

[H.A.S.C. No. 115-23]

HEARING
ON
NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT
FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018
AND
OVERSIGHT OF PREVIOUSLY AUTHORIZED
PROGRAMS
BEFORE THE
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
ONE HUNDRED FIFTEENTH CONGRESS
FIRST SESSION
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS HEARING
ON
**THE CURRENT STATE OF THE
U.S. AIR FORCE**

HEARING HELD
MARCH 22, 2017



U.S. GOVERNMENT PUBLISHING OFFICE

25-089

WASHINGTON : 2018

SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

JOE WILSON, South Carolina, *Chairman*

ROB BISHOP, Utah	MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, Guam
AUSTIN SCOTT, Georgia	JOE COURTNEY, Connecticut
STEVE RUSSELL, Oklahoma	TULSI GABBARD, Hawaii
MIKE ROGERS, Alabama	CAROL SHEA-PORTER, New Hampshire
VICKY HARTZLER, Missouri	A. DONALD McEACHIN, Virginia
ELISE M. STEFANIK, New York	SALUD O. CARBAJAL, California
MARTHA MCSALLY, Arizona, <i>Vice Chair</i>	ANTHONY G. BROWN, Maryland
SCOTT DESJARLAIS, Tennessee	STEPHANIE N. MURPHY, Florida
TRENT KELLY, Mississippi	RO KHANNA, California
MIKE GALLAGHER, Wisconsin	

MARGARET DEAN, *Professional Staff Member*

BRIAN GARRETT, *Professional Staff Member*

JODI BRIGNOLA, *Clerk*

CONTENTS

	Page
STATEMENTS PRESENTED BY MEMBERS OF CONGRESS	
Bordallo, Hon. Madeleine Z., a Delegate from Guam, Ranking Member, Subcommittee on Readiness	2
Wilson, Hon. Joe, a Representative from South Carolina, Chairman, Subcommittee on Readiness	1
WITNESSES	
Miller, Lt Gen Maryanne, USAF, Chief of Air Force Reserve, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force	4
Rice, Lt Gen L. Scott, USAF, Director, Air National Guard, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force	3
West, Maj Gen Scott D., USAF, Director of Current Operations, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force	5
APPENDIX	
PREPARED STATEMENTS:	
Rice, Lt Gen L. Scott, joint with Lt Gen Maryanne Miller and Maj Gen Scott D. West	27
DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD:	
[There were no Documents submitted.]	
WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING THE HEARING:	
Mr. Scott	52
Mr. Wilson	51
QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MEMBERS POST HEARING:	
[There were no Questions submitted post hearing.]	

THE CURRENT STATE OF THE U.S. AIR FORCE

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS,
Washington, DC, Wednesday, March 22, 2017.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to call, at 2:13 p.m., in room 2118, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Joe Wilson (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

OPENING STATEMENT OF HON. JOE WILSON, A REPRESENTATIVE FROM SOUTH CAROLINA, CHAIRMAN, SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

Mr. WILSON. Ladies and gentlemen, I call this hearing of the Readiness Subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee to order.

I am pleased to welcome everyone here today for an unclassified session on the current state of the U.S. Air Force. The purpose of this hearing is to clarify the information we have heard repeatedly over the past several weeks and months. We have received briefings and hearings from leading national security experts, testimony from all of the service vice chiefs, the Department of Defense's quarterly readiness report to Congress, and the Government Accountability Office assessment of the military's readiness recovery.

We have also recently heard from both the U.S. Army and the U.S. Navy on those services' current state of readiness. Each briefing and hearing further confirms that our services are indeed in a readiness crisis.

I reiterate my belief that the first responsibility of the Federal Government is to provide for the security of its nations, to accomplish for citizens what they cannot do by themselves.

Therefore, it is our responsibility as members of the subcommittee to continue to better understand the readiness situation of the U.S. Air Force, to understand where we continue to take risks and to understand the plan to recover readiness ability.

I would like to welcome the distinguished panel of senior leaders of the U.S. Air Force, the U.S. Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve present today. This afternoon, we are honored to have with us Lieutenant General L. Scott Rice, U.S. Air Force, Director, Air National Guard; Lieutenant General Maryanne Miller, U.S. Air Force, Chief of Air Force Reserve, and Commander, Air Force Reserve Command; and Major General Scott D. West, U.S. Air Force, Director of Current Operations and Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Headquarters, U.S. Air Force.

I thank each of you for testifying today and look forward to your thoughts and insights as you highlight the current state of the U.S. Air Force.

I now turn to our ranking member, Delegate, Congresswoman Madeleine Bordallo of Guam, for any remarks she may have.

STATEMENT OF HON. MADELEINE Z. BORDALLO, A DELEGATE FROM GUAM, RANKING MEMBER, SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. And thank you to the witnesses for being here this afternoon.

General Rice, I would also like to thank you again for your January visit to the territory of Guam.

And welcome to General Miller and General West.

We have had airmen from all squadrons deployed over the past year. And as you know, our men and women of the Guam Air National Guard are keeping busy, and I know they appreciate your support. And of course, there is significant investment and activity at Andersen Air Force Base, which will require continued attention as the most strategic American base in the Pacific region.

I would also like to note my appreciation that each component of the Air Force is represented today, given that we had to reschedule the Reserve Component discussion last year.

While some challenges, such as critical skills shortages, affect each component, they do so differently. So it is essential that we receive perspectives from each of you to fully understand the Air Force's state of readiness.

This is the third in a series of hearings we have held in this subcommittee on the state of the military departments. However, the Air Force is unique in that the demand for its units has increased in recent years while the service has shrunk.

While we will certainly discuss pilot shortages, I am also interested to learn about where recruiting and retention challenges are facing other critical specialties.

The new administration has proposed a significant increase in military spending, the majority of which is, theoretically, to help build back readiness in the short term. However, it is not clear that the Department of Defense has a coherent view to do so in the long term. And I will be interested to hear about the Air Force's plan to meet both its near- and long-term readiness and what methods are in place to guide your progress.

I am concerned that without careful attention, existing challenges could be compounded, as we are likely to continue to sustain high operational tempos.

So again, ladies and gentlemen, I look forward to our discussion here today. And I, again, thank you to our witnesses for being here and for your service to our great country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you, Congresswoman Bordallo, for your extraordinary service.

We will now have opening statements beginning with General Rice and proceed. And we look forward to your testimony today.

**STATEMENT OF LT GEN L. SCOTT RICE, USAF, DIRECTOR, AIR
NATIONAL GUARD, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE**

General RICE. Thank you, sir. Chairman Wilson and Ranking Member Bordallo and the distinguished members of the committee, thank you for inviting me here today to join the Active Component and the Air Force Reserve in the discussion about the United States Air Force readiness.

First, I would like to express my sincere appreciation to the men and women of the Air National Guard for their hard work, professionalism, and dedication to serving this great Nation. Day in and day out, we have 105,700 uniformed Guard airmen as well as civilians serving with great distinction and patriotism as they help defend the homeland and support America's national security interests around the world.

I also want to thank you for your support of the Air National Guard and its important mission.

Today, the Air National Guard, as an operational Reserve, continues to be exceptionally capable and effective in its global warfare, warfight, and domestic roles. The complexities and uncertainties of the strategic environment underscore the importance of ensuring that the Air National Guard is resourced to respond successfully to the Nation's growing reliance on its capabilities.

We ask a lot of our people and it is my job to ensure our airmen have the resources and training to do the jobs we ask them. Readiness is my first priority, followed second by 21st century Guard airmen, with modernization and recapitalization third.

Our lines of effort in these areas will enable the successful accomplishment of the National Guard's core mission sets of fighting America's wars, protecting and defending the homeland, and building domestic and global partnerships.

Readiness is more than an isolated priority within the Air National Guard. Improved readiness implicitly includes advancement in my two other priorities. The Air National Guard is undertaking two lines of effort to improve readiness.

First, we are working to increase end strength and effective manning. As you know, end strength alone does not tell an accurate story about readiness. A better indicator of readiness is effective manning or measuring the amount of fully qualified Guard airmen who occupy positions within their career field.

I need your support for a wide variety of recruiting and retention initiatives in order to ensure I have the right airmen in the right positions. I would also ask for your support to take advantage of opportunities to recruit new members into the Air National Guard, including those separating from the Active Component.

My second line of effort to improve readiness is maximizing training opportunities and the funding to support it. Right now, the total force faces a training shortfall in many critical areas. There simply is not enough initial training slots to meet demand. Numerous unit conversions, churn, endured by the Air National Guard over the past 15 years have increased the demand for training, which decreases the value of experience.

We also need continuation training, the training in which our fully qualified Guard airmen must engage to remain current. Two ways to increase readiness to meet the continuation training de-

mands are funding both a second-shift maintenance in order to make additional aircraft available and authorizing and funding the additional full and drill status positions.

This committee's interest, knowledge, support, and time is vital to increasing the readiness of the Air National Guard. Together, we must ensure the men and women of the Air National Guard have the support they need as they balance responsibilities at home, civilian careers, patriotic domestic service, and their responsibility that this commitment is to our national security. We must ensure they are prepared for the tasks we expect them to perform.

Thank you for inviting me here today, and I look forward to your questions.

[The joint prepared statement of General Rice, General Miller, and General West can be found in the Appendix on page 27.]

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, General Rice.

General Miller.

**STATEMENT OF LT GEN MARYANNE MILLER, USAF, CHIEF OF
AIR FORCE RESERVE, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE**

General MILLER. Chairman Wilson, Congresswoman Bordallo, and members of the subcommittee, I thank you very much for the opportunity to address you on the readiness of the Air Force Reserve.

For 69 years, this Nation has called on the Air Force Reserve to support national security objectives and all types of military operations all over the globe. Today, the Air Force Reserve balances the operational agility needed for today's fight while simultaneously providing the strategic depth needed to respond to the unexpected and emerging threats of our Nation.

Combatant commanders benefit from the capabilities and experiences our Reserve citizen airmen bring to the joint fight. On any given day, there are approximately 6,000 Air Force Reservists on Active Duty orders operating in air, space, and cyber domains, supporting overseas contingency efforts and operations around the globe.

Ready airmen ensure the capability of a unit to accomplish its designed mission to meet the demands of the National Military Strategy when called upon. Over the past few years, shrinking defense budgets and lack of fiscal stability have stressed our readiness levels, threatening our ability to reach and sustain full readiness. Congress' efforts to assist with our budget shortfalls have helped, but permanent relief from the BCA [Budget Control Act] caps is crucial to a steady and enduring full readiness recovery.

As I measure the state of readiness within the Air Force Reserve, I assess across the spectrum of people, equipment, training, and the demands of the operational tempo. As you know, our people are our greatest asset to ensuring global vigilance, global reach, and global power.

In order to support emerging mission requirements of the Air Force while continuing to support enduring combat missions, I need a slight growth in manpower over the next few years.

With respect to our personnel readiness challenges, I am focused on three main areas, the first being the pilot shortage, the second,

the shortfalls in full-time support, and finally, critical skills manning.

The readiness and modernization of our aircraft and equipment are essential to maintaining an agile, combat-capable, and interoperative Air Force. The Air Force Reserve leverages the National Guard and Reserve equipment appropriation to increase capability and ensure interoperability within the joint fight. This account is particularly important in this fiscally constrained environment, and I want to thank you all for your tremendous support of that account.

Training is our number one job when not engaged in the fight. To maximize our training successes, we need predictable, reliable funding and training allocations in order to match our resources to our Reservists' availability.

Over the last 26 years of being engaged across the globe in exercises, contingencies, and operations, we have successfully adjusted to an operational Reserve. Portions of our force are stressed, but our airmen are resilient, engaged, and honored to serve.

Thank you for your tremendous support of the Air Force Reserve and for the opportunity to discuss our readiness. I look forward to your questions.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, General Miller.

We now proceed to General West.

STATEMENT OF MAJ GEN SCOTT D. WEST, USAF, DIRECTOR OF CURRENT OPERATIONS, DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR OPERATIONS, HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE

General WEST. Chairman Wilson, Ranking Member Bordallo, distinguished members of the Subcommittee on Readiness, thank you for conducting this hearing and allowing me to join the leadership of the Air National Guard and Air Reserve Command in testimony on readiness.

For the past 69 years, the Air Force has been breaking barriers as a member of the finest joint warfighting team on the planet. We have protected the homeland, provided two legs of the Nation's nuclear triad, and provided unmatched air, space, and cyber dominance. Our joint partners and allies rely on us. We ensure freedom from attack, the ability to attack at a time and place of our choosing, and the ability to operate freely in peace and in combat. In no modern war, no other nation has achieved such an asymmetric advantage.

We describe what we provide to the Nation as global vigilance, global reach, and global power. By global vigilance, airmen have built a real-time global intelligence and command and control network that can find, fix, and finish the smallest of targets, to include individuals who wish to do us harm.

Airmen operate multiple satellite constellations which range from GPS [Global Positioning Satellite] and space situational awareness, to nuclear warning and protected satellite communications. Cyber operators build, secure, operate, and defend our networks and are ready to take offensive actions in, from, and through cyberspace.

Via global reach, airmen rapidly range the earth to respond to a crisis or deliver critical supplies or personnel to any location on

the planet. Airmen are engaged 24/7 with an aircraft taking off every 2.8 minutes somewhere around the globe.

Airmen are in 23 countries at 77 locations operating a global system of airfields that enable operations of allies and joint partners. It is the strength and reliability of our mobility forces that make the U.S. military a global force.

Via global power, airmen can strike an enemy on short notice anywhere in the world with fighters, bombers, remotely piloted aircraft, and ICBMs [intercontinental ballistic missiles]. Air Force special operators conduct counterterrorism operations daily while our nuclear force provides the foundation for deterrence.

Airmen provide two legs of the triad and are responsible for resourcing 75 percent of the nuclear command and control and communications network that connects the President to the triad.

In sum, your airmen fight from just about anywhere at any time. More than 100,000 airmen stand watch around the globe in deployed locations, from Korea to the Arabian Peninsula.

In the United States 27,000 airmen are engaged in operations against ISIS [Islamic State of Iraq and Syria], from flying bomber sorties to conducting surveillance missions from the homeland.

However, the Air Force is as small as it has ever been. Many envision our Air Force is as large as the one that helped win Operation Desert Storm in 1991. That is not reality. At the start of 2016, our numbers stood at 311,000 Active Duty, down from more than 500,000 during Desert Storm, a 38 percent decrease.

For 26 years, the Air Force has conducted continuous combat operations, resulting in a growing toll on airmen, their readiness, and their equipment. That 1991 force, which featured 134 fighter squadrons across the Active, Guard, and Reserve, has gradually declined to a total of 55 operational fighter squadrons today. We have become more reliant on our civilians for critical mission support. Though we will increase the force to about 321 [thousand] in 2017, that size will be too small for the myriad tasks that America's airmen perform around the world every day.

Over this same time period, the Air Force has also reduced its aircraft inventory from 8,600 to 5,500. And today, the average aircraft is 27 years old.

The Nation faces today a resurgent Russia, a rising China powered by new warfighting approaches and modern weapons. We keep a watchful eye on North Korea, Iran, and other hot spots around the globe. Accordingly, current budget levels and Budget Control Act restrictions will force the Air Force to continue to make trade-offs between force structure, readiness, and modernization, all while potential adversaries close the technological gap in critical warfighting areas.

Our Nation needs to increase its investment in the Air Force's force structure, readiness, and modernization. With the focus of today's hearing being readiness, I note that investments in all three result in readiness improvements. For example, modernization investments today underpin the readiness of our future.

Nonetheless, to begin to improve readiness now and attain manning levels that match requirements, the Air Force must increase its Active Duty, Guard, and Reserve end strength to include growing the Active Duty end strength to 350,000 over the long term. As-

sessing and retaining more airmen is the first step to improve our readiness.

Today we need congressional support for an FY17 [fiscal year 2017] appropriation and amendment that accelerates our readiness recovery. Repeal of the Budget Control Act and predictable future funding are critical to rebuilding military readiness, a priority of our Secretary of Defense.

The Bipartisan Budget Act was extremely helpful. And on behalf of the airmen who serve our Nation, thank you for your support. I look forward to your questions.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you to each of you. And we will now begin with 5-minute sections for each person.

And Margaret Dean will maintain our time.

Even before we begin, I want to thank each of you in a different way. The Air National Guard is so special and the district that I represent with the McEntire Joint Air Base. I grew up in Charleston, and I know how important the Reserves are there.

And then, General, when you mentioned 1991, it brought back extraordinary memories of a State Senate colleague, Phil Leventis, who was a pilot in 1991, the victory there in the Persian Gulf War.

So each one of you really have made such a difference for our country. Thank you very much.

General Rice, I understand the Air Force is looking to retire the F-15C/D fleet as a cost-saving measure and try to fill the air superiority role with F-16s. Clearly, these are two different types of aircraft with different capabilities. What would replacing the F-15C/D fleet with F-16s, would this have a negative impact on air superiority? Is there a risk with this decision?

General RICE. There is a risk in changing any of our force structure decisions. But specifically on the F-16 with the F-15, there are capabilities we can add and provide on the F-16 that will provide us a gap as we try to go into the future. So overall, our readiness and then our protection of the U.S. will change. But I think overall, we will be okay.

Mr. WILSON. And so this could be addressed?

General RICE. Yes, it could be addressed.

Mr. WILSON. And, General West, provided in today's hearing memo is a copy of the Air Force's aircraft availability numbers. These reflect how many aircraft are fully mission capable and available to be flown. All but one aircraft type model failed to meet that requirement in the last quarter. In fact, I understand that just this morning two B-1 aircraft were scheduled to respond to a clear and present danger in North Korea, yet only one aircraft was able to be successfully launched.

For too long, the dictatorship in North Korea has become emboldened, testing weapons and missiles, but also testing and expanding their ballistic missile capability. And I have introduced bipartisan House Resolution 92 to address the issue of sanctions on North Korea.

Can you please explain to us the impact of nearly every type of Air Force aircraft failing to achieve the aircraft availability targets? Does this have impact on our strategic response?

General WEST. Yes, sir, it does. It has impacts on our ability to recover readiness. As I said in my prepared statement that the av-

erage age of our fleets is 27 years old; it ranges from the oldest which is JSTARS [Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System], down to our newest acquisition which is F-35s that have just joined the fleet.

Given that the age of the aircraft and parts obsolescence and the fact that older aircraft tend to fail in newer ways, it is more difficult to make them available for training, which affects our readiness. Coupled with our shortage of maintainers to be able to generate sorties to improve our readiness and enable us to train for full-spectrum operations, it exacerbates the issue with sustaining older fleets with less-than-required manning in order to achieve the readiness levels that we need to.

As to continuous bomber presence in Guam, we have done that for years, we will continue to do that in Guam. And it is important that we do that not only for dissuasive reasons in the Pacific, but also to assure allies. We conduct exercises and training events with allies and partners in Guam on a routine basis. We will continue to do that with appropriate funding.

So it is important that we be able to generate the sorties when we want to to have the effect that we want to have on the day and the time of our choosing. And it is more difficult to be able to rely upon that when the systems we operate can't be generated in a timely manner.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you for responding.

And, General Miller, during the past few years, the Air Force has espoused the idea of an integrated total force as a model for integration of Active Duty, Reserve, and National Guard. A key example is the use of classic and active associations between the Active Duty and Guard, Reserve Components. What impact do these associations have on Air Force readiness? What are the benefits of these associations and should they be expanded in the future?

General MILLER. Sir, we have been associating since 1968. And associations are critical to our readiness in order to be able to get the mission done every day. We are the smallest Air Force that we have ever been and it takes each one of our components at this table to get the mission done. Integration is key.

On the classic association side, we have been doing it, as I said, since 1968. On the active association side, Active Component members join us in the Guard and Reserve as we own the aircraft on the ramp and they participate.

This is critical to the absorption on the fighter side of our force to absorb pilots and to experience them so they can then go back out and do staff jobs and do other things that work towards them becoming our future leaders of the Air Force. So associations are critical to our future. And we are committed to them at the Air Force Reserve level and through each component.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you each for your response and your service.

We now proceed to Ranking Member Bordallo.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

General Rice and General Miller, to what extent are you experiencing pilot and other critical skill shortages? We know that bonus and incentive programs alone are not a cure-all as quality-of-life

concerns persist. So where are you finding success in addressing these issues? And how can we in Congress assist you?

And we will begin with General Rice.

General RICE. We are definitely feeling the similar types of pilot shortages that the Active Component is experiencing. For example, we have over our whole fleet of pilots we are probably approximately 800 to 900 pilots short.

And we are working on our different statuses, from our Active, Guard, and Reserve members that are pilots, to our technicians that are pilots, both of those are full-time personnel, to our drill-status guardsmen and our part-time pilots. And each one of them have different metrics and different reasons on why we have shortages. And our most critical one is our technicians. And a piece of that is, is the way that that model is constructed.

So what we are attempting to do as we go into the future budgets is convert some of this program to an AGR [Active Guard/Reserve]-type program, and that will help us because that is one of our strongest accounts.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you.

General Miller.

General MILLER. We are currently 300 pilots short across the Air Force Reserve. Our part-time numbers, our percentage of part-time pilots is around 92 percent. It is the full-time piece that we are struggling with right now. We are roughly 66 percent manned on the full-time side. And that is due to overall the pull from the airlines, and the second part of that is being able to compete in the salary range of the technician force.

So where could we use your assistance? In relocation, retention, and bonuses. We are providing bonuses, but we could really use your help on special salary rate and recruiting, retention, and relocation bonuses.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you. Thank you, General.

General MILLER. Thank you.

Ms. BORDALLO. I have a question for General West. As force structure declines and weapon systems and aircraft experience different issues and challenges, is the way we measure readiness a single, static Air Force goal for a percentage of C-1 and C-2 units? Is its simplest form, is that helpful, or do we need to revisit to ensure we are speaking most accurately when talking about readiness levels?

General WEST. We measure readiness, ma'am, in two different ways, and they are both related to—well, one way is readiness for what? And we measure that through the Defense Readiness and Reporting System where commanders get to subjectively assess their capacity to meet their mission statement. That covers the what part.

And our concern about the what part is not that we don't have capacity and won't continue to have capacity to support operations related to counterterrorism. We can continue to do that as airmen. The issue we have is our readiness to conduct combat against a near-peer adversary or the systems that they export. That is a much tougher issue on the readiness for what, and that is what we mean by full-spectrum readiness. That is the what.

The other thing that we measure is ready with what. And the with what gets to metrics of, do you have the right personnel? Are they trained to the right skill level? Do they have the right equipment? And are they properly resourced, the status of resource, and training system that we have had in existence in the Department of Defense?

I think the combination of the two of them are important to take together, an objective, whether or not you agree with the percentages or not, because all the services have the same percentages on the ready with what, and then a subjective commander's assessment, do I think my unit is prepared to support its mission statement. And those two together inform how we measure readiness.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you. I don't have much time left, so if you can be brief in your answers, I would like to really ask each of you, we have heard you speak of the five key areas needed for readiness. In other words, which is your biggest concern, your number one priority?

General Rice.

General RICE. If there is one thing I could do, it would be put more maintenance on the flight line, so part-time and full-time.

Ms. BORDALLO. General Miller.

General MILLER. Manpower, part-time, full-time.

Ms. BORDALLO. And General West.

General WEST. Manpower, ma'am.

Ms. BORDALLO. Thank you. And, Mr. Chairman, I still have 22 seconds, but I am yielding back.

Mr. WILSON. Excellent questions. Again, we can count on the ranking member. Thank you very much.

We now proceed to Congressman Austin Scott of Georgia.

Mr. SCOTT. General West and General Rice, in the joint testimony you mentioned the C2ISR [command and control, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance] platform and specifically the E-8C JSTARS aircraft.

And, General West, could you explain how or why it is so important to the joint and combatant commanders' needs?

And then, General Rice, could you give us some input on how we or the Air Force program office could accelerate the acquisition process? And what do you think the process should look like?

General WEST. JSTARS has and will continue to have and provide an important capability to provide battle management command and control and provide an all-weather ground moving target indicator capability to be able to detect enemy movements on the ground. The demand for that from combatant commanders, I do not see that that will diminish.

General RICE. And from my point of view, as I see it, two parts to that question on the acquisition process and then how we would accelerate it. I am not really well-versed because I am not an acquisition person, so most of that I will take for the record and say how do we accelerate this. I will push that to the record and say we can get back to you on that.

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 52.]

General RICE. The other piece, though, on acquisition is I think the Air Force is in a good place right now. And moving forward,

we have made the decision to fundamentally support the mission requirements that General West just talked about. And now we are down to the process of requesting information, getting contractors to start building the packages to present a platform with a capability on it. And I think we are heading in a good direction. But how we accelerate, I will take that for the record.

Mr. SCOTT. Thank you.

General Miller, you have stated that you were focusing on critical skills manning. And what exactly does that mean? And what is the impact on your mission?

General MILLER. Critical skills are those career fields that do not have enough people to support them based on the demand. So the manning is low and the demand is high. So those are the critical skills that we target. So within the Air Force Reserve, those career fields are the pilots and it is across the fighter, mobility, RPA [remotely piloted aircraft], it is across all spectrums of that.

On the enlisted side, it is cyber, intel, and RPA sensor operators. So those are the key. I have a longer list, but those are the critical, those are the most critical of the critical. And we provide incentives for those folks to bring them in and keep them because, like I said, they are in high demand, but there are few of them.

Mr. SCOTT. In your opening statement, you referred to the emerging mission requirements. Growth in manpower over the next few years in those areas, emerging mission areas for the Air Force Reserves, what do you see the volume of that growth being and in what particular areas?

General MILLER. We would really, first of all, like to get our manning documents up to 100 percent to meet that wartime readiness requirement. That will help with our ops [operations] tempo.

The second growth area would be in the space arena, looking at future growth in the intel support of all space ops. And I am working with General Raymond on that.

In the cyber community, really it is a growth with the Active Component in mission defense teams, cyber mission forces and, of course, supporting the combatant commander joint environment in the cyber ops arena. So it is really the space and cyber that we are going to focus most of that on.

Mr. SCOTT. General West, in the joint testimony, again, you relay that installations are in excess of our operational needs, specifically in the continental U.S. In addition, during the state of the military hearing last month, General Wilson related there are 25 percent of excess in Air Force infrastructure. How is this calculated and what is included? Is it 25 percent of aircraft support facilities, such as runways, hangars, et cetera? Is it 25 percent of overall base infrastructure to include workspace facilities and housing? What installations specifically have excess? And if we did not have—if we weren't 900 pilots short and the aircraft short, would we have that excess capacity?

General WEST. Sir, if the Congress supported Air Force growth to 350,000, we would still have 24 percent excess infrastructure capacity. Today, we have a backlog of \$25 billion in either MILCON [military construction] or facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization. If we were to be able to apply \$1 billion per year,

it would just arrest the decline of what we have got to do to keep facilities up to proper standards.

That is a tradeoff of how much money we put into proposals for MILCON and facilities sustainment and restoration and modernization versus how much funds do we recommend to modernize, to new aircraft, B-21s, F-35s, KC-46s, versus how much funds do we propose to recapitalize existing fourth-generation systems versus how big is our end strength.

Our total obligation authority is limited, so we have to make tough choices. That is why in the comments I think that our vice [chief] made, we would recommend that another round of base realignment and closure be initiated by Congress.

Mr. SCOTT. Ma'am, gentlemen, thank you for your service. Mr. Chairman, I yield.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you very much, Congressman Scott.

We now proceed to Congressman Salud Carbajal of California.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman and Ranking Member.

And thank you to all the generals that are here presenting to us today.

I have the honor of representing Vandenberg Air Force Base, home to the 30th Space Wing, where the Joint Space Operations Center and Joint Functional Component Command for Space are located and where various launch operations take place.

In your joint testimony, all of you have stressed the importance of U.S. ability to effectively operate within the space domain. However, I have some concerns in terms of the lack of investments we are making in space, especially as space has to compete with other Air Force priorities, such as more aircraft.

There is a concern that the Air Force is not investing enough in the research and development area, and we are losing the talent pool that we need to maintain space superiority. I would like to hear from you on what steps the Air Force is taking to ensure Vandenberg Air Force Base—I am losing my sheets here—on what steps Vandenberg is taking to ensure that readiness in space, including sustaining a strong space industrial base.

General RICE. I will start with answering actually a very narrow piece of that. The Air National Guard supports space operations in a number of places, but our forte is that surge to war capability. As space evolves into a benign environment to a contested environment, the Air National Guard is very much a piece of that.

And so as we build capability and as General Miller talked about one of her priorities is space, that is among our first priorities as well, to provide combat-ready airmen to the enterprise and the agency to provide all these capabilities with space. Thank you.

General MILLER. Congressman, space is certainly a priority for me. As I spoke before, I sat with General Raymond, actually General Hyten before he left for STRATCOM [U.S. Strategic Command] and then General Raymond, and we talked about the future of space and the Reserve Component piece of that.

Currently, I have 1,500 space professionals and operators in that space environment. And we are looking to grow in the space mission forces along with General Raymond. And we are working specifically on areas to leverage our space capabilities. We do have civilians who work in the space industry and those folks are also, in

some cases, Reserve citizen airmen, so we are leveraging that experience.

It is a priority. I can't get out ahead of the growth, but I can certainly be a wingman for that growth.

General WEST. Sir, I would highlight two initiatives that the Air Force has underway, initiated by Air Force Space Command, General Hyten during his tour of command. One is development of the space mission force and the second is space enterprise vision.

The space mission force is changing the way we provide space airmen such that they concentrate more on conducting operations in a contested environment. It is demonstrated contested something along the order of 10 years ago, China launched an anti-satellite weapon on one of its own degrading satellites to demonstrate that the domain is contested.

So what space mission forces does is changes the training regimen that includes, how do we operate systems wherein we are contested? How do we develop the techniques, tactics, and procedures so that we continue to provide all the capabilities that we need across all the joint forces to conduct operations? We rely on space, and it is our asymmetric advantage.

The space enterprise vision is getting at, how do we field systems that cannot only continue to provide protected communications, space situational awareness, GPS position, navigation, and timing, et cetera, that all the 12 constellations provide, but how do we field those that are more resilient? And how do we build our capacity to know and have more space situational awareness?

Between the two, equipping the force and focusing our training on a contested environment, I think that is the proper way to go forward. And Vandenberg is a big part of it since it is one of only two places that we have to conduct launches and it gives us an opportunity to choose between the two based on the conditions for each launch.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Thank you very much. I yield back.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Congressman Carbajal.

We now proceed to Congresswoman Vicky Hartzler of Missouri.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all for your service. We appreciate you very much.

General West, I just want to follow up, the chairman was asking about the F-15s. And General Wilson, as you know, testified that only 50 percent of the combat air forces were prepared for a high-end fight, like might be encountered over South China Sea or Eastern Europe. And many of our air-to-air fighters were designed and built during the late 1970s and cannot face new threats, such as the Chinese J-20, without capability enhancements and service life extension.

So I was wondering if you could give us some insight into the Air Force's plan to bridge the capability gap between now and the next-generation air dominance program. And do you foresee the Air Force making significant investments into aircraft, such as the F-15C, with upgrades and service life extension programs? And if not, what are the alternatives?

General WEST. Thanks, ma'am. As General Rice had just mentioned briefly here, the choices that we have to make, given certain total obligation authority, it balances the choices that we have to

make. The F-15C has served the Nation well, as have its pilots for decades, and it was our air superiority fighter. Now F-22 has taken that role.

We do have capacity in the F-16C community to recapitalize it with an improved radar to serve the same function as the F-15 has done, and thereby reduce the different systems that we have to sustain and operate. And that makes it more efficient so that we can make other choices, either for modernization or grow end strength, without having multiple different systems to maintain.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Okay, great. And I wanted to follow up also on, both, General Rice, and you, General West, talked about the maintainer issue. And that is something that I have been very concerned about, too, is the shortfall there.

So, you know, one Fox News report said there was 4,000 aircraft maintainers short, short vital parts. So how have these shortfalls affected the Air Force's ability to generate the necessary forces to meet mission requirements? And do these shortages still exist? And if so, how does the Air Force plan to address them?

General RICE. Those shortages definitely exist. And fundamentally, what we are doing now is we have built a maintenance model to maintain our flying the aircraft. And as the aircraft age and get older, they require more maintenance and we haven't changed that model. And we have underfunded those to meet the Budget Control Act and sequestration limits.

So accordingly now, we are asked, do you need more money and where would you put it? I would put it in maintenance. And I would put it in maintenance in two ways. One is to fill out our documents as they are existing now, and then I would even add more authorizations on top of that and fill those out as well. And I am asking not only for the authority to increase that manning, but the funding to fund that and the authorization.

And also at the same time, I am asking for the authority and the authorization to increase our overall manning of the Air National Guard to grow from roughly 106,000 to 110,000. Most of that I will put into maintenance to flesh this out and add more maintenance, more hours on the jets to keep those jets flying at a higher rate.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Very good.

General West.

General WEST. Ma'am, we appreciate the support that Congress has given us to be able to address our maintenance shortfalls. Absent filling our manning documents for maintenance, it is difficult for us to generate the sorties on a fast-enough basis.

But as something that General Rice said earlier, it is not just having the maintainers, it is having them in the right position, but more importantly what we have got to be able to grow to is that mid-career, noncommissioned officer who has been in the service 8 to 10 years, has done a lot of troubleshooting, has seen a lot of issues and has experience to guide our newly accessed maintainers on how to solve problems as quickly as possible. That is why it takes so long to get where we are fully ready.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Sure. That is where I am a fan of the Reserves and the Guard, they help bring that component in.

General Miller, you want to add anything?

General MILLER. We are roughly 400 maintainers short. Our stress is—on the part-time side I am nearly 100 percent manned; it, again, is on the full-time side, that technician force. Because the draw there is I can't compete from a dollars perspective with the commercial or civilian industry on that.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Sure. And as a former teacher, and my husband and I own a farm equipment dealership, it is just very difficult to find people interested in being technical skills. You see that, having trouble with recruiting new people. If you had the funds to have more manning, are there enough people out there interested in going into, becoming maintainers?

General WEST. Yes, ma'am, I think there is because there is a sense of patriotism that still exists in our younger generation.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Good.

General WEST. And they want to join not only for patriotic reasons, but there is a lot of benefits that you can get, education and so forth, when you come into the military, the capability to go forward.

Mrs. HARTZLER. Absolutely, that is very encouraging. I am glad. Thank you.

My time is up, appreciate it.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you, Congresswoman Hartzler.

We now proceed to Congresswoman Tulsi Gabbard of Hawaii.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Aloha and welcome. Lieutenant General Rice, it is good to see you.

My question is about National Guard pay status. Obviously, the National Guard has a very unique role to play on many different levels and what has gone along with that is a wide variety of duty and pay statuses, whether it is a traditional drill-status guardsman, a dual-status technician, active guardsman as well as other various State and Federal statuses.

Can you speak to your view on whether or not this large number of different statuses impacts the overall readiness of the Guard? Should it be simplified? Would it help? And if so, how should that be done?

General RICE. I definitely think it adds complexity to our organizations. Not only does the pay status diverge among different statuses, there are whole different authorities that come with each one. Our dual-status technicians are under great stress. They don't carry the protections that an Active, Guard and Reserve and AGR member might have.

So accordingly, I would like to simplify the program. And indeed, I am starting down the path to say it seems that AGR status is a less costly status for us, where in the past it was more. So now that it is a less costly and it is more aligned with the duty status of a title 10 member that is on Active Duty, I am leaning and moving and driving our agency in that direction.

Ms. GABBARD. How do your TAGs [The Adjutant Generals] feel about this move?

General RICE. There are TAGs that sit on both sides of the fence because the Army is even a little bit different than the Air Force. So the Air Force, the TAGs lean towards yes, let us move to a more AGR force.

Ms. GABBARD. The Air Force TAGs?

General RICE. No, all TAGs in dealing with an Air Force program. And then all TAGs in dealing with an Army program need the split because there are still authorities differences and the benefits and value of authorities in both is of interest.

But for the Air Force program, for all TAGs, they are leaning towards an AGR program.

Ms. GABBARD. Okay. And so it is possible or likely perhaps that there would be a different, some changes made perhaps to the Air Force side, but not the Army side.

General RICE. Correct. And it is all about percentages where I am 25,000 technicians, 14,000 AGRs. I am moving towards flipping that so that I have more AGRs than I do technicians. It is going to save the government money overall and it is going to reduce my duty status and complexities.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you.

Lieutenant General Miller, you have, all of you have spoken about the manning shortages and the stress that that places on readiness and some of the challenges of recruiting. Given cyber, intel, and some of these other, pilots for that matter, areas where it is high demand and also high competition with the private sector, what are some of the tools that you folks are looking at in being able to recruit, given you are never going to be able to compete monetarily?

General MILLER. You know, we were talking about yesterday that recruiting is really not the issue. We can get them in the door. On the Active Component side, they are coming into the Air Force, they are coming into pilot training. On the Reserve side, I fill all my quotas with that.

It is retaining them. So it is a retention issue. Once we get them in and get them trained, then, you know, only 17 percent of the Active Component go to retirement. And in accessing 11Fs last year for the Air Force Reserve, and actually an average over the last 5 years, we have accessed on the 11F, which is the fighter pilot, around 23 percent of the pilots getting off of the Active Component.

Overall, 11Ms, which are the mobility pilots, we access roughly 33 percent of those, almost equivalent to the Guard actually. Our accessions are almost equal with them for folks coming off.

The accessions rate for pilots coming off the Active Component has decreased 6 percent over the last couple of years and the trend is down. So they are affiliating less with us and they are not getting to retirement, but they are leaving the Air Force early and then proceeding to the airlines.

So it is not getting them in the door, it is keeping them and getting them to affiliate.

Ms. GABBARD. I guess then the question is, is the same, then, you know, what are some approaches or do you conduct exit surveys to try to understand why folks are leaving? Is it purely financial? Is it, you know, the high OPTEMPO? Is it, you know, what are the things that are causing that to happen?

General MILLER. It is a balance between—it is a little bit of both. It is the OPTEMPO and some weapon systems. It is the draw of the airline because the airline has increased the pay over the last few years. And we just can't keep up with that, we can't match that.

General WEST. I think four areas that—I am going to be redundant just a little bit. But we focus on production, absorption, retention, and requirements between the four of them. We will put forward initiatives for your consideration that relate to our increased capacity for production across Active and Reserve Components, same thing with absorption across the components.

Thanks for the help with retention efforts for the bonus. But I think just as important with retention, it has to do with the capacity to train so that you have a sense that I am actually good at what I joined the Air Force to do.

And finally with requirements, we limit where we put—we focus on the line first to be able to execute combat operations, which means we don't man staff positions as heavily as we once were able to. And the staff suffers for not having rated experience.

Ms. GABBARD. Thank you.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Congresswoman Gabbard.

We now proceed to Congresswoman Martha McSally of Arizona.

Ms. MCSALLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you all for your testimony.

I had another line of questioning, maybe I will get to it in round two, but I feel like I have heard some breaking news here today, and I want to just make sure I understand. Has there been a decision or a proposal by the Air Force to get rid of the F-15C and to replace it with F-16s with new radar on it? This is the first I have heard. I didn't see that in any of the budget documents, so I am just trying to understand. It has been mentioned now twice. What exactly are we talking about here?

General WEST. I don't know if that is formal, but I know we are discussing ways to maximize the use of what limited total obligation authority that we have. And to minimize the number of systems that we operate and the sustainment for that, but still be able to accomplish the mission is what we are always trying to do to be able to address a myriad of things with the limited total obligation authority.

So has it been official, is it official? I don't think so. But I want to be forthcoming.

Ms. MCSALLY. Is it predecisional?

General WEST. Predecisional would be a good way to word that, ma'am.

Ms. MCSALLY. Predecisional Active Duty. What about in the Guard?

General RICE. Yes, predecisional because we are actively a part of planning choices.

Ms. MCSALLY. Right.

General RICE. And right now it is planning. We haven't made the choices yet. So planning choices started for 2019 last fall. We got and received this information. There are about four or five different things. One of the options is retiring the F-15Cs and then replacing them with F-16s with upgraded AESA [active electronically scanned array] radars. Can we do that? Is that a plan and time-wise? Is it the capability we want? Those are still in planning choices and we are talking about those.

Ms. MCSALLY. And let me just say I know sequestration has, you know, put all the services in a very, very difficult situation in the

choices that you have all laid out. I totally get that. But as we are working through this process, I think the other subcommittee I am on, Tactical Air and Land, we would like to be a part of this discussion with you for sure.

As you know, and I don't want to get into pilot rivalries here, but if we are talking about fourth-generation, you know, assets, you have got the F-15C which is, you know, prior to the F-22, the best at air-to-air; or had the A-10, best at close air support, rescue; F-15E if you want to do air interdiction. And the F-16 is an incredible, versatile, multi-role, a little bit less expensive, sort of, decathlete, right? Sort of fills in those gaps.

So I think, you know, comparing the capabilities side by side, we all need to be careful through that analysis. That an F-16 with an upgraded radar does not meet the same capabilities as an F-15. But I realize the funding challenges that you have as you go through this decision process, but it doesn't bring the same capability that the F-15C does with the expertise in air-to-air.

General RICE. That is correct. But I think we are getting beyond that. And as we get into the digital age and we get to these systems of systems, those systems and how they integrate is as important and in the future will be even more important than the platform itself. And so we are trying to balance that as well. How does one specific system with its optimized capability fit into a system of systems? And those are the kind of things that, you know, does a bunch of F-16s equal one F-15 or numbers? And how does it integrate to the whole spectrum?

Ms. MCSALLY. Exactly. And I would just add—

General RICE. It is part of planning choices.

Ms. MCSALLY. You know, we have had long discussions about the A-10 decision. But in hindsight, a lot of factors of how many of these does it take to replace this many A-10s on station and how many more tankers is that and how many more squadrons is that based on the weapons load?

So just, you know, after the fact those were some considerations that weren't really, you know, GAO [Government Accountability Office] validated, weren't really looked into. So as you are going forward and looking at this, please, you know, learn those lessons.

And I think there is also a readiness issue if we are talking about units that are shifting from F-15C to F-16. You now have a bunch of pilots who are qualified and capable and want airplanes and we are already in a readiness crisis. And if you are not retraining everybody to another aircraft, that does have, in the midst of a crisis, a bit of a short-term dip in readiness as well just as far as the capabilities and qualifications of those that are flying. Is that fair? Are you looking into that as a factor as well?

General WEST. We do. And we manage how often and how quickly because when you are doing a change from one major weapon system to another, you are going to be off the line for a while.

However, I would also, given the fact that our technology advantage that we enjoy today is lessening, it is important that we also achieve modernization as rapidly as possible. So we are going to have to take some units off the line to achieve the transition. But I think sooner is better, given that the investments that are being made by China and Russia particularly are pretty significant.

Ms. MCSALLY. Yes, I am with you on that point for sure. But with us being down to 55 fighter squadrons, we have just got to be careful on how that, manage, transition would happen should this decision come to fruition.

Do you have any idea of the timeline? Is this, like, a fiscal year 2019 issue? Or where are you in the decision-making process on this? I just want to make sure we are asking the right questions.

General RICE. I would say it is coming into 2019 for planning choices. I don't think we will get there, though, in this cycle. I think it is probably next year it will come more to a head.

Ms. MCSALLY. Okay. Thank you. I have a lot more questions for a second round, so I yield back now.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Congresswoman McSally.

We now proceed to Congressman Joe Courtney, of Connecticut.

Mr. COURTNEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be quick because I know the vote is happening right now on the floor.

Again, thank you to all the witnesses for your testimony which I read, but I just kind of had to jump in from other stuff going on here.

I just wanted to really quickly touch on the C-130 program which, again, Seapower and Readiness negotiated over the last couple of years with the NDAA [National Defense Authorization Act] and then with the budget the AMP 1 and 2 modernization, moving it up. I was just wondering if you could just sort of in public talk about, again, the Air Force's commitment to moving forward on that and how it is doing.

General RICE. The Air Force is very committed to modernizing the C-130H. In fact, AMP 1 has been fully funded and we believe the timeline on what the technology that is coming to the table and what we are hearing from the contract will be ahead of schedule and we will meet the deadlines by 2020.

AMP 2 is not fully funded, but it is definitely fully committed to. That is outside the FYDP [Future Years Defense Program], most of that, so we have definitely laid in the right kind of money now during this fiscal budget and that program is well on track. I believe that will also come in early and under cost as well. So that is also in good shape.

Mr. COURTNEY. Great. Ahead of schedule, under budget, those are—

General RICE. Under budget, that is the word I was looking for, yes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Yes, that is right, those are good messages.

So with that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back.

Mr. WILSON. Thank you, Congressman Courtney.

We now proceed to Congressman Rob Bishop, of Utah.

Mr. BISHOP. All right. I will get this in so we can both ask these questions in here today.

Look, everything we ask is parochial. Obviously, I have Hill Air Force Base which has F-16s and F-35s and the Utah Test and Training Range which I consider, you know, a world-class national asset. If you don't, tough. It still is a national asset.

However, with the new F-35s, advanced, modernized, electronic warfare threats, I am making the assumption that our test and training range need to be updated as well, even though we are sim-

ply suffering from the effects of years of maintenance backlog as well as deferred upgrades as time goes on. So I am assuming that is a given that we need to do that.

Can you just tell me how the overall issue of test and training ranges modernization fits into the Air Force's future budget? How significant, where does it fit, where are you going with it? And you have got to do it in 30 seconds or less.

General WEST. Yes, sir. I think you will see something in our budget submissions to address our operational and test and training infrastructure that addresses not only what we have on the ranges, but also what we can do via simulation and virtual systems as well.

Mr. BISHOP. That would be helpful. And the recent Red Flag, I think the 34th Squadron did a 15-to-1 kill ratio down there. Obviously, what is the need for adversary air for training purposes? And what is the Air Force's long-term strategy to provide that kind of training?

General WEST. Largely contractual in the short term. Longer term, we will look to, after we get our operational forces filled with manning and longer term I think we will look at making that blue suit again. But in the short term—

Mr. BISHOP. Manpower comes first.

General WEST. Manpower for—blue suiters for operational, and then training support will be contracted.

Mr. BISHOP. Thank you, I appreciate that. Trent, you have got 3 minutes. Go for it.

Mr. KELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you.

I represent Columbus Air Force Base in Mississippi. And I know some of you have probably trained there or most people go through there at some point in time.

My primary concern, I am also a serving National Guardsman. And I am a traditional guy. I am one of those non-AGR, non-technician guys that I think are the heart and soul of our entire Reserve Component. We have to have all three of those things; the right mix is important.

But I am concerned about a program now that transfers equipment, specifically airplanes, from one unit to another, specifically from National Guard or Reserve units to Active Component units based on usage in which the same people are determining what type of usage that they have are also making the decision of which assignments and how often you get to use those aircraft.

Are you all familiar with what I am talking about, General West? Because that really concerns me that the same person would decide we are going to transfer airplanes based on usage requirements, but we are going to also control who gets to use what and which contracts people get and which ones goes to civilian and those kind of things. Are you all aware of that?

General RICE. Yes, sir, I am definitely aware of that. And the fleet management program has a good side and a bad side. And some of the devil is in the details that could come out on the bad side if you move older aircrafts all to one unit through this fleet management program. That could be a bad side.

But the good side of what fleet management does is, if you think about older aircrafts have to retire when they get to a certain end

of their life and certain hours on the airframe, and if that happens sooner in some units because their OPSTEMPO is higher and they start falling off and retiring, and yet we have others that have 20, 30, 40, 50 years left in their life, we will have too much of a dispersion in the fleet.

So we do need to narrow down the time in the fleet from something, like, some of our fleets, for example the C-17 fleet, as we manage that C-17 right now has a 50- to 60-year timeframe when the first plane hits its end of life to the last plane. And we can't have our units that are out orphaned at the 50-year point with just a few aircraft.

So we need to squish that time down to, like, 20 years and move some of the older ones around, mix them in with the newer ones and do that and make sure we do no harm with the capability of the aircraft and the unit itself.

Mr. KELLY. Just a final comment, Mr. Chairman.

I just think it is very important that we not wind up with all the old-model equipment in the Guard and Reserve and all the other stuff wind up somewhere else. I think it is important that we look and smell alike across the board, that our Active, Reserve, and National Guard all look the same with the same types of equipment and that we don't go back to being a strategic Reserve as opposed to an operational Reserve.

And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

General RICE. I couldn't agree more, sir.

Mr. WILSON. And thank you, Congressman Kelly.

Thank each of you for being here today. We are actually voting right this second.

Before we leave, I do have a question for the record. How does a full-year CR [continuing resolution] impact readiness to the Air Force? How does it impact service members? And how does it impact families?

[The information referred to can be found in the Appendix on page 51.]

Mr. WILSON. Additionally, Congresswoman McSally has additional questions that she will be providing for the record.

And at this time I want to thank Ms. Dean again for her service here.

And again, thank each of you for being here and your service for our country.

We are adjourned.

[Whereupon, at 3:17 p.m., the subcommittee was adjourned.]

A P P E N D I X

MARCH 22, 2017

PREPARED STATEMENTS SUBMITTED FOR THE RECORD

MARCH 22, 2017

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE
PRESENTATION TO THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON READINESS
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

SUBJECT: TOTAL FORCE READINESS

STATEMENT OF: LIEUTENANT GENERAL SCOTT RICE
DIRECTOR AIR NATIONAL GUARD
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE

AND

LIEUTENANT GENERAL MARYANNE MILLER
CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE

AND

MAJOR GENERAL SCOTT WEST
DIRECTOR OF CURRENT OPERATIONS,
DEPUTY CHIEF OF STAFF FOR OPERATIONS
HEADQUARTERS, U.S. AIR FORCE

March 22, 2017

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

INTRODUCTION

Since our establishment 70 years ago, the United States Air Force has secured peace throughout the full spectrum of hostilities with a decisive warfighting advantage in, through, and from air, space, and cyberspace. Without pause, we deliver global combat power by deterring and defeating our nation's enemies, while supporting joint and coalition forces at the beginning, middle, and end of every operation. Though the intrinsic nature of warfare remains unchanged, the character of war—and the approach joint forces must take to address new and changing threats—must continually evolve.

As the nation plans to counter the national security challenges posed by Russia, China, Iran, North Korea, and Violent Extremist Organizations, controlling and exploiting air, space, and cyberspace remains foundational to joint and coalition success. Today's 660,000 active duty, guard, reserve, and civilian Airmen meet these challenges by deterring threats to the U.S., assuring our allies, and defeating our adversaries 24/7/365. We provide unwavering homeland defense and operate a robust, reliable, flexible, and survivable nuclear enterprise, as the bedrock of our national security.

This steadfast watch, however, comes at a price. Conducting continuous, worldwide combat operations since 1991 has taken a toll on our Airmen, equipment, and infrastructure and the overall readiness of our Air Force. While the Bipartisan Budget Act (BBA) of 2015 provided some space to improve readiness and continue modernization efforts, your Air Force needs ongoing Congressional support to ensure we continue to strengthen America's military to win today's fight, while building the Air Force our nation needs to meet tomorrow's challenges.

ALWAYS THERE

Your Air Force has been globally engaged for the last 26 years in combat operations. We relentlessly provide **Global Vigilance**, **Global Reach**, and **Global Power** for the nation...we're always in demand...and we're always there...in every domain. Though our end strength has decreased by 38% since 1991, we have experienced significant growth across several mission areas.

Our Airmen provide joint forces with **Global Vigilance** using real-time multi-domain platforms and sensors integrated across our global intelligence and command and control networks to find, fix, and finish a range of hostile targets simultaneously around the world. Without fail, the Total Force flies 60 combat lines of persistent attack remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) per day...the unblinking eye supporting combatant commanders around the globe. Through our Intelligence, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) capabilities, we provided warfighters over 6,000 intelligence products per day used to identify enemy targets and trigger 70% of Special Operations Forces assaults on terrorists.

In securing our networks and digital infrastructure, 2016 saw Air Force cyber operators block more than 1.3 billion attempted malicious connections – an average of more than 40 per second. Meanwhile, our space operators provide relentless and reliable interconnectedness, global positional awareness, global missile warning, and battlefield situational awareness for our joint forces.

Nearly every three minutes a mobility aircraft departs on a mission, providing **Global Reach** and access, projecting power through a network of airfields in 23 countries and 77 locations, while providing critical aerial refueling capability. In 2016, our aeromedical professionals evacuated over 5,700 patients and provided emergency medical care resulting in a

98% survival rate. Your Air Force provides unrelenting ability to maneuver, sustain, and recover personnel and assets...at home, abroad, and with our allies and partners.

With our fighters, bombers, RPAs, and Intercontinental Ballistic Missiles (ICBMs), the Air Force provides conventional and nuclear **Global Power** that can strike an enemy on short notice anywhere in the world. In Iraq and Syria, the Air Force led 65% of the more than 17,000 coalition airstrikes since 2014. We delivered decisive firepower supporting joint, special operations, and coalition ground forces to defeat and degrade ISIS in order to regain critical territory. All the while, our Airmen continue to provide two legs of the nuclear triad, resource 75% of the Nuclear Command, Control, and Communications framework, deter our adversaries, and connect the President to strategic options.

Stitched together, the fabric of our Air Force weaves multi-domain effects and provides the strongest blanket of protection and ability to project America's full range of combat capabilities. Make no mistake, your Air Force is always there.

READINESS IN A CHANGING WORLD

However, being "always there" comes at a cost to our Airmen, equipment, and infrastructure; we are now at a tipping point. Sustained global commitments combined with continuous fiscal turmoil continue to have a lasting impact on readiness, capacity, and capability for a full-spectrum fight against a near-peer adversary. In 2013, sequestration abruptly delayed modernization and reduced both readiness and the size of the Total Force.

We entered FY14 expecting a corresponding decrease in both operations and overall funding. Instead, FY14 began with increased operations, a government shutdown and fiscal planning focused on a second year of sequestration. Compounding the fiscal austerity, 2014 presented enormous geopolitical challenges to the U.S. including ongoing operations in Iraq and

Afghanistan, the rapid rise of ISIS, Russia's annexing of Crimea, and Chinese island-building in the South China Seas. The combination of decreased funding and increased military operations required the Air Force to make tradeoffs that adversely affected readiness. In FY16 and FY17 budgets, we made necessary adjustments to balance near-term readiness with future modernization. However, due to continuous combat operations, reduced manpower, an aging fleet, and inconsistent funding our readiness suffered.

Instead of rebuilding readiness for near-peer conflicts, your Air Force is globally engaged in operations against lesser-equipped, but still highly lethal enemies. This requires Airmen to serve at home and abroad to underpin joint force success, but at the expense of full-spectrum readiness.

Your Air Force needs permanent relief from the BCA caps, predictable funding, and sufficient end strength to recover full-spectrum readiness. We will continue to innovate, transform, and improve how we maximize our resources. However, we can't do this by ourselves, we still need your help in providing stable, predictable funding giving us the ability to provide a predictable path to modernizing our capabilities at the pace required to fight and win against any threat.

STATE OF AIR FORCE READINESS

We are America's first and most agile responder to crisis and conflict, underwriting every joint operation.

To meet the full requirements of our Defense Strategic Guidance and current operation plans, we require 80 percent of our combat squadrons to be full-spectrum ready. We define full-spectrum readiness as the right number of Airmen, properly led, trained and equipped, to

accomplish our Air Force mission in support of joint forces in both contested and uncontested environments.

We measure full-spectrum readiness through our five levers of readiness: critical skills availability, weapons system sustainment, training resource availability, flying hour program, and operational tempo. The following sections highlight key areas where Congressional support is needed in order to balance our five levers of readiness.

PEOPLE

Airmen are our greatest resource and our Air Force needs sufficient end strength to meet national security requirements. Manpower shortfalls in key areas remain the number one issue limiting readiness and is our top priority. At the start of 2016, our end strength stood at 311,000 active duty Airmen, down from more than 500,000 during Desert Storm—a 38 percent decrease. We appreciate your support to build the force up to about 321,000 in 2017, yet we will remain stretched to meet national security requirements.

We are currently working with the Secretary of Defense to develop the FY18 Presidential Budget to address manning shortfalls in key areas. We must increase our Active Duty, Guard and Reserve manning levels in key skill areas to meet the emerging mission requirements while continuing to support enduring combat operations. Our Total Force model (incorporating our active duty, guard, reserve, civilians, and our contracted capabilities), not only recognizes the value of an integrated team, but helps guarantee capabilities for today and tomorrow's fight. We are developing plans to address shortfalls in a number of key areas, including critical career fields such as aircraft maintenance, pilots, NC3, ISR, cyber, and battlefield Airmen.

As we drew down active duty manpower in recent years, we have relied more heavily on our civilian Airmen. Our civilians make up 26% of our Total Force—of which, 94% are in the

field, providing vital mission support through weapons system maintenance, sustainment, engineering, logistics, security, intelligence, and medical functions. Currently, our civilian workforce has over 8,000 vacancies. At the historical attrition rate, vacancies in the civilian workforce may grow to almost 13,000 over the next four months.

In the aircraft maintenance field, the active component is short approximately 3,400, the Air National Guard is short 1,600 and the Air Force Reserve is short 1,500 full-time aircraft maintainers. Because of this shortage, we cannot generate all of the training sorties needed for our aircrews. The same pool of maintainers keeping our existing aircraft flying at home and in combat, must simultaneously support fielding new platforms. Due to an ongoing shortage of active and reserve component aircraft maintainers, we will continue to fund contractors to fill the gap at select non-combat A-10, F-16, and C-130 units. This allows us to strike a balance between meeting today's demand while modernizing for the future.

We also face a pilot shortage crisis across all disciplines, most acutely in the fighter community. The Air Force has the world's finest pilots who enable an incomparable duality of global mobility and combat lethality. As airlines continue hiring at aggressive rates, they draw away experienced pilots from both active and the reserve components. Without a healthy pool of pilots, we will lack the ability to provide airpower to the nation.

Pilots are strategic national assets and the pilot crisis extends beyond the Air Force and military. To address this national challenge, the "Air Force -Airline Collaboration", formally known as the National Pilot Sourcing Forum has increased efforts to effectively utilize and train an adequate number of pilots to meet our nation's pilot demand signal.

However, Air Force pilot retention has declined for five straight years. We ended FY16 at 723 *fighter* pilots below requirement and 1,555 *total* pilots short across all mission areas.

Similarly the Air National Guard is 887 pilots short and the Air Force Reserve is 445 pilots short. Pilot training and retention are priorities across the Total Force. The increased end-strength provided in the FY17 NDAA will allow us to increase the training pipeline and better fill our under-manned units, which is vital to our recovery. We are grateful for your support to increase the pilot bonus, and we will continue to ensure our retention programs are appropriately sized and utilized.

NUCLEAR DETERRENCE OPERATIONS

We require additional resources to invest in our nuclear capabilities and infrastructure that are the bedrock of our national security. While our nuclear forces remain safe, secure, and effective, we require significant investment to ensure robust, reliable, flexible, and survivable nuclear readiness and deterrence well into the future.

On average, our B-52 bombers are 55 years old and our nuclear facilities are now over 50 years old, with many facility systems operating well past their 20-year designed life span. Currently, all of our weapons storage areas are operating with waivers and deviations from our high standards. Although these storage areas are uncompromised—they remain safe and secure—we must recapitalize this infrastructure to address the recommendations identified in our Nuclear Enterprise Reviews for facility and weapons sustainment.

Meanwhile, we must continue to invest in modernization of our air- and ground-based nuclear weapons delivery platforms. The B-2 and B-52 require upgrades and we must ensure one of our main acquisitions priorities, the B-21 bomber, proceeds on schedule. In addition, our ICBMs, which provide the US with a stabilizing and responsive strategic deterrent capability, are being maintained and operated well beyond their planned operational life-cycles and face significant sustainment challenges. The Ground-based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD)

recapitalization program, which will replace the ICBM fleet, must proceed as planned in order to ensure the ground leg of the nuclear triad remains credible and effective in the decades ahead. Our nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3) system ensures the authorized employment and termination of nuclear weapon operations under all threats and scenarios. Accordingly, NC3 must be modernized to support accompanying nuclear capabilities.

Finally, we must modernize our nuclear weapons stockpile, by continuing to support the B-61 nuclear bomb life extension program, while investing in the development of the Long-Range Standoff weapon as a survivable air-launched cruise missile providing credible standoff attack options and holding heavily defended targets at risk. Though we are grateful for modest relief of spending limitations that allow us to address a scrutinized priority list of nuclear modernization efforts, we will still need to invest in foundational nuclear capabilities and infrastructure.

SPACE

Underwriting every joint operation across the globe is our ability to operate within the space domain at the time and place of our choosing. But our freedom of action in, through and from space can no longer be taken for granted. Our potential adversaries have had a front row seat to the many successes achieved by our space integration into joint warfighting and, unfortunately, they are rapidly developing capabilities to deny us space superiority. In the not too distant future, our potential adversaries will have the capability to hold all of our military space capabilities at risk.

Space is a warfighting domain. The paradigm for space operations has shifted from a force enabler/enhancer to an integrated warfighting capability. As the Nation's lead service for space, we require your support to build more resilient and agile Air Force space systems. This

means supporting investment requests for capabilities to defend our space assets, while maintaining a cycle of continuous upgrades in each generation of spacecraft to ensure systems are fully ready when called upon by the joint warfighter and can continue to operate in an increasingly contested environment.

Maintaining assured access to space remains one of our top priorities. We are working to mature and advance our Launch Service Agreement strategy to develop affordable, sustainable launch capabilities that will eliminate dependence on foreign rocket propulsion systems.

We are also developing Space Situational Awareness and Battle Management Command and Control (BMC2) capabilities, which underpin our efforts to integrate space into full spectrum joint operations. Investments in space situational awareness capabilities, such as Space Fence, ground-based radar and optical systems and on-orbit surveillance capabilities, like the Geosynchronous Space Situational Awareness Program (GSSAP) [our geosynchronous orbit “neighborhood watch”], enables critical battlespace awareness in space and the unprecedented ability to characterize the space operational environment.

Similarly, investments in the Joint Interagency Coalition Space Operations Center (JICSpOC) and the Joint Space Operation Center (JSpOC) Mission System (JMS) provide the decision superiority and data we need to deter attack, and, if necessary, defend our capabilities and freedom to operate in space. Lastly, space systems provide mission-critical services and capabilities to support our joint forces in theater and around the globe, every day. Continuing to modernize and replenish our missile warning, nuclear command and control, satellite communication and Global Positioning System constellations ensures we will have resilient, mission-assured capability to support daily joint operations.

Finally, we need to continue integrating our organizations and capabilities across both the DoD and the Intelligence Community, while improving training for our space force and cultivating an enduring cadre of space operators and acquirers. We must normalize and operationalize the space domain by maturing our tactics, techniques and procedures and “train like we fight,” in space, just as we would in any other domain to ensure we are fully prepared to deal with today’s adversaries and emerging technology.

CYBERSPACE

Cyberspace capabilities are essential to joint operations. The Air Force remains committed to providing 39 fully operational Cyber Mission teams by the end of FY18. Our cyber teams are conducting defensive cyber operations in support of combatant commanders daily, therefore we must commit to a robust and resilient cyber enterprise.

Today, the Air Force cyber enterprise lacks sufficient numbers of trained cyber forces to meet the ever-increasing demands. Additionally, the increasing frequency of malicious cyber activity targeting our cyber infrastructure and weapon systems, from state and non-state actors, continues to tax the limited personnel and tools to effectively defend critical assets and preserve freedom of movement in cyberspace where actions happen at the speed of light. Adequate and consistent resourcing over time will enable us to obtain and maintain cyber superiority in this highly dynamic environment.

We need to continue modernizing and developing offensive and defensive cyberspace tools and measures to harden current infrastructures while integrating cyber security into every new capability to counter cyberspace adversaries. This will ensure Air Force and joint force mission assurance—command and control, weapon system cyberspace defense, information dominance, and integrating offensive cyberspace effects into multi-domain operations.

COMBAT AIR FORCES

Our average age of Air Force aircraft is 27 years old. If aircraft required license plates, 54% of our platforms would qualify for antique designation in the state of Virginia. The ability to fly, fight, and win with aging aircraft is made possible by remarkable Airmen in an all-volunteer force. Modernization can no longer be delayed...it is the capability and capacity for a high-end fight. Today's modernization is tomorrow's readiness.

To continue to provide unrelenting air superiority and global precision strike, we cannot accept a less than ready force. We have an ever-growing demand signal, our Air Force requires sufficient combat air forces capacity to keep pace. In addition to our other recapitalization efforts, we must also continue to procure the F-35 to counter rapidly advancing near-peer threats.

To ensure our Airmen are ready to face any emerging or future threat, we need to provide our Airmen with advanced threat testing, training, and associated technology. Our forces must have access to realistic test and training ranges and investment in computer-aided live, virtual, and constructive (LVC) infrastructure. LVC capability provides opportunities to test and train against the world's most capable threats, reduces costs, and supports full-spectrum readiness. Finally, we must have sufficient munitions to counter current threats, while developing advanced munitions to counter future threats.

INTELLIGENCE, SURVEILLANCE, AND RECONNAISSANCE (ISR)

The Air Force ISR enterprise is often the first in the fight and the last to leave...providing continuous coverage of global threats and targets...from the earliest surveillance of the battlespace, to long after weapon impact. However, Combatant Commander's demand for continuous ISR presence is insatiable and ever growing, and our ISR enterprise is strained.

Over the past 15 years we grew the RPA enterprise 1,200%...and today we support 60 continual combat lines of persistent attack RPAs. Within current constraints, we are committed to improving quality of life and work for our Airmen, and are prioritizing investments to create a dedicated launch and recovery MQ-1/9 squadron, increase training, and restore two MQ-9 operations squadrons. Additionally, we are training enlisted operators to fly the RQ-4 Global Hawk and funding a strategic basing initiative to eventually fly RPAs at new locations on schedule.

However, our ISR enterprise still needs help. We have more than 7,000 Airmen working around the clock in our Distributed Common Ground System. These Airmen supported over 29,000 ISR missions, analyzed more than 380,000 hours of full motion video and disseminated 2.6 million images to our warfighters in the last year alone, attempting to quench the insatiable demand for ISR. They have operated at these surge levels for over a decade with no forecasted decline in the near future.

To meet the needs of combatant commanders, the RPA force requires additional Airmen to achieve a healthy and sustainable force. Moreover, we continue to pursue emerging ISR Cyber and Space capabilities. We must also recapitalize our C2ISR platforms, such as our E-8C JSTARS aircraft, which provides a unique combination of airborne C2, communications, and high-fidelity moving-target surveillance capability. The joint and coalition's demand for Air Force ISR will only continue to grow in the foreseeable future and we must be prepared to meet their demand.

INFRASTRUCTURE

We project airpower from a network of globally positioned bases, and we must focus on maintaining these bases as part of our strategic force posture. However, our infrastructure,

particularly our installations in the continental U.S., are in excess of our operational needs. This is an inefficient arrangement with aging and underused facilities consuming funds that should be prioritized for readiness and modernization.

Budget pressures have repeatedly delayed investments in aging infrastructure such as test and training ranges, airfields, facilities, and even basic infrastructure like power and drainage systems. Our infrastructure problem has only been exacerbated by the funding caps imposed under the BCA. Every year we delay infrastructure repairs affects operations and substantially increases improvement costs. It is time for another round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) to allow us to reinvest funds in higher priority areas across the Total Force.

CONCLUSION

Since 1947, the Air Force has relentlessly provided America with credible deterrence and decisive combat power in times of peace, crisis, contingency, and conflict. However, our relative advantage over potential adversaries is shrinking and we must be prepared to win decisively against any adversary. We owe this to our nation, our joint teammates, and our allies. The nation requires full-spectrum ready air, space, and cyber power, now more than ever. America expects it; combatant commanders require it; and with your support, Airmen will deliver it.

Lieutenant General L. Scott Rice

Lieutenant General L. Scott Rice is the Director, Air National Guard, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C. He is responsible for formulating, developing and coordinating all policies, plans and programs affecting more than 105,500 Guard members and civilians in more than 90 wings and 175 geographically separated units across 213 locations throughout the 50 States, the District of Columbia, Puerto Rico, Guam and the Virgin Islands.

General Rice was commissioned in 1980 through the Reserve Officer Training Corps at Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, New York and graduated from undergraduate pilot training at Reese Air Force Base, Texas in 1982. He is a command pilot with more than 4,300 hours in the F-111 and A-10. Before assuming his current position, General Rice served as The Adjutant General and Commander, Massachusetts Air National Guard.

He has served in various operational and staff assignments including Commander, Air Force Forces, Exercise Eastern Falcon in United States Central Command. He has commanded a squadron, operations group, and fighter wing. He also served as the Assistant Adjutant General for Air, and Commander, Massachusetts Air National Guard.

EDUCATION

1980 Bachelor of Science in Industrial Engineering, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.
 1981 Master of Science in Industrial Engineering, Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, Troy, N.Y.
 1986 F-111 Weapons Instructor Course, Mountain Home AFB, Idaho
 2000 Air War College, by correspondence
 2009 National and International Security Studies, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 2009 and 2010 George C. Marshall Center for Security Studies, Garmish, Germany
 2010 CAPSTONE, National Defense University, Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C.
 2011 Senior Reserve Component Officer Course, Army War College, Carlisle Barracks, Pa.
 2011 Combined Force Air Component Commanders Course, Maxwell Air Force Base, Montgomery, Ala.
 2011 General and Flag Officer Homeland Security Executive Seminar, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.
 2012 National Security Studies, Syracuse University, Syracuse, N.Y.
 2015 National Preparedness Leadership Initiative, Harvard University, Cambridge, Mass.

ASSIGNMENTS

1. May 1981 - May 1982, Undergraduate Pilot Training, Reese Air Force Base, Texas.
2. May 1982 - Feb 1983, Student, AT-38B Lead-In Training Course, Holloman Air Force Base, N.M.
3. February 1983 - June 1983, Student F-111 Course, Royal Air Force, Lakenheath, England
4. June 1983 - October 1985, F-111 Pilot, Instructor, Evaluator, Weapons and Tactics Pilot, 493rd, 494th, and 495th Tactical Fighter Squadrons, Royal Air Force, Lakenheath, England
5. October 1985 - May 1986, Flight Examiner, Royal Air Force, Lakenheath, England.
6. May 1986 - June 1987, Chief Weapons and Tactics Officer, Royal Air Force, Lakenheath, England
7. June 1987 - April 1988, F-111 Student, Instructor Pilot, 391st Tactical Fighter Squadron, Mountain Home, Air Force Base, Idaho
8. April 1988 - November 1989, Chief, Wing Weapons Section, 366th Tactical Fighter Wing, Mountain Home, Air Force Base, Idaho
9. November 1989 - September 1999, A10 Pilot, Instructor, Evaluator, Flight Commander, 131st Fighter Squadron, 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Air Guard Base, Mass.
10. September 1999 - June 2002, Commander, 131st Fighter Squadron, 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Air Guard Base, Mass.

11. June 2002 - May 2004, Commander, 104th Operations Group, Barnes Air Guard Base, Mass.
12. May 2004 - July 2007, Director of Air Operations, Director of Joint Intelligence, Joint Force Headquarters, Massachusetts National Guard, Hanscom Air Force Base, Mass.
13. July 2007 - September 2010, Assistant Adjutant General - Air, Joint Force Headquarters, Massachusetts National Guard, Hanscom Air Force Base, Mass.; dual hatted February 2009 - September 2009, Commander, 104th Fighter Wing, Barnes Air National Guard Base, Mass.
14. September 2010 - December 2012, Chief of Staff and Air Commander, Massachusetts Air National Guard, Hanscom Air Force Base, Mass.; dual hatted February 2010 - February 2011, Headquarters Air Force A-6 Assistant to the Director, Air National Guard, Washington D.C.; dual-hatted March 2011 - June 2012, Mobilization Assistant to the Commander, United States Air Forces Europe
15. December 2012 - May 2016, Adjutant General, Massachusetts National Guard, Hanscom Air Force Base, Mass.
16. May 2016 - present, Director, Air National Guard, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

JOINT ASSIGNMENTS

1. May 2004 - July 2007, Director of Joint Intelligence, Joint Force Headquarters, Massachusetts National Guard, Hanscom Air Force Base, Mass., as a colonel
2. April 2012 - May 2016, The Adjutant General, Massachusetts National Guard, Hanscom Air Force Base, Mass., as a major general

FLIGHT INFORMATION

Rating: command pilot
 Flight hours: more than 4,300
 Aircraft flown: T-37, T-38, F-111A/D/F, and A-10

MAJOR AWARDS AND DECORATIONS

Distinguished Service Medal
 Legion of Merit
 Bronze Star
 Meritorious Service Medal with two oak leaf clusters
 Air Medal with four oak leaf clusters
 Aerial Achievement Medal with oak leaf cluster
 Air Force Commendation Medal with three oak leaf clusters
 Army Commendation Medal

OTHER ACHIEVEMENTS

1972 Eagle Scout
 2005 George W. Bush Award for Leadership in the Guard/Reserve

EFFECTIVE DATES OF PROMOTION

Second Lieutenant May 17, 1980
 First Lieutenant November 18, 1982
 Captain November 18, 1984
 Major November 18, 1992
 Lieutenant Colonel September 9, 1998
 Colonel June 15, 2003
 Brigadier General July 24, 2007
 Major General December 23, 2010
 Lieutenant General May 04, 2016

(Current as of July 2016)

Lieutenant General Maryanne Miller

Lt. Gen. Maryanne Miller is the Chief of Air Force Reserve, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C., and Commander, Air Force Reserve Command, Robins Air Force Base, Georgia. As Chief of Air Force Reserve, she serves as principal adviser on reserve matters to the secretary of the Air Force and the Air Force Chief of Staff. As commander of Air Force Reserve Command, she has full responsibility for the supervision of all U.S. Air Force Reserve units around the world.

General Miller was commissioned in 1981 as a distinguished graduate of the ROTC program at The Ohio State University. She is a command pilot with more than 4,800 flying hours in numerous aircraft.

The general has commanded two wings and held numerous staff positions at the unit, Air Staff and Joint Staff levels. Prior to her current assignment, she was the deputy director of Partnership Strategy for the director of Strategic Plans and Policy on the Joint Staff at the Pentagon.

EDUCATION

1981 Bachelor of Arts degree in criminal justice (minor in sociology,) The Ohio State University, Columbus
 1983 Squadron Officer School, Maxwell AFB, Ala.
 1986 Flight Safety Officer School, Norton AFB, Calif.
 1994 Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, Ala.
 2004 Air War College, Maxwell AFB, Ala., by correspondence
 2006 Director of Mobility Forces Course
 2009 Senior Reserve Component Officers Course, Army War College, Carlisle, Pa.
 2011 Seminar XXI, Center for International Studies, Massachusetts Institute for Technology, Washington, D.C.
 2011 Master's degree in business administration, Trident University, Calif.
 2012 Senior Executives in National and International Security, Harvard Kennedy School of Government

ASSIGNMENTS

1. September 1981 – August 1982, Student, undergraduate pilot training, Williams AFB, Ariz.
2. August 1982 – March 1983, Student, pilot instructor training, Randolph AFB, Texas
3. March 1983 – July 1984, T-37 Instructor Pilot and RSU supervisor, Williams AFB, Ariz.
4. July 1984 – January 1985, T-37 Check Pilot and RSU Supervisor, Williams AFB, Ariz.
5. January 1985 – March 1985, Student, Squadron Officer School, Maxwell AFB, Ala.
6. March 1985 – February 1986, Executive Officer for 96th FTS Commander, T-37 Instructor Pilot, Williams AFB, Ariz.
7. February 1986 – July 1986, Student, distinguished graduate C-141 training, Altus AFB, Okla.
8. July 1986 – July 1987, C-141 Aircraft Commander and Executive Officer for 8th Airlift Squadron Commander, McChord AFB, Wash.
9. July 1987 – June 1988, C-141 Instructor Pilot, 8th Airlift Squadron McChord AFB, Wash.
10. June 1988 – July 1989, Chief of Flying Safety and C-141 Examiner Pilot, McChord AFB, Wash.
11. July 1989 – September 1993, C-141 Examiner Pilot, 313th Airlift Squadron, McChord AFB, Wash.
12. September 1993 - April 1994, Deputy Operations Group Commander, 459th Airlift Wing, Andrews AFB, Md.
13. April 1994 – October 1995, Operations Officer, 756th Airlift Squadron, Andrews AFB, Md.
14. October 1995 – October 1996, Chief, Strategic Airlift, Reserve Operations, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.
15. October 1996 – January 1998, Fighter Forces Programmer, Reserve Plans and Programs,

Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.

16. January 1998 – December 2001, Operations Officer and Deputy Operations Group Commander, 459th Airlift Wing, Andrews AFB, Md.

17. December 2001 – May 2004, Air Reserve Technician C-5 pilot, Dover AFB, Del.

18. May 2004 – January 2006, Operations Group Commander, 932nd Airlift Wing, Scott AFB, Ill.

19. January 2006 – January 2008, Commander, 932nd Airlift Wing, Scott AFB, Ill.

20. January 2008 – November 2009, Commander, 349th Air Mobility Wing, Travis AFB, Calif.

21. November 2009 – January 2012, Director of Programs and Requirements, Office of the Air Force Reserve, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.

22. January 2012 – October 2013, Deputy Director of Partnership Strategy, J5, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

23. April 2012 – August 2012, Interim Deputy Director for Trans Regional Policy, J5, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

24. October 2013 – July 2016, Deputy to the Chief of Air Force Reserve, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C.

25. July 2016 – present, Chief of Air Force Reserve, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C., and Commander of Air Force Reserve Command, Robins AFB, Ga.

SUMMARY OF JOINT ASSIGNMENTS

January 2012 – September 2013, Deputy Director of Partnership Strategy, J5, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C., as a brigadier general and a major general

FLIGHT INFORMATION

Rating: Command pilot

Flight hours: More than 4,800

Aircraft flown: T-37, T-38, C-141B/C, C-5A/B, C-9A/C, C-40C, KC-10A and C-17

MAJOR AWARDS AND DECORATIONS

Defense Superior Service Medal

Legion of Merit with two oak leaf clusters

Meritorious Service Medal with four oak leaf clusters

Aerial Achievement Medal

Air Force Commendation Medal

Air Force Achievement Medal

Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with four oak leaf clusters

Air Force Organizational Excellence Award

Combat Readiness Medal with two oak leaf clusters

National Defense Service Medal with bronze star

Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal with oak leaf cluster

Southwest Asia Service Medal with bronze star

Kosovo Campaign Medal

Global War on Terrorism Medal

Air Force Expeditionary Service Ribbon with Gold Border

Air Force Longevity Service Award with three oak leaf clusters

Armed Forces Reserve Medal with hourglass

Small Arms Expert Marksmanship Ribbon with bronze star

Air Force Training Ribbon

Kuwait Liberation Medal

EFFECTIVE DATES OF PROMOTION

Second Lieutenant June 12, 1981

First Lieutenant Aug. 30, 1983

Captain Aug. 30, 1985

Major March 5, 1992

Lieutenant Colonel June 13, 1996

Colonel Feb. 17, 2005

Brigadier General June 1, 2009

Major General Jan. 1, 2013

Lieutenant General July 15, 2016

(Current as of July 2016)

Major General Scott D. West

Maj. Gen. Scott West is the Director of Current Operations, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C. The directorate, encompassing five divisions, the Air Force Operations Group and the Air Force Agency for Modeling and Simulation, is responsible for policy, guidance, and oversight of Air Force current operations in air, space and cyberspace. The Directorate provides time-sensitive situational awareness and analysis to Air Force senior leaders and links worldwide operations with core Air Force processes to enable global vigilance, reach and power.

General West entered the Air Force in 1982 after graduating from The Citadel. He has served as an instructor pilot in the F-16 and flown combat missions in Operation Southern Watch. General West has commanded the 36th Fighter Squadron, 8th Operations Group, 27th Fighter Wing, 613th Air and Space Operations Center, the Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center, 9th Air and Space Expeditionary Task Force-Afghanistan and NATO Air Command-Afghanistan. He has completed staff assignments on the Joint Staff, Air Force Secretariat, Pacific Air Forces and NATO's Joint Warfare Centre.

EDUCATION

1982 Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering, The Citadel, Charleston, SC
 1985 Master's in Business Administration, Barry University, Miami, FL
 1991 USAF Fighter Weapons School, Nellis AFB, NV
 1994 Squadron Officer School, by correspondence
 1997 Air Command and Staff College, Maxwell AFB, AL
 1998 Master's in Airpower Arts and Sciences, School of Advanced Airpower Studies, Maxwell AFB, AL
 2002 Master's in National Resource Strategy, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Fort McNair, Washington, D.C.
 2007 Senior Executive Fellow's program, John F. Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA
 2011 Combined Force Maritime Component Commander course, Pacific Fleet Headquarters, HI
 2014 Joint Force Air Component Commander course, Maxwell AFB, AL
 2015 Joint Force Land Component Commander course, Carlisle Barracks, PA

ASSIGNMENTS

1. June 1982 – June 1984, Design Engineer, 31st Civil Engineer Squadron, Homestead AFB, FL
2. July 1984 – December 1985, student, Undergraduate Pilot Training, Columbus AFB, MS, and Lead-in Fighter Training, Holloman AFB, NM
3. January 1986 – June 1986, F-16 student pilot, 311th Tactical Fighter Training Squadron, Luke AFB, AZ
4. July 1986 – June 1989, F-16 Instructor Pilot and Chief of Training, 429th Tactical Fighter Squadron, Nellis AFB, NV
5. July 1989 – December 1991, F-16 Instructor Pilot and Chief of Weapons, 72nd Tactical Fighter Training Squadron, MacDill AFB, FL
6. January 1992 – June 1994, F-16 Instructor Pilot and Flight Commander, USAF Fighter Weapons School, and F-16 Flight Examiner, 57th Operations Group, Nellis AFB, NV
7. July 1994 – July 1996, staff officer, Weapons Division, Office of the Secretary of the Air Force (International Affairs), the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.
8. August 1996 – July 1998, student, Air Command and Staff College and School of Advanced Airpower Studies, Maxwell AFB, AL
9. August 1998 – September 1999, Assistant Operations Officer, 68th Fighter Squadron, and Operations Officer, 69th Fighter Squadron, Moody AFB, GA
10. October 1999 – July 2001, Commander, 36th Fighter Squadron, Osan Air Base, South Korea
11. August 2001 – June 2002, student, Industrial College of the Armed Forces, Fort McNair,

Washington, D.C.

12. July 2002 – December 2002, Commander, 8th Operations Group, Kunsan AB, South Korea

13. January 2003 – December 2004, Chief of Forces Division, Force Structure, Resources and Assessment Directorate (J8), Joint Staff, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

14. January 2005 – February 2006, Vice Commander, 52nd Fighter Wing, Spangdahlem AB, Germany

15. March 2006 – September 2007, Commander, 27th Fighter Wing, Cannon AFB, N.M.

16. October 2007 – August 2008, Commander, 613th Air and Space Operations Center, Hickam AFB, HI

17. September 2008 – August 2010, Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff, Joint Warfare Centre, Supreme Allied Command for Transformation, NATO, Stavanger, Norway

18. August 2010 – August 2011, Vice Commander, 13th Air Force, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI

19. August 2011 – September 2012, Deputy Director of Operations, Plans, Programs and Requirements, Headquarters Pacific Air Forces, Joint Base Pearl Harbor-Hickam, HI

20. September 2012 – April 2015, Commander, Air Force Operational Test and Evaluation Center, Kirtland AFB, NM

21. April 2015 – April 2016, Commander, 9th Air and Space Expeditionary Task Force-Afghanistan; Commander, NATO Air Command-Afghanistan; Director, AFCENT's Air Component Coordination Element for U.S. Forces-Afghanistan & NATO's Operation Resolute Support; and Deputy Commander-Air for U.S. Forces-Afghanistan.

22. May 2016 – present, Director of Current Operations, Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations, Headquarters U.S. Air Force, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C.

SUMMARY OF JOINT ASSIGNMENTS

1. January 2003 – December 2004, Chief of Forces Division, Force Structure, Resources and Assessment Directorate (J8), Joint Staff, the Pentagon, Washington, D.C., as a colonel

2. September 2008 – August 2010, Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff, Joint Warfare Centre, Supreme Allied Command for Transformation, NATO, Stavanger, Norway, as a brigadier general

3. April 2015 – April 2016, Commander, NATO Air Command-Afghanistan; Director, AFCENT's Air Component Coordination Element for U.S. Forces-Afghanistan & NATO's Operation Resolute Support, as a major general

FLIGHT INFORMATION

Rating: Command pilot

Flight hours: More than 2,500

Aircraft flown: A-10 and F-16

MAJOR AWARDS AND DECORATIONS

Distinguished Service Medal with oak leaf cluster

Defense Superior Service Medal

Legion of Merit

Meritorious Service Medal with three oak leaf clusters

Air Medal

Air Force Commendation Medal with oak leaf cluster

Air Force Achievement Medal

Joint Meritorious Unit Award with two oak leaf clusters

Air Force Outstanding Unit Award with three oak leaf clusters

Air Force Organizational Excellence Award

Combat Readiness Medal with four oak leaf clusters

National Defense Service Medal with bronze star

Armed Forces Expeditionary Medal

Southwest Asia Service Medal with bronze star

Global War on Terrorism Service Medal

Korea Defense Service Medal

EFFECTIVE DATES OF PROMOTION

Second Lieutenant June 2, 1982

First Lieutenant June 2, 1984

Captain June 2, 1986

Major July 1, 1994

Lieutenant Colonel Sept. 1, 1998

Colonel Aug. 1, 2002

Brigadier General Nov. 21, 2008

Major General June 8, 2012

(Current as of April 2016)

**WITNESS RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS ASKED DURING
THE HEARING**

MARCH 22, 2017

RESPONSES TO QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY MR. WILSON

General RICE. The impact of a full-year CR to the Air National Guard (ANG) is manageable, assuming normal CR constraints were relaxed or eliminated. A full-year CR provides funding at FY16 levels, and overall the ANG will be able to fund required training, full-time manpower and mission essential requirements. For the ANG Operations and Maintenance (O&M) appropriation, a full-year CR represents an \$88 million increase over the current FY17 Conference Report numbers. Assuming there are no other statutory limits on funding for O&M, the ANG will be better off with a full-year CR in O&M. For the ANG Military Personnel appropriation, a full-year CR represents a decrease of \$82 million from the FY17 Conference Report numbers. Although the decrease will reduce the level of funding available for ANG readiness, the Air National Guard will still be able to maintain required training levels for FY17. A full-year CR will have one negative impact for ANG, in that National Guard Reserve Equipment Appropriation (NGREA) funding will not be available for FY17 which would affect the C-130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) and delay the C-130 modernization program. A full-year CR will not impact service members and will not impact families. [See page 21.]

General MILLER. A full-year continuing resolution (CR) would stifle improvements in Air Force Reserve (AFR) readiness and degrade our ability to sustain any progress to date. It would cut crucial funding to our special tour program and Operations and Maintenance funds curtailing critical training and equipment. Aircrew proficiency training would be limited, as well as our key participation in joint exercises. A full-year CR would further decrease aircraft availability, shrink critical commodities and weaken our ability to meet the demands of the Air Force. The uncertain nature of a full-year CR uniquely affects AFR service member participation. The lack of predictable funding caused by a CR can create proficiency gaps for the AFR when training is forced to be rescheduled or cancelled, which can result in personnel becoming non-current in their AF specialty. In addition to impacting their military training, a full-year CR can negatively affect an AFR member's civilian employment, family, remuneration and morale. In particular, AFR Traditional Reservists (TR) may become hesitant to commit to their military training in an uncertain fiscal environment as most need to consider the impact on their civilian jobs. This hesitancy is because they do not want to take leave from a civilian job to participate with the AFR and subsequently have their military duty curtailed due to a lack of stable/predictable funds. This type of situation causes not only a loss of military pay for the member, but also a potential problem with their civilian employer and stress for their family. [See page 21.]

General WEST. A full-year Continuing Resolution (CR) will affect the Air Force's top readiness priorities with readiness recovery repercussions felt long after FY17. A full-year CR creates a \$2.4B (Base and OCO) shortfall in the O&M portfolio that will need to be sourced at the expense of readiness requirements. It eviscerates our Flying Hour Program (FHP), grounds non-deploying squadrons, and degrades qualifications and proficiencies of remaining aircrew. This reduces the Air Force's ability to meet pilot production throughout and reduces readiness in Air Forces units for the foreseeable future. In addition, it forces a \$1B cut to our Weapon System Sustainment (WSS) accounts, preventing us from maintaining predictable and sufficient funding for our sustainment actions—limiting aircraft availability, beyond those grounded for lack of FHP, needed for wartime and full-spectrum training.

The Air Force would need to reconsider participation in 3rd and 4th quarter live-fire exercises. Distributed exercises could be supported but would continue at a lower level of participation. While the Air Force cannot "cancel" any Combatant Command exercise, the Air Force could reduce participation in such exercises, which would impact training in support of combat capabilities.

A year-long CR would also significantly reduce Air Reserve Component (ARC)-filled OCO taskings, causing significant degradation in Air Force support of current global operations.

A full-year CR would have an adverse impact on our people and readiness recovery. We would have to cut over \$2.8B in base and Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) funding in the remaining five months of the Fiscal Year, forcing actions simi-

lar to those taken in 2013 during Sequestration. In addition, the full-year CR halts efforts to grow active duty personnel end-strength as directed in the FY 2017 National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA), preventing us from meeting our top readiness priority. It also inhibits manpower growth in new or expanding mission areas including Remotely-Piloted Aircraft (RPA), cyberspace operations, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR), and nuclear command, control, and communications (NC3).

The full-year CR would delay operational, unit, and training permanent-change-of-station moves until Fiscal Year 2018, halting all moves internal to the Continental U.S., creating a severe training backlog, and leaving positions vacant across the Air Force. This severely degrades the quality of life for our Airmen and their families in the process of moving, as schools, jobs, child care, and other plans are disrupted.

It would defer bonus payments across numerous critical career fields, devastating critical programs we must have in place to retain Airmen with indispensable skillsets. Our taxpayers invest approximately \$11M to produce each fifth-generation fighter pilot, and our active-duty fighter pilot shortage is expected to exceed 1,000 by the end of Fiscal Year 2017. The Aviation Retention Bonus is critical to our efforts to address this crisis. Most important, deferring bonuses breaks faith with our Airmen, who make great sacrifices every day to defend our nation. It also would preclude filling civilian vacancies outside of mission-critical areas, which would directly increase workload demands on remaining personnel, decreasing quality of life.

It would also halt all restoration and modernization projects, effectively cancelling 301 projects at 78 installations across the Air Force, including 51 directly related to maintaining Air Force readiness levels. It also limits facility projects to only those actions addressing life, health, and safety.

A full-year CR would impact more than 60 Air Force acquisition new starts in aircraft, space, missile, and ammunition procurement while simultaneously curtailing our Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation efforts. In addition, it limits munitions production to Fiscal Year 2016 rates, which do not meet current usage and inventory requirements. Finally, inventory levels for flares, cartridges, and training munitions are already very low, impacting our aviators' ability to counter real-world enemy fire while reducing live fire training scenarios—both essential for success on the battlefield. [See page 21.]

RESPONSE TO QUESTION SUBMITTED BY MR. SCOTT

General RICE. The fastest way to JSTARS Recap Initial Operational Capability (IOC) is to execute the current acquisition strategy. This strategy establishes the conditions required to create and exploit opportunities to accelerate IOC/Full Operational Capability through four means: (1) Radar Risk Reduction; (2) source selection criteria; (3) incentive fee structure; (4) and use of mix of contract types. The Air Force has and will continue to look for opportunities to accelerate. However, the focus at this stage—prior to selection of a prime contractor and integrated solution (platform, radar, battle management command and control, communications)—is on establishing the conditions for success. If there are opportunities to accelerate after selecting the prime contractor and integrated solution, the Air Force will brief the Congressional Defense Committees as directed in the FY17 NDAA and Appropriations Act. [See page 10.]