and the others that represent it,  
1787 and we are working very hard on that with them. And our  
1788 commitment is that we are not going to get this. We need to  
1789 do a coordinated bridge with the oversight of this body and  
1790 make sure that we do it right.

1791 We are putting training wedges of dollars as well as the  
1792 BRAC wedge of money through the Department of Defense to work  
1793 specifically there to give us the funding streams to make  
1794 this happen.

1795 But, sir, it is a hard process with it, and we need to  
1796 do it right, and so we need to do it together, and that is  
1797 what we are doing.

1798 Mr. GIBBONS. Now, are you engaging the National Guard,  
1799 the Air National Guard with regard to the funding levels for

1800 | the training and all of that, to make sure that their  
1801 | decisions and their input on these new missions as well as  
1802 | the training levels will be adequate?

1803 |       Lieutenant General WOOD. Absolutely, sir. That is part  
1804 | of this whole process that we do this right in regards to  
1805 | adequate training. In fact, one of the things that is not a  
1806 | showstopper, but one of it is that we have to use to manage  
1807 | the acceleration or the level of how quickly we transform is  
1808 | the availability of training.

1809 |       In other words, the training slots, whether it is a  
1810 | maintenance personnel or a space personnel or an air crew, to  
1811 | get them into the right kind of training they will need to do  
1812 | that, and training slots, as we call them, is something that  
1813 | we have got to manage very closely, and we are working on  
1814 | that.

1815 |       Mr. GIBBONS. Well, it seems to me that in the public  
1816 | eye there is a gap between what our plans and predictions are  
1817 | for the utilization of current and existing systems, legacy  
1818 | aircraft, et cetera, the removal, the time lines for those,  
1819 | and when we will see funding and training for new missions  
1820 | and what those missions will be.

1821 |       So I urge you to marry those up as quickly as you can  
1822 | with regard to how we perceive what is going on out there in  
1823 | the real world, because we have many, many Guard units that  
1824 | are saying we do not know where our men and women are going

1825 | to go, we do not know what the mission will be, we are going  
1826 | to end up in a void, in a vacuum.

1827 |         And I am hoping that we make sure that the engagement of  
1828 | our National Guard and the information that is out there  
1829 | marries those up so the time line is seamless so we do not  
1830 | lose these highly skilled, highly trained, valuable men and  
1831 | women who are serving now in the National Guard and Reserves.

1832 |         General Blum, I think that you are doing a marvelous  
1833 | job, both working through the total force structure,  
1834 | liaisioning with the Air Force active duty and, of course,  
1835 | running and controlling the National Guard as well.

1836 |         I know that the National Guard has homeland defense,  
1837 | national security responsibilities, as well as national  
1838 | disasters. Chairman LoBiondo and I have been working on  
1839 | finding the answer to Title 32, Title 10 discrepancies, and I  
1840 | would certainly hope that as we look at how missions like our  
1841 | mission support for civil law enforcement, MSCLE, that allows  
1842 | active duty to fund Air Force Reserve functions but not  
1843 | National Guard doing the same thing.

1844 |         So we have tried to work through that, ran into a few  
1845 | bumps and hurdles, because I guess trial lawyers, being the  
1846 | bane of everything, got in the way of our helpful assistance  
1847 | in that.

1848 |         I certainly hope that we see the National Guard working  
1849 | actively with this committee to solve some of those Title 32

1850 | problems in advance of having to look back and say well, now  
1851 | we are in a pinch, we can not do this, because there is so  
1852 | many things that are taking place today.

1853 |         Lieutenant General BLUM. Well, you have my commitment  
1854 | that we will work hand in glove with you and the services.  
1855 | The services have come to an epiphany or a realization rather  
1856 | recently that there is a significant equity for both the  
1857 | United States Army and the United States Air Force in the  
1858 | homeland defense and the support to homeland security effort.  
1859 | The present QDR I think will address that in a way it has  
1860 | never been addressed in previous QDRs.

1861 |         The Air Force has huge investment in homeland defense  
1862 | and homeland security in their Air National Guard. And the  
1863 | Army has about 350,000 citizen soldiers all over the country  
1864 | available to the governors for this purpose as well. It is  
1865 | not what we will do exclusively, but we need to be able to do  
1866 | that first and foremost and still simultaneously support the  
1867 | joint expeditionary fight overseas.

1868 |         So we will work very closely with you. It is the right  
1869 | thing to do for the country. It is not protecting the  
1870 | National Guard. It is protecting America.

1871 |         Mr. GIBBONS. Thank you.

1872 |         And, Mr. Chairman, my time has expired.

1873 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr. Gibbons.

1874 |         Gentlemen, I join with my colleagues in thanking you

1875 | very much for being here today and for your service to our  
1876 | country. Like others, I have concerns about the plan as it  
1877 | has been expressed.

1878 |         And I think most of you probably know that I have the  
1879 | honor of representing the 177th Fighter Wing, an extremely  
1880 | proud 24-hour alert unit. Its men and women do a magnificent  
1881 | job.

1882 |         But I have listened to all the testimony, and I am just  
1883 | having a hard time understanding where we are now with legacy  
1884 | aircraft, when new aircraft are coming online, and how we  
1885 | fill what is referred to in a number of different ways,  
1886 | bathtub being one of them.

1887 |         And I note for the record, all very important, I have  
1888 | had number of private conversations, some of them with some  
1889 | rather high-ranking officials, that have expressed serious  
1890 | concerns but believe that it sort of does not toe the company  
1891 | line to say so publicly.

1892 |         And, General Wood, for you, I understand that the end  
1893 | state of Future Total Force is 25 percent fewer fighters and  
1894 | 10 percent fewer overall aircraft, but what happens to our  
1895 | total fighter forces over the next 5 years as legacy F-15 and  
1896 | F-16 aircraft are retired?

1897 |         And how low does our fighter force go when this happens?

1898 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, what we believe is we  
1899 | have a physically responsible plan to start divesting old

1900 | aircraft that are no longer--still great air crews flying  
1901 | them, but airplanes that no longer meet the needs of the  
1902 | combatant commanders that fight our nation's wars with the  
1903 | support of--whether it is war on terrorism or future  
1904 | conflicts.

1905 |         So, sir, we have, as we gain new aircraft that--for  
1906 | example, the FA-22s. We are buying that aircraft and now  
1907 | fielding it at Langley Air Force Base and in other bases  
1908 | after that. Because of the capability of that aircraft, then  
1909 | we can divest greater numbers of older fighters. It is not  
1910 | necessarily one to one for us.

1911 |         Certainly, after the FA-22, we plan to bring the F-35 on  
1912 | board. As Chairman Hunter opened up today's session, he  
1913 | expressed your similar view in the sense of what if. Well,  
1914 | sir, if for some reason the F-35 slows or there are  
1915 | technological problems on that, then we need to have on-ramps  
1916 | or delays or other things that we need to make corrections to  
1917 | to keep our force structure so that we are able to do our job  
1918 | for the nation.

1919 |         So we have a plan. It goes out 20 years in front of us.

1920 |         It is based on well documented--in regards to the threat and  
1921 | anticipated what we will be able to face. But again, if  
1922 | there is delays in certain kinds of aircraft, then we will  
1923 | have to make corrections to our plan.

1924 |         Sir, so I guess I am telling you that we are watching

1925 | this very carefully in regards to as we bring on new  
1926 | aircraft. The Air Force's stated goal is 381 FA-22s. We are  
1927 | working that through the Quadrennial Defense Review right now  
1928 | to ensure that we articulate the importance of that aircraft,  
1929 | the magnitude of the capabilities it provides for the nation  
1930 | as well.

1931 |         So that is what we are trying to do, is not make in a  
1932 | bathtub there, but in order to make sure that we have a glide  
1933 | slope that is manageable in regards to as new aircraft come  
1934 | in, and with better or more improved capabilities.

1935 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. I hear what you are saying, but what I am  
1936 | having a hard time understanding, General, is that with a  
1937 | production schedule that always develops bumps and hiccups,  
1938 | sometimes it is not a matter of choice with the legacy  
1939 | aircraft we are dealing with, especially some of the F-16s  
1940 | that have air frames that just--we just can not do much more  
1941 | with them.

1942 |         And I do not know if, in fact, we hit that bump in the  
1943 | road with anticipated production and we hit F-16 air frames  
1944 | that we can not upgrade or do anything with--how do we have  
1945 | enough aircraft to do the homeland security mission with the  
1946 | Air Guard?

1947 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, a great point. I will  
1948 | tell you homeland defense is our number one point, and we  
1949 | will do whatever is necessary and it takes for homeland

1950 | defense.

1951 |         Our air sovereignty mission--again, we are confident the  
1952 | plan we have, which has been improved by Northern Command and  
1953 | Admiral Keating, meets those needs. But again, you bring up  
1954 | the crux of this problem for us. We now have F-16s that are  
1955 | going to approach 8,000 hours.

1956 |         We have already done, or in the process or going to do  
1957 | mid-life updates to get them that far. We have never flown  
1958 | any previous fighters that far. I mean, originally the F-16  
1959 | was to be flown 4,000 to 5,000 hours, and we are essentially  
1960 | doubling that.

1961 |         Sir, we are going to double or triple our F-15s to  
1962 | 12,000 hours. And in fact, what a gentleman over to my left  
1963 | said earlier about the A-10s is we are going to extend the  
1964 | life of that aircraft almost triple that lifetime through  
1965 | updates in order to preserve our capability.

1966 |         But again, a lot of what we are talking about here is  
1967 | dependent on not buying old legacy aircraft--that is staying  
1968 | toward the past--but buying new, state-of-the-art aircraft  
1969 | that have proven themselves such as the FA-22 and preparing  
1970 | for the F-35.

1971 |         But that is what we are watching closely, and the pledge  
1972 | is to make sure that you have a visibility over that entire  
1973 | time as we work through this year to year, but also to watch  
1974 | that and have on-ramps for any kinds of delays of procuring

1975 | new aircraft.

1976 |       Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, General.

1977 |       And I do appreciate your answer. I am just having a  
1978 | hard time comprehending. This is not something that turns on  
1979 | a dime, and if we find that we have a problem, we have a  
1980 | couple years to figure out a solution. We may not have a  
1981 | couple years for the homeland security mission.

1982 |       But I thank you very much. It is obviously something I  
1983 | am very concerned with, and I appreciate that Chairman Hunter  
1984 | took the time to be able to raise these issues.

1985 |       Next we will go to Mr. Shuster.

1986 |       Mr. SHUSTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1987 |       And thank all of you for being here today. Obviously, I  
1988 | think there is great concern from all the members of this  
1989 | committee--the planning process, the concern about linking  
1990 | BRAC with the FTF. I think that is of great concern.

1991 |       My question is first to General Blum. You have been  
1992 | quoted as saying you were not consulted about the Air Force  
1993 | BRAC 2005 recommendations, yet the DOD spokesmen folks have  
1994 | said that the NGB was--or you were coordinated with on those  
1995 | recommendations.

1996 |       And I wanted to know if you or anybody at the NGB was  
1997 | coordinated with concerning the Air Force recommendations and  
1998 | what was your input? What was your role in that?

1999 |       Lieutenant General BLUM. Thanks. I appreciate the

2000 | question, because it will give me a chance to set the record  
2001 | straight. If someone quoted me--and I do not know where that  
2002 | quote came from, but I will assume you are absolutely  
2003 | accurate and that I was quoted as saying--that is a misquote.

2004 | I was at National Guard Bureau. The National Guard  
2005 | Bureau was involved in the BRAC. They were not effective as  
2006 | I would like them to be in some areas. But they were, in  
2007 | fact, absolutely involved every step of the way in the BRAC.

2008 | The adjutants generals and the governors are a separate  
2009 | issue. They were not involved in the BRAC. The law did not  
2010 | require them to be involved--the BRAC law did not require  
2011 | them to be involved. The BRAC law did not consider other  
2012 | special statutes on the books--Title 10 and Title 32 section  
2013 | 104.

2014 | That happens sometimes, where you have federal statutes  
2015 | that do not consider the other, and they kind of create  
2016 | problems for one another, or they actually in some cases  
2017 | contradict one another.

2018 | That is a matter for the courts or it is a matter for  
2019 | this body to clean up that language so we do not have that  
2020 | contradiction in future BRACs, if we are to continue BRAC as  
2021 | a future kind of consideration.

2022 | But for the record, the National Guard was in there. I  
2023 | had a brigadier general, Anthony Hayes, that was in as our  
2024 | representative for the BRAC. He was one member of seven

2025 voting members. For the record, that was our value. That  
2026 was our weight. That was our input. But we were absolutely  
2027 involved in that.

2028 The Future Total Force is a different issue. We in the  
2029 National Guard Bureau, General James and General Aldridge,  
2030 are in there every day involved in Future Total Force.  
2031 Twelve adjutants general are making recommendations for their  
2032 peers on Future Total Force and the way ahead.

2033 I look at BRAC as the rear view mirror. I am concerned  
2034 about what happened in the rear view mirror. It, in  
2035 hindsight, perhaps could have been done differently. The  
2036 Army certainly chose a different path and we had a much  
2037 better outcome, more consensus outcome.

2038 But I am more interested in where we are going than  
2039 where we have come from on this, and General Lempke and his  
2040 adjutants general have a committee that are fully involved in  
2041 every say for the way ahead with the Air Force.

2042 The considerations and the questions that were brought  
2043 up here today are shared by General Lempke and his peers.  
2044 And frankly, they are shared to a greater extent by the air  
2045 staff than comes across in the press or some of these  
2046 hearings.

2047 There is collaboration in its truest sense between John  
2048 Bradley and the Air Force Reserve, Danny James and the Air  
2049 Guard, Steve Wood and the Air Force, and the adjutants

2050 | general of the 50 states and the four territories.

2051 |         So if you can separate BRAC from FTF, which should be  
2052 | done, then you get two different answers. If you confuse  
2053 | those two issues, the question--

2054 |         Mr. SHUSTER. But are we confusing those two? Are we  
2055 | combining them together? My TAG believes that we are linking  
2056 | them, and it should not be linked at all.

2057 |         Lieutenant General BLUM. The adjutants general and the  
2058 | governors' perception and assessment expressed to me--again,  
2059 | my job is to act as a channel of communication between the  
2060 | states and the Department of the Air Force on this matter,  
2061 | and the adjutants generals and their commanders in chief, the  
2062 | governors, feel that they were not consulted. In fact, they  
2063 | were not consulted.

2064 |         Mr. SHUSTER. They were not, right..

2065 |         Lieutenant General BLUM. So the perception is, in fact,  
2066 | accurate.

2067 |         Mr. SHUSTER. How did we miss that? How did we not--I  
2068 | mean, historically and by law--and even the BRAC Commission's  
2069 | legal folks have said--

2070 |         Lieutenant General BLUM. That answer, frankly, sir, you  
2071 | would have to address to General Wood in the Air Force for  
2072 | how and why they chose to approach that process. Now, I will  
2073 | tell you, professionally and personally, I support the  
2074 | process. I think it is right for the country.

2075           Could we have done the process better in hindsight? I,  
2076 for one, say yeah, I think we probably could have.

2077           Mr. SHUSTER. Well, General Wood, could you answer that?  
2078 Why did not we consult with governors and with TAGs when we  
2079 closed some of these bases? I am especially concerned about  
2080 Willow Grove and the 911th out near Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

2081           Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, what I would like to be  
2082 able to do is take the question for the record and give you a  
2083 detailed explanation back with it. I know how tough this is,  
2084 and we have talked about this that way, about the dilemma we  
2085 are in, the entire hearing.

2086           I believe from the Department of Defense--on Monday,  
2087 Department of Defense was in front of the BRAC Commission  
2088 itself with us and thought we were working with them and  
2089 still believes--the department believes that we are within  
2090 the guidelines that were laid down.

2091           So again, I would like to be able to give you a detailed  
2092 explanation back for the record.

2093           Mr. SHUSTER. I would appreciate that.

2094           Mr. SKELTON. May I interrupt at this point?

2095           Mr. SHUSTER. Yes, sir. I yield to the gentleman from  
2096 Missouri.

2097           Mr. SKELTON. Were you involved with this issue from the  
2098 early stages of the BRAC process, General?

2099           Lieutenant General WOOD. No, sir. And if you would

2100 | allow me to explain why, I would--

2101 |         Mr. SKELTON. No, just were you not? You were not  
2102 | involved.

2103 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. No, sir, I was not.

2104 |         Mr. SKELTON. Who was your predecessor involved with  
2105 | this issue?

2106 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. We took a special commission  
2107 | and group of officers in installation logistics--worked this,  
2108 | because BRAC was an infrastructure issue.

2109 |         Mr. SKELTON. I am puzzled why, General--and all  
2110 | respect, sir; I have known you for so long, I know you will  
2111 | give us the best honest answer you can--why you have to take  
2112 | it for the record as to why the governors were not consulted.

2113 |         That is not brain surgery. That doesn't take a lot of  
2114 | difficult research.

2115 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Well, sir--

2116 |         Mr. SKELTON. You know.

2117 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, I believe that we went  
2118 | through--per Title 10, our dealings with the Air National  
2119 | Guard and the National Guard Bureau--in fact, that we were  
2120 | doing that as their representatives to that.

2121 |         Again, sir, that is the way we worked it in the Air  
2122 | Force--and with it, and that is what I believe is true with  
2123 | the department in general. But again, sir, any other details  
2124 | on that I would have to take for the record.

2125 Mr. SKELTON. Thank you.

2126 Mr. SHUSTER. Reclaiming my time, I can see that General  
2127 Whitney would like to get at the microphone.

2128 Can I have 30 more seconds?

2129 Major General WHITNEY. Mr. Chairman, if I could just  
2130 give an answer--

2131 Mr. LOBIONDO. Without objection. Concise answer,  
2132 please.

2133 Major General WHITNEY. Yes, sir, just real quickly. To  
2134 give an adjutant general's perspective as to why we were not  
2135 included in the BRAC, when we ask about the BRAC, at least  
2136 from where I stood at the time, I was told that it is a Title  
2137 10 issue, it is another Title 10-Title 32 friction issue.

2138 We are not in the chain of command in Title 10, and so  
2139 therefore the accountability piece of this--in other words,  
2140 if we released elements of that, then there were some  
2141 problems with that.

2142 So it was always a legal issue that said we were not  
2143 allowed to be involved in the Title 10 BRAC issue because of  
2144 our Title 32 status, where we were not in the chain of  
2145 command. And that is essentially the answer I got.

2146 Mr. SHUSTER. Well, I thank the General.

2147 And I would encourage General Wood--you said earlier  
2148 that you want to work together with the TAGs. Well, I do not  
2149 think--I think we fell down in this instance, and it is very

2150 | difficult for, I think, governors and the TAGs to take the  
2151 | Air Force's word when something as important as BRAC--they  
2152 | were not consulted as they should have been.

2153 | I yield back. Thank you.

2154 | Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Shuster.

2155 | Mr. Turner, you are up.

2156 | Mr. TURNER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2157 | Frequently I am asked what is it like to serve on the  
2158 | Armed Services Committee, and I tell people how wonderful it  
2159 | is to serve with our men and women in uniform and their deep  
2160 | commitment to our country, their expertise, their knowledge,  
2161 | their intellectual base.

2162 | And with that, I want to echo everyone's thanks and  
2163 | appreciation to each of you for your service to your country.

2164 | I must say that I am very disappointed in what we are  
2165 | dealing with in looking at the Air Force's BRAC  
2166 | recommendations and the Future Total Force structure process.

2167 | When people talk about BRAC, they talk about leveraging  
2168 | the knowledge and expertise that is in our various branches  
2169 | of government and looking for what are the best ideas of  
2170 | things that we can do to both streamline and improve and  
2171 | enhance our operations.

2172 | We expect in recommendations that they would reflect  
2173 | those things that are hard to do and that could not be done  
2174 | through merely incrementalization. And we expect that we are

2175 | going to see some of the best and brightest recommendations  
2176 | come out of it so that when we look at these, we can say that  
2177 | we all have a greater respect for what we have, and we have  
2178 | greater assets and more effectiveness.

2179 |       I am going to submit my questions for the record, but I  
2180 | want to instead just give what I hear as a summary of the  
2181 | disappointment that has occurred as a result of these Air  
2182 | Force recommendations, because I think we have missed the  
2183 | opportunity to leverage what was important in a BRAC  
2184 | opportunity, and instead, I think we are seeing perhaps some  
2185 | expressions of culture in what is occurring in the Air Force  
2186 | leadership.

2187 |       The criticisms that we are hearing today are the issues  
2188 | of lack of being a team player. When you hear the issues of  
2189 | lack of consultation and the lack of adequately looking for  
2190 | the intellectual capital that you have throughout your  
2191 | organization, you have a disregard for your team.

2192 |       You are not asking them or reflecting from them what are  
2193 | those brilliant ideas, what do we want to look like in the  
2194 | future versus looking at something as to how people can be  
2195 | excluded from a process.

2196 |       It highlights the disparate treatment of active and  
2197 | Guard and Reserve, and what I think is a disparate issue of  
2198 | morale without a reflective looking to how do you enhance and  
2199 | encourage morale.

2200           And it sort of goes against an issue of a vision of  
2201 where you are going, because these recommendations are  
2202 contrary to everything that members of this committee hear,  
2203 whenever we travel to Iraq or any other areas of  
2204 conflict--Afghanistan--as to how we currently believe that  
2205 our forces are working to their optimum.

2206           We hear issues with respect to acquisition in the Air  
2207 Force. That has been most recently the least credible  
2208 function of the Air Force, and it appears to be one that  
2209 perhaps is a justification for the structure.

2210           And the other thing that concerns me the most is that we  
2211 are hearing issues of incomplete work. When we have before  
2212 us a proposal of major restructuring and reorganization--and,  
2213 General Wood, where I hear you use words that say "we are now  
2214 searching for the clarity and detail"--usually when you have  
2215 a proposal of this magnitude, it is based upon someone having  
2216 had clarity and detail and looking for how that can be  
2217 evolved into a recommendation, rather than a recommendation  
2218 that seeks clarity and detail.

2219           I have in my state of Ohio a significant number of  
2220 facilities that are being impacted by this process, and I  
2221 will be submitting questions for you with respect to those  
2222 facilities for the record.

2223           But I certainly hope that you take the tenor of the  
2224 questions that you are hearing here as issues that you need

2225 | to look at in the process, because it is not just that you  
2226 | are having this committee give you feedback with respect to a  
2227 | specific proposal. Most of these questions go to issues of  
2228 | culture.

2229 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Turner.

2230 |         Are you finished? Mr. Turner, that was it, right?

2231 | Okay.

2232 |         Mr. TURNER. I yield back my time.

2233 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you. Okay.

2234 |         Mr. Taylor?

2235 |         Mr. TAYLOR. I want to thank all of you gentlemen for  
2236 | your service to our country and for sticking around as long  
2237 | as you had. I very much appreciate that the points you have  
2238 | made on equipment and the concerns that you have that once  
2239 | these missions have changed you will have the adequate  
2240 | equipment.

2241 |         A couple questions I have is, number one, for anyone who  
2242 | has been to Iraq--and I guess everyone in this room has  
2243 | been--it is very obvious that a heck of a lot of the C-130  
2244 | flights in and out of the theater are performed by guardsmen  
2245 | and reservists, obviously putting a lot of hours on those air  
2246 | frames.

2247 |         The first question would be are you convinced that those  
2248 | air frames are going to be either repaired or replaced as  
2249 | necessary. The second thing goes more to the personnel

2250 | issues that my colleague from Georgia brought up very  
2251 | briefly, and that is the purpose of this hearing is to  
2252 | respond to the concept of a total force.

2253 |         Well, how in the heck can you have a total force when  
2254 | one group is eligible for the military health care system and  
2255 | another group is not? How in the heck can you have a total  
2256 | force when one group has one standard for retirement and the  
2257 | other group does not?

2258 |         As General Blum points out in his testimony, two-thirds  
2259 | of America's guardsmen and reservists have been called up  
2260 | since September 11th, but not all of those folks are eligible  
2261 | for the military health care system or the same retirement.

2262 |         And if we are going to have a total force, it ought to  
2263 | be a total force. I grew up in a part of the world where  
2264 | they used to have a statement called separate but equal. It  
2265 | was not. It was definitely separate. It was not equal. I  
2266 | do not think we need to have separate but equal in the United  
2267 | States military. I would like to hear your thoughts on that.

2268 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, if I could, I would start  
2269 | to address and then add comments from the panel here on  
2270 | recapitalization of the aircraft. Again, thanks to you all,  
2271 | we have the C-130J program back on track. It is a significant  
2272 | thing to age out our E Models and replace it with our C-130s.

2273 |         The department is going through a detailed study now on  
2274 | the--mobility capabilities studies of our airlift assets,

2275 | from our C-5s to our C-17s. And in fact, there will be a  
2276 | follow-on study that will provide more details on our C-130s,  
2277 | not in just the numbers we need, but in the recapitalization  
2278 | effort.

2279 |         So that will report out here in the upcoming months, so  
2280 | that will have a large degree about exactly the framework or  
2281 | the boundaries of the numbers of aircraft that we need to do.

2282 |         But we need to continue a steady recapitalization  
2283 | program of our air assets at all three levels of this, in  
2284 | regards to what we are doing with the C-17 as well as the  
2285 | C-130. So we are working that. We have a larger study that  
2286 | will help us frame it.

2287 |         Lieutenant General BRADLEY. Congressman Taylor, good to  
2288 | see you again. I would like to address the second part of  
2289 | your question with regard to health care and retirement  
2290 | possibly. And more oriented toward, perhaps, the Army Guard  
2291 | where the more serious recruiting problems exist.

2292 |         We appreciate all the support we have been given with  
2293 | regard to additional entitlements and especially bonuses. It  
2294 | has helped greatly in terms of retaining our Army National  
2295 | Guard force in particular. But in the Guard, we say to  
2296 | recruit the soldier you recruit the family.

2297 |         And if we are going to continue and if we are going to  
2298 | get ourselves back on track with recruiting and retention,  
2299 | health care becomes a tremendously important item to our

2300 soldiers and their families. It is something that could be  
2301 provided to those that do not have opportunity and access  
2302 elsewhere, which can be very important to the family.

2303 Another aspect deals with our more senior members in the  
2304 National Guard, especially in the Army National Guard.  
2305 Typically, a 20-year career--a guardsman would attempt them  
2306 to stay as much longer as they could. With a situation as  
2307 today, we are seeing more and more of our experienced  
2308 leaders, our senior majors, lieutenant colonels, and senior  
2309 NCOs that are leaving earlier rather than wanting to stay  
2310 later.

2311 I think this is a gap where perhaps--and there are very  
2312 few motivations, bonuses or anything else, that motivates  
2313 them to stay beyond that basic 20 years. A number of  
2314 proposals before Congress, that Congress has proposed,  
2315 involve a different form of retirement system that would  
2316 perhaps incentivize those that have served 20 years to  
2317 encourage them to stay longer in return for a lower age  
2318 beginning retirement.

2319 Those, I think, are important items if we are going to  
2320 sustain a healthy National Guard, especially on the Army  
2321 side, and probably eventually also on the air side.

2322 Mr. TAYLOR. General Blum, I realize this puts you in a  
2323 pickle, but I would like to hear your thoughts on both  
2324 TRICARE for reservists and on retirement age.

2325 Lieutenant General BLUM. Thank you, Congressman. It is  
2326 not so much a difficult spot. I think your feelings and your  
2327 impressions are spot on. The Department of Defense has a  
2328 position that I fully have to support. We are incrementally  
2329 making adjustments to bring parity or equity to what was out  
2330 of balance, clearly, several years ago.

2331 TRICARE now is extended to, for instance, the brigade in  
2332 Mississippi. All of those young men and women will be  
2333 TRICARE eligible for 4.5 years of health care by virtue of  
2334 their service, their mobilization and service for a year in  
2335 Iraq and their 6 months of mobilization time. For every 90  
2336 days that they are in theater, they accrue a year of  
2337 eligibility for TRICARE.

2338 But I understand your position that how about the rest  
2339 of the Mississippi Guard that has not served yet but will,  
2340 obviously, or probably, with what we face for the long term  
2341 here. Everybody will get their fair turn at least once,  
2342 perhaps more than once. And maybe the old paradigm or the  
2343 old model needs to be re-looked at through a different lens.

2344 So that is about as far as I can go at this hearing. I  
2345 think that this is the correct body to look at it, and I  
2346 think that this is the correct body--one of the good parts  
2347 about the checks and balances of our system is there are  
2348 other places where problems can be addressed and fixed, and  
2349 this may be one of those.

2350 |       And I applaud, frankly, your concern for the soldiers  
2351 | and airmen and the contributions that they make to the  
2352 | national defense both here at home and abroad. One is not  
2353 | greater than the other, in my view.

2354 |       It takes the same amount of courage, and the same kind  
2355 | of commitment, and the same kind of dedication and  
2356 | professionalism to respond to a Class 5 hurricane as it does  
2357 | to walk the streets of Baghdad. They are different kind of  
2358 | dangers. They are different kind of threats. But they both  
2359 | require commitment and sacrifice and probably we need to  
2360 | reevaluate or re-look at that issue.

2361 |       Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. Chairman, I would ask for an additional  
2362 | 30 seconds, if I may.

2363 |       Mr. LOBIONDO. Without objection.

2364 |       Mr. TAYLOR. General Blum, while I have you, speaking of  
2365 | total force, I have received a number of reports, since you  
2366 | brought up the Mississippians over in Iraq, that unit never  
2367 | received their jammers, their Warlocks, until March. They  
2368 | were actually sent to that theater in January and had no  
2369 | training with them prior to getting into theater.

2370 |       The question that is being asked of me in letters from  
2371 | home is do you feel like the Guard and Reserve units, on a  
2372 | proportional basis, are being assigned jammers the same as  
2373 | their active counterparts?

2374 |       I do not think there are enough jammers over there. But

2375 | the question is are they being assigned them on a  
2376 | proportional basis equal to their active component  
2377 | counterparts?

2378 | Lieutenant General BLUM. I honestly think so. But I  
2379 | will commit to you to check into it. I will send a team over  
2380 | there to, in fact, assess that specifically. But my answer  
2381 | to you, if I had to give it to you based on my visits in  
2382 | theater and communication with the eight brigades that we  
2383 | have over there right now, is that the answer would be yes,  
2384 | it is proportional.

2385 | General Schoomaker, General Cody, Secretary Harvey--this  
2386 | is an Army issue. It is almost refreshing to talk about the  
2387 | Army here in this hearing. But they are absolutely committed  
2388 | to making sure that a soldier is a soldier and that it does  
2389 | not matter whether they are active, Reserve or Guard, when  
2390 | they are in theater, they will have exactly the same parity  
2391 | of equipment and protection, and that would include jammers.

2392 | So I would think that the answer is yes. But I owe it  
2393 | to you to check it out.

2394 | Mr. TAYLOR. Thank you very much, sir.

2395 | Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2396 | Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Taylor.

2397 | Mr. Akin?

2398 | Mr. AKIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2399 | I just have one quick--I would like to try and get a

2400 quick answer if I could and then shift over to a main  
2401 question I have for you.

2402 And this would just be to you, General Whitney. I  
2403 thought I heard you say--and tell me if I understood it  
2404 right--that part of the reason that the Air Force did not  
2405 contact the adjutants general was there was a legal  
2406 understanding that you were not supposed to do that, is that  
2407 correct, or is that not right?

2408 Major General WHITNEY. You have got it correct, yes,  
2409 sir. Title 10 versus Title 32 I think has always been a  
2410 problem for release of information to the National Guard  
2411 and--

2412 Mr. AKIN. So the answer is yes that that was part of  
2413 the--okay. Here is my main question. I think probably the  
2414 point has been made that politically maybe you did not  
2415 approach things exactly the way some people would prefer that  
2416 you did it.

2417 My background is engineering. I also have the 131st  
2418 Guard unit in St. Louis, so it is something that we have been  
2419 paying attention to. I guess my question is I assumed it is  
2420 your job to take a look at the Air Force and see what are we  
2421 going to need and how do we plan for the future.

2422 And I assume that that is what you are trying to do, and  
2423 that you are genuinely trying to solve that problem. What I  
2424 am curious about, because I have read the stuff the other

2425 | lawyers said that, you know, you have got to get the  
2426 | governors' signatures and stuff like that, and there is some  
2427 | problems doing this in BRAC--I am interested in the overall  
2428 | question, though, because I missed the beginning of this  
2429 | hearing, what were you trying to do with the Guard units,  
2430 | aside from the politics of it?

2431 |         What is the logic of what you are trying to accomplish?  
2432 | I assume you are trying to move aircraft around for some  
2433 | reason. Is that true, and can somebody in a sentence or two  
2434 | just say what are you trying to do by moving those aircraft?

2435 |         I know that, generally speaking--I have been to enough  
2436 | hearings--that you guys like F-22s pretty well and that you  
2437 | want to buy as many of them as you can, yet the problem was  
2438 | you can not get enough of them to fill up all the slots that  
2439 | you would like to have, so I guess that is what I want to  
2440 | say, is what are you trying to accomplish.

2441 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Well, let me, if I can, try to  
2442 | get a couple of the points you said. I mean, let me just  
2443 | restate here for the record the purpose of the BRAC. And  
2444 | again, it is about infrastructure and facilities versus,  
2445 | necessarily, about future force structure. The BRAC law  
2446 | directed us to give them a force structure by year that we  
2447 | gave to the Congress through 2025.

2448 |         But if I could, the goals of BRAC was transformed by  
2449 | maximizing war fighting capability of each squadron, and that

2450 | is our Air Force position--transformed by realigning Air  
2451 | Force infrastructure with future defense strategy, maximize  
2452 | operational capability by eliminating excess physical  
2453 | capacity, and capitalizing on opportunities for more joint  
2454 | activity, which we discussed earlier.

2455 |         Sir, the issue or, as I see it, is what we are also  
2456 | trying to do is once we see the outcome of this is prepare  
2457 | for the future of a force that is going to have less  
2458 | aircraft, because we are going to have more capable aircraft.

2459 |         So in order to take advantage of the outstanding  
2460 | guardsmen and reservists we have there is to look at new  
2461 | missions for them, the same missions that the active duty is  
2462 | either flying or training to in multiple kinds of specialties  
2463 | in space, in UAV operations, in intelligence, and many, many  
2464 | more.

2465 |         So I guess what BRAC has done--at the outcome with it  
2466 | goes on with it--and our job is to look at those valuable  
2467 | airmen, those guardsmen and reservists, and see how we will  
2468 | train and use them for the future with it.

2469 |         Now, with aircraft--

2470 |         Mr. AKIN. I am not quite following. I am just trying  
2471 | to understand what your thinking is.

2472 |         I think what I hear you are saying is because of the  
2473 | diversity of missions that you have and because of the  
2474 | limited number of aircraft, you think from an efficiency

2475 | point of view it would be better to have them clustered in  
2476 | fewer locations, and that was part of the logic of moving the  
2477 | smaller number of aircraft out of different places and  
2478 | concentrating more aircraft in one place. Did I get what you  
2479 | said right or not?

2480 | Lieutenant General WOOD. Well, what we try to say there  
2481 | is that we believe the most efficient structure for a fighter  
2482 | squadron, United States Air Force, is 24 aircraft in that  
2483 | squadron. In an airlift squadron, we would like to be able  
2484 | to get 16 aircraft.

2485 | Because experience level of our Reserve and our  
2486 | Guard--we can go lower numbers, and we looked at 18 aircraft  
2487 | in the fighter squadron and 12 aircraft in the mobility  
2488 | squadron. So from that force structure standpoint, that is  
2489 | one of the goals and one of the things we tried to do.

2490 | Mr. AKIN. So you are saying that you need a certain  
2491 | number of aircraft to make something work efficiently.

2492 | Lieutenant General WOOD. That is correct.

2493 | Mr. AKIN. And some of these Guard units have got less  
2494 | than that number of aircraft and therefore you want to  
2495 | consolidate some of them. Is that the logic?

2496 | Lieutenant General WOOD. Yes, sir.

2497 | Mr. AKIN. And your calculus is that in spite of the  
2498 | experience of people that live in a particular region, such  
2499 | as St. Louis, that are pretty experienced, in the longer term

2500 sense, what you wanted to do was to get more aircraft  
2501 concentrated in a smaller number of units, and that gives you  
2502 some overall efficiency.

2503 Lieutenant General WOOD. Yes, sir, but we want to still  
2504 take advantage of the experienced airmen in the St. Louis  
2505 area, some that will want to move to go where we have new--or  
2506 the aircraft. We want to take advantage of those airmen  
2507 and--

2508 Mr. AKIN. Were you assuming a lot of them would want to  
2509 move, by the way?

2510 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, we just do not know. I  
2511 mean, there is--we are going to work very hard collectively,  
2512 all of us, to put missions in there that will keep airmen in  
2513 their locations into the--and transition them into new  
2514 missions.

2515 I have experience with the Predator operations. In my  
2516 previous job as the warfare center commander at Nellis we  
2517 were responsible for Predators. Everyone was worried at  
2518 first with the Predators that none of the fighter pilots,  
2519 none of the bomber pilots and even airlift pilots would want  
2520 to do this, because it is not flying aircraft, it is  
2521 physically flying a console much like a computer game.

2522 And, sir, I am telling you that we can not keep people  
2523 away from knocking on our door. They understand the value of  
2524 what that has and for the nation and for the joint force..

2525 So again, we just do not know what we do not know. We  
2526 are trying to be optimistic and look for this and do our  
2527 best.

2528 Mr. AKIN. Let me see if I have got your answer.

2529 I do not mean to run over, Mr. Chairman, but I am.

2530 Just see if I have got your answer. What you are saying  
2531 is you think there is more efficiency in having more planes  
2532 in one location. Was that the logic of what you were trying  
2533 to do in a nutshell?

2534 Lieutenant General WOOD. Yes. In my statement, that is  
2535 exactly right. I tried then to reinforce the idea about  
2536 recruitment and taking advantage of those experienced airmen  
2537 in those locations in the new missions after that.

2538 Mr. AKIN. Right.

2539 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2540 Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Akin.

2541 Mr. Meehan, you are up.

2542 Mr. MEEHAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2543 And thank you to all of you for taking all this time to  
2544 spend with us. We have heard a lot this morning about issues  
2545 related to Air National Guard bases being placed on the BRAC  
2546 list.

2547 General Lempke, yesterday Congress Daily reported that  
2548 you drafted a compromise plan that would give one flying wing  
2549 to each state, and I am concerned that this sort of

2550 | compromise would be working toward more of a political  
2551 | solution and not a military solution.

2552 |       I was wondering if you could comment on that for the  
2553 | committee, and let me say, during Monday's hearing  
2554 | Commissioner Admiral Harold Gehman stated that the Air Force  
2555 | officials had "misapplied their own data when--substituted  
2556 | military value in making decisions when the numbers did not  
2557 | work out right."

2558 |       And for my part, I know that there are great concerns in  
2559 | my home state--the Otis National Guard base in my home state  
2560 | of Massachusetts--that we believe was severely  
2561 | underestimated.

2562 |       But broader than that, I am concerned that the  
2563 | developing of a political compromise solution now rather than  
2564 | revisiting the military value estimates would essentially be  
2565 | making the same mistake twice. And I know, you know, there  
2566 | are many that share this concern on both sides of the aisle,  
2567 | and you have heard from some of them today.

2568 |       But I wonder if you could comment. Reaching a  
2569 | compromise plan that is not based on military value it seems  
2570 | to me would politicize the BRAC process and threaten our  
2571 | nation's national security.

2572 |       Major General LEMPKE. Yes, sir. Thank you for the  
2573 | question. The BRAC Commission is on a time line. They are  
2574 | moving ahead. Their testimony Monday was very clear that

2575 | they intend to move ahead. They also in that testimony, I  
2576 | believe, asked for help in terms of how do we get through  
2577 | portions of the BRAC list and try to come out with a product  
2578 | that will be successful.

2579 | All we are trying to do right now as adjutants general  
2580 | is to go back and take a look to see what sound advice and  
2581 | support we can provide to that request for support. And to  
2582 | do that, obviously, you need to look at something, and that  
2583 | is what that--that is what we have out there right now, is  
2584 | something.

2585 | We are going to be meeting ourselves to try to come up  
2586 | with how to use that and then take it forward, in hopes of  
2587 | doing something that we can indeed influence or support the  
2588 | commission as they attempt to resolve the issue before them.

2589 | Mr. MEEHAN. And is that the Friday meeting where--  
2590 | Major General LEMPKE. Correct.

2591 | Mr. MEEHAN. Okay. You understand my point.

2592 | Major General LEMPKE. I wish I could take the  
2593 | chalkboard and erase it all and start over again, but I can  
2594 | not. And so we have got to pick up where things are and  
2595 | attempt to provide them with something that will get them  
2596 | moved down the road.

2597 | And I agree that there are faults. There are lines. It  
2598 | is not perfect with regard to the criteria. But we believe  
2599 | that, in many parts of it, it does capture and retain some of

2600 | the better parts of the recommendations, but then it enhances  
2601 | some other areas.

2602 |         Some states are helped by that somewhat. Others are not  
2603 | helped as much. And some are not helped at all. And I wish  
2604 | we could help them all, but we are playing with what we have  
2605 | right now.

2606 |         Mr. MEEHAN. Well, when the TAGs meet on Friday, if you  
2607 | would just keep some of those thoughts in mind, I would  
2608 | appreciate it. Thank you.

2609 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Meehan.

2610 |         Next is going to be Mr. Kline, and I would like to thank  
2611 | Mr. Kline for joining me very early on in understanding the  
2612 | critical nature of this issue and helping to convince  
2613 | Chairman Hunter that it was important to hold a hearing.

2614 |         Mr. Kline?

2615 |         Mr. KLINE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And indeed, I  
2616 | agree that it is an important issue, a critical issue.

2617 |         And frankly, gentlemen, I am just appalled. I am really  
2618 | appalled. My TAG in Minnesota came to me some time ago  
2619 | talking about what was going to happen to the F-16 squadron  
2620 | in Duluth, not in my district but certainly in my state.

2621 |         And he did not have any information on what was going to  
2622 | happen. He was guessing on what was the best thing to do for  
2623 | his troops, the best thing to do for his state. He did not  
2624 | have any information.

2625 And so I have been listening to my colleagues, and I  
2626 identify myself with the remarks of certainly most of them  
2627 that this is absolutely unacceptable that our Air Force, our  
2628 Department of Defense, came forward and announced to units  
2629 like the F-16 squadron in Duluth that they were going to go  
2630 out of business, with no indication whatsoever--and I think I  
2631 heard General Blum say, and it was confirmed by others of  
2632 you, that you do not know what is going to happen to them.

2633 And so that will be a question for the record. Can you  
2634 now tell me, any of you, what is going to happen, if your  
2635 plan goes forward, to that F-16 squadron in Duluth and to the  
2636 people that are there, to the members of the Guard that are  
2637 there? Does anybody know?

2638 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, again, as I stated  
2639 earlier, our job now is to work with the TAG there, work with  
2640 the governor, work with General Blum and General James to  
2641 come up--a mission that they want to do, that they want to be  
2642 part of, and that benefits the state but also benefits the  
2643 nation for fighting our wars overseas.

2644 Mr. KLINE. Okay. Thank you, General. I appreciate  
2645 that you are going to work with them, but it underscores the  
2646 fact that they do not know now. They have been told that  
2647 their F-16s are going to go away. They do not know what is  
2648 going to happen to them, and you can not tell them.

2649 And it is just amazing to me that we have gotten a plan

2650 | this broad, this far-reaching, that is laid out there, that  
2651 | has affected the morale, and the plans, and the aspirations  
2652 | and all those things for all these men and women in the  
2653 | Guard, and we do not know what is going to happen to them.

2654 |         So my question was going to be is there a training plan  
2655 | in place for whatever the new thing is that these men and  
2656 | women are going to do, and the answer to that is obviously  
2657 | not, because you do not have any idea what they are going to  
2658 | do.

2659 |         So I guess my worst fears are kind of realized here, and  
2660 | I am very, very disappointed, reflecting the comments of my  
2661 | colleague from Ohio, Mr. Turner. I mean, obviously, I spent  
2662 | my whole life serving in the armed forces. I am very proud  
2663 | of the men and women of the armed forces.

2664 |         I believe in the outstanding leadership--in fact, the  
2665 | leadership of you gentlemen here at this table--really fine  
2666 | officers and tremendous men and women serving.

2667 |         But this thing is amazing in its incompleteness and in  
2668 | the disruption that it has caused, the insecurity that it has  
2669 | caused. And I am just, frankly, appalled. And I do not  
2670 | really know what question to ask anymore, because I  
2671 | understand from listening that you can not answer the  
2672 | questions that are on the minds of the men and women in the  
2673 | Air Guard in Minnesota or any other state.

2674 |         If I am wrong, if you know the answers to those

2675 | questions, what they are going to do and how they are going  
2676 | to train and what is going to happen, I would love to hear  
2677 | it.

2678 |       Lieutenant General BLUM. Congressman, I have got to  
2679 | play the hand I am dealt. When the process is complete, the  
2680 | recommended list by the secretary of defense that was  
2681 | submitted to him by the Air Force will either survive as it  
2682 | is, or it will come out in some modified form, or this body  
2683 | will exercise their prerogatives to do what the law allows  
2684 | there.

2685 |       And whatever comes out, I will work with the adjutants  
2686 | generals and the governors to deliver what I said I would  
2687 | deliver to them on Monday and what I will tell the adjutants  
2688 | general on Friday when they assemble here in D.C.

2689 |       There will be a flying unit in every state, not just  
2690 | one, but at least one in every state. That is my authority.  
2691 | That is my prerogative to work out. Where the National Guard  
2692 | units go is the job of the National Guard Bureau with the  
2693 | consent of the governors and the collaboration of the TAGs.  
2694 | So we will deliver that.

2695 |       We will deliver a bridge from the present mission to the  
2696 | future mission, and Steve Wood and the senior leadership of  
2697 | the Air Force has committed to me several times personally we  
2698 | will be in every mission the Air Force flies, in every  
2699 | aircraft type the Air Force flies, and every mission that is

2700 | a non-airplane mission--

2701 |           Mr. KLINE. General, I am sorry to interrupt, but the  
2702 | time is about to go and I refuse to go over time. But my  
2703 | point is that you are now stepping forward to play a hand  
2704 | that you have been dealt. I would argue that somebody dealt  
2705 | a very bad hand. It was not well planned out, and you should  
2706 | not be in the position of having to come up with the bridge  
2707 | that you are trying to manufacture to play a hand that, to  
2708 | continue your analogy, was, in fact, poorly dealt.

2709 |           I do not even know where the deck of cards came from,  
2710 | but it is pretty upsetting to me, and I know it is upsetting  
2711 | to the men and women in the Guard.

2712 |           And, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

2713 |           Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Kline.

2714 |           Mr. Boozman?

2715 |           Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank the  
2716 | ranking member, Mr. Skelton, for having this hearing. And I  
2717 | appreciate you allowing me to participate even though I am  
2718 | not a member of the committee.

2719 |           I am a member, though, of the group that is designated  
2720 | by the speaker in the NATO Parliament, so I am very, very  
2721 | familiar with some of the challenges that we face worldwide.

2722 |           I have been briefed many times by General Jones and his  
2723 | staff, was recently in Germany, saw what we are doing there,  
2724 | visited many of the bases in the draw down. I am on Veterans

2725 Affairs. My dad did 20 years in the Air Force, so I am very,  
2726 very familiar with the military, and I do appreciate you.

2727 I guess the problem that I have with this is that for  
2728 me, the BRAC process--and I have been very, very supportive  
2729 of the BRAC process, but the BRAC process to me is  
2730 designed--you set your policy, and then you set the  
2731 infrastructure with the BRAC process.

2732 And in this case, we have got a situation where we are  
2733 setting our infrastructure and then somehow we are trying to  
2734 make policy out of it. Now, I do not think it started that  
2735 way, but that is the situation, I think, that we find  
2736 ourselves in now, is we talk about the enclave concept and  
2737 some of these other things.

2738 Nobody really has any good whatever as far as what we  
2739 are doing. And some of that stuff you can talk about, some of  
2740 it you can not, but again, the situation I think that we find  
2741 ourselves in--some of you have got some real heartburn about  
2742 this. The states definitely do.

2743 The people now that are most familiar with it in talking  
2744 to the commissioners privately and in looking at their public  
2745 comments--the BRAC commissioners have some real problems with  
2746 this. Congress, as you can tell, has some problems with it.

2747 In order for us to go forward with continuity for the  
2748 future, then again, you know, we have to have everybody on  
2749 board or it just does not work.

2750           The other thing that I have got concerns about is, you  
2751 know, being on International Relations, being on these other  
2752 things, is the world is different now than I think it was a  
2753 year ago, and some of the things that are happening abroad,  
2754 some of the people that are arming and things like that  
2755 definitely play a case.

2756           So again, that is the problem I have got, is, like I  
2757 say, we are setting the infrastructure and then trying to  
2758 drive some policy out of it, and that is not a good  
2759 situation. It is not a very workable situation. Does  
2760 anybody want to comment at all, or--

2761           Lieutenant General WOOD. Well, sir, I mean,  
2762 respectfully, I want to push back just a little bit on this.  
2763 I mean, BRAC is an infrastructure issue. And it gets back to  
2764 Mr. Kline and what you alluded to. For the committee, since  
2765 October I have briefed every TAG on three different occasions  
2766 exactly the process we are going to use in regards to the  
2767 merging missions.

2768           There was nothing that we kept a secret of the process  
2769 that we wanted to do. In fact, we gathered their inputs on  
2770 new missions. So this idea that we are keeping a secret and  
2771 units are just waiting on us to do something is wrong. Their  
2772 TAGs, their senior leadership, are involved in this process.

2773           Because of the timing of the BRAC and some of the other  
2774 things, we are now focused on it, giving it every effort.

2775 | Previous to that, we could not. We went with test cases that  
2776 | we worked with the committee to outline so that we could  
2777 | start the emerging mission process.

2778 | But, sir, we have our heads in the game on this. We are  
2779 | working together. And we are going to work through this.

2780 | But on the FTF, the Future Total Force, defining this thing  
2781 | that Congressman Kline expressed frustration with, we are on  
2782 | track and all the TAGs and the states are involved.

2783 | Mr. BOOZMAN. Thank you.

2784 | Lieutenant General BLUM. Would you mind if I commented  
2785 | on that also?

2786 | Mr. LOBIONDO. Yes, without objection, go ahead.

2787 | Lieutenant General BLUM. Thank you.

2788 | General Wood, I believe, came on board over at Air Force  
2789 | X.P. October or November time frame, and the relationships  
2790 | that he has developed through the National Guard Bureau to  
2791 | the TAGs in orchestrating the GOSC, the General Officers  
2792 | Steering Committee, bringing the TAGs together, realigning  
2793 | his staff, the Air Guard Bureau has realigned their staff,  
2794 | worked together on Future Total Force--these are all, in our  
2795 | minds, very positive and appreciate steps forward.

2796 | So I would like to concur, we have got a big--we talk  
2797 | about the gap, and it is a big gap, but he has taken  
2798 | tremendous amount of action so far to at least get us rolling  
2799 | quickly down the road to help cover that gap in the future.

2800 A lot of work to do, but he has made tremendous strides  
2801 in bringing the team back together.

2802 Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, General.

2803 I will now go to Mr. Skelton for second round.

2804 Mr. SKELTON. Let me point out at the outset, if I may,  
2805 in the entire United States of America, you will not find  
2806 anyone more supportive of the United States Air Force,  
2807 National Guard, active duty, Reserves than the people on this  
2808 committee.

2809 And I hope you take what we say in our comments and  
2810 criticisms as constructive, because we do want to do what is  
2811 best for our country, for the defense thereof, under the law.

2812 First, I would like to make reference to a January 3  
2813 memorandum letter from Raymond Rees, major general of the  
2814 United States Army, acting chief National Guard Bureau,  
2815 wherein he requests, "I am requesting a permanent position on  
2816 the Infrastructure Steering Committee as the chief of the  
2817 National Guard Bureau regarding the BRAC process."

2818 He was answered on January 29 by the deputy  
2819 undersecretary, Raymond Dubois, which says, in part, "I  
2820 expect the composition of the Infrastructure Executive  
2821 Council would recommend against any change."

2822 I ask unanimous consent to put these two letters into  
2823 the record.

2824 Mr. LOBIONDO. Without objection.

2825 Mr. SKELTON. This hearing takes me back to my law  
2826 school days of yesteryear, and I had a professor, who, when  
2827 in doubt, would say, regarding statutory law or case law,  
2828 "read it, what does it say?"

2829 So following his recommendation, Title 10 USC 18238  
2830 reads, in section A: a unit of the Army National Guard of  
2831 the United States or the Air National Guard of the United  
2832 States may not be relocated or withdrawn under this chapter  
2833 without the consent of the governor of the state or, in the  
2834 case of the District of Columbia, the commanding general of  
2835 the National Guard of the District of Columbia.

2836 In addition thereto, 32 USC section 104(c) states: to  
2837 secure a force the units of which when combined will form  
2838 complete higher tactical units, the president may designate  
2839 the units of the National Guard, by branch of the Army or  
2840 organization of the Air Force, to be maintained in each state  
2841 and territory, Puerto Rico, and the District of Columbia.  
2842 However, no change in the branch, organization or allotment  
2843 of a unit located entirely within a state may be made without  
2844 the approval of the governor.

2845 My question is this, after reading those clearly drafted  
2846 sections of the United States Code, General Wood, was there  
2847 any recommendation or request to the adjutants, the lawyers,  
2848 of the United States Air Force as to whether those applied to  
2849 the BRAC process or not? If there was, was there an answer

2850 given in writing?

2851 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, I do not know the answer  
2852 to that. I would like to get that information for you, if I  
2853 can.

2854 Mr. SKELTON. I hate to be in a position of lecturing,  
2855 but doesn't that seem like a rather basic question, like in  
2856 doing this, are we not violating the law of the United  
2857 States?

2858 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, in response to that  
2859 question, I will tell you that we believe in the Department  
2860 of Defense that Mr. Wynne, as the head of our BRAC process,  
2861 testified on Monday that we believe we are full extent within  
2862 the law.

2863 Mr. SKELTON. Based upon written opinions of the Air  
2864 Force JAGs?

2865 Lieutenant General WOOD. No, sir, I think it was in the  
2866 entire Department of Defense.

2867 Mr. SKELTON. Is there a written opinion on this?

2868 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, I do not know that.

2869 Mr. SKELTON. Would you ask two questions and submit it  
2870 for the record, please? Number one, was any opinion drafted  
2871 by the Air Force lawyers that addresses these two statutes,  
2872 and any opinion written by any lawyer of counsel to the BRAC  
2873 Commission regarding these two statutes?

2874 Would you supply those to the record?

2875 Lieutenant General WOOD. Yes, sir.

2876 Mr. SKELTON. I would certainly appreciate it. Thank  
2877 you.

2878 It seems like we have three legs on the stool here. I  
2879 am not sure how many of you have ever milked a cow, but you  
2880 sit on a stool with three legs. One leg is the wants of the  
2881 Air Force. The second is the statutory law as described in  
2882 Title 32 and Title 10. And the third leg is consultation or  
2883 lack thereof of the governors and as the TAGs as testified by  
2884 the two gentlemen here today.

2885 And I think we see not only a legal problem but a  
2886 problem of goodwill. You see, the National Guard folks live  
2887 at home. They have neighbors. And people at home are very  
2888 supportive of the National Guard folks, our active duty, our  
2889 Reserve. And I am thrilled that they are in these very  
2890 troubling ties.

2891 But in attempting to do what the wants are of the Air  
2892 Force, I think you may be running the risk of denting that  
2893 goodwill, insofar as the Air National Guard is concerned.  
2894 And I would hope that this could be addressed correctly in  
2895 the days ahead in compliance with the law that I have quoted  
2896 a few moments ago.

2897 And I must tell you, I am deeply concerned about it. We  
2898 all want the finest force in America, and we all realize that  
2899 the Army and the Air National Guard are a significant part of

2900 that. And we just hate to see that damaged and any result  
2901 being dents to the goodwill that exists at this moment.  
2902 Thank you.

2903 Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, Mr. Skelton.

2904 General Wood, I would like to just follow up a little  
2905 bit on the line I was taking before with a couple more  
2906 questions. Can you tell the committee how many FA-22s are in  
2907 your calculus or formula as part of the Future Total Force  
2908 plan?

2909 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, right now it is--we are  
2910 limited to 170-plus aircraft as part of the budget decision  
2911 out of the Department of Defense and the president.

2912 What we are also, though--is the secretary of defense  
2913 has given us the opportunity through the Quadrennial Defense  
2914 Review to look at the total number of aircraft that we will  
2915 need to implement the strategy and ensure that we can do our  
2916 job in the defense of the nation.

2917 The Air Force's goal is 381 FA-22s.

2918 Mr. LOBIONDO. Is there a minimum number? There has got  
2919 to be a minimum number, but can you tell us what it is, of  
2920 FA-22s required to make the Future Total Force plan work?

2921 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, the 381 FA-22s gives  
2922 us--we believe that we have 10 air expeditionary force  
2923 groupings. These are bundles capability that we use for our  
2924 rotations overseas--forces. We would like to have one

2925 | squadron in each of those 10 units--in other words, 240  
2926 | combat aircraft.

2927 |         In order for us to put 240 combat aircraft, that is 24  
2928 | aircraft per squadron, 10 squadrons, and on top of that we  
2929 | would need the aircraft that we use for testing, use for  
2930 | training in our training pipeline to train air crews for it,  
2931 | and also for attrition reserve, and then that number is where  
2932 | we get the 381 aircraft.

2933 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. We talked about possible bumps in the  
2934 | road, and can you tell the committee what the Air Force is  
2935 | considering to do to meet requirements if that number of  
2936 | FA-22s is not procured or procured when we think they will  
2937 | be?

2938 |         Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, our plan in the force  
2939 | structure that we submitted to you took in account the  
2940 | present on record of the 170-plus FA-22s.

2941 |         So in other words, if we would get more FA-22s, because  
2942 | of the capabilities of the aircraft, not only in war fighting  
2943 | both air-to-air, air-to-ground and sensors from an ISR  
2944 | standpoint, that we could then, based on our calculation,  
2945 | reduce the numbers of other aircraft that we had of legacy  
2946 | aircraft.

2947 |         So because of the numbers that were limited to, we  
2948 | plussed-up the other legacy fighters complementary to that in  
2949 | order to get the same combat value as it would have been the

2950 more FA-22s.

2951 Mr. LOBIONDO. Thank you, General.

2952 I would like to make the request that if you could also  
2953 give us that answer on the record so that we would be able to  
2954 review it as well.

2955 Lieutenant General WOOD. Sir, I would be honored to.  
2956 And I would also offer to the committee that in a closed  
2957 session we would be able to go into further detail at  
2958 whatever level or information you needed.

2959 Mr. LOBIONDO. Maybe Chairman Hunter would entertain  
2960 that.

2961 The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, we are going to do  
2962 that.

2963 Mr. LOBIONDO. Chairman Hunter, you are recognized.

2964 The CHAIRMAN. Thank you.

2965 I want to thank Mr. LoBiondo for running this hearing so  
2966 efficiently.

2967 I want to apologize for having to step out. We have got  
2968 some IED work that we are doing. It is real relevant to the  
2969 war fighting theaters.

2970 And I want to thank Mr. LoBiondo for bringing this to my  
2971 attention when I was in New Jersey, this series of issues  
2972 that this hearing is all about.

2973 Gentlemen, I asked you a question at the beginning of  
2974 the hearing or posited this idea of it. If we go down to

2975 | this very small number of aircraft, F-22s and joint strike  
2976 | fighters, as the core of our force, are we going to have this  
2977 | robust, in-depth pool of war fighters, of these people, great  
2978 | pilots, who have projected American air power around the  
2979 | world for over a century now in very difficult crises?

2980 |         And it looks to me like this--you know, we have gone  
2981 | through this series of questions regarding enclaves, whether  
2982 | you can take planes away and retain the same connection with  
2983 | the community and the same enthusiasm for participation in  
2984 | the armed forces.

2985 |         And I am reminded about our friend--a story is told by  
2986 | our friend Duke Cunningham. When he got his 12th MiG over  
2987 | the skies of North Vietnam, he came back to the aircraft  
2988 | carrier--I think it was the Kitty Hawk--and as he was getting  
2989 | out of his cockpit and starting to take his gear off, one of  
2990 | the guys working the catapult operation came up and got up on  
2991 | the wing and said, "We got our MiG today."

2992 |         Of course, this is a Navy story, so it is probably  
2993 | heavily embellished, but everybody on that carrier felt that  
2994 | they were part of the team that had gotten that 12th MiG.

2995 |         And my point is that to a large degree I think it is  
2996 | very--my observation of the Air Force is very similar.  
2997 | Everybody feels like they are part of a team. And the  
2998 | culmination of that teamwork is aircraft that get into the  
2999 | air, go out, do a mission and return.

3000 |       And the idea of being able to operate enclaves without  
3001 | aircraft, taking away that focal point for the mission, and  
3002 | operate them as effectively and with as much public  
3003 | participation and appreciation as we have had in the past in  
3004 | our communities that have these great bases--I think that is  
3005 | a very problematic issue.

3006 |       And so I want you to--if you focus on that chart that we  
3007 | put up to start this thing off, where you have got just a  
3008 | little handful of aircraft, what is your opinion on putting  
3009 | together a force, continuing production of, say, F-15E,  
3010 | highly capable aircraft, not just for the Guard and Reserve  
3011 | but also for active forces, so that we have got much better  
3012 | in-depth coverage and much deeper air power?

3013 |       In 1991 I think we had 24 fighter air wings. Today we  
3014 | are down to 13. That is active. So the entire force has  
3015 | been shrunk.

3016 |       And I think all of you would concur that this new plan  
3017 | that you have discussed today involves one thing that stands  
3018 | out starkly, and that is a lot fewer pilots, a vastly smaller  
3019 | number of people who are capable in times of crisis of  
3020 | getting into a cockpit and projecting American air power,  
3021 | whether it is Korea or other spots in Asia, or over the  
3022 | Taiwan Straits, or any of a number of other problem areas.

3023 |       So what do you think? Do we need to have a bridge  
3024 | production of F-15 aircraft, and do not you think we need to

3025 | have a larger pool of operators to attend that equipment?

3026 | What do you think?

3027 |       General Wood, maybe you would like to answer, and we can  
3028 | go right down the line, if we could.

3029 |       Lieutenant General WOOD. Thank you, sir. I mean, all  
3030 | of us that wear the blue uniform share your concerns with  
3031 | this, and we are watching this as we go forward very closely.

3032 |       Sir, I would tell you what we would do first is look at the  
3033 | Quadrennial Defense Review and look at 381 FA-22s there,  
3034 | because we have that line open.

3035 |       And the airplane that comes off the assembly line today  
3036 | is--and if we get the numbers that we want--is an airplane  
3037 | that is very affordable compared to buying old legacy  
3038 | aircraft--to buying not old but new legacy aircraft and the  
3039 | capabilities of them, because of the numbers we would get.

3040 |       But if we can not get more FA-22s, and we have  
3041 | significant slips in the F-35 program, we are going to have  
3042 | to continue to look at bridging that, and it is very viable  
3043 | to look into other aircraft.

3044 |       But, sir, I would tell you that we are working very hard  
3045 | in the Quadrennial Defense Review to make the case that the  
3046 | nation needs 381 FA-22s and to keep that line going.

3047 |       The CHAIRMAN. Okay.

3048 |       General Blum, any thoughts on that?

3049 |       Lieutenant General BLUM. Sir, the Air Force has got to

3050 | decide what capabilities it has got to deliver for the Army,  
3051 | and the Air Force, the Navy and the nation, and then find out  
3052 | the systems that can best do it, and then apply that against  
3053 | how much resources this nation is willing to invest in that.

3054 |         And I think then it will lead us to the proper answer.  
3055 | Frankly, I am not prepared to tell you that on the spot  
3056 | today.

3057 |         I am concerned about any system that puts too heavy a  
3058 | reliance in one particular system with a limited number of  
3059 | those capabilities, because if for some reason they do not  
3060 | pan out to be as good as we would like to think they were, I  
3061 | would like to have some redundancy or options, which gives  
3062 | some legitimacy to what you are proposing.

3063 |         The CHAIRMAN. Well, and I think you have got to be  
3064 | concerned about attrition. I think we need to have air power  
3065 | that has endurance, that can handle a long period of  
3066 | attrition, with pilots and machines that are in reserve and  
3067 | are capable of going.

3068 |         And we are going down to a very, very small number of  
3069 | aircraft that almost presupposes total survivability on what  
3070 | could become very difficult and dangerous combat  
3071 | environments.

3072 |         Lieutenant General BLUM. And, sir, frankly, the same  
3073 | resources are going to have to be applied against the new  
3074 | emerging missions as well, and one of those new emerging

3075 | missions that excites me quite a bit, because it is near and  
3076 | dear to a guy that works on the ground more than in the air,  
3077 | is the intratheater airlift aircraft that the Army and the  
3078 | Air Force are currently looking at.

3079 |       To me, that is very exciting joint capability that ought  
3080 | to be--that would be a great emerging mission for the Air and  
3081 | Army National Guard of the future. So I am very concerned  
3082 | that whatever we do in terms of programmatic and budgeting,  
3083 | we adequately address that emerging mission and then really  
3084 | program the resources in an adequate manner so we have that  
3085 | capability.

3086 |       That capability will be highly needed not only around  
3087 | the world as we move into other expeditionary areas, but here  
3088 | at home as well.

3089 |       The CHAIRMAN. And one other thing, too. And,  
3090 | gentlemen, I want you all answer that question, if you can,  
3091 | before we go.

3092 |       But Mr. Cooper mentioned one thing that I thought was  
3093 | important, too, on this, and that is that you need to have  
3094 | combat capable people.

3095 |       And the Guard represents lots of folks who have flown in  
3096 | combat, as I understand it, and in operations, and who,  
3097 | because of their love of flying, remain competent and remain  
3098 | available and stay in the system.

3099 |       I think we are going to have some very challenging

3100 environments with missile systems and lots of other stuff  
3101 that is going to put enormous stress on our pilots. And  
3102 having some old hands available, some guys that have been  
3103 under fire before and some guys who have handled aircraft in  
3104 very difficult situations, is going to be important in these  
3105 new situations.

3106 If they are gone because we ran out of horses, and we  
3107 did not have platforms for them to keep working, we are  
3108 losing a lot more than a one for one. We are losing people  
3109 who have got that steadiness and that judgment and that  
3110 combat capability that only comes from experience.

3111 I would rather have people flying F-15Es or F-16s and  
3112 still be in the force than to have those people gone because  
3113 there was not a shiny new F-22 for those guys to drive.

3114 Lieutenant General WOOD. Mr. Chairman, it is really  
3115 difficult because I share your opinion in a way, but in  
3116 another way I have looked at the bottom line, and the bottom  
3117 line has to do with capability. And when you look at  
3118 capability, there is no other weapon system that does what  
3119 the FA-22 does.

3120 The CHAIRMAN. Well, I think we all agree with that.

3121 Lieutenant General WOOD. But when you look at bringing  
3122 on new legacy aircraft, you are spending very precious  
3123 resources for something that does not have that stealth.

3124 The CHAIRMAN. Yes, but here is what I am thinking of,

3125 | General, and that is this. I think we may have to spend  
3126 | extra money. And one problem is if we get this into a  
3127 | tradeoff where we do not bring on--we divest ourselves of  
3128 | this enormous talent, of these people who can fly aircraft to  
3129 | protect our nation, we divest ourselves of that capability on  
3130 | the basis of we could not afford enough F-22s for everybody,  
3131 | then we will be shooting ourselves in the foot.

3132 |         And so I would rather spend extra money to have those  
3133 | bridge aircraft that we are talking about. But you guys are  
3134 | going to have to be slamming the table pretty hard to make  
3135 | that case, because we start out with a budgetary strained  
3136 | equation. You are going to come down to that very tiny mark  
3137 | that is at the right end of that poster, where we have almost  
3138 | no aircraft to go around, and we can not afford that.

3139 |         Lieutenant General JAMES. I am one of those old  
3140 | warriors you talk about who has been there in combat. So is  
3141 | John Bradley, who fortunately is still flying airplanes. And  
3142 | there is nothing more precious than to have someone who can  
3143 | lead you, who has been there and done that.

3144 |         And if you are looking in terms of a bridge and spending  
3145 | what you called more resources to make sure we do not delink  
3146 | ourselves from something we may need in the future, I  
3147 | understand where you are going.

3148 |         Lieutenant General BRADLEY. Chairman Hunter, excuse me,  
3149 | sir. You make excellent points. I would agree with General

3150 | Wood. We need the capabilities of the F-22s. F-15s and  
3151 | F-16s are fabulous airplanes, and we can bring new ones off  
3152 | the production line today, and they are very, very capable.  
3153 | But there are also some very capable threats, surface-to-air  
3154 | missile systems--

3155 |         The CHAIRMAN. I am aware, but, General, once again, I  
3156 | am not talking about cutting a single F-22.

3157 |         Lieutenant General BRADLEY. Yes, sir.

3158 |         The CHAIRMAN. I am talking about spending extra money  
3159 | so we have got some depth in this great pool of manpower.  
3160 | There is not going to be enough F-22s to handle all of the  
3161 | great pilots that this country can field and can keep in  
3162 | reserve. And we have got to have some depth.

3163 |         Lieutenant General BRADLEY. Yes, sir. I understand.

3164 |         The CHAIRMAN. General Lempke, any thoughts on that?

3165 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Chairman, I do apologize. We are  
3166 | under 8 minutes.

3167 |         The CHAIRMAN. You know, gentlemen, thank you.

3168 |         And, Mr. Chairman, thank you for running this hearing  
3169 | and doing such a great job. We will keep talking.

3170 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. Mr. Cooper, you have been waiting very  
3171 | patiently. I do not know what we do, unless you want to give  
3172 | a very quick one and then it can be answered for the record.  
3173 | And we apologize that it is interrupted.

3174 |         Mr. COOPER. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I

3175 appreciate that.

3176 In response to the chairman's line of questions, 58  
3177 percent of the folks at the 118th Air Guard unit in Nashville  
3178 will not be able to continue with the Guard if the planes are  
3179 moved.

3180 My main point is this. I have always supported BRAC. I  
3181 have been against any delay or tampering with it. But I  
3182 would always assumed that BRAC would be done in a competent  
3183 fashion and without ill intent. And unfortunately, I am  
3184 getting worried about both assumptions right now.

3185 First, on the competence, if the legal memo done by the  
3186 BRAC's own attorney is at all correct, the whole BRAC process  
3187 could be foundering due to legal incompetence. That would be  
3188 a tragedy. I do not want to see our military guilty of  
3189 incompetence.

3190 But I am also worried--our ranking member, Mr. Skelton,  
3191 pointed out what I think is the smoking gun on the  
3192 consultation issue, how in 2003 people begged to be included  
3193 and they were turned down.

3194 There is another memo I would like to insert for the  
3195 record, this one by T.F. Hall that was written to the  
3196 undersecretary of defense for personnel and readiness.

3197 Mr. Hall states--and this is a letter dated the 4th of  
3198 December 2002--"My personal experience and participation in  
3199 BRAC 1991, 1993 and 1995 convinces me that if the Reserve and

3200 | Guard are not properly connected and participating in the  
3201 | process from the beginning, the process will be less than  
3202 | optimal."

3203 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. I want to deeply apologize. We are now  
3204 | under 5 minutes, Mr. Cooper.

3205 |         Mr. COOPER. Thank you.

3206 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. You know, we have got five votes. I  
3207 | apologize.

3208 |         Mr. COOPER. I appreciate it. Thank you.

3209 |         Mr. LOBIONDO. Maybe they could give you a response for  
3210 | the record.

3211 |         Gentlemen, I thank you very much.

3212 |         And the committee hearing is adjourned.

3213 |         [Whereupon, at 1:02 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]

\*\*\*\*\*  
 SPEAKER LISTING  
 \*\*\*\*\*

AKIN.	104	105	107	108	109	110	
BLUM.	24	48	49	54	55	56	63
	77	83	88	91	102	104	116
	120	130	131				
BOOZMAN.	117	120					
BRADLEY.	30	57	58	100	134	135	
CHAIRMAN.	2	11	14	23	28	29	33
	43	48	49	53	56	60	61
	65	69	70	127	130	131	132
	133	135					
COOPER.	65	66	68	135	137		
GIBBONS.	78	80	81	83			
HEFLEY.	50	51	52				
JAMES.	29	134					
KLINE.	113	114	117				
LEMPKE.	34	49	77	111	112		
LOBIONDO.	74	78	83	86	88	94	95
	98	103	104	110	113	117	120
	121	125	126	127	135	137	
MARSHALL.	74	76	77	78			
MCHUGH.	70						
MEEHAN.	110	112	113				

SCHWARZ.	71						
SHUSTER.	88	91	92	94			
SKELTON.	8	48	49	92	93	94	121
	122	123	124				
SNYDER.	53	55	56	57	58		
TAYLOR.	98	101	103	104			
TURNER.	95	98					
WELDON.	60	61	63				
WHITNEY.	44	49	94	105			
WOOD.	14	50	52	57	59	66	67
	76	77	79	81	84	86	92
	93	99	106	108	109	110	114
	119	123	124	125	126	127	130
	133						

\*\*\*\*\*  
 CONTENTS  
 \*\*\*\*\*

STATEMENTS OF LIEUTENANT GENERAL STEPHEN WOOD, USAF, DEPUTY  
 CHIEF OF STAFF FOR PLANS AND PROGRAMS; LIEUTENANT GENERAL H.  
 STEVEN BLUM, USA, CHIEF, NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU; LIEUTENANT  
 GENERAL DANIEL JAMES III, USAF, DIRECTOR, AIR NATIONAL GUARD;  
 LIEUTENANT GENERAL JOHN A. BRADLEY, USAF, CHIEF OF AIR FORCE  
 RESERVE; MAJOR GENERAL ROGER P. LEMPKE, USAF, THE ADJUTANT  
 GENERAL OF NEBRASKA; AND MAJOR GENERAL MASON C. WHITNEY,  
 USAF, THE ADJUTANT GENERAL OF COLORADO

STATEMENT OF STEPHEN WOOD	PAGE	14
STATEMENT OF STEVEN BLUM	PAGE	24
STATEMENT OF DANIEL JAMES	PAGE	29
STATEMENT OF JOHN BRADLEY	PAGE	30
STATEMENT OF ROGER LEMPKE	PAGE	34
STATEMENT OF MASON WHITNEY	PAGE	44

\*\*\*\*\*

INDEX OF INSERTS

\*\*\*\*\*

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 7

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 22

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 27

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 32

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 42

\*\*\*\*\* INSERT \*\*\*\*\*

PAGE 47

