

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION
FOR APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR
2014 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE
PROGRAM**

TUESDAY, MAY 7, 2013

U.S. SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:40 a.m. in room SH-216, Hart Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin, Nelson, McCaskill, Udall, Shaheen, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, and Lee.

Committee staff members present: Peter K. Levine, staff director; and Leah C. Brewer, nominations and hearings clerk.

Majority staff members present: Jonathan D. Clark, counsel; Gabriella E. Fahrer, counsel; Creighton Greene, professional staff member; Gerald J. Leeling, general counsel; and John H. Quirk V, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: John A. Bonsell, minority staff director; Steven M. Barney, minority counsel; Allen M. Edwards, professional staff member; Thomas W. Goffus, professional staff member; Anthony J. Lazarski, professional staff member; and Natalie M. Nicolas, minority staff assistant.

Staff assistants present: Jennifer R. Knowles and John Principato.

Committee members' assistants present: Jason Rauch, assistant to Senator McCaskill; Casey Howard, assistant to Senator Udall; Patrick Day, assistant to Senator Shaheen; Jess Fassler and Brooke Jamison, assistants to Senator Gillibrand; Ethan Saxon, assistant to Senator Blumenthal; Marta McLellan Ross, assistant to Senator Donnelly; Nick Ikeda, assistant to Senator Hirono; Karen Courington, assistant to Senator Kaine; Steve Smith, assistant to Senator King; Jacob Heisten, assistant to Senator Inhofe; Paul C. Hutton IV, assistant to Senator McCain; T. Finch Fulton and Lenwood Landrum, assistants to Senator Sessions; Todd Harmer, assistant to Senator Chambliss; Joseph Lai, assistant to Senator Wicker; Brad Bowman, assistant to Senator Ayotte; Craig Abele,

assistant to Senator Graham; Charles Prosch, assistant to Senator Blunt; and Peter Blair, assistant to Senator Lee.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN, CHAIRMAN

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody.

The committee meets this morning to discuss the plans and programs of the U.S. Air Force in our review of the fiscal year 2014 annual budget and the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP).

I want to welcome Secretary Donley and General Welsh to the committee this morning. This will be General Welsh's first posture hearing as Air Force Chief of Staff and it is likely to be Secretary Donley's final posture hearing, not certainly, but probably, as Secretary. We thank you both for your long careers of leadership and your service to the Department of Defense (DOD) and to our Nation. A special thanks as we also appreciate your flexibility on scheduling. This hearing has been scheduled and rescheduled a number of times because of complications from the late budget submission.

We are presented this morning with dramatic evidence of the need for DOD to act swiftly and decisively to address the plague of sexual assaults in the military. A DOD report, scheduled to be issued later today, reportedly estimates that on the average there are more than 70 sexual assaults involving military personnel every day.

Just this past weekend, Air Force Lieutenant Colonel Jeff Krusinski, the branch chief of the Air Force's Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Program, was arrested in Arlington County, VA, and charged with sexual battery. While under our legal system, everyone is innocent until proven guilty, this arrest speaks volumes about the status and effectiveness of DOD's efforts to address the plague of sexual assaults in the military. We will ask our witnesses to explain in their opening statements today what actions the Air Force has taken, plans to take to address this plague.

The issue of possible changes in the Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) relative to the power of the convening authority will be addressed at our markup of the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) next month.

Over the past 12 years, Air Force personnel and equipment have played a key role in support of our national security goals in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the world. Over this time period, we have relied heavily on Air Force strike aircraft to take on important ground targets, Air Force manned aircraft and unmanned aerial vehicles to provide intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR) support, and Air Force tankers to support coalition air operations. I hope that you two will extend on behalf of our committee our gratitude to the men and women of the Air Force and their families for the many sacrifices that they have made on our behalf.

The Air Force faces a number of difficult challenges in fiscal year 2014 and the following years.

First, the Air Force faces the ongoing challenge of ensuring that it will have the right size and mix of assets and capabilities to meet our strategic needs in a manner consistent with a tight budget environment. The Air Force budget this year calls for a pause

in the major restructuring of Air Force structure proposed last year, pending the results of the National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force. We will look forward to receiving the Commission's report next spring.

Second, the Air Force is expected to play a key role in implementing recent defense strategic guidance calling for a shift to refocus emphasis to the Asia-Pacific region. I hope our witnesses today will help us understand how this strategic shift is reflected in the Air Force budget and in the Service's future plans.

Third, the Air Force faces a continuing challenge in managing its acquisition programs, including the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF), which now stands as the most expensive acquisition program in history. This challenge is exacerbated when rising costs and tight funding lead the Air Force to stretch out production lines, which delays modernization programs and further increases unit costs. The Weapon Systems Acquisition Reform Act of 2009 requires that DOD make significant changes to avoid the kind of costly delays and overruns that have hit our acquisition system in the past. While this legislation should help correct past problems, it will succeed only through concerted efforts within the executive branch to implement it.

These problems are greatly exacerbated also by the implementation of sequestration in fiscal year 2013 and the specter of further sequestration in fiscal year 2014 and beyond. Sequestration, which is already required, is having an adverse impact on the Air Force. General Larry Spencer, the Air Force Vice Chief of Staff, testified last month that "lost flight hours will cause unit stand-downs which will result in severe, rapid, and long-term unit combat readiness degradation. We have already ceased operations for one-third of our fighter and bomber force. Within 60 days of a stand-down, the affected units will be unable to meet emergent or operations plans requirements."

Last week, Senator Inhofe and I sent a letter to the Secretary of Defense in which we asked the Secretary to provide us with a package of reductions to the fiscal year 2014 budget that would meet the \$52 billion savings requirement established by the Budget Control Act (BCA). Now, that requirement in the BCA will, hopefully, be met by Congress without a sequester. All three budgets on table—the President's budget, the House budget resolution, and the Senate budget resolution—would avoid a sequester, but none of those are likely to be adopted as proposed. As we explained in our letter to the Secretary, we believe that the identification of specific reductions should help prepare DOD for the possibility that we will be unable to avoid another round of sequestration. But at the same time, it should help Congress avoid sequestration because sequestration is so irrational and draconian, and if the public knows how unpalatable that outcome would be, it will hopefully help us avoid the outcome. We cannot afford as a Nation to let sequestration continue for another year.

So we look forward to exploring these and other issues with our witnesses this morning.

I now call upon Senator Inhofe.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR JAMES M. INHOFE

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I join you in welcoming our witnesses and the tribute you made to Secretary Donley. I believe this probably will be your last appearance as a witness. You are a very good friend to all of us up here and we appreciate your service. I am sure you will continue to contribute to our country and to the men and women in uniform.

Today's hearing comes at not just a pivotal time, but at a tragic time for our Air Force, and declining defense budgets and ongoing effects of sequestration are having a significant impact on the capabilities and readiness of our airmen.

I look to our witnesses to provide the committee with their candid assessment of what this new budget reality means to the Air Force and the risks that they are being forced to accept, as well as what is being done to manage those risks.

General Welsh, you recently stated—and I am quoting, “the need for modernization is pervasive across our Air Force.” I could not agree with you more. I just wish that were the only problem that we are facing right now.

America's combat air assets are worn out and spread too thin after 2 decades of modernization programs being deferred and canceled. The Air Force has to replace its aging aircraft inventory, field new tankers and fifth generation fighters, and build a new bomber and increase our long-range strike capability. We have to maintain our space-based capabilities, enhance our ability to operate in the cyber domain, and ensure that our airmen are trained and ready to execute combat operations across the spectrum of conflict.

Sadly, these efforts are being undermined by a broken acquisition process. The way we develop and buy new weapons systems is an arcane and cumbersome process that continues to saddle the taxpayers with billions of dollars in cost overruns while delaying the delivery of much needed technology to our warfighters. Congress, DOD, and the defense industry have to come together to reform and streamline this process.

The greatest near-term threat to the readiness and capabilities of our Air Force is sequestration, as the chairman stated. In order to meet the budget caps associated with sequestration, the Air Force is raiding its readiness and modernization accounts.

We learned last month that flight hours have been cut by 94,000. Seventeen combat squadrons, nearly a third of the Active Duty combat fleet, have been grounded. The Air Force estimates that it will take between 6 and 12 months at a minimum to return these squadrons to mission-ready status. This is unconscionable at a time when we are facing a global security environment that is as dangerous and complex as any time that I can remember.

Finally, it is critical that we take care of the most important component of our Air Force. That is our airmen. We must ensure that they are properly trained for the full spectrum of operations, that they and their families receive the medical care that they are entitled to, and that their rights are protected.

Your written statement details several actions the Air Force has taken to combat sexual assault. I agree that providing a safe, respectful, and productive work environment is the responsibility of

every airmen at every level. But let me be clear: I am not satisfied with the progress to date. More must be done to eliminate this scourge and do everything possible. Sexual assault undermines morale, hurts readiness, and breaks the trust of those who have volunteered to serve our Nation.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe.

Secretary Donley, we call on you, as Senator Inhofe said, as kind of an old friend of many of ours. I may be the only one on the committee—although I look around, there may be one other one—who was here when you were on the committee staff. You were a great staffer then and you have been a very fine Secretary of the Air Force. We welcome you and we call upon you now for your testimony.

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

Mr. DONLEY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Inhofe, members of the committee. It is a pleasure to be here representing our Active Duty, Guard, Reserve, and civilian airmen.

I am also honored to be here this morning with my teammate, our 20th Chief of Staff of the Air Force, General Mark Welsh, a great partner and a great Air Force leader.

For fiscal year 2014, the Air Force requests \$114.1 billion in our baseline budget. As with all budgets, our fiscal year 2014 request represents a snapshot in time, our best analysis of Air Force needs, based on available information. Especially given the budget turmoil over the past year, this morning's discussion on the fiscal year 2014 budget needs to begin with where we stand this year in fiscal year 2013.

First, I would like to highlight that throughout the current budget turmoil, our Air Force priorities remain aligned with the January 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance. This includes supporting combatant commanders in the current fight in Afghanistan, maintaining a strong and stable presence in the Pacific and Korea, supporting nuclear and regional deterrence, counter-terror, and other operations.

There is demand for airpower, and your airmen are busy around the world. Today more than 35,000 airmen are deployed. More than 57,000 airmen are stationed overseas, and more than 132,000 are providing support to combatant commanders every day.

As the fiscal constraints get tighter, we must tighten our alignment with this new strategy and strengthen our commitment to joint interdependent solutions to the Nation's military challenges.

You have heard many times that the implications of the sequestration reductions are dire. They are. That is why the President has put forward a balanced deficit reduction proposal that would allow Congress to repeal sequestration in fiscal year 2013 and beyond. While DOD is working full out to adapt to new fiscal realities, it was not possible, given the necessary timelines, to turn around a new fiscal year 2014 budget based upon new assumptions derived from the March 1 sequestration and from the final Defense Appropriation Act, also approved in March, nearly 6 months into the fiscal year.

We need to stipulate upfront that the fiscal year 2014 budget does not provide funding to recover from the damage done by even a partial year of fiscal year 2013 sequestration, much less the full impacts that would hit the Air Force if the President's budget proposal to replace sequestration for fiscal year 2013 and beyond is not enacted.

This morning I will summarize the state of our Air Force in three broad areas: force structure, that is, the size and composition of the Air Force; readiness, the training and preparedness of our airmen and their equipment; and third, modernization, the replacement of aging aircraft and infrastructure and our investment in future capabilities.

Last year, in our efforts to meet the requirements of the first half of the BCA, which included reductions of \$487 billion over 10 years, the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 budget proposed a number of force structure changes, including aircraft transfers, retirements, and changes in unit missions, that were the subject of much controversy in our Reserve components, with the State Adjutants General, and congressional delegations. Thanks to the work of this committee and others, we were able to fashion a compromise which you approved in the NDAA.

This year, I can report that the fiscal year 2014 budget proposes no major changes in force structure. As compared to the levels enacted in the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013, the fiscal year 2014 proposal would reduce our Active Duty end strength by 1,860 airmen, reduce Air Force Reserve end strength by 480, and reduce Air National Guard end strength by 300. We retain C-130 and Global Hawk Block 30 force structure as directed through the end of fiscal year 2014. Our nuclear forces remain at current levels, pending future decisions on implementation of the New START agreement, and we are on track to achieve 65 medium-altitude combat air patrols with our remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) fleet. We will focus in fiscal year 2014 on implementing the retirements, transfers, and mission changes outlined in the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013. We have provided two reports to Congress outlining implementation plans for each affected unit and location.

Looking ahead, it has never been more important for the Air Force to maximize the strength of the total force. Our Active, Reserve, and Guard components are increasingly integrated, training, deploying, and conducting the full range of missions together as a total force. We must continue to ensure that our Active and Reserve component mix correctly balances the strengths of each component and meets our strategic requirements and fiscal demands.

We have made progress over the last year in our intergovernmental relationships, working with DOD and the Council of Governors to formalize the consultative process between DOD and the States to provide more transparency in planning and programming. Within the Air Force, working with our Guard and Reserve leaders, General Welsh and I have established a Total Force Task Force to provide strategic options on the appropriate mix of total force capabilities and to inform our strategic planning for fiscal year 2015 and beyond. This task force will also serve as a resource to the congressionally-directed National Commission on the Structure of the Air Force, which held its first meeting on April 30.

In summary, our proposed force structure is relatively stable for now, but beyond fiscal year 2014, it is dependent on decisions yet to be made and especially on achieving a balanced approach to deficit reduction to avoid further sequestration.

Turning to readiness, while the Air Force has met the demands of a high operational tempo in support of today's fight, this has taken a toll on our weapon systems and our people. Unit readiness declined significantly from 2003 onward, and despite significant investments in the past few years, only half of our combat air forces have met acceptable readiness standards.

With the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific and our continued presence in the Middle East and Africa, we expect the demand for Air Force capabilities will remain constant and perhaps even rise over the next decade. We must improve readiness to prevent a hollow force.

With respect to fiscal year 2013, the Joint Chiefs of Staff and Air Force leaders have already recounted the readiness impacts we anticipated this year as a result of sequestration. Passage of the final fiscal year 2013 Continuing Resolution (CR), which included defense appropriations, was helpful to DOD overall but did not improve the active Air Force's operation and maintenance (O&M) budget. It left shortages in the Overseas Contingency Operations (OCO) accounts and did not mitigate the impacts of sequestration which required approximately \$10 billion in reductions to be taken in the last 7 months of fiscal year 2013.

Anticipating this challenge, at the beginning of January, we took steps to cut back normal operations, including a civilian hiring freeze for permanent, temporary, and term vacancies, canceling non-mission critical official travel and conferences, reducing major command and combatant command O&M budgets by about 10 percent, and deferring non-emergency facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization projects. However, these steps alone are not sufficient to absorb the full impacts of sequestration without affecting readiness.

Collectively, these sequestration reductions and readiness impacts are now being felt across the Air Force. Currently, nine combat-coded fighter units and three combat-coded bomber units are stood down and have ceased flying operations. Seven combat-coded units are flying at basic mission capable levels and will only return to combat mission ready status if funding becomes available. Flying hour reductions will halt training for the rest of the year in many units and will take up to 6 months to restore pilot proficiency.

Other impacts include reductions in weapon systems sustainment that will delay necessary maintenance, increase costs, and take perhaps 2 to 3 years to recover from repair backlogs. The potential furlough of our valued civilian workforce is significantly reducing civilian pay and devastating morale and slowing productivity.

Our main objective in the fiscal year 2014 budget mirrors our objective for 3 years running: to slow and reverse the erosion of Air Force readiness. To that end, the fiscal year 2014 budget request is aimed at setting the Air Force back on the course toward full spectrum readiness. The fiscal year 2014 request prioritizes funding for 1.2 million flying hours, an increase of 40,000 hours over

fiscal year 2013 to ensure pilot proficiency and continue new pilot production. It funds training ranges to enhance flying training effectiveness and to restore deteriorating infrastructure. It also adds \$1.5 billion across the FYDP to weapon systems sustainment to keep our aircraft and space systems ready.

Unfortunately, fiscal year 2013 sequestration now jeopardizes the gains we had hoped to achieve next year. Even assuming this budget is approved as proposed, and even if Congress acted sometime this summer to repeal and replace sequestration for fiscal year 2013, we would almost certainly begin fiscal year 2014 carrying forward a significantly degraded readiness posture from this year.

The Air Force is working with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) on a fiscal year 2013 reprogramming request to cover OCO shortfalls and to address some of the worst effects of sequestration. However, the budgetary transfer authority available to DOD is not sufficient to address all our known shortfalls. Even if such transfer authority were available, we do not have sufficient internal resources to pay for these shortfalls without digging far too deeply into modernization programs, and there may not be sufficient time left in fiscal year 2013 to repair the damage now immediately ahead.

To sum up the readiness situation, we have been consuming Air Force readiness for several years and will continue to focus resources available to meet combatant commander requirements. But with the steep and late fiscal year 2013 budget reductions brought on by sequestration, the readiness hole that we have been trying to climb out of just got deeper. The full readiness and budgetary implications of this situation could not be accounted for in the fiscal year 2014 Air Force budget request and they are still under review. We will continue to work with our DOD leadership and Congress to fashion a practical way forward.

With respect to modernization, as I have previously testified, this challenge facing the Air Force is pervasive and will, if it is unaddressed, seriously undermine our ability to accomplish the missions the Nation asks us to undertake. The average age of our fighter aircraft is now 23 years; rescue helicopters, 22 years; training aircraft, 25; bombers, 36 years; and tankers, nearly 50 years. Satellites for missile warning, navigation, secure communications, and other needs are also aging, and replacements must be built and launched on a schedule consistent with the life expectancy of current constellations.

Our most significant Air Force priorities remain on track in fiscal year 2014: the fifth generation F-35, JSF; the KC-46 tanker; the long-range strike bomber (LRS-B). The continued modernization of existing fleets like the B-2, the F-22, the F-15, the F-16, and the C-17 to keep them operationally effective and to extend their service lives is also key.

We request funding for preferred munitions, as well as critical space satellite assets such as the global positioning system (GPS); and the Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) satellite; and the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS). We intend to maintain science and technology funding in order to stay on the cutting edge of technological innovation and sustain our airpower advantage.

While we often face challenges with major acquisition programs, we have recently achieved some notable success using block buys and efficient procurement strategies to drive down the costs of our three largest space programs—the Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle, AEHF, and SBIRS—by over \$2.5 billion. The fiscal year 2014 request includes the first year of a multiyear procurement for the C-130J, which is expected to save over \$500 million over the next 5 years. We will need more successes like these in the future because there is still significant pressure on our modernization programs.

Last year, in programming the Air Force share of \$487 billion in defense reductions over 10 years, the cancelation or delay of modernization programs accounted for 65 percent of total Air Force reductions across the FYDP. This year, each program was reduced by more than 7 percent in sequestration. In the immediate years ahead, major programs such as the F-35, the KC-46, and the bomber are scheduled to grow as the overall DOD budget declines, and some longstanding needs such as a new trainer and a replacement for the E-8 Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) are unfunded.

Looking ahead, if there continues to be resistance to force structure changes, to base closures, and constraining growth and compensation, and given our current focus on improving readiness, it is very likely that out-year budget reductions through the BCA will require further disproportionate cuts to our modernization programs. As advanced technologies continue to proliferate around the globe, these cutbacks in modernization would put at risk the Air Force capabilities this Nation will need in the next decade.

The decisions ahead of us are extraordinarily difficult, but Congress has the power to help the Air Force and DOD maneuver through these unparalleled budget challenges. In recent years, Congress has placed limits on the Air Force's efforts to take tough but urgently needed actions to balance our readiness, modernization, and force structure and rejected some of DOD's proposals to help slow the growth in military compensation. As our DOD leaders have testified, these congressional actions, if sustained, will add billions to our costs over the next 5 years. We hope that in the view of the serious economic problems facing our Nation that Congress will allow us to implement these and other important changes.

It is now all the more critical that we get your support on reductions in base infrastructure. The Air Force executed Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) 2005 on time and under budget, and those adjustments are today generating savings estimated at \$1 billion per year. We are looking at European basing requirements with our DOD partners, and we are ready to begin next steps in the continental United States (CONUS). We estimate that more than 20 percent of our basing infrastructure is excess to need. BRAC authority is a tool that we urgently need to allow DOD to divest excess infrastructure and refocus resources to meet other critical needs, including readiness, modernization, and taking care of our people.

In the area of military compensation, we are committed, as you are, to taking care of our airmen, but the impact of increasing personnel costs continues to be a serious concern and can no longer

be ignored. Therefore, we support DOD's efforts to slow the growth of personnel costs. We support the modest 1 percent pay raise and the TRICARE fee and pharmacy co-pay changes included in the President's fiscal year 2014 budget.

While these are some of the broad outlines of our fiscal year 2004 budget request, there is clearly more work to do as we assess the rolling implications of sequestration in fiscal year 2013 and beyond. We will need your help to make necessary adjustments in our force structure, to keep us ready and to avoid a hollow force, and to equip this Air Force with the modern capabilities it needs for the future.

But perhaps one of the most helpful things Congress can do is to return to regular order and to approve the annual defense authorization and appropriations measures in a timely way. Throughout our history, this Nation has effectively dealt with strategic challenges and fiscal constraints, but our recent track record of repeated delay and uncertainty, CRs that disrupt programs and budget planning, and mid-year cuts that impair readiness and threaten civilian furloughs must not become the new normal. We sincerely appreciate the ongoing commitment of this committee and its professional staff to return to regular order.

Today's world is a dangerous place and it is counterproductive to generate problems of our own making when so many other serious threats beyond our control demand attention. Together we must do better for our men and women in uniform and their families, our civilian workforce, and our national security.

Mr. Chairman, the American people have the world's best airmen and the world's finest Air Force. Your Air Force leadership team remains committed to getting the most capability possible from whatever level of resources you provide. We remain grateful for the support this committee unfailingly provides to the Air Force and to the men and women of our Armed Forces. The Air Force stands ready to assist in any way we can, and we look forward to discussing our proposed budget.

Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you so much, Secretary Donley, for a very clear and a very forceful statement.

General Welsh.

**STATEMENT OF GEN. MARK A. WELSH III, USAF, CHIEF OF
STAFF OF THE AIR FORCE**

General WELSH. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Inhofe, and members of the committee. It is always really a privilege to appear before you.

It is a special privilege for me today because I get to sit next to Secretary Donley on what is likely his last visit to this committee. For the last 5 years, he has led our Air Force with dignity and treating every airman with respect, and we have been absolutely privileged to follow him. I would just like to take this opportunity, Mr. Chairman, with your forbearance to thank him publicly. Boss, thank you for being a remarkable leader for our Air Force.

Ladies and gentlemen, despite the budgetary turbulence in what I hope will be an atypical year, I believe that we will see a continuing demand for American airpower in the future. Because of

that, while our fiscal year 2014 budget request does not fully account for the necessary recovery actions from sequestration, what it does do is prioritize our effort to reverse our declining readiness trend, recognizing that low states of readiness negate many of the strategic advantages of that airpower.

Flying hours are allocated to maintain and in some cases to incrementally improve readiness across the total force. In the past, we relied on OCO funding to partially fund those flying hour programs, and that cannot continue. So we will continue to reduce our reliance on OCO funding for our flying hour program through 2015, at which point we should meet as much as 90 percent of our peacetime flying requirement within our base budget, a level we have not reached in quite some time.

We have also restored emphasis on our training ranges and are funding about 75 percent in the 2014 budget request, up from a low of about 25 percent only a couple of years ago.

As a side note, we also hope to realize cost savings from the findings of our Total Force Task Force. This group was formed to examine the operational impacts and cost factors associated with various approaches to Total Force integration. By identifying and implementing the optimum mix of our Active, Reserve, and Guard components, we should be able to maximize operational effectiveness, better provide stability over time to our Reserve component missions and organizations, and better support the States as well as provide for the national defense. You can expect to see the results of this work presented in our fiscal year 2015 budget submission.

Our fiscal year 2014 budget request also strives to protect the modernization that will make our Air Force viable in the future. The KC-46, the F-35, and the LRS-B remain our top three investment priorities. We need the F-35. It remains the best platform available to address the proliferation of highly capable, integrated air defenses and new air-to-air threats. The LRS-B will give our Nation a flexible, credible capability to strike globally with precision on limited notice should the national interest require. The KC-46 is our highest modernization priority and will ultimately replace a third of our current tanker fleet. That tanker fleet is what puts the “global” in global vigilance, global reach, and global power. It provides strategic options for the Nation and we must modernize it.

Four of the Air Force’s 10 largest modernization programs are space-based platforms. We plan to extend our streak of 58 consecutive successful launches and expand and modernize our constellations like the GPS, the defense meteorological satellite program, and others upon which our Nation and many of our allies and partners depend.

We will also continue to invest in our most important resources, our airmen. We will provide the training, education, and professional development opportunities they need to be the best in the world at what they do. That is all they ask of us.

On a decidedly negative note, both Secretary Donley and I were appalled at the deeply troubling sexual battery allegations against the chief of our Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Branch on the air staff just this weekend. As we have both said over and over

and over again, sexual assault prevention and response efforts are critically important to us. It is unacceptable that this occurs anywhere at any time in our Air Force and we will not quit working this problem.

So you know, this case is being adjudicated by the Arlington County prosecutor. We have requested jurisdiction, which is standard practice in cases like these. The individual will be arraigned this Thursday on a single count of sexual battery, and the sexual assault prosecutor in Arlington County will make the decision on jurisdiction and we will go from there. That is as much as I know about this case.

We remain committed to supporting victims of this crime and, consistent with the requirements of due process, to holding those who commit this crime accountable for their actions. We will continue to foster work environments that are safe and respectful. We will develop leaders of character who demonstrate operational effectiveness, innovation, and the selfless caring approach required to lead America's sons and daughters. We will continue to do everything in our power to care for airmen and their families, while balancing the resources required to do that, with the understanding that our primary job is to fight and win the Nation's wars.

My job is to help Secretary Donley field the most capable, credible Air Force possible. I believe our fiscal year 2014 budget request moves us in that direction. It postures the Air Force to improve readiness, to limit force structure costs, and to protect vital modernization. Secretary Donley and I stand ready to answer your questions about it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[The prepared joint statement of Mr. Donley and General Welsh follows:]

PREPARED JOINT STATEMENT BY HON. MICHAEL B. DONLEY AND
GEN. MARK A. WELSH III, USAF

INTRODUCTION

Today's airmen play a pivotal role in the constant pursuit of better ways to defend the Nation. Since the airplane was employed over the battlefields of World War I, airmen have stood for and pioneered new and innovative ways to shape the fight and reinvent the battle itself. While pre-Kitty Hawk warriors relied on breaking through fortified lines on the ground, airmen have always sought to go over, not through, those fortifications to achieve victory. This spirit of innovation, seeing problems from an alternative, multi-dimensional perspective, is in our Service history, in our culture, and in every airmen—Active, Guard, Reserve, and civilian—regardless of his or her specialty or role. We call this perspective "airmindedness." Airmen characteristically view security challenges differently—globally, without boundaries.

As a direct result of our status as the world's preeminent aerospace nation, airpower—the ability to project military power or influence through the control and exploitation of air, space, and cyberspace to achieve strategic, operational, or tactical objectives—allows America to control the ultimate high ground that is essential to winning our Nation's wars. The air arms of the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are supremely capable at what they do—facilitating their parent Service's respective mastery of operations on the ground, at sea, and in a littoral environment. However, America has only one Air Force specifically designed and precisely employed to exploit the singular global advantages of military operations in air, space, and cyberspace. Airmen provide global vigilance, global reach, and global power for America through the enduring Air Force core missions of air and space superiority, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (ISR), rapid global mobility, global strike, and command and control. By integrating capabilities across these core missions, we bring a unique set of options to deter war, deliver rapid, life-saving responses to

threatened areas anywhere on the planet, and strike hard and precisely wherever and whenever the national interest demands.

Recruiting and developing high-quality, innovative airmen who leverage technology to rethink military operations to achieve strategic objectives will remain a fundamental tenet of the U.S. Air Force. Only through the efforts of airmen who have led the way in integrating military capabilities across air, space, and cyberspace—even as their numbers have become significantly smaller—has our Nation maintained its airpower advantage. In an uncertain world, the Nation will depend even more on ready airmen to deliver global reach, global vigilance, and global power.

STRATEGIC ENVIRONMENT

In January 2012, the Secretary of Defense issued new defense strategic guidance (DSG)—Sustaining U.S. Global Leadership: Priorities for 21st Century Defense—which serves as a foundational document in establishing national security interests, the threats to these interests, and the fiscal realities that guide our military posture. The DSG directed a rebalance of forces, with a renewed focus on the Asia-Pacific region, as well as continued emphasis on the Middle East. Using the DSG as a point of departure, the Secretary of Defense recently directed a strategic choices and management review in light of budget realities—such as sequestration—and strategic uncertainty. This review will continue to help the Air Force to identify the major strategic choices that we must make to properly and realistically plan for the future.

Although the future is uncertain, we know that the capability to sustain national priorities hinges upon a strong and capable Air Force. Over the last 12 years, the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan required Air Force capabilities to help force rogue regimes from power and then to provide critical support to land forces engaged in counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations, and the Air Force currently plans to maintain these capabilities. In addition, the expected military challenges of the Asia-Pacific region, the Middle East, and Africa suggest an increasing reliance on airpower, not only by America and her allies, but also by her adversaries. The defining characteristics of American airpower—range, speed, flexibility, precision, persistence, and lethality—have played a crucial role in cultivating stability in these regions, a trend that will only increase in the future. The sheer geographic size and extended lines of communication of the Asia-Pacific region, along with the developing military expansion of potential regional adversaries, demand an air force that is postured to ensure stability and preserve U.S. interests. The Air Force is committed, along with our joint partners and allies and through cooperative military relationships, to ensuring global and regional stability and mutual freedom of access to the global commons to secure our common interests around the world.

The Air Force's technological advantage is threatened by the worldwide proliferation of advanced technologies, including integrated air defenses, long-range ballistic and cruise missiles with precision-capable warheads, and advanced air combat capabilities. Advances in adversarial capabilities in space control and cyber warfare may also limit U.S. freedom of action. Some of these technologies are attained with relatively minimal cost, greatly reducing the barriers to entry that have historically limited the reach and power of non-state actors, organized militias, and radical extremists. We live in an age of surprise, where individual acts can be powerful and the effects can be global. Today's strategic environment presents a broad range of threats and an unpredictable set of challenges, ranging from non-state actors to nuclear armed nations. We must continue to invest in our science and technology base to ensure that the future balance of power remains in our favor. This requires flexibility, versatility, and a shift to inherently agile, deployable, and networked systems from those designed for fixed purposes or limited missions.

One initiative that we continue to pursue as we consider the strategic environment is the Air-Sea Battle concept. Air-Sea Battle is an operational concept focused on the ways and means that are necessary to overcome current and anticipated anti-access and area denial threats. By focusing on increased integration and interoperability between all Services, the concept ensures that joint forces maintain the ability to project power and protect national interests despite the proliferation of anti-access/area denial threats worldwide. The concept is not a strategy, nor does it target a specific adversary, but instead focuses on acquiring pre-integrated, joint capabilities. Beyond conflict, the Air-Sea Battle concept can enhance response to humanitarian missions where weather or geography may deny access.

Even as we rebalance our forces, we are aware that the time, place, and nature of the next contingency can never be predicted with certainty. When contingencies arise, we must maintain the ability to respond immediately and effectively if called

to action. To align with the DSG, the Air Force has traded size for quality. We aim to be a smaller, but superb, force that maintains the agility, flexibility, and readiness to engage a full range of contingencies and threats.

FISCAL ENVIRONMENT

We recognize that because our Nation is striving to reduce spending and our military is transitioning operations from the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility and rebalancing to the Asia-Pacific region, the Air Force must adapt to a relatively static or reduced budget. However, reliance by the joint team and the Nation on our unique ability to provide global vigilance, global reach, and global power constrains Air Force options in reducing or terminating capabilities or missions. Therefore, we are working hard and making real progress in eliminating unnecessary expenses and ensuring more disciplined use of resources. Nonetheless, the fiscal environment requires us to make trades between force structure, readiness, and modernization among the core missions to ensure the highest quality and ready Air Force possible.

Fiscal Year 2013 Sequestration Effects

As a result of the triggering of the 2011 Budget Control Act's sequestration provision, the Air Force is implementing significant reductions to our fiscal year 2013 operations. If the post-sequester Budget Control Act funding caps remain in effect, the Air Force will be unable to achieve our agenda of reinvigorating readiness and aligning to the DSG. In both the short- and long-term, sequestration will have devastating impacts to readiness, will significantly affect our modernization programs, and may cause further force structure reductions.

Sequestration will force the Air Force to reduce expenditures by around \$10 billion in fiscal year 2013. These actions include a planned furlough of more than 170,000 civil service employees, an 18 percent reduction in flying training and aircraft maintenance, and deferment of critical facility requirements (including runway and taxiway repairs).

Many of these actions severely degrade Air Force readiness. Lost flight hours will cause unit stand downs which will result in severe, rapid, and long-term unit combat readiness degradation. We have already ceased operations for one-third of our fighter and bomber force. Within 60 days of a stand down, the affected units will be unable to meet emergent or operations plans requirements. Lost currency training requires 6 months to a year to return to current suboptimal levels, with desired flying proficiency for crewmembers requiring even longer. Sequestration impacts are already occurring, and the fiscal year 2014 President's budget (PB) does not assume the costs of recovering the readiness impacts from even a partial year of sequestration.

Depot delays will also result in the grounding of some affected aircraft. The deferments mean idled production shops, a degradation of workforce proficiency and productivity, and corresponding future volatility and operational costs. It can take 2 to 3 years to recover full restoration of depot workforce productivity and proficiency. In our space portfolio, sequestration will force the elimination of some system redundancies, as well as other preventative maintenance actions designed to minimize risk. All of these sequestration impacts negatively affect Air Force full-spectrum readiness at a time when we have been striving to reverse a declining trend in this critical area.

As a result of the Consolidated and Further Continuing Appropriations Act, 2013, the Air Force has been able to make limited funding transfers and reprogramming actions that will help alleviate the most problematic and immediate fiscal year 2013 funding shortfalls. However, the decisions that we have been forced to make in short-term spending may increase total costs over the long run. For example, sequestration cuts to Air Force modernization will impact every one of our investment programs. These program disruptions will, over time, cost more taxpayer dollars to rectify contract restructures and program inefficiencies, raise unit costs, and delay delivery of validated capabilities to warfighters in the field. The drastic reduction to modernization programs reduces our Air Force's competitive advantage and decreases the probability of mission success in the Asia-Pacific region.

Sequestration Effects in Fiscal Year 2014 and Beyond

The President's budget includes balanced deficit reduction proposals that would allow Congress to replace and repeal sequestration in fiscal year 2013 and the associated cap reductions in fiscal year 2014–2021. If sequestration is not replaced, however, the Air Force will have to rebuild degraded unit readiness, accept further delays to modernization, absorb the backlog in depot maintenance inductions, and invest additional funding to restore infrastructure. While the Air Force has made

every effort to minimize impacts to readiness and people, the bow-wave of reductions, deferments, and cancellations associated with sequestration will challenge the strategic choices made in the fiscal year 2014 budget submission.

The exact impacts of sequestration on Air Force resources in fiscal year 2014 and beyond depend on congressional action. We do know, however, that the national fiscal situation will require some reductions that may increase risk to our readiness, force structure, and our ability to modernize an aging aircraft inventory. In addition, the outcome of the strategic choices and management review may drive further changes.

As we navigate the uncertain way ahead, in order to mitigate risk in critical areas like readiness, force structure, and modernization, and to avoid a hollow force, we will continue to work with Congress to develop force shaping options, urgently seek another base realignment and closure (BRAC) round, and ask for relief from legislative restrictions on the reduction of excess force structure and from mandatory expenditures on programs that we have proposed to retire or terminate. To slow the growth in military compensation while also fully supporting the All-Volunteer Force, we also request congressional support on limiting the basic military pay raise to 1 percent and allowing sensible TRICARE fee and pharmacy co-pay changes.

In spite of these fiscal challenges, the Air Force will continue to strive to balance reductions across the force to maintain the capabilities of the remaining forces and keep the Air Force strong.

AIR FORCE CORE MISSIONS

The Air Force will only remain a superb fighting force in fiscal year 2014 and beyond by investing in the capabilities that enable us to bring our five core missions to the joint team. President Truman assigned several roles and missions to the Air Force at its establishment in 1947. Today, the Air Force brings essentially the same interdependent, integrated, and enduring contributions to the joint fight:

- Air and space superiority;
- Intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance;
- Rapid global mobility;
- Global strike; and
- Command and control.

Through these core missions, our airmen provide global vigilance, global reach, and global power for America. While the means through which we provide these core missions will change and evolve—for example, the addition of space and cyberspace—the core missions themselves will endure. None of these core missions function independently. Their interdependency and synchronization provide an unparalleled array of options, giving America the ability to respond quickly in the face of unexpected challenges.

The five core missions shape where we invest the resources we are given. However, the significant reductions that the Air Force has faced in the last few years have required us to make difficult choices. We have become a markedly smaller Service—the smallest in Air Force history.

Despite this decline in size, our airmen have stepped up to the challenge and delivered incredible airpower for the Nation, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year. They always respond when needed—from combat rescue airmen who exfiltrate the wounded from battlefields, to joint terminal attack controllers who direct the actions of combat aircraft engaged in close air support, to mobility airmen who quickly airlift personnel, vehicles, and equipment in both combat and relief operations, to the missile combat crews who sit nuclear alert to deter our enemies. These brave and innovative men and women must be properly trained and equipped to defend the Nation. Experience has taught us that during periods of fiscal austerity, tough decisions are necessary to avoid a hollow force—one that looks good on paper, but has more units, equipment, and installations than it can support, lacks the resources to adequately man, train, and maintain them, and are not provided with enough capable equipment and weapons to perform their missions.

In each core mission described below, we highlight what each core mission means, why it is important, our airmen's recent accomplishments in that area, and what we are focusing on for the future with respect to force structure and modernization.

Air and Space Superiority . . . Freedom From Attack, Freedom to Attack

Air Superiority

Air superiority is foundational to the application of joint military power, and it ensures that the advantages of the other Air Force core missions, as well as the contributions of our sister Services, are broadly available to combatant commanders. It includes the ability to control the air so that our military forces do not have to

worry about being attacked from the air, and it ensures that joint forces have the freedom to attack in the air, on the ground, and at sea. Air superiority has been and remains an essential precondition for conducting successful military operations. Air superiority has provided our Nation with a decades-long asymmetric advantage. Joint force and coalition commanders have come to expect mission-essential air superiority provided by America's airmen. The Air Force has given them ample reason—not since April 15, 1953, has an enemy combat aircraft killed a servicemember in the American ground forces.

In the six major U.S. combat operations of the last two decades, the Air Force's ability to provide air superiority has played an indispensable role in determining the outcome of each conflict. Recently, in Operations Odyssey Dawn and Unified Protector, our airmen patrolled the skies of Libya providing 50 percent of allied airborne reconnaissance and 40 percent of allied strike missions, equating to over 1,800 total strikes in support of the United Nations-sanctioned no-fly zone. In addition, the Air Force provides nearly 100 percent of the Nation's homeland air defense.

Although air superiority underwrites the freedom of action required for all joint military operations, there is no guarantee of it in the future. Substantial near peer investment and proliferation of advanced technologies threatens this freedom of action. Our legacy, or fourth-generation, fighter fleet has secured more than 20 years of an air superiority advantage, but may lose its ability to operate as effectively in contested environments. Large-scale use of legacy aircraft in these environments could be inhibited by the increased survivability of highly lethal, advanced integrated air defenses that will likely persist for the duration of future conflicts. Our air superiority future depends on modern technology and fifth-generation fighter capability. Weapon systems like the F-22, with contributions from the F-35, are what will carry America's Air Force forward to continue to provide that capability. Fifth-generation aircraft possess the survivability to operate despite these threats, and the Nation will need them in quantity.

In fiscal year 2014, the Air Force will focus on maintaining air superiority by investing \$1.3 billion to modernize the F-22 and F-15 fleets. The last F-22A was delivered in May 2012. The current F-22 upgrade programs include hardware and software enhancements to improve electronic protection, weapons capabilities, and service life. The F-15 is undergoing full scale fatigue testing to determine remaining service lifespan. In fiscal year 2014, the Air Force is requesting \$308 million for F-15 fleet radar and electronic warfare upgrades that will permit it to operate in conjunction with fifth-generation aircraft in the future threat environment.

Space Superiority

Along with air superiority, space superiority is integral to our forces' ability to remain free from attack and have the freedom to attack in the air, on land, and at sea. Joint, interagency, and coalition forces depend on Air Force space operations to perform their missions every day. For example, the Global Positioning System (GPS) enables precision guided munitions employment by all Services, in all weather conditions, minimizing collateral damage and providing the nanosecond-level timing needed by today's interconnected and highly-networked communications systems. Beyond defense uses, annual GPS benefits to the economy are in the tens of billions of dollars. Air Force military satellite communications (MILSATCOM) systems, including Advanced Extremely High Frequency (AEHF) and Wideband Global SATCOM (WGS) satellites, provide wideband and protected communications to deployed forces around the globe. This enables the command and control needed by our joint force commanders and allows deployed warfighters to receive intelligence, logistical, and other support from those serving at their home stations.

In calendar year 2012, the Air Force launched nine National Security Space (NSS) satellites to bolster our GPS, MILSATCOM, and situational awareness, and this year, we have successfully launched an additional satellite to enhance our missile warning capability. These launches include putting the fourth WGS, the second AEHF satellite, and the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS) GEO-2 satellite into orbit. The Air Force also delivered to orbit a new communications satellite for the Navy, a third GPS II-F satellite, and four National Reconnaissance Office satellites, as well as handled the third successful launch of an orbital test vehicle (OTV), including the first reuse of OTV-1. These launches make 58 consecutive successful Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) launches to date and 90 consecutive successful NSS missions.

To continue to advance our space superiority mission, the Air Force will continue to launch satellites to enhance the GPS, AEHF, WGS, Defense Meteorological Satellite Program (DMSP), and SBIRS constellations. In calendar year 2013, in addition to the SBIRS GEO-2 launched in March, the Air Force has five more launches planned—two GPS, one AEHF, and two WGS. In calendar year 2014, the Air Force

plans five launches—three GPS, one DMSP, and one additional EELV launch. Each of these launches will continue the necessary modernization of space-based positioning, navigation, and timing, protected communications, weather monitoring, and missile warning.

Despite our success in space, we cannot take our space technological capabilities and advantages for granted. The barriers to space access have dropped; nine nations have cleared the engineering and technical challenges required to reach space independently, and at least 40 other nations have a space presence. As a result, the current space environment is more congested, contested, and competitive than ever, and we will see this trend continue for the foreseeable future. To ensure that America remains a nation with unfettered access to space and superior space capabilities, the Air Force is pursuing ways to maintain a resilient¹ and affordable system architecture. Building and launching satellites is expensive, and we are exploring ways to reduce costs, increase competition, and improve resiliency without introducing unacceptable risk.

Our space programs demand significant modernization investment, and the pace of modernization for those programs often is based on the life expectancy of on-orbit capabilities. The Air Force's 10 largest programs include four space systems upon which the joint team and the American public depend. We must sustain these critical space capabilities with a focus on warfighting and mission assurance priorities, while accepting risk to meet fiscal goals.

To get our satellites safely into orbit, the Air Force has implemented a new EELV acquisition strategy to efficiently purchase up to 36 EELV common core boosters at a savings of more than \$1 billion. This strategy also introduces a competitive environment for up to 14 additional common core boosters for which new launch provider entrants can compete, starting as early as fiscal year 2015, giving new entrants a clear path to compete for future NSS missions. For fiscal year 2014, we are investing \$2 billion in EELV.

Our Efficient Space Procurement (ESP) strategy² is driving down satellite costs, resulting in savings across the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) of more than \$1 billion for AEHF satellites, and modernizing MILSATCOM systems to provide greater capacity, force reach back, and access in benign, contested, and nuclear environments. To improve our ability to provide global, persistent, and infrared surveillance capabilities, the Air Force is requesting \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 2014 for sustained funding of the Space-Based Infrared System (SBIRS). We have already achieved over \$500 million in savings due to our "block buy" approach and have the potential for additional future savings in the SBIRS program due to the ESP strategy.

In addition to replenishing and modernizing aging satellite constellations in critical space mission areas, the Air Force must improve space surveillance and the resilience of space-based capabilities. Therefore, in fiscal year 2014, we are requesting \$1.2 billion to modernize the GPS space, control, and user segments, including the addition of new signals and enhanced anti-jam capabilities. To ensure precision navigation and timing capabilities in the future, we are also developing technologies, including chip scale atomic clocks, cold atoms, and vision-based navigation to reduce dependency on GPS. Space situational awareness (SSA) is truly foundational for ensuring our ability to operate safely and effectively in space. To improve our ability to discover, search, and monitor near earth objects, we are requesting \$403.7 million to fund the Space Fence, a new system that will provide increased capacity to observe objects in space and, therefore, improve our ability to safely operate our critical space systems.

International Space Partnerships

The Air Force remains fully committed to the long-term goal of fostering international relationships and supporting ongoing security efforts with partner nations around the globe. Teaming with allies and partners not only helps cost-sharing, but it also increases their capability and their capacity to support contingency oper-

¹ Resilience is the ability of an architecture to support the functions necessary for mission success in spite of hostile action or adverse conditions. An architecture is "more resilient" if it can provide these functions with higher probability, shorter periods of reduced capability, and across a wider range of scenarios, conditions, and threats. Resilience may leverage cross-domain or alternative government, commercial, or international capabilities.

² ESP is an acquisition strategy that builds on the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation-developed concept known as Evolutionary Acquisition for Space Efficiency (EASE). EASE sought to lower the cost of acquiring space systems by using block buys and reinvesting the savings into the Space Modernization Initiative. The Office of the Assistant Secretary of the Air Force for Acquisition took the EASE concept as a building block and added "should cost/will cost" methodology and fixed price incentive fee contracting.

ations. Space is an area in which we have made significant progress in building partnerships. For example, in May 2012, the Air Force concluded a United States-Canada SSA partnership memorandum of understanding (MOU) regarding the Canadian Sapphire satellite system, and we successfully concluded a United States-Australia MOU in November 2012 to begin an 8-year, bilateral effort to provide dedicated space surveillance coverage in the southern hemisphere. International partners are also supporting our SATCOM efforts. In January 2012, the Air Force signed the WGS MOU with Canada, Denmark, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, and New Zealand to enable expansion of the WGS program to a ninth satellite, thus increasing interoperability and partner access to the system. We are also acquiring and fielding the AEHF constellation in cooperation with our international partners from the United Kingdom, the Netherlands, and Canada. In addition, the Air Force has also established nine bi- or multi-lateral international agreements to advance the benefits of the GPS system.

In coming years, our Nation's ability to gain and maintain superiority in air and space will become progressively more contested as sophisticated technologies continue to proliferate. Beyond modernizing our systems, the key to maintaining air and space superiority is ready and trained airmen who are properly equipped for their mission. When called upon, these airmen must command a well-honed combat edge so that they are ready to prevail even against the most advanced opponents.

Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance . . . Eyes and Ears on Adversaries

Since the beginning of armed conflict, superior knowledge of adversary intentions, capabilities, and actions has been a critical enabler to victory. The evolution of globally integrated ISR has fundamentally changed how our military fights wars. The tremendous demand for Air Force ISR during recent conflicts and crises highlights their combat advantage. ISR capabilities are among the first requested and deployed, and they are increasingly essential to all facets of Air Force and joint operations. Airmen deliver integrated, cross-domain ISR capabilities that allow the Air Force to provide our Nation's decision-makers, commanders, and warfighters with a continual information advantage over our adversaries.

The Air Force ISR force is networked to provide both foundational intelligence and immediate warfighter support. Sensors operating in air, space, and cyberspace, global communication architectures, and a network of regionally aligned centers enable our forces to conduct exploitation and analytical efforts in support of combatant commander requirements. The Air Force Distributed Common Ground System (DCGS) is a critical capability within this global network, providing decision advantage across the spectrum of conflict, in all theaters, and in support of all operations.

Last year, our ISR airmen conducted intelligence preparation of the operational environment, shaped combat plans for 33 named operations, enabled the removal of 700 enemy combatants from the fight, and provided critical adversary awareness and targeting intelligence to U.S. and coalition forces in over 250 "troops-in-contact" engagements. ISR airmen enhanced battlespace awareness through 540,000 hours of sustained overwatch of tactical maneuver forces and lines of communication and identified over 100 weapons caches and explosive devices that would have otherwise targeted American and partner forces.

ISR Force Structure and Modernization

In fiscal year 2014, our ISR budget request maintains investments in the DCGS, the MQ-1 Predator, the RC-135 Rivet Joint, the RQ-4 Global Hawk Block 40, and U-2 programs, and makes internal adjustments in MQ-9 Reaper program funding so that the program was able to meet a key acquisition milestone.

The Air Force remains on track to field 65 MQ-1B Predator and MQ-9A Reaper combat air patrols by May 2014. To maintain our ability to conduct counterterrorism operations, we are standing-up five new medium-altitude remotely piloted aircraft (RPA) combat air patrols in calendar year 2013 and continuing our transition to an all-MQ-9 fleet. We have built a highly effective permissive ISR capability—a growth of 4,300 percent since 2000—but the survivability in contested environments of some RPA is questionable. Therefore, in a post-Afghanistan security environment and as we rebalance to the Asia-Pacific, we are reviewing the need to adjust the RPA mix toward more survivable systems.

The enduring and universal requirement for ISR capabilities, coupled with a complex and dangerous future security environment, drive the need to modernize our ISR forces. This modernization will include improved automated tools for the Air Force DCGS, a system that allows the processing, exploitation, and dissemination of an enormous amount of information every day, as well as integrated networks that are secure and reliable. The regionally aligned distributed ground sites will be the centerpiece of our cross-domain, global ISR enterprise and will allow airmen to

exploit real-time data from sensors and platforms, even in contested environments. To modernize to an easily upgradable and interoperable architecture, we must overcome policy and technical impediments to allow for seamless intelligence sharing and integration with intelligence community agencies, other Services, and coalition partners. The fiscal year 2014 PB requests \$62 million for military construction investments for a new DCGS building to support more than 200 operators, maintainers, support personnel, and mission systems at Beale AFB, CA.

Significant reductions in Air Force-provided ISR capabilities would be inconsistent with the current needs of our joint forces. Although ISR forces will continue to engage in counterinsurgency and counterterrorism operations, they must also evolve to address the challenges of the more contested environment of the Asia-Pacific region, including increased emphasis on air and naval forces, as well as greater cooperation and partnership with allies and regional partners. For example, we are currently exploring potential ISR efficiencies that can be gained by collaborating with the Navy, and we continue to grow and mature our intelligence partnerships with strategic allies across the Pacific. One ISR airmen will also continue their partnerships within the intelligence community to leverage national capabilities for the air component commander and better position combat support agencies to support air, space, and cyber operations.

To enhance our ability to conduct ISR across the range of military operations, we must shift our efforts to solutions that enable robust and reliable communication architectures, all-domain data processing and exploitation, advanced analytical tools, and cross-domain targeting. We are dedicated to improving the automation and machine-to-machine capabilities of intelligence analysis systems in order to deliver greater operational advantage to combatant commanders. Therefore, in the fiscal year 2014 PB, we are requesting an increase of 88 personnel at the Air Force Targeting Center to support deliberate planning requirements, and we are investing \$20 million for network centric collaboration targeting capabilities, which includes developing targeting automation tools, machine-to-machine interfaces, and auto-populate capabilities across ISR intelligence and command and control systems. We also plan to add Air National Guard targeting units at two locations to solidify our commitment to reinvigorating the Air Force targeting enterprise.

The strength of our Air Force ISR enterprise continues to be our professional, well trained, and dedicated airmen, officer, enlisted, and civilian, who take all this technology and data and transform it into a decision advantage for our Air Force, our joint teammates, and our Nation. Air Force ISR allows our forces to own the night in Afghanistan, connect with partners across Europe and Africa, and provide warning on the Korean peninsula. The integration of air, space, and cyber ISR is a powerful capability—one in which we must continue to invest our talent and resources.

Rapid Global Mobility . . . Delivery on Demand

The Air Force's rapid global mobility core mission projects American influence quickly and precisely to anywhere on the face of the earth. Air mobility forces provide swift deployment and sustainment capability by delivering essential equipment and personnel for missions ranging from major combat to humanitarian relief operations around the world and at home. On any given day, the Air Force's mobility aircraft deliver critical personnel and cargo and provide airdrop of time-sensitive supplies, food, and ammunition on a global scale. America's mobility fleet averages one take-off or landing every 2 minutes, every day of the year.

Airlift

The Air Force provides unprecedented airlift responses through our strategic and tactical airlift fleets. Here at home, a 12-base effort was initiated within 72 hours of Superstorm Sandy's landfall in October 2012. Active and Reserve airlift crews from Wright-Patterson Air Force Base (AFB), McChord AFB, and Travis AFB converged on March Air Reserve Base and worked together to move 356 utility workers from across California and 134 utility vehicles with their associated equipment—totaling 2.4 million pounds of cargo—in less than 96 hours to places like Stewart Air National Guard Base and John F. Kennedy International Airport in New York. This Total Force effort helped quickly bring utility trucks and workers to where they were needed on the east coast to help restore power to affected Americans 4 days sooner than if the vehicles and equipment would have been driven across the country.

In calendar year 2012, airmen flew 38,000 airlift missions, and over the course of 1,300 airdrops, the Air Force dropped 40 million pounds of life-saving sustainment to coalition forces on the ground in Afghanistan—86 percent more than the entire Korean War. The capability to airdrop personnel, equipment, and human-

itarian relief, especially in contested environments, remains critical to our Nation's defense.

For the inter-theater airlift fleet, C-17 procurement will complete this year, but essential modernization programs to standardize the configuration of the entire 223 aircraft fleet continue. Our fiscal year 2014 budget request includes \$1.1 billion to continue the conversion of 52 C-5B aircraft to C-5M Super Galaxy aircraft, with expected completion in fiscal year 2017.

In fiscal year 2014, the Air Force will also continue its efforts to modernize its intra-theater airlift and special operations C-130-type aircraft. In 2014, the Air Force seeks congressional support to embark upon a C-130J multi-year procurement contract that will extend through fiscal year 2018. Over the course of this contract, we will procure 72 C-130J-type aircraft to further recapitalize our airlift, special operations, and personnel recovery platforms. The contract is expected to provide approximately \$574.3 million worth of savings to the Air Force over the life of the procurement program and deliver aircraft earlier than annual contracts would.

Supported by the C-130 multi-year contract, the Air Force has programmed \$963.5 billion dollars to continue procurement of AC/MC-130Js to recapitalize Air Force Special Operation Command's MC-130E/P and AC-130H aircraft. The AC-130H recapitalization effort concludes in fiscal year 2014, as does the CV-22 procurement, with the purchase of the last three airframes.

Air Refueling

Mobility forces also provide in-flight refueling—the linchpin to power projection at intercontinental distances. Over the past 50 years, the Air Force has provided unparalleled air refueling capability to support the interests of our Nation and her allies. The Air Force flew 16,000 tanker missions last year, and since September 11, 2001, America's tanker fleet has offloaded over 2.36 billion gallons to joint and coalition air forces. The new KC-46 tanker will help maintain this capability—the backbone of America's military reach—while also extending the range and persistence of joint and coalition aircraft.

As the Air Force considers where to invest in this core mission area, we are seeking the most effective and efficient way to move people and equipment. We also anticipate a future that will call for us to provide rapid global mobility to remote, austere locations in contested environments. This will first require a very capable tanker fleet. Replacing one-third of the 50-year-old KC-135 aerial refueling tanker fleet with the KC-46A is our top Air Force acquisition priority. The KC-46A program will ensure that our Nation retains a tanker fleet able to provide crucial air refueling capacity worldwide for decades to come. In fiscal year 2014, we programmed \$1.6 billion dollars for the manufacture of four developmental aircraft. The initial flights of the KC-46A test aircraft are scheduled to begin in fiscal year 2014. The program is currently executing as planned, and we are on track to receive 18 operational aircraft by late fiscal year 2017. Until the KC-46A reaches full operational capability, we are resourcing critical modernization of the KC-10 and KC-135 tanker fleets.

Combat Rescue/Aeromedical Evacuation

Combat rescue and aeromedical evacuation forces are other key parts of the rapid global mobility force. The Air Force is the only Service with a dedicated force organized, trained, and equipped to execute personnel recovery. These highly-trained airmen support Air Force, joint, and coalition forces in a wide variety of mission areas. With a unique combination of armed, highly advanced HH-60G Pave Hawk helicopters and specially trained airmen, we provide a unique capability to recover wounded soldiers and civilians in environments considered too hostile for standard medical evacuation units. In addition to overseas contingency deployments, these airmen also serve as first responders during disaster relief and humanitarian assistance operations, making pararescue one of the most highly stressed career fields in the U.S. military. Since 2001, our combat rescue forces have saved over 7,000 lives, and in 2012 alone, they flew 4,500 missions that saved 1,128 coalition, joint and partner nation lives in some of the harshest environments in the world.

Aeromedical evacuation also continues to play a vital role in providing responsive, world-class medical support to wounded soldiers and injured civilians around the globe. In calendar year 2012, the Air Force airlifted 12,000 patients; since 2003, we have transported a staggering 195,000 patients. To enhance our response to battlefield evacuation support, we developed and deployed tactical critical care evacuation teams to provide triage care on rotary wing aircraft closer to the point of injury. Our health response teams include rapidly deployable, modular, and scalable field hospitals. They provide immediate care within minutes of arrival, surgery and intensive care units within 6 hours, and full capability within 12 hours of deployment.

These advances have elevated battlefield survival rates to unprecedented levels, with a nearly 30 percent improvement since Operation Desert Storm (Iraq) in the early 1990s.

With the recapitalization of the HC-130N/P with the HC-130J through the C-130 multi-year program, the Air Force continues its effort to modernize its personnel recovery programs. The Combat Rescue Helicopter Program will replace the aging HH-60G fleet, and the Operational Loss Replacement Program will replace HH-60G aircraft lost during operations over the past decade, returning the HH-60G inventory to 112 aircraft. This year, we budgeted \$393.6 million to finalize the modification process and begin testing the first two aircraft. The ability of Air Force helicopters to fight their way in and out of medical evacuation and recovery operations is unique to the joint team and has proven its value over the past 10 years. Currently, the combat rescue fleet is sized appropriately to meet our global strategy.

Mobility Force Structure

Air Force mobility forces, including long-range strategic airlifters, tankers, and tactical airlifters are sized to move and sustain joint forces over long distances. Congress manages the long-range fleet to a specific floor, currently 301 aircraft. However, after submission to Congress of a report required by the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013, we anticipate that this floor will be lowered to 275. The tanker fleet is largely right-sized to support the joint force. However, the tactical airlift fleet is sized somewhat larger than the defense strategy requires.

Rapid global mobility will continue to be a critical core mission for the Air Force. Whether it is sustaining the warfighter in any environment or delivering hope with humanitarian assistance, airmen will ensure that the whole of government and international partners are strengthened with this unique capability to get assets to the fight quickly, remain in the fight, and return home safely.

Global Strike . . . Any Target, Any Time

As a significant portion of America's deterrent capability, Air Force global strike provides the Nation the ability to project military power more rapidly, more flexibly, and with a lighter footprint than other military options. The Air Force's nuclear deterrent and conventional precision strike forces can credibly deny adversary objectives or impose unacceptable costs by effectively holding any target on the planet at risk and, if necessary, disabling or destroying targets promptly, even from bases in the continental United States. Global strike may entail close support to troops at risk, interdicting enemy fielded forces, or striking an adversary's vital centers from great distances. Credible long-range strike capabilities are indispensable for deterrence and provide fundamental military capabilities to underpin U.S. military power. Air Force global strike capability relies on a wide-range of systems including bombers, missiles, tankers, special operations platforms, fighters, and other Air Force systems.

Nuclear Deterrent Forces

The unique attributes of the Air Force's nuclear deterrent forces—the stabilizing characteristics of the intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM) and the flexibility of the bomber—underwrite the Nation's ability to achieve stability amidst the likely crises and challenges of the coming decades. Air Force B-2 and B-52 bombers and ICBM crews—who continually stand watch all day, every day—provide two legs of the Nation's nuclear triad, while our nuclear command, control, and communications systems provide the National Command Authority the necessary tools to employ all strategic forces. Together, our bombers, tankers, ICBMs, and dual-capable fighters provide this “no fail” capability as the backbone of America's deterrence.

Against a backdrop of increasingly contested air, space, and cyber environments, the Air Force must maintain its ability to hold any target at risk and provide the Nation a credible strategic deterrent force. This capability, unmatched by any other nation's air force, will only grow in importance as America rebalances its force structure and faces potential adversaries that are modernizing their militaries to deny access to our forces. Therefore, the Air Force will modernize global strike capabilities to ensure that American forces are free to act when, where, and how they are needed.

Consistent with the DSG, in fiscal year 2014, the Air Force is investing in the development of the long range strike family of systems. The Long Range Strike-Bomber (LRS-B)—another of the Air Force's three top acquisition programs—is a key piece of that effort, and we are requesting \$379.4 million for LRS-B in fiscal year 2014. The Air Force is committed to leveraging mature technologies and streamlined acquisition processes to deliver an affordable new bomber with conventional and nuclear strike capabilities. Therefore, the Air Force will certify the LRS-B for nuclear weapons employment within 2 years after initial operating capability

to simplify the development and fielding of the aircraft, as well as have the benefit of conducting its nuclear certification on a mature system.

While the LRS-B is in development, sustaining and modernizing B-52 and B-2 bombers is critical to ensure that these aging aircraft remain viable. Upgrades to the B-2's Defensive Management System, communications improvements on the B-52 via the Combat Network Communications Technology (CONNECT) program, and aircraft sustainment efforts, such as the anti-skid system replacement on the B-52, are just a few examples of steps being taken to ensure the effectiveness of our bomber fleet for years to come. Independent of specific platforms, we budgeted \$122.8 million to continue the adaptive engine technology development effort to mature advanced propulsion technology to decrease fuel consumption and increase range and loiter time.

Nuclear weapons improvements include the B61-12 tail kit assembly program, which is undergoing its preliminary design review. We are also modernizing ICBM fuzes for Mk21 and Mk12A re-entry vehicles, leveraging common technologies and components with the ongoing Navy fuze program.

As long as nuclear weapons exist, the Air Force is committed to meeting the President's direction to maintain safe, secure, and effective nuclear deterrence capabilities. The quantity of nuclear-capable bombers and ICBMs comprising the bulk of the Nation's deterrent force may be reduced as we continue to implement the New START treaty. However, the treaty allows both sides to determine their own force structures, which gives us flexibility to deploy and maintain our strategic nuclear forces in a way that is best calculated to serve our national security interests. But deeper reductions must consider multi-dimensional challenges from the world's emerging nuclear powers in a more complex security environment. The Nation's nuclear expertise must not be allowed to atrophy, and focused attention is necessary no matter the size of the nuclear force.

Precision Strike Forces

In addition to nuclear deterrent forces, our conventional precision strike forces hold any target at risk across the air, land, and sea domains. Currently, precision strike forces and armed ISR support joint and coalition ground forces in Afghanistan and Africa. In 2012, the Air Force flew and supported over 28,000 close air support sorties in Operation Enduring Freedom (Afghanistan). However, as our forces rebalance to the Asia-Pacific region and as anti-access/area-denial capabilities proliferate, the ability of our fourth-generation fighters and legacy bombers to penetrate contested airspace will be increasingly challenged.

Success in counterterrorism and irregular warfare missions requires the continued ability to conduct operations in hostile, denied, or politically sensitive environments, using other than conventional forces. Air Commandos provide specialized expertise for infiltration, exfiltration, precision strike, battlefield air operations, ISR, and aviation foreign internal defense that are essential to joint special operations capabilities. In 2012, Air Force special operations personnel executed 1,642 strike missions and 7,713 specialized mobility missions. Persistent special operations presence in Afghanistan and elsewhere, increasing requirements in the Pacific, and enduring global commitments will continue to stress our Air Force special operations airmen and aircraft.

In fiscal year 2014, the Air Force is concentrating on funding the F-35 program—one of our top three acquisition programs. While also complementing the F-22's world class air superiority capabilities, the F-35A is designed to penetrate air defenses and deliver a wide range of precision munitions. This modern, fifth-generation aircraft brings the added benefit of increased allied interoperability and cost-sharing between Services and partner nations. In fiscal year 2014, we are investing \$4.2 billion in the continued development of the F-35 weapon system and the procurement of 19 low rate initial production Lot 8 aircraft. The Air Force is focused on completion of the system design and development of the F-35 by fiscal year 2017 and requests \$782.3 million in fiscal year 2014 for this purpose.

During F-35 development, it is imperative that we maintain our fourth-generation fighter fleet. The F-16 is undergoing full-scale durability testing to inform structural modification efforts to extend its service life. At least 300 F-16s will undergo a service life extension program and a capability enhancement called Combat Avionics Programmed Extension Suite, which permits them to remain relevant in the near-term threat environment until the F-35 is available in sufficient numbers. We are requesting \$52.3 million in fiscal year 2014 for these enhancements.

Modernizing our munitions to align with the DSG is also an urgent requirement that is fundamental to managing the risk associated with combat force reductions. In fiscal year 2014, the Air Force is investing \$1.1 billion in preferred conventional munitions, such as the AIM-120D, AIM-9X, AGM-158, and GBU-53, and is devel-

oping new munitions to address future needs. We are also continuing our efforts to ensure the safety, security, and effectiveness of our nuclear arsenal.

The Air Force must maintain its ability to neutralize any target at any time with global strike forces so that America's military credibility will remain uncontested, allies will not worry, and potential adversaries will not be emboldened to challenge the pursuit of our national objectives.

Command and Control ... Total Flexibility

Airmen employ the Air Force's other four interdependent and enduring core missions through robust, adaptable, and survivable command and control systems. The Air Force provides access to reliable communications and information networks so that the joint team can operate globally at a high tempo and level of intensity. Air Force command and control systems give commanders the ability to conduct highly coordinated joint operations on an unequaled scale using centralized control and decentralized execution.

The Theater Air Control System (TACS) is the Air Force's primary system to enable planning, control, and execution of joint or combined air operations. The senior element of the TACS is the air operations center (AOC). The inherently flexible capabilities of the AOC and its crews allow for deliberately planned responses to anticipated challenges and dynamically planned responses to contingencies. The Air Force's primary TACS weapons systems, such as the Control and Reporting Center (CRC), the E-3 B/C/G Airborne Warning and Control System (AWACS), and the E-8C Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS), provide the AOC with the critical battle management, sensors, and communications that are required to get the right information to the right person in a timely manner.

In Operation Odyssey Dawn (Libya) in 2011, TACS airmen enabled more than 2,000 sorties to enforce the United Nations' no-fly zone. In 2012, Air Force command and control operations included: planning, executing, and controlling over 60,000 combat sorties in support of Operation Enduring Freedom (Afghanistan); over 12,000 sorties in support of Operation Noble Eagle (U.S. air defense); over 1,700 sorties supporting 35 defense support to civil authorities events; over 9,000 global aeromedical evacuation missions; noncombatant evacuation operations as a result of the terrorist attack on the American embassy in Libya; and over 1,500 ISR missions supporting U.S. Southern Command and Northern Command. Our command and control systems enabled us to conduct many of these operations simultaneously.

It is essential that we continue to modernize, upgrade, and refit our operational and tactical level command and control systems and sensors to maintain the Nation's advantage in command and control. Our systems are under constant attack, as illustrated by the new and more capable threats emerging daily in the areas of cyber weapons, anti-satellite systems, advanced fighter/attack aircraft, and electromagnetic jamming. Our potential adversaries are also making advances by electronically linking their own combat capabilities, creating new military challenges that our forces must be prepared to address.

To respond to these challenges, the Air Force will field advanced command and control systems that are more reliable, resilient, and interoperable. More importantly, we will recruit and train innovative airmen to build, manage, and advance our complex and diverse command and control systems while enabling their ready use by our own and allied forces. Modernization of existing systems, such as the CRC and E-3G Block 40/45, and AOC 10.2 will serve as the backbone of this effort. In fiscal year 2014, we are investing \$396.8 million in E-3G Block 40/45, \$58.1 million in AOC 10.2, and \$26.4 million in CRC. We are also funding critical investments in future capabilities, such as the Joint Aerial Layer Network. The Air Force has also initiated modernization of crucial national command, control, and communications systems and is investing \$52.3 million in fiscal year 2014 to fund data linkages between fifth-generation aircraft and legacy fleets. Finally, the Air Force continues to examine alternatives for the future of the JSTARS mission area.

Cyber Capabilities

The capability to deliver airpower is intimately dependent on the ability to operate effectively in cyberspace, which is critical to all of our core missions and many of our command and control systems. Operations in cyberspace can magnify military effects by increasing the efficiency and effectiveness of air and space operations and by helping to integrate capabilities across all domains. Pervasive and highly interconnected, cyberspace operations will remain extremely contested. The United States faces cyber-attacks on key infrastructures. The cost of entry is low, anonymity is high, and attribution is difficult. The Air Force recognizes the severity of these threats, as well as the speed and interconnected nature of cyberspace, and is dedi-

cated to ensuring the access and freedom of maneuver that are essential for effective cyber operations.

Cyber roles and responsibilities are certainly not exclusive to the Air Force; however, the integration of cyber capabilities with each of our core missions is an essential component of how we bring innovative, globally focused “airmindedness” to ensure our warfighting advantage. In fiscal year 2013, the Secretary of Defense decided on a new force model for Department of Defense (DOD) cyber operations. This model will increase the Air Force cyber force structure and manning. The additional manpower will provide the Air Force capability for national, combatant command, and Air Force cyber missions. For example, the Air Force has increased funding to \$3.6 million in fiscal year 2014 to cyber hunter teams who provide precision capability to identify, pursue, and mitigate cyberspace threats affecting critical links and nodes within the Air Force network.

The Air Force will continue to synchronize forces across air, space, and cyberspace to achieve mission success in dynamic battlespaces and support integrated and interoperable joint command and control capabilities that are agile, responsive, and survivable, even in contested environments.

AIRMEN READINESS AND DEVELOPMENT

While it is common to define the Air Force by its core missions or by our aircraft, missiles, and satellites, the reality is that our Service’s unmatched capabilities exist only because of the imagination and knowledge of our outstanding airmen. Accordingly, we believe in taking care of our people first, while always remaining focused on the mission. To ensure that our airmen can continue to power the enduring core missions for the Nation, we must invest in their readiness and development.

Readiness

Underpinning our airmen’s ability to provide global vigilance, global reach, and global power to the Nation and contribute our core missions to the joint team is their readiness. “Readiness” is the ability of a unit to provide its designed operational capabilities within the required timeline. It is comprised of personnel requirements, training (to include flying hours), weapon system sustainment, facilities, and installations. A good readiness posture depends on health in all of these key areas. While protecting future readiness includes modernizing the weapons systems and equipment, creating combat readiness in the near-term is a complex task involving the intersection of personnel, materiel, and training. It includes balancing time between operational and training commitments, funding from multiple sources, informed levels of risk, and effectively managing resources to achieve the desired state of readiness.

Mitigating the risk associated with a smaller military requires a fully ready force. A smaller force with less capacity requires greater attention to ensuring adequate personnel levels, aircraft availability, weapons, and sufficient training to support the full range of mission requirements at the desired level of competency. If we attempt to sustain current force levels while personnel and operational costs rise, there will be progressively fewer resources available to support our current number of installations, maintain existing aircraft inventories, vital equipment, and weapons, and invest in future capabilities. These factors become more critical as shortages in aircraft availability, weapons, and key personnel grow and exert a larger negative effect on the overall readiness of the force.

While the Air Force has met the demands of a high operational tempo in support of today’s fight, this has inevitably taken a toll on our weapons systems and people, putting a strain on the overall readiness of the force. As reflected by Office of Secretary of Defense (OSD)-mandated Status of Requirements and Training System (SORTS) metrics, we have seen a steady decline in unit readiness since 2003; our readiness must improve. The rebalance to the Asia-Pacific and our continued presence in the Middle East and Africa indicate that the demand for Air Force capabilities will remain constant, or perhaps even rise, over the next decade.

Currently, the bulk of the funding for maintaining numerous missions initially fielded with overseas contingency operations (OCO) funding (e.g., MQ-1/9, MC-12, and the E-11A with its battlefield airborne communications node capability) remains in the upcoming fiscal year 2014 budget request. If the Air Force is to retain those capabilities for the long-term, funding for the aircraft and the capabilities and the infrastructure that supports them must migrate from OCO funding to an adjusted base budget. If the base budget is not adjusted, these capabilities will either have to be retired or be retained at the expense of other full spectrum forces and capabilities, which would increase risks.

The Air Force supports combatant command missions that require 24/7 availability and attention. Space operations, command and control, cyber defense, ISR,

special operations, personnel recovery, and nuclear deterrence are all high priority missions that cannot be done adequately, and in some cases cannot be done safely, at low readiness levels. In support of U.S. defense strategy, air forces are inherently capable of responding quickly and can be shifted on relatively short notice between critical theaters of operation. Allowing the Air Force to slip to a lower state of readiness that requires a subsequent long buildup to full combat effectiveness will negate the essential strategic advantages of airpower and put joint forces at increased risk.

Therefore, the Air Force's portion of the fiscal year 2014 PB aligns resources in an effort to slow the readiness decline and sets the stage for restoring full-spectrum readiness. However, as noted previously, the effects of sequestration in fiscal year 2013 will hamper our readiness efforts in fiscal year 2014 and beyond. The pillars of our full-spectrum readiness effort include: a consistent, equitable, and attainable flying hour program; prioritized full-spectrum training venues; focused weapons systems sustainment funding; appropriate reallocation of manpower to our highest priority missions; sustainment of our power projection platforms (Air Force installations); and developing and caring for airmen and their families.

Through planned funding of weapons system sustainment, the flying hours program, training ranges, facilities and installations, and modernization programs, the Air Force could maintain its legacy of "spring-loaded" readiness. In the past 35 years, the Air Force has been called upon nearly 150 times to conduct combat or humanitarian operations in more than 45 countries, and combat sorties in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility have continued uninterrupted since 1991. The completion of combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan are important milestones that should provide an opportunity to reset the force, but other international security challenges remain and, in some cases, are growing. America will continue to need a ready Air Force.

Weapons System Sustainment (WSS)

WSS is a key component of full-spectrum readiness. Years of combat demands have taken a toll across many weapons systems, and we continue to see an increase in the costs of WSS requirements, which are driven by sustainment strategy, complexity of new weapons systems, operations tempo, force structure changes, and growth in depot work packages for aging, legacy aircraft. With recent force structure reductions, we must carefully manage how we allocate WSS in order to avoid availability shortfalls.

The fiscal year 2014 budget submission adds \$1.5 billion to the WSS portfolio across the FYDP. Although the fiscal year 2014 PB adds baseline funds for WSS, we continue to rely on OCO funding for global contingency operations.

WSS funding requirements for combat-ready air, space, and cyber forces have consistently increased at a rate double that of DOD inflation planning factors. Although service life extension programs and periodic modifications have allowed our inventory to support 20 years of unabated operations, the cost of maintenance and sustainment continues to rise. As a result, we want to improve the link between resources and readiness for Air Force weapons systems by reducing costs, improving risk-based decision making, and balancing costs with performance. To address the trend of higher costs, we are reviewing and streamlining organizations and processes to reduce maintenance and material costs, develop depot efficiencies, and manage weapons systems requirements growth. We are taking actions to reduce requirements by examining the potential for restructuring or modifying new and existing contractor logistics support contracts to optimize tradeoffs, provide visibility, and improve flexibility between costs and outcomes. We will also leverage risk-based strategies and evaluate maintenance schedules to maximize aircraft availability and apply performance-based logistics solutions to balance total sustainment costs with performance.

Despite our efforts, WSS costs are still expected to grow, and new, more capable aircraft are often more expensive to maintain than those they replace. In the current fiscal environment, our efforts to restore weapons system availability to required levels will be a serious challenge.

Flying Hour Program (FHP)

The emphasis on readiness in the DSG reinforced the need to implement a FHP that achieves full-spectrum readiness. The Air Force balanced the allocation of flying hours across the Total Force to incrementally improve readiness levels. The flying hour program will continue to rely on OCO funding to support Operation Enduring Freedom and the redeployment of combat forces from Afghanistan. With the expectation of decreasing OCO flying hours, we have programmed increasing O&M-funded flying hours in fiscal year 2015 and throughout the FYDP. Beginning in fiscal year 2015, the program is approximately 90 percent of the peacetime training

requirement to attain full-spectrum readiness across the Total Force, reflecting our assessment of the full executable program.

We are also committed to a long-term effort to increase our live, virtual, and constructive operational training (LVC-OT) capability and capacity by funding improvements in LVC-OT devices (e.g., simulators and virtual trainers) and networks. Adjustments to the flying hour programs will continue to evolve as the fidelity of simulators and LVC-OT capabilities improve. Increasing our virtual capabilities will minimize fuel consumption and aircraft maintenance costs while ensuring high quality training for our aircrews. In fiscal year 2014, we are investing \$3.3 million for LVC-OT purposes.

Training Ranges

Full-spectrum training requires the availability of air-to-air and air-to-ground training ranges. Many of our ranges are venues for large-scale joint and coalition training events and are critical enablers for concepts like Air-Sea Battle. In fiscal year 2014, we are requesting range O&M funding of \$75.8 million to sustain these crucial national assets to elevate flying training effectiveness for the joint team, which in turn improves individual and unit readiness levels. Unfortunately, previous years' baseline range funding was at levels as low as 25 percent of requirements, resulting in a corresponding corrosive effect as range infrastructure deteriorated and aircrews only maintained readiness in skill sets oriented toward current combat operations. This year, we are reversing this trend by raising baseline range funding to 74 percent of requirements to begin a return to full-spectrum readiness. As we continue to realign to the DSG, additional range investment and sustainment funding will be necessary to ensure that our combat forces are prepared for the full range of potential threats and environments.

In fiscal year 2014, the Air Force is poised to work with the joint community to enhance cyber ranges to enable realistic testing and evaluation of new cyber concepts, policies, and technologies. These ranges will provide a venue for evaluating network services, information assurance, and offensive and defensive cyber capabilities in a closed and secure environment. Coupled with the Air Force's program for simulator-based cyber education, training, crew certification, and exercises, these cyber ranges will provide trained and tested cyber operators able to strike targets anywhere on the globe, as well as defend against foreign and domestic attacks.

Facilities, Installations, and Energy

From cyber to long-range strike, installation readiness buttresses the Air Force's core mission. Therefore, the Air Force's fiscal year 2014 budget request employs a balanced approach to our installation investment strategy. Our installations are power projection platforms comprised of both built and natural infrastructure that: (1) effectively enable Air Force core operational capabilities—we deliver air, space and cyber capabilities from our installations; (2) send a strategic message of commitment to allies and intent to adversaries; (3) foster partnership-building by stationing our airmen side-by-side with our coalition partners; and (4) enable worldwide accessibility in times of peace or conflict. Therefore, we must maintain sustainable installations to enable Air Force support to the vectors outlined in the DSG.

In the fiscal year 2014 PB, the Air Force returned military construction (MILCON) investment levels to near historic norms following the deliberate pause of fiscal year 2013. This year, the \$1.2 billion investment focuses on supporting bed-down requirements for the F-35 and KC-46, combatant commanders' top priorities in cyber and nuclear deterrence, and the rebalance to the Asia-Pacific theater.

Recognizing the links between MILCON and facilities sustainment, restoration, and modernization (FSRM), we are funding facilities sustainment at 80 percent of the OSD facilities sustainment model requirement, and we added over \$400 million for restoration and modernization across the FYDP to enable consolidation efforts and improve the quality of our most mission-enabling facilities.

Foundational to all of our efforts, energy enables the force and sustains our national security posture. Energy, which comprises about 8 percent of the Air Force budget, enables Air Force core missions, and fuels our operational capabilities. The Air Force recognizes the vulnerability and volatility created by our dependence on finite, non-renewable energy supplies. Therefore, we are committed to increasing energy security and becoming ever more energy efficient. We have already made great strides in reducing consumption and improving efficiency. Since 2006, the Air Force has reduced its fuel consumption by 12 percent, exceeding a 10 percent reduction goal 3 years ahead of schedule.

Overall, our focus is to reduce our energy footprint across all operations. Investments we made in fiscal year 2012 to improve our facility energy efficiency and reduce our energy requirement are expected to start generating savings in fiscal year

2014. The Air Force is also looking to improve its energy security and diversify its energy supply through increased use of renewable energy. We also plan to improve our energy security by making the most of private sector knowledge, technology, and financing to capitalize on underutilized land on our installations.

The Need for Base Realignment and Closure

As we make efforts to improve and sustain our installations, we also recognize that we are carrying infrastructure that is excess to our needs. A capacity analysis conducted prior to the 2005 BRAC suggested that the Air Force had 24 percent capacity that was excess to our mission needs. However, the 2005 BRAC did not make major reductions to Air Force facilities, and since that time, we have reduced our force structure by more than 500 aircraft and reduced our active duty military end-strength by 7 percent. The Air Force currently has significant excess infrastructure that is very expensive to maintain in terms of both financial and human resources. In the current and projected fiscal environment, we simply cannot afford it. The Air Force has limited authority under current public law to effectively consolidate military units or functions and divest excess real property. The money that we are spending on maintaining excess infrastructure is more urgently needed to recapitalize and sustain our weapon systems, improve readiness, and invest in the quality of life needs of airmen.

Readiness and Modernization

The decline in future budgets does not allow us to improve readiness while also maintaining force structure and continuing all planned investment programs. To prioritize readiness, we have made a conscious choice to take some risk by making sacrifices in modernization programs. Although we have been more effective in our use of operating resources and garnered savings from better business practices,³ the Air Force has been forced to terminate or restructure several programs. Program restructures and terminations include terminating the Space Based Surveillance Block 10 follow-on, freezing Gorgon Stare at Increment II, terminating Air Force participation in the Joint Precision Approach and Landing System land-based segment, and divesting the UAV (unmanned aerial vehicle) Battlelab in fiscal year 2014.

The Air Force also terminated acquisition of the underperforming Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS). ECSS was initiated in 2005 in an effort to provide end-to-end visibility of the Air Force's supply chain and enable better logistics decisionmaking. As planned, ECSS would have transformed the logistics enterprise, making all aspects interoperable and synchronized with the financial and accounting systems to enhance business and mission operations and realize efficiencies. Unfortunately, after several years of schedule delays, poor contractor performance, and cost increases, we determined that the program could not meet the fiscal year 2017 financial improvement and audit readiness statutory requirement and was not likely to achieve other promised capabilities at an affordable cost. Instead of continuing to spend money on an underperforming program, the Air Force determined that the prudent course of action was to pursue other ways to transform our logistics business processes.

The fiscal year 2013 sequestration cuts took away all program flexibility, deferred some buys, added risk to many programs while at the same time forced us to reallocate investment funds to more critical O&M needs. Budget projections for fiscal year 2014 and beyond, along with the fiscal year 2013 cuts, may force us to halt or slow pending development or production milestones on 11 acquisition category (ACAT) 1 programs. Small scale program terminations began in fiscal year 2013, and we will have to consider expanding terminations in fiscal year 2014. Similarly, several key modernization priorities remain unfunded given the current fiscal environment, including a replacement for the aging T-38 trainer and the JSTARS surveillance aircraft.

America's Air Force remains the most capable in the world, but we cannot allow readiness levels to decline further and modernization cannot wait for the next cycle of increased defense spending. We have important production lines under way and development programs that are, or will soon be, mature enough for production. Cancelling programs in anticipation of a future generation of technology would be wasteful and, in some cases, risk the loss of critical engineering talent and techno-

³There are \$1.3 billion in fiscal year 2014 funding reduction adjustments and \$7.9 billion across the future years the Air Force has categorized as being reflective of a more disciplined use of resources. Program terminations and restructures are \$2.4 billion of this total. Savings from better business practices and more effective use of operating resources total \$3.2 billion across the future years.

logical advantage. New threats and corresponding investment needs are not theoretical possibilities for the future. They are here, now. The future success of the Nation's military and the joint team depends on modernizing our Air Force and keeping it ready to fight.

Airmen Development

The Air Force's strategic advantage begins with its ability to attract, recruit, develop, and retain innovative warriors with a commitment to high standards and our core values of Integrity First, Service Before Self, and Excellence In All We Do. To accommodate an uncertain and fiscally challenging future, we must continue to invest in our airmen through education, professional development, and support programs for airmen and their families, coupled with other programs to maintain a safe, respectful, and positive work environment. We are focusing on the recruitment, development, retention, and overall effectiveness of each individual airman. Through this investment, we will not only improve the capability of today's force, but also illustrate our commitment to future generations of airmen to ensure a diverse and inclusive rich pool of the highest quality recruits well into the future.

Sexual Assault Prevention and Response

Providing a safe, respectful, and productive work environment is the responsibility of every airman at every level, and we are working hard to achieve this. We do not tolerate sexual assault. In the last year, the Air Force redoubled its efforts to eradicate sexual assault within our ranks, and we have invested in several programmatic, educational, and resourcing efforts aimed at reinforcing a zero tolerance environment. When sexual assaults are alleged, we are providing improved support to victims. In coordination with OSD, the Air Force created a special victims capability comprised of specially trained investigators, prosecutors, paralegals, and victim and witness assistance personnel. A cadre of 24 special investigators has received special victim training, along with 16 senior trial counsel, 9 of whom specialize in the prosecution of particularly difficult cases, including sexual assault cases. In addition, 60 Air Force attorneys have been identified and trained to serve as "special victims' counsel" to provide comprehensive and compassionate representational legal assistance to victims. Special victims' counselors currently represent over 200 sexual assault victims. The Air Force has also approved all 46 expedited transfer requests for Air Force victims over the past year, to include both permanent change-of-station and local installation reassignments, and we continue to employ over 3,100 volunteer victim advocates. In accordance with the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2012, each of these volunteer victim advocates will receive full certifications to provide confidential victim support beyond the training they already receive, and the Air Force is on track to place a full-time victim advocate at every installation by October 1, 2013.

Innovative, Global Airmen

Globalization and the pace of technology advances are accelerating. Airmen work with advanced technology every day, and developing innovative and technically-savvy airmen to continue to operate on the cutting edge is the lifeblood of our Service. The Air Force's ability to leverage and field crucial technologies is dependent on America's aerospace research and development infrastructure—a national asset that must be protected to ensure future U.S. advantages in technology, commercial aviation, and space. Accordingly, we are protecting science and technology funding as a share of our total resources. To ensure that airmen increase their technical acumen, we are strategically managing our science, technology, engineering, and math (STEM) workforce and conducting outreach activities to recruit and train an adequate and diverse STEM talent pool to develop, operate, and maintain our technical advantage. While airmen must remain technically proficient, we are most interested in whole person development—creating leaders of character who demonstrate creativity and empathy in addition to technical competency.

Globalization also makes the development of a global community of airmen a more achievable goal. Efforts to enhance the language and cultural skills of the force continue to lay the groundwork for access and coalition building activities that enable future cooperative efforts with friends and allies. Likewise, outreach through foreign professional military education programs where members of other nations attend Air Force programs, as well as personnel exchange programs, significantly increases the likelihood of current and future cooperative relationships. The combined effects of these personnel programs and relationship-building efforts help ensure that future leaders of friendly foreign air forces will continue to regard the U.S. Air Force as one of the finest air forces in the world.

Airmen and Family Support

The quality of airmen and family support programs remains a critical element of the Air Force resilience program. Using a strength-based approach to the resilience program builds an improved ability to cope with stress and forms the basis for an approach for suicide prevention. Regardless of the fiscal environment, the Air Force must continue to address the Service's evolving demographics and maintain balanced, healthy, and resilient airmen and families. We will adjust, consolidate, or eliminate services where required to meet changing demands, capitalize upon community resources, and gain efficiencies where possible.

To better support our airmen and families, we continue to move forward with our "3 to 1 Total Force Personnel Management" initiative. This effort integrates personnel management policies, processes, and procedures across the Total Force to create a more efficient and effective Air Force. To the greatest extent possible, "3 to 1" will yield uniformity, enhance coordination across components, optimize warfighter support, and improve service levels for our airmen. This effort will also eliminate cumbersome paper-based personnel workflows, standardize human resource management under common directives, and provide "one-stop shopping" for personnel support from anywhere, at any time. Finally, we expect this effort to ease airmen transitions on and off active duty and across the three components, all of which are vital to our Air Force mission.

Our airmen continue to contribute significant capabilities in the joint arena and do so with the integrity and excellence expected of them. They remain committed to the Air Force mission and our core values. It is imperative for us to apply sufficient resources coupled with well-informed personnel policies to support and maintain our high quality, All-Volunteer Force, retain their trust and confidence, and empower them to fly, fight, and win.

ACTIVE/RESERVE COMPONENT BALANCE

Today's Total Force consists of about 329,500 Regular Air Force (or Active) airmen, 105,700 Air National guardsmen, and 70,900 Air Force Reserve airmen actively serving in the Selected Reserve, as authorized by the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013. For fiscal year 2014, the total number of airmen will decrease slightly to 327,600 Active airmen, 105,400 guardsmen, and 70,400 reservists. In addition to these numbers, the Air Force Reserve maintains a strategic depth of more than 790,000 stand-by or non-participating reservists and retirees who can be called up for national emergencies. We are one Air Force—Regular Air Force, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve airmen—working together as a Total Force team every day around the world.

There is great interdependence between Active, Guard, and Reserve Forces. We must ensure the right balance between them because too much force structure in the active component does not capitalize on potential lower operational costs of personnel and installations in the Reserve component. Too little force structure in the active component requires guardsmen and reservists to deploy more often—even in peacetime—which breaks the model of a part-time force, threatens the sustainability of the Total Force, and increases costs significantly.

The analytical foundation used to develop Active and Reserve component force balance starts with the National Defense Strategy. The strategy is based on scenarios and associated concepts of operation and forces developed by the Office of the Under Secretary of Defense for Policy, the Joint Staff, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation. These scenarios form the common starting point for all DOD force structure assessments and include major contingency demand (i.e., surge) as well as pre- and post-contingency rotational demand (non-surge and post-surge, respectively). Force demands, both surge and post-surge rotational, are compared to projected inventories to determine how much and what type of force structure is required. Capabilities and risk are balanced across the Air Force's core missions to field the most capable and sustainable force within available resources. Analysis of Active and Reserve component force levels provides insights into the balance within this force that can most effectively and efficiently meet demand within DOD deployment goals.

Maintaining the appropriate Active and Reserve component force mix is critical to the ability of the Air Force to meet forward presence requirements, maintain rapid response, and meet high-rate rotational demands within a smaller force. Additionally, appropriate force mix is critical to the sustainment, readiness, and health of the Total Force components. Force mix decisions cannot be made based solely on cost. We must consider the symbiotic relationship of the active and Reserve components and treat the three components as a complete system, evaluating the effects of change on all components to better understand unintended consequences to the

whole. For example, Reserve Forces depend on healthy Active component forces from which trained and experienced airmen transition to part-time status. If the active component force becomes too small, the flow of personnel into the Reserve component will slow, driving the Reserve components to increase direct-entry recruitment, causing experience levels to fall and costs to rise. Our analysis also will consider how the Reserve component leverages important civilian skills and experience, such as in cyber, for the needs of the Nation. Air Force leaders must have the flexibility to reorganize force structure within the Active and Reserve components to maintain the health of the Total Force and its ability to ultimately execute the National Military Strategy.

Total Force Initiatives

To get a better understanding of our Total Force mixture, we launched the Total Force Task Force, a team led by three two-star general officers from the Regular Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the Air Force Reserve. The Total Force Task Force is leading a reassessment of the Air Force's efforts to develop the appropriate Active and Reserve component balance through processes that enable the Department of the Air Force to leverage the inherent strengths, unique aspects, and characteristics of each component. The Total Force Task Force is conducting a comprehensive review of Total Force requirements and will develop strategic options to ensure that the Air Force balances the strengths of each component while sustaining necessary capabilities in the years ahead. The team is scheduled to present their findings by October 1, 2013. We expect the task force to serve as a focal point for the National Commission on the Force Structure for the Air Force that was directed by Congress and is scheduled to provide a report to the President by February 1, 2014.

Total Force Integration (TFI) works to shape the most capable force possible under fiscal and operational constraints for our current and future force. TFI associations are a cost-efficient value to the taxpayer as the active and Reserve components share equipment and facilities. We are increasing the number of units that partner Active, Guard, or Reserve airmen at a single location. We currently have 121 such unit associations and plan to add additional associations; however, implementation of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013 may affect the number of associations. Already a success story for mobility forces, we are planning for every U.S.-based Reserve fighter unit to become an association with the Regular Air Force within the FYDP, as will the continental United States locations for the KC-46 tanker. We will continue to refine this combination of Active and Reserve Forces across all appropriate areas of the Total Force.

Force structure changes require continual dialogue between the Active component, the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard, and the respective Governors. Over the past year, we have worked with OSD, the National Guard Bureau, and the Council of Governors to formalize a consultative process to exchange views, information, and advice, consistent with the applicable guidelines on programming and budgetary priorities and requirements on matters specified in Executive Order 13528. Recently, DOD and the Council of Governors agreed to the "State-Federal Consultative Process for Programming and Budgetary Proposals Affecting the National Guard." This process will, among other things, increase National Guard involvement in DOD's planning, programming, budgeting, and execution processes and improve the dialogue between the Council of Governors and the DOD before resource decisions affecting the National Guard are made. It is essential that we manage the health of the Total Force holistically, and we are committed, now more than ever, to strengthen our integration of effort.

CONCLUSION

From airpower's earliest days, airmen have exploited technology to provide essential knowledge and information on when and where to act, to move people and materials when and where needed, to control the ultimate high ground, and to strike when and where directed.

We are confident in our airmen. They are the best in the world, and we can rely on them to meet any challenge, overcome any obstacle, and defeat any enemy—as long as they are given adequate resources and the freedom to innovate. As they have time and again, our innovative airmen will find new and better ways to approach future military challenges across the spectrum of conflict, throughout every domain, and against nascent and unpredicted threats.

The Air Force's core missions will continue to serve America's long-term security interests by giving our Nation and its leadership unmatched options against the challenges of an unpredictable future. In the last several decades, Air Force airpower has been an indispensable element of deterrence, controlled escalation, and,

when so tasked by the Nation's leadership, been an instrument of destruction against an adversary's military capability—all accomplished with minimal casualties to U.S. service men and women and civilians. However, investments in Air Force capabilities and readiness remain essential to ensuring that the Nation will maintain an agile, flexible, and ready force. This force must be deliberately planned and consistently funded, as reconstitution of a highly sophisticated and capable Air Force cannot occur quickly if allowed to atrophy.

Today's Air Force provides America an indispensable hedge against the challenges of a dangerous and uncertain future. Regardless of the future security environment, the Air Force must retain and maintain its unique ability to provide America with Global Vigilance, Global Reach, and Global Power.

We are committed to excellence and we will deliver with your help. We ask that you support the Air Force budget request of \$114.1 billion for fiscal year 2014.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, General.

We will have an 8-minute first round.

First, on the question of sequestration, Mr. Secretary, you gave us some specifics in your oral testimony about the impacts on unit readiness. Can you go into that in a little bit more detail? We did not have that in your written statement. So it is very important that we flesh it out here in your oral statement. Number of units that have been reduced in readiness and so forth.

Mr. DONLEY. Yes, sir. I will ask the chief to chime in.

We have 12 units that have been stood down completely. That means that there is no flying going on. I think I referred to an additional seven units that are being held at a reduced readiness status, that is, basic mission capable. If the resources are made available, we might be able to move some of those from basic mission capable up to combat mission ready, but those funds are not yet available. We are still working on assessing whether or not that would be feasible. That may depend on the reprogramming to which I referred.

We are concerned that, as the chief outlined—taking units to a stand-down position where they are not flying at all negates the advantages that airpower brings to the joint team. So we are very concerned that this situation be only temporary and that we get back to restoring combat capability as quickly as possible.

Chairman LEVIN. How many units are there all together? That is 12 of how many, 7 of how many?

Mr. DONLEY. This is of, I think, 31 active squadrons. Chief?

General WELSH. We have 54 fighter squadrons in the Air Force, sir. Right now, those 17 are about a third of that. There are additional squadrons the Secretary did not mention because they are not part of our combat air forces. We have also shut down the Thunderbirds. We have shut down our weapons school squadrons. We have closed down a couple of our additional training units that we use, our aggressor squadrons who helped train in Red Flag both in Nevada and Alaska. We have taken those flying hours and we prioritized it toward units scheduled to deploy to Afghanistan or to the Pacific.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

I think, Mr. Secretary, you mentioned OCO shortfalls. That was, I assume, for 2013 because the OCO request for 2014 has not yet been coming. What is the OCO shortfall for 2013 and what is the reason for it?

Mr. DONLEY. It is at least about \$1.8 billion.

Chairman LEVIN. This is for the Air Force.

Mr. DONLEY. This is for the Air Force. I believe you will see us attempting to get funding for that in the upcoming reprogramming. We simply did not get support for all of the OCO costs in the original OCO request.

Chairman LEVIN. Okay. Now, relative to BRAC, let me just make a request of you rather than a question. We have made this request before. You have indicated a savings from the last BRAC round of about \$1 billion. If you could furnish for the record the detail that goes into those savings, we would appreciate it.

Mr. DONLEY. I am happy to do that.

[The information referred to follows:]

Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) savings are substantial and allow the Air Force to apply scarce resources to emerging and/or higher priority missions. The Air Force continues to realize approximately \$1.0 billion in annual net savings from commission recommendations implemented during BRAC 2005.

BRAC savings begin to be realized during the first year of implementation, growing through the 6-year implementation period, and maximizing the first year of post-implementation. For BRAC 2005, post-implementation net annual savings are approximately: civilian salaries (\$183 million), military entitlements (\$555 million), base operating support (\$68 million), sustainment (\$28 million), recapitalization (\$32 million), mission (\$66 million) and procurement (\$24 million).

Specific amounts for each category in BRAC 2005 during the implementation period can be seen in Exhibit BC-02, Implementation Period Financial Summary, page 6, contained in the Department of Defense Base Closure Account—Air Force Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Estimate Justification Data submitted to Congress in April 2013.

Chairman LEVIN. In terms of the role of the chain of command in addressing sexual assaults and other crimes in the military, some propose removing the chain of command from the decision-making process for prosecuting assaults and other crimes in the military both before and after trial. We are going to be taking up this issue, as I indicated, in markup.

Can you very briefly, both of you, tell us what your position is relative to whether or not the chain of command should be making the decision relative to prosecution? If so, why? Whether or not the chain of command should have the power to reverse a finding of fact after a finding of fact of guilt where that is the case, and whether or not the chain of command should retain the power relative to modifying the sentence where there is a finding of guilt. On those three areas, very briefly, if you could. Mr. Secretary, we will start with you.

Mr. DONLEY. Sir, I think maintaining good order and discipline is a commander's responsibility. So I think it is very important that the administration of the UCMJ occur within the military chain of command.

With respect to the role of the convening authority, which reviews evidence and determines whether or not court martials ought to occur, I think that should stay in place.

There is the issue of Article 60, which provides for the opportunity for the convening authority to review the results of courts martial after they are completed and to make any change the convening authority deems appropriate.

When that Article 60 was built, the U.S. military had a much less robust appeal process for court martial cases. Now that that appeal process is in place, we strongly support the Secretary's proposal for Article 60 that the convening authority no longer be given

carte blanche to review the results of court martial and that be cut be back and limited quite a bit.

Chairman LEVIN. General, do you have a view on that?

General WELSH. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

On the convening authority's ability to refer cases to court, I feel very strongly that that is in the commander's purview for a reason.

Number one, if over time you take the UCMJ, particularly if you move the whole caseload, not just sexual assault cases, away from the commander's discretion, commanders eventually will lose touch with the UCMJ, and that would be a terrible occurrence I think over time.

Second, I do not think there is an issue with commanders not agreeing with their lawyers on what cases ought to go to court. In the Air Force, we have looked back the last 3 years, and we have taken a look at over 2,500 cases. We have reviewed them manually. In 0.5 percent of those cases, the commander made a decision to prefer charges or not counter to the recommendation of their judge advocate general (JAG). So this is not a common thing that occurs. I do not know what we would be fixing by doing that.

For the commander's ability to review and make changes to findings of a court, my personal opinion is there is no need for that. We have a court. We have a military judge in the courtroom. We have an appeal process.

I do believe the commander has a role in reviewing the sentencing of a court, and I believe that we should talk very carefully about the commander's involvement in that because there are reasons to keep the commander involved in that discussion.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

The administration is proposing to substantially increase enrollment fees for military retirees who enroll in the TRICARE Prime health care program to institute enrollment fees for participation in TRICARE Standard Extra and TRICARE For Life and to increase pharmacy copayments, to increase deductibles and the catastrophic cap. DOD has assumed budget savings of nearly \$1 billion for all of these changes.

Let me ask the General first. Did you personally support these proposals?

General WELSH. I did, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Do you?

General WELSH. I do.

Chairman LEVIN. Mr. Secretary, I assume—let me ask you, I will not assume anything. Mr. Secretary?

Mr. DONLEY. I do support the President's proposals.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Senator Inhofe.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Welsh, the chairman had asked you to give us an analysis of the \$1 billion on the BRAC savings over that period of time. He is referring, I am sure, to the 2005 BRAC round. I would like to have that report include the amount of loss that came from that in the first, let us say, 3½ years. Would you mind doing that?

General WELSH. No, sir. We will do it.

[The information referred to follows:]

Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) does not drive “losses;” rather there is an upfront investment required to implement the commission recommendations. These upfront implementation costs are offset by savings garnered during the implementation period.

BRAC one-time implementation costs occur primarily in the following categories: military construction, to include planning and design; operations and maintenance; military personnel, other procurement, and environmental cleanup. The invested total one-time implementation cost in the first 4 years of implementing BRAC 2005 was \$3.2 billion.

Also during implementation, BRAC savings are generated primarily in the following categories: civilian salaries, military entitlements, base operating support, sustainment, recapitalization, mission and procurement. The net savings generated during the first 4 years of implementing BRAC 2005 was \$1.4 billion (grand total savings minus total recurring costs (non-add) in the first 4 years).

Bottom line, the net implementation cost during the first 4 years of BRAC 2005 was \$1.8 billion (grand total one-time implementation and total recurring costs (non-add) minus grand total savings in the first 4 years).

Specific amounts for each category in BRAC 2005 can be seen in Exhibit BC-02, Implementation Period Financial Summary, contained in the Department of Defense Base Closure Account—Air Force Fiscal Year 2014 Budget Estimate Justification Data submitted to Congress in April 2013.

Senator INHOFE. All right.

General, you and I talked in my office about the reduction of the 94,000 flying hours and the grounding of about one-third of the squadrons. Now, it is my understanding that once the units have stood down for about 60 days, they are no longer able to meet the operational requirements. Is that correct?

General WELSH. Yes, Senator, or accept great risk in doing so.

Senator INHOFE. Yes, which we do not want to do.

It is my understanding that the Air Force estimates it will take—and I think the Secretary mentioned this in his opening remarks—between 6 and 12 months to return these to mission ready status.

General WELSH. Senator, that would be true, assuming you have the additional flying hour money required to requalify—

Senator INHOFE. That is my next question. Do you see that in the request of the 2014 budget?

General WELSH. No, sir. It is not there.

Senator INHOFE. That is serious, don’t you think?

General WELSH. Yes, sir. We would require additional funds.

Senator INHOFE. A very similar thing is true in depot maintenance and in the modernization program. We have deferred a lot of things. We have the best depot maintenance system, I think, that anyone would expect us to have. However, the maintenance has been kicked down the road, probably deferring some 60 aircraft and 35 engines from depot maintenance. So I would ask the same question. By delaying these things, we are going to have to be requiring something in the 2014 budget to make up for that. Do you see that in the 2014 budget?

General WELSH. No, sir, nor is there the capacity to surge to catch up with that bow wave within a year.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you.

When General Odierno was here, we talked a little bit about the hollow force. Nobody likes to talk about that, and I think that, Mr. Secretary, you did mention that we are going in that direction right now. I am going to read to you the quote that the Congressional Research Service (CRS) used back a short while ago. It was actually just last year. They said, talking about the hollow force, that

although the size and composition of the force appeared adequate on paper—this is talking about in the 1970s and the 1990s—shortcomings identified when these forces were subjected to further scrutiny raised questions if these forces would be able to accomplish their assigned wartime missions.

Some feel that we are already approaching the hollow force. We heard General Odierno talk about the hollow force insofar as the Army is concerned. We know that we have smallest size of the Air Force that we have had in history, and we are flying the oldest aircrafts. So where do you think we are, each one of you, in terms of approaching a hollow force similar to that which we experienced in the 1970s and 1990s?

Mr. DONLEY. Sir, I have been very concerned about the decline in readiness since about the 2003 timeframe and our inability to get the resources necessary to keep up with the weapon systems sustainment costs, in particular, that have come with some of the new platforms that require lots of contractor logistics support to support the ongoing efforts in Afghanistan, et cetera. So I have been concerned about this. Sequestration makes the problem worse, quite simply. Standing down units again with no flying hours at all and deferring aircraft and engines, as you mentioned—and I think the numbers you quoted are correct, about 60 airframes and about 35 engines—will create a backlog that needs to be addressed down the line, and we will not be able to recover as quickly as we should. So we are right now making the problem worse, not better.

Senator INHOFE. Do you agree with the comments or the answers that General Welsh stated in terms of the fact that it is not currently in the 2014 budget to get this done?

Mr. DONLEY. That is correct.

Senator INHOFE. It is a very serious thing.

The F-35. You commented on the significance of that, General Welsh. A lot of times, people are challenging that. I know that there have been cost overruns, have been problems, and all that. Is there anything further you want to state in terms of the significance of the JSF to our fleet for the future?

General WELSH. Senator, as I mentioned, we need the airplane. We have committed to it. It brings a capability that nothing else in our fleet has, and we will be able to bring it to the battle space in 2030. It is beyond our ability to upgrade legacy platforms to produce the kind of capability this aircraft will bring to the battlefield. It is just the way it is.

The program for the last 2 years has been making steady progress and has stayed on track in my view since about 2011. The major issues that remain are cost-related. I believe the company now knows how much it costs to build an airplane. I think they have demonstrated stability in that cost in the production line for the last two lots. I think we have to make very clear we understand the long-term operating costs of the airplane. We are working very hard at doing that in conjunction with the company to make sure that we see the same picture.

It is important that we keep our partners involved in the program because they also affect the long-term investment that the United States makes in this program. It becomes much cheaper for

us if we have partners in investing in future builds, et cetera, not just in the production value.

So we are committed to the F-35. I am pretty happy with where it is right now. We need to keep moving toward as high a production rate as we can get. Sequestration has impacted that. We have had to back off our production rates for the next couple of years, although we will still hope to hit 60 per year starting in 2018.

Senator INHOFE. Is the figure that they used initially still a reality figure?

General WELSH. Sir, 1,763 remains the number in the President's budget.

Senator INHOFE. Now, you say that there were 179 that were delayed for 2 years. I have had occasions to go down to Fort Worth and talk about the significance of delays, and you talk about the out-of-country purchases that are out there. As the price does go up—and it does go up every time there is even a delay, not just a cancelation—that does drive some people out of the market. That is something that I am concerned about because that makes it more expensive for us at the same time.

Let me ask you one last question on the C-130. It is the work horse. Now, we are completely out of the E models now. Is that correct?

General WELSH. Yes, sir. The intent is to go to all C-130H and J models.

Senator INHOFE. But the H1 series—as we get new J models on, are we taking out of service then the H1 or the earlier H models?

General WELSH. Yes, sir. The intent is to attrit the older models as we get new J models.

Senator INHOFE. Is that not one program that has not slid on the J models?

General WELSH. The J model program is doing very well.

Senator INHOFE. That is good.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Inhofe.

Senator Blumenthal.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to join my colleagues, Secretary Donley, in thanking you for your excellent service to our Nation and wishing you well in the future if this is, indeed, your last appearance before our committee.

General Welsh, welcome and thank you for your extraordinary service over many years and the men and women under your command.

I want to begin, if I may, with a question about the combat search and rescue (CSAR) helicopter, the CSAR HH-60, which I understand is scheduled to be replaced with a new aircraft which is necessary to perform the very challenging rescue and recovery missions that the Air Force undertakes so frequently. If I may, let me ask—first of all, to commend the Air Force on a very well-structured request for proposal (RFP) that emphasized the best capability and the lowest operating cost for the taxpayers. Could you provide me with an update as to the status of this program and an idea as to when the decision will be reached?

Mr. DONLEY. It is funded in the President's budget, but it is currently under source selection. So we do not have much to say about the particulars of that. It is scheduled for a decision later this year.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Will the RFP, as it was issued, be implemented?

Mr. DONLEY. Again, I expect that the RFP would be addressed in the source selection process and that is the process that is underway today. Again, we are looking to make a decision later this year.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Do you have a more precise idea as to when later this year it would be made?

Mr. DONLEY. I do not at this point.

I will just offer transparently that we are also looking at the affordability of all our modernization programs going forward. This is a very important one, but as we look at the potential for sequestration over a 10-year period, if that sight picture does not change, as I suggest in my testimony, it is going to change a lot of acquisition programs. So we are taking a broad look at all of our modernization programs to make sure they will be affordable for the future.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I understand. If you could keep us informed about the status of that program, I would appreciate it.

General Welsh, first of all, let me commend you for being so forthcoming to many of us in your efforts to combat sexual assault in the Air Force and in particular the special victims counsel (SVC) program that you have implemented since January 28, 2013. I understand that the SVC program has already represented 224 sexual assault victims. I have joined two of my colleagues, Senators Boxer and Gillibrand, in urging that funds be made available to every Service to follow the model that the Air Force is setting in this regard.

I wonder if you could give us an update on this program and the efforts that are being made because the kind of representation of victims or survivors is so critically important to enabling and encouraging them to come forward and report these predatory crimes. They are predatory, violent crimes for the most part. They should be treated as such. In the civilian world, as I know from my experience, providing aid to victims is critically important in encouraging more reporting of a crime that in the military is so drastically under-reported. Could you give us an update, please?

General WELSH. Yes, sir, I can.

We now have 265 victims assigned to SVCs. Our SVCs are busy enough that we have taken them off of all other duties. They are now completely dedicated to this particular task. We left them regionally distributed around the country as opposed to centralizing them, which was one of the debates we had, because we think it allows victims better access to them.

We have seen two significant statistics.

One is that in the past we had about a 30 percent rate of unrestricted report victims who would decide not to continue with prosecution after they began the process of investigations, interrogations, questioning, et cetera. So far, of the 268 represented by SVCs, we have 2, which is a huge improvement, which allows us

to prosecute more cases over time which is key to moving forward in this area in my view.

The second thing I would mention to you is that our change of restricted reports to unrestricted reports in the past was about 17 percent on average. Of the victims who have SVC, that number is about 55 percent. So more victims are willing to change to an unrestricted report and allow us to investigate because they are more comfortable having a legal advisor who is with them throughout the entire process.

Just those two statistics make me feel very comfortable this program is moving in the right direction, and there is a lot of other anecdotal evidence, including victim testimony, et cetera.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. Let me ask you. You may have read, General Welsh, the Washington Post story this morning about Lieutenant General Susan Helms reversing a conviction similar to the one that General Franklin did that has aroused a great deal of interest and more than a little controversy.

I wonder if you could enlighten us as to whether that story was accurate and what action you would contemplate under these circumstances.

General WELSH. Senator, I would be happy to.

First of all, by way of context, because I think this is such an emotional topic from every angle that context is important. In the U.S. military, in DOD over the last 5 years, there have been five sexual assault cases where a convening authority has reversed the decision. In three of those cases, the actual allegation of sexual assault—the subject was found not guilty at a trial but was found guilty of lesser offenses, not sexual assault charges. In those three cases, the convening authority set the court aside and punished the subject under nonjudicial punishment for the three lesser offenses.

In the two cases where a sexual assault allegation was found to be guilty in court and then set aside by the convening authority, in one of those, the case you refer to, General Helms' case, there were actually two sexual assault charges. The court found the subject innocent of one and guilty of the second. General Helms has the convening authority and, following due process of the law as written, reviewed the case, determined that in her view the evidence presented did not meet a burden of reasonable doubt. She reversed the guilty decision on the second count of sexual assault. She then took the other three charges, the minor charges that had also been found guilty in court, and she punished the subject under nonjudicial punishment for those offenses. She also punished the sexual assault charge under nonjudicial punishment.

The last case, and the only one where a court has been completely set aside that we can find in DOD in the last 5 years, was the Aviano case that has also gotten a lot of publicity.

So we have had two cases over the last 5 years where this has occurred. It does not happen routinely. I think clearly it makes us question two things. Number one, we have to do a review of the convening authority's actions. In the Aviano case, Secretary Donley did a very thorough review of that and determined that our convening authority followed the law as written, made a decision that we expect our convening authorities to make, not right or wrong in our judgment, but just made a decision. That is their job.

Now we think the issue is whether the law is written correctly. Should Article 60, which gives the convening authority that responsibility and designs the process—should it be reviewed and adjusted? The Secretary and I both very clearly believe it is time to do that.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I think it also undermines the credibility of the convening authority to make prosecutorial decisions in the first place. You have defended that authority here and I understand and respect your views. But I would just respectfully suggest that it also indicates a need to review the entire convening authority's actions and powers and credibility in light of these decisions.

General WELSH. Senator, if I might. It is clearly an issue that we need to debate openly and honestly and look at all the second- and third-order effects.

One practical example of why removing a convening authority's disposition authority is that it would create a huge problem for commanders in the field. Article 15, which is one of the tools commanders use routinely, is a baseline building block for enforcing military justice and discipline in their units. It almost requires the ability to compel someone to accept it. If you do not have the ability to refer that individual to court, you have no way to compel them to accept the Article 15. So from a very practical perspective, we just need to think through that implication because it is significant.

Senator BLUMENTHAL. I thank you very much. My time has expired, but I look forward to exploring these questions with you further. Thank you personally for your actions, as well as Secretary Donley. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Blumenthal.

Senator McCain.

Senator MCCAIN. Secretary Donley, thank you for your great service in many capacities to this country, and we thank you for that. I think I share the view of all of us in thanking you for your outstanding service.

I do not usually speak about parochial matters, but if I could just for a minute. The forest fire season is coming earlier than ever. In our defense bill that we passed, we authorized the transfer of aircraft of the C-27J to replace the very rapidly aging, very old fire fighting aircraft that we have.

Can you give us an update on that particular evolution and how soon we could expect those very aging fire fighting tankers to be replaced?

Mr. DONLEY. Yes, Senator. We are implementing the planned retirement of the C-27s using the language that the NDAA passed last year. We have had letters of interest from U.S. Special Operations Command, from the Coast Guard, from the U.S. Forest Service. It is our intent to have those aircraft off the books by the end of the fiscal year. So we will go through a process this summer of evaluating those letters of interest and negotiating out which agencies might receive the C-27s that DOD plans to divest.

Senator MCCAIN. I hope you will view it with some urgency because I am told that we may have a shortfall in our ability to combat these fires. Obviously, it is not a question of whether there are going to be forest fires in the entire West, but when. So I hope you

will give it some priority and make sure that we are on track to replace those aircraft that we have to retire.

Now, back again on sequestration, does your budget planning for fiscal year 2014 consider—does it assume that sequestration will be repealed?

Mr. DONLEY. No.

Senator McCAIN. It does not.

Mr. DONLEY. Let me think this through. The President's budget does propose the repeal of sequestration. So if all the budget assumptions that go with the President's budget were passed, there would be no need for sequestration in fiscal year 2014. Therefore, the fiscal year 2014 budget, as proposed, does not anticipate sequestration. If those budget assumptions do not come to pass and sequestration occurs, it will occur from whatever level, as I understand it, Congress has enacted for fiscal year 2014.

Senator McCAIN. But right now, you are not budgeting for sequestration remaining in effect.

Mr. DONLEY. Correct.

Senator McCAIN. General Welsh, are you concerned about morale and retention of pilots in the U.S. Air Force as a result of the reduced flying hours and actual stand-down in some of the most important training components like the Fighter Weapons School at Nellis and others?

General WELSH. Senator, if this continues for any period of time, I am absolutely concerned about it. They did not join to sit. You know that as well as anyone. They will get frustrated and they have other options.

Senator McCAIN. I am told that there will be a very large exodus of airline pilots who have joined in a block period and that will create a demand for pilots in the airlines that we have not seen in a long time. Are you aware of that?

General WELSH. Yes, sir, I am.

Senator McCAIN. So you are having to, as you listed, stand down some of the most vital training regimens that we have in the U.S. Air Force.

General WELSH. Senator, we have stopped Fighter Weapons School classes. We have stopped Red Flag training, and we canceled the last Red Flag at least. We are looking at them one at a time as they come up on the schedule to see how much money we have to execute them. We have stopped instructor pilot upgrade programs that are dedicated to that function. These are bills that we will continue to pay for 20 years. We will never recover this training capacity. The longer we shut down, the more traumatic it is. This is a big deal to our Air Force.

Senator McCAIN. General Odierno testified that it could take 10 to 15 years to restore the operational capability of the U.S. Army if we continue with sequestration throughout the next year. Do you agree with that assessment?

General WELSH. If we continued for another year, I am not sure it would take us 10 years to restore the operational capability. It would take us much longer than that to fill the personnel and the requirements bathtubs that we have generated in year groups now. If we do not do Weapons School instructor training for another

year, our ability to create the top tier leaders of our Air Force will be affected for 20 years until those people retire.

Senator MCCAIN. The ability of your pilots to perform at the highest level in combat will be degraded because of the lack of training.

General WELSH. Yes, absolutely, Senator. That training is what makes all our Services the best in the world.

Senator MCCAIN. Secretary Donley, in that context, in your retirement—and you have been around longer than most—I think one of the reasons that members of both parties are willing to allow this sequestration to proceed is a widespread belief that a profligate DOD is unwilling to rein in runaway costs on under-performing programs. The most recent example is the Expeditionary Combat Support System (ECSS), \$1 billion, JSF cost overruns, the F-22 cost overruns, the criminal Boeing tanker case. It is damaging DOD's fiscal credibility which in turn permits elected officials to believe that haphazard cuts, which damage our readiness, are the right thing to do. As you testified, grounding of 17 squadrons, critical operations, maintenance. What do you say to this, Secretary Donley?

Mr. DONLEY. I think our acquisition process just takes way too long and costs way too much. We have become, in many ways, risk averse, I think, in acquisition programs because we have seen so many different ways over the years that programs can get off track, and each time a program gets off track, we try to correct it by putting in a new law, a new regulation, a new layer of oversight to try to prevent that from happening again. After 20 or 30 years of that, we are pretty thick on regulations and oversight in our acquisition system.

So I think there is a lot of streamlining that needs to be looked at going forward and especially as the resources come down after the fights in Iraq and Afghanistan and looking at the budget totals contemplated in the BCA, sequestration or no, whatever would take the BCA's place, we need to put more pressure on streamlining our acquisition process and getting some of the people and the processes out and get focused on more rapid introduction of technology.

I support the spiral approach where we are introducing technology more rapidly and planning for changes later, not trying to build the perfect airplane right off the bat, but spiraling that capability in 5- or 10-year increments to improve it over time.

Senator MCCAIN. If you think that Congress needs to act in any way, I promise you we are more than eager to accept your recommendations as to what actions need to be taken to do exactly as you said. I am sure you understand the frustration. We share the frustration of a lot of American taxpayers. We need to fix it, and any recommendations that you can provide to us with the benefit of your experience we would certainly be pleased to have.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

Senator KAINE.

Senator KAINE. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Secretary Donley, General Welsh, welcome today.

Last week, we were in a recess and as I often do in recess, I travel around Virginia and go to parts of our State that touch upon our armed services mission, Department of Veterans Affairs' hospitals, bases, military contractors, Reserve Officer Training Corps programs. I was at an interesting one last week. Mary Baldwin College is a women's college in Staunton, VA, that has a 100-member Virginia Women Institute of Leadership in this small, private college, and they have a commissioning percentage among these 100 women that is higher than most of the 6 senior military colleges designated in title 10.

One of the young ladies was asking me a question and said do you think the military's decision to remove barriers to combat service might have a broader effect on women's opportunities in the civilian world. That led to an interesting discussion about what happens in the military and its effect on the civilian world and the important leadership role that the military takes.

It is in that spirit—I am just very sorry that the rescheduling has you here today, in the same week when this incident in Arlington is in the news, and yet it is. I just worry about the effect of this. There are all kinds of today effects that this kind of event suggests when somebody charged particularly with overseeing a program to deal with victims of sexual assault is in fact charged. The chairman said that we have to presume innocence until proven guilty.

But I worry as much about the tomorrow effects. I worry about the tomorrow effects of women who are thinking about making military careers and for the young woman who asked me the question about what happens in the military has a civilian effect. I also worry about those women in the program who do not commission but go into a civilian world but maybe go in with a little more of a concern that if this happens at the top echelon in military leadership, then it could happen in the civilian world as well.

The stakes on this one are enormously high. They are enormously high. Senator McCain asked about morale questions with respect to sequester, and I am going to get to that in a minute. But we need to worry about the morale of tomorrow's military leaders, and in that context I was quite concerned.

General Welsh, you mentioned that you have sought jurisdiction in this case, which is a standard matter, and if you could just educate me for a second about the procedure. There is an arraignment that is scheduled through the Commonwealth's Attorney in Arlington County, and that is scheduled later in the week. It would be military standard to seek jurisdiction of the matter. I gather that the prosecutor has discretion as to whether to continue with the criminal case in the courts of the Commonwealth of Virginia or to put it in abeyance in some way and transfer it over to military jurisdiction. Is that correct?

General WELSH. Senator, that is exactly right. The sexual assault prosecutor in Arlington County will make that decision. Our 11th wing assigned at Bolling Air Force Base here in Washington, DC—their JAG office is actually the one that is the interface with Arlington County. They have submitted the request for jurisdiction and we will let the process play out.

Senator Kaine. You have educated me on the process, so I clearly do not know. But I imagine that one of the things the prosecutor's office weighs in wrestling with a request such as that is their degree of confidence about whether a trial or proceeding, if transferred over to military jurisdiction, would in fact be a fair one.

General Welsh. Senator, I would assume that would be part of this.

Senator Kaine. Just that the stakes are very high. The stakes are very high on this one.

Talking about morale in a different way and now moving to sequester, I visited Langley about a month ago. I met with wonderful Air Force personnel there, both pilots but also wonderful mechanics who maintain F-22s, not just those in Virginia, but from all around the country. I talked to General Hostage about this one-third of the Air Combat Command (ACC) units standing down. My assumption is that in the dangerous circumstances we find ourselves in in the world, there is an awful lot of contingency planning going on about use of ACC assets in Syria possibly, with respect to North Korea, other places in the world.

If you could, just talk about what it means to stand down one-third of the ACC units and how that impacts the kinds of planning and then, God forbid, the need to actually go forward on executing any of those contingency plans in a status where we have curbed our training and our missions in that way.

General Welsh. Senator, what we have prioritized to keep units flying is the units that are either already in Afghanistan or preparing to deploy to Afghanistan or units on the Korean Peninsula or those doing the nuclear mission—everything else was affected by this, either drawdown to minimal flying or standing down completely. So any new contingency activity that requires the rest of that force structure will be impacted.

As one example of the type of disconnect you can get, because we are meeting a known tasking from a combatant commander for a type of capability, an F-15C let us say, which is an air-to-air airplane—we have other units that do suppression of enemy air defenses that are not flying right now because they are not required in the current deployment cycle. In an example like a new contingency where you need to go suppress enemy air defenses, they would be the first things you need and they will not be fully ready. So we are trying to manage them day-to-day as the world's situations change.

Senator, if I could go back to your last comment just one time on the fair trial or not. One of the issues that seems to come up routinely is this belief that the military does not prosecute as much as a local jurisdiction might. We actually took the Air Force statistics that are in a little bit of a convoluted equation that comes out of DOD because of the way we track these things. We took them to the Rape, Abuse, and Incest National Network (RAINN) folks. We sat down side-by-side with them, and we said use your model and put our data into it and tell us what our prosecution and conviction rates are. For 2012, our prosecution rate was 1 percent below the national average. Our conviction rate was 3 percent above. So the idea that we do not prosecute should not be a concern of the special prosecutor. The idea that we cannot convict relative

to the local jurisdiction should not be a concern of his if we can ensure they have all the facts.

Senator KAINE. That is certainly my hope. I am not suggesting otherwise. Yet, just the controversy over the Aviano situation, the article about the second case this morning, the fact that the individual who is charged with leading an important leadership position to deal with sexual assault cases has, in fact, himself been charged, those are the kinds of things that just, again, as a prosecutor is making up a mind about where a case can be prosecuted in a way that will certainly protect victims and it will also protect the accused—Arlington is a pro-military community. So it is not going to be a hostile environment. These are the kinds of things that prosecutors wrestle with, and that goes back to my comment about the stakes being pretty high in this situation.

I wanted to follow up on Senator McCain's question because I think you each knew something that I do not know and maybe others do not. This issue about is there a cohort of civilian aviation pilots that is expected to retire or depart that would create a significant present competition that might pull out military pilots if they feel like Congress, through budgetary or other actions, is demonstrating that we are not committed to certainty in their future work and path.

General WELSH. Senator, we have been hearing for about a year now that the airline industry expects to increase their hiring rates dramatically over the next 1 to 3 years. So we do anticipate there will be opportunities and a draw, and historically we lose a much higher percentage of air crew members from all the Services when the airlines hire.

Senator KAINE. Let me just say in conclusion that there were 53 votes, I think, in this body at the end of February in the Senate to not allow the sequester to go into effect. There were 50 votes to pass the Senate budget that did pass on March 23 that would have dramatically changed the sequester and made the cuts targeted rather than across-the-board, back-end rather than spread evenly across 10 years, and cut in half. It is my deep hope, based on your testimony and the testimony of others who have been before us that this committee can play a lead role in trying to find a solution that does not continue to jeopardize the missions that you are promoting.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Kaine.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to thank the witnesses, both of you, for being here and for your distinguished service to our country and all that serve underneath you.

Secretary Donley and General Welsh, in your prepared statement, you talked about the KC-46 as one of the top Air Force acquisition priorities, particularly given that obviously our tankers go back to the Eisenhower era of making sure that we update our tankers. The importance of the in-flight refueling missions is certainly the linchpin for our being able to carry out almost any mission in the world, as well as supporting our allies.

I understand, General Welsh, from the discussion you and I certainly had this morning in my office that you are in the process, the Air Force is in the process, of making the decision on the basing of this particularly for the Air National Guard and that will be upcoming. I just want to applaud you for the transparent and objective process you have applied thus far. I think it will not come as a surprise to both of you that both Senator Shaheen and I feel very strongly about the performance of our 157th air refueling unit at Pease and we welcome the objective nature of this process because certainly Pease has a strategic location, only 12 minutes from very important refueling tracks, and also an already existing Active Duty association that we are very proud of. Of course, for us just what our unit has already done in every conflict in terms of their utilization and the excellent work they have done to support essentially almost every mission that the Air Force has been involved in most recently. So I am very proud of Pease. I know that Senator Shaheen is as well. I want to commend both of you just for the way you have conducted the process thus far.

Do we expect this process to go forward in May when you will be making final decisions?

Mr. DONLEY. Yes.

Senator AYOTTE. Okay, good. So one of the questions I would have to you going forward, as we look at the impact of sequestration, what type of impact could that have on, for example, our acquisition of the KC-46A in terms of purchasing the numbers that we need to meet our capacity going forward?

Mr. DONLEY. As I suggested, Senator, the acquisition plan for the KC-46 remains intact. It is 179 aircraft, I think 8 aircraft by fiscal year 2017, the first development aircraft by fiscal year 2015. So the program is on track today. It is a contract which is, we think, in the best interests of the warfighter and the taxpayer, limiting the Government's exposure at about \$4.9 billion. We need to make sure that those contract requirements stay funded over the next several years. So we will do our best to keep that on track and make sure that the KC-46 remains a high priority and a funded program.

Senator AYOTTE. Of course, we also need to make sure that our pilots get the appropriate training and flying hours not just in our refuelers, but obviously our fighters as well. That remains a significant challenge going forward with sequestration, does it not, General?

General WELSH. Senator, clearly it does. In fact, just as a side note, if you will permit me, we have a KC-135 crew we lost in Kyrgyzstan just this past week, and this morning, we were still searching for the remains of one of those crew members.

Senator AYOTTE. Our thoughts and prayers are with their families and their loss for their sacrifice for our country. Thank you.

I wanted to discuss with you, General Welsh. Earlier you told Senator Blumenthal that the Air Force was seeing positive results by providing victims of sexual assault a SVC. I understand that that is a pilot program within the Air Force that you think is effective.

Today, Senator Murray and I are introducing a bill which, in part, will provide a SVC to all sexual assault victims within all branches of the military. This is something modeled after, obvi-

ously, what is happening now in the Air Force pilot program. So I wanted to get your view on this and how important you thought having that counsel was helping the process of making sure victims have the support that they need to navigate through the system, the judicial system.

General WELSH. Senator, I believe to date the evidence in my mind is clear that it has been immensely helpful particularly to the victims, and that is who we are most interested in helping. Our intent in this program is to complete the pilot with a report that I will work with the Air Force JAG, and I will forward that to the Secretary with my recommendations on whether the Air Force continues and recommendations on what he should forward to the Secretary of Defense for recommendations across DOD. Then the Secretary will make a decision from there.

Senator AYOTTE. I believe that this is not something that when you are within the Air Force and a victim that you should receive, but I believe that victims across the branches should be receiving this type of support. Obviously, as you can hear from the questions today from many of us, this is a very important issue that we are concerned about in terms of the readiness of our forces and also making sure that those who are victims receive the support that they need and a proper legal process to see that justice is done going forward. So I think this is an issue that we will work on on a bipartisan basis, and it is an important issue for our country.

I wanted to finally follow up on the issue of audits, which is when I look at the cancelation late last year of the ECSS, that raised a flag for me, and I wanted to hear from both of you. Is the Air Force on track to meet the 2014 and 2017 audit deadlines?

Mr. DONLEY. The short answer is yes, but there is risk in this work and the cancelation of ECSS puts a little bit more emphasis on the need to go forward with existing systems and to modify existing systems, it is clear that our enterprise resource programs are not going to all be in place to support this work. So there is going to be a lot of manual work and a lot of work with existing systems to do that. We have had some success in getting a clean opinion on about 46 percent of Air Force inventory, on missile motors, other parts of our Air Force inventory. So we continue to work toward the fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2017 goals.

Senator AYOTTE. Mr. Secretary, do you think that you will today, as we sit in this hearing, meet those goals?

Mr. DONLEY. We are working very hard to get there. There is risk but we are working very hard to get there. We have been trying to use outside auditors and experts to do pre-audit work with us. Some of that work was intended to be contracted out. The contract is under protest. So that did set us back. We are looking for opportunities to regain some lost time there, but we are working very hard to get there.

Senator AYOTTE. I thank you. This is, obviously, a very important issue just for us to meet those audit deadlines finally and to be able to have the right type of financial information and accountability, particularly with the fiscal challenges that we face.

So I thank you both for being here today and for your leadership.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Ayotte.

Senator McCaskill.

Senator McCASKILL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I know you had a bad weekend, General Welsh, and I understand that this is painful for you. But I need to ask a couple of questions.

What background did Lieutenant Colonel Krusinski have that qualified him for this job?

General WELSH. He is a personnel officer by training. He has spent the last 2½ years working on the air staff in the personnel policy arena. He was a Force Support Squadron commander before coming to the Pentagon. The Force Support Squadron is the squadron in which things like sexual assault coordination counselors, et cetera work in our active Air Force units. He has been around the business his entire career as a personnel officer.

Senator McCASKILL. Have you looked at his file?

General WELSH. Yes, Senator, I have. His record is very good.

Senator McCASKILL. Did you look at his file for any kind of problems related? I mean, clearly the accusation is that he was drunk and sexually attacked a complete stranger in a parking lot. It is hard for me to believe that someone would be accused of that behavior by a complete stranger and not have anything in their file that would indicate a problem in that regard. Have you looked at his file and determined that his file was absolutely pristine?

General WELSH. Senator, I looked at his officer record of performance, which is all I could access last night. I talked to his current supervisor. I have not talked to people who knew him or supervised him in the past. There is no indication in his professional record of performance or in his current workplace that there is any type of a problem like this.

Senator McCASKILL. Who selected him?

General WELSH. He was selected by Brigadier General Eden Murrie who is the director of our services part in our personnel area, the office above the Sexual Assault Prevention and Response Office, and Lieutenant General Darrell Jones who runs our directorate of personnel manpower.

Senator McCASKILL. Will those two people be responsible for selecting his replacement?

General WELSH. Yes, ma'am, they probably will be.

Senator McCASKILL. I hope that you will evaluate the qualifications. I have spent hours with JAG prosecutors, not just General Harding and his colleagues at the top of the military justice food chain, but with courtroom prosecutors. You have a wealth of people in the Air Force that understand what this job has to be. If this allegation is proved true, this was not someone who understood what this job was about. I will be watching very carefully who is selected to replace Lieutenant Colonel Krusinski because I think it is one of those times you are going to be able to send a message, and I think it is important you do.

These cases turn on who is believable. In the Aviano case and in the case that General Helms overturned, in both instances you had the victim testifying to one set of facts and the accused testifying to another. In both instances, juries selected by those generals said they believed the victim. In both of those instances, the generals said, no, no, we believe the member of the military. That is the crux of the problem here because if a victim does not believe

that the system is capable of believing her, there is no point in risking your entire career. Or as the victim in the Helms case said, how difficult it was for her to encounter the accused who had been convicted by a jury and have to salute him. Now, I cannot imagine what that would feel like to have to salute the man who had been convicted by his peers of assaulting her in the way that he did.

So I agree with you that we have to be very careful about removing the convening authority entirely, but I will look forward to visiting with General Helms about her decision.

The other point I want to make about her decision, General, is that these generals have the ability to consider anything when they make this decision. Anything and everything. She did it without meeting with the victim. She did get some email from the prosecutor about the victim's point of view. But should the victim be required to have something in the file before clemency is determined even if we decide to remove the convening authority from the ability to overturn? Should the victim's statement not be part of any clemency proceeding?

General WELSH. Senator, I would assume that every victim would want their statement to be part of a clemency proceeding. I know in the cases you have referenced, the victim was requested to provide matters for clemency.

Senator McCASKILL. So would you have any problem with us requiring that?

General WELSH. Senator, I personally would not have any problem with that. I have no idea if there is a legal implication of that, but from a common sense perspective, it makes eminent sense.

Senator McCASKILL. Yes. They are all getting stacks of letters about what a great guy this is. In this instance, they got an email from the prosecutor characterizing what the victim had said. It seems to me that is a little weighted.

When she made this decision, we had changed Article 120, and I do not know how familiar you are with 120. But 120 has been a difficult part of the UCMJ dating back to 2007. We wanted to change it, to update it, and then mistakes were made in the way it was drafted. We changed it again. We had changed 120 at the time Helms made her decision. It had been signed into law. It just had not gone into effect yet. But yet, she reached back and used the old 120 instead of looking at the new 120 as she was evaluating what standard of consent was available. I will be anxious to visit with her about that decision, if she got any legal advice about how that law had been changed.

Senator Ayotte covered also ECSS. For both of you, I share her concerns about auditability on ECSS. But the main question I would like for both of you—and I know, Secretary Donley, you have served well and long, and I too salute your service in leading one of the most important parts of our great military in this country. What I really want to focus on—and we would like some follow-up answers to this—is what did we learn about when to cancel a system. We spent a billion with a “B” on ECSS before it was canceled.

At what point in time should we have canceled it, and why was it not canceled earlier? Why did we get to \$1 billion before we realized this was unworkable? If we do not do this analysis, I know this is going to happen again. I just know it. So what steps do you

think we need to memorialize here that would be instructive to the future ECSSs that we could avoid wasting \$1 billion of taxpayers' money?

Mr. DONLEY. Senator, this is a very good question. There are two reviews underway, one in OSD, one inside the Air Force, to get formally the lessons learned out of this experience. In the case of the Air Force, we are treating it in terms of developing for the acquisition this process, the same kind of rigor and discipline that we put to an accident investigation process, why and how did this happen, in great detail.

I will tell you that ECSS got lots of oversight and that the program was restructured at least twice over a 4- or 5-year period. That the program manager was held accountable, that the program was rescoped down to try to make it more implementable, and it got oversight not just from the Air Force but from three other offices in OSD.

So deciding when we have gone far enough—we have restructured it once. We have restructured it a second time, and in this case the third review determined this is unrecoverable.

So I am very interested in getting the results of these two reviews to see if it can help us decide earlier when we should cancel programs such as this. But we certainly went through restructurings and it certainly had lots of oversight.

Senator MCCASKILL. Now with the fiscal restraints we have, it is going to be very important that we absolutely have a very clear document showing when mistakes were made and how they could have been avoided. We have good news and bad news about our military, and that is, our military is so good we think we can do anything. The bad news sometimes is our military is so good we think we can do anything. In this instance and many other instances I can cite, a failure to give up ends up being very costly for the bottom line, and that is just something we cannot afford going forward.

So I will look forward to those reports. I will continue to follow up on this subject until I feel like we have real clear guidance as to where mistakes were made and how we can avoid them in the future.

I will continue to want to work closely with you, General Welsh, in a way that is responsible on the UCMJ on these cases, and I will look forward to any kind of information I can get about the replacement for the lieutenant colonel who was arrested over the weekend. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator McCaskill.

Senator WICKER.

Senator WICKER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you, gentlemen, for your testimony.

I am going to try to squeeze three issues in to my 8 minutes. So I think on the first one, let me just make a statement for the record, and perhaps we can talk about that later.

I want to reiterate my concerns regarding the concept of the Air Force Total Force Plan (TFP) and its implementation. I remain deeply concerned about the fiscal year 2013 defense authorization conference decision made without consultation of all conferees, which enabled the Air Force to begin implementation of the TFP

without hearings or adequate deliberation by the full Senate Armed Services Committee. I am convinced that some elements of the TFP were short-sighted and may adversely impact our intra-theater airlift capability at a time when our Services are evolving toward a more rotational deployment model.

I say to my chairman and to my ranking member, I look forward to working with them as well and with the Airland Subcommittee chairman, Senator Manchin, on markup initiatives to help ensure the Air Force makes its force structure decisions based on the best possible understanding of long-term global force requirements. These decisions should not be based solely on artificial or self-imposed resource constraints.

Now, having made that statement, let me move to another issue. I think what I will ask you to do is just take this series of questions for the record, but I want to get it out in public. It is concerning the Air Force's rotorcraft acquisition strategy.

I understand you are considering a common support helicopter to recap your UH-1N fleet of aircraft. I believe there are existing and affordable replacement systems available to meet global strike command's nuclear missile security mission during the decades to come. So I would appreciate it if both of you could provide this committee with written answers concerning the following.

Number one, current requirements for all UH-1N missions.

[The information referred to follows:]

The Air Force's UH-1N is flown by five major commands, which include multiple mission sets: Air Force Global Strike Command's Intercontinental Ballistic Missile (ICBM) helicopter security support, the Air Force District of Washington's National Capital Region Mass Passenger Transport, Pacific Air Forces' Operational Support Airlift, Air Education and Training Command's Air Force Survival School, and Air Force Materiel Command's flight test support.

The current requirements for the various missions of the UH-1N are documented in the Joint Requirements Oversight Council's approved Common Vertical Lift Support Platform (CVLSP) capability development document. Although these requirements are no longer tied to a specific acquisition program (i.e., the CVLSP), the requirements for the UH-1N mission set remain valid.

Senator WICKER. Number two, whether the Air Force requirements have been reviewed and validated since those missions were separated from the combat rescue helicopter program.

[The information referred to follows:]

The current requirements for the various missions of the UH-1N are documented in the Joint Requirements Oversight Council's approved Common Vertical Lift Support Platform (CVLSP) capability development document. Although these requirements are no longer tied to a specific acquisition program (i.e., the CVLSP), the requirements for the UH-1N mission set remain valid.

Air Force Global Strike Command will continue to sustain the existing UH-1N fleet for the foreseeable future, and look for opportunities to acquire excess aircraft from other Department of Defense organizations at low or no cost to the Air Force.

Senator WICKER. Number three, the findings and recommendations of the Air Force's request for information on the UH-1N modernization with regard to the costs of the program modification versus a replacement cost.

[The information referred to follows:]

In the case of the UH-1N, as stated in the original request for information (RFI), "in terms of mission capability rates the UH-1 remains one of the most reliable platforms within the USAF inventory." The purpose of the Air Force's RFI on UH-1N Modernization was to determine the feasibility of sustaining and making modest modernization enhancements to the platform via low cost options. The Industry Day

presentations reaffirmed that the robust helicopter industry and the large number of UH-1's operating globally will enable the Air Force to effectively sustain the UH-1N until such a time that it can be replaced with an aircraft that provides all required capabilities.

Air Force Global Strike Command has determined that the most cost effective way ahead includes safety and simulator modifications totaling just over \$500,000 per aircraft in the near-term. Follow-on improvements to the forward looking infrared radar and secure communications at \$100,000 to \$200,000 per aircraft yield a total cost of less than \$1 million per aircraft over a 10-year period. Compared to the previously assessed cost of the Common Vertical Lift Support Platform program, or any other new helicopter acquisition, this approach is far more cost effective for the Air Force.

Senator WICKER. Number four, the current operational availability of the UH-1N fleet and the Air Force's assessment of any risk regarding the maintenance and adequate availability levels.

[The information referred to follows:]

The current UH-1N average aircraft availability for fiscal year 2013 is 73.7 percent, meeting the Air Force Global Strike Command-established standard of 73.7 percent. The future aircraft availability rate is projected to continue to meet or exceed the 73.7 percent requirement. We expect to maintain adequate readiness levels for the foreseeable future.

Senator WICKER. Number five, whether the Air Force has evaluated potential replacement aircraft for any of the missions performed by the UH-1N.

[The information referred to follows:]

The Common Vertical Lift Support Platform was cancelled due to cost considerations in this constrained economic environment after determination that the Air Force could assume manageable risk in this area. Air Force Global Strike Command is no longer pursuing a Combat Rescue Helicopter option to replace the UH-1N fleet for similar reasons. Instead, Air Force Global Strike Command will continue to sustain the existing UH-1N fleet for the foreseeable future, and look for opportunities to acquire excess aircraft from other Department of Defense organizations at low/no cost to the Air Force.

Senator WICKER. So having asked for that on the record, I will now see if I can let you gentlemen actually speak on an issue, and that is concerning the safety of our U.S. Air Force data security.

There have been numerous media articles referring to an egregious breach of U.S. computer networks when the Chinese gained access to some data from the JSF program back in 2009. The incident was part of a wave of data thefts that year, during which Beijing stole proprietary and in some cases classified information from the U.S. defense contractors.

I asked General Bogdan, the program executive officer for the JSF program, at a subcommittee hearing 2 weeks ago about these data intrusions. General Bogdan's testimony was this: DOD and our allies have a robust system in place to prevent cyber theft, but the general went on to say, "I would tell you that I am not confident outside the Department." Then he went on to say that he is "less confident about industry partners."

So let me ask you each about that, and I will start with you, Mr. Secretary. How confident are you about the Air Force's ability to secure classified and sensitive data within DOD data networks and how confident are you about the ability of our industry partners to secure this very important classified and sensitive data?

Mr. DONLEY. Sir, I do believe we have the appropriate security protocols in place to protect key classified information in DOD. We have protected networks to do that on, and we work very hard to

maintain appropriate security levels on each of our classified and unclassified networks.

I will say that in the last 5 or 6 years, 7 years—since I have come back to DOD, really 8 years now, I have seen more and more attention to this issue progressively each year. We have learned from weaknesses or errors seen and experienced from the past. We developed strong partnerships with industry partners who are what I would call our prime contractors who deal with the JSF, for example, Lockheed Martin, Northrop, Boeing, other large contractors with whom we do lots of defense business.

So we have a stronger network of collaboration among key industry partners today than we had, say, 5 or 6 years ago. But it is continuing work, and there is always a concern that we are covering all that needs to be covered.

Senator WICKER. General Welsh?

General WELSH. Senator, I would tell you that internal to DOD, the one thing that we have worked very hard on over the last year and will continue to work on and refine is the way we support U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) which, I believe, will be the orchestrator and the architect of the proper defense of the DOD information network. The Air Force has to be hand-in-glove with General Alexander and his people moving forward on this, and we are trying to identify clearly how we do that, what kind of training our people need to support him. They have been tremendously helpful in this regard, and the entire joint world is trying to move in that direction.

Senator WICKER. Are you as confident about our industry partners as you are about security within DOD itself? Or do you agree with General Bogdan that you are less confident about our industry partners?

General WELSH. Senator, first of all, I am not a technical expert on what industry is doing in every case. I believe we have some partners who are very reliable in this area, and there are probably some who are not as reliable. I would leave this up to the experts at CYBERCOM to offer a better assessment than I can give you.

Senator WICKER. Are either of you aware of any further intrusions like the one I mentioned in 2009 into the Air Force research and development (R&D) and acquisition programs since that time? Either one of you?

Mr. DONLEY. I think I would like to provide you an answer for the record on that. This is ongoing work.

Senator WICKER. You could do that in a non-classified answer for the record.

Mr. DONLEY. We will do our best to do that.

[The information referred to follows:]

The Department of Defense (DOD) Chief Information Officer recently released the latest National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) Section 935 2012 Report to Congress, which contains an unclassified summary of cyber intrusions.

To summarize that report, in fiscal year 2012, the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) investigated 86 cyber intrusions reported by Defense Industrial Base (DIB) participants. Fifty-four of the 86 were reported prior to fiscal year 2012 and 32 additional cases were reported during fiscal year 2012. Of the 86 cases, OSD cyber intrusion damage assessment entities concluded the analysis for all or part of 35 cases. Twelve other cases were closed in fiscal year 2012 when the DIB cyber security and information assurance participant certified that no DOD information

was involved. Most cases involve multiple DOD acquisition equities (e.g., programs, systems, or technologies).

DOD is concerned with the vulnerabilities throughout the information and communications technology supply chain. As part of its ongoing efforts to institutionalize the Trusted Defense Systems/Supply Chain Risk Management (SCRM) strategies, DOD continued to develop policies and legislative input to formalize SCRM.

Supply chain risks pose a complex and evolving threat to defense systems. In the January 2010 NDAA for Fiscal Year 2009 Section 254 Report on Trusted Defense Systems, DOD described supply chain risks and DOD's strategies for countering those risks. During fiscal year 2012, DOD continued efforts to implement those strategies, policies, and risk management activities with the goal of developing a fully operational SCRM capability by fiscal year 2016.

The Air Force can provide more details via a classified venue if requested by the committee.

Senator WICKER. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Wicker.

Senator KING.

Senator KING. General, do you fellows have data on the frequency of occurrence of sexual assault in the military or in the Air Force in particular versus the general society?

General WELSH. Sir, anecdotally we do. One of the things that we have also learned in our discussions with RAINN is that that data is not easily available anywhere else. It is much better tracked inside DOD than it is in most places.

I have talked to a number of university deans of student affairs, the vice president for student affairs. There are some who estimate that as many as 50 percent or more of their students experience some type of sexual harassment or unwanted sexual contact or sexual assault during their time at their university. I hate to try and characterize this as better or worse anywhere. It is a big problem for our Nation. It may be as big or bigger elsewhere.

My view is that we can lead the pack in this. We have the ability. We have the organizational structure, the leadership, the training, the education, and a disciplinary system and a judicial process that allows us to attack every aspect of this problem. We should be the best in the world at it.

Senator KING. I am delighted to hear you say that. In dealing with these kinds of problems, often it is a cultural issue. You can do all the law enforcement and all of those things, but the culture is what you have to deal with. You and I grew up at a time when drinking and driving was more or less tolerated in this country. The culture changed and that has had a really profound impact. So I hope that—and I am sure this is the case—that within the Air Force, it has to become unacceptable culturally in the pub after work that this is just not something that we do.

General WELSH. Senator, that is clearly what it has to be. Roughly 20 percent of our young women who come into DOD and the Air Force report that they were sexually assaulted in some way before they came into the military. So they come in from a society where this occurs. Some of it is the hook-up mentality of junior high even and high school students now, which my children can tell you about from watching their friends and being frustrated by it. The same demographic group moves into the military. We have to change the culture once they arrive. The way they behave, the way

they treat each other cannot be outside the bounds of what we consider inclusive and respectful.

Senator KING. Thank you, General. I appreciate your attention to this.

Secretary Donley, sequester. It keeps coming up. We talk about it at all of our hearings. There is a discussion around here that the real problem is flexibility and that you can take the cuts if you are given the flexibility. Now, you said something like transfer authority will not help. Can you focus this discussion for us? Because this is going to come up over the next year as we wrestle with this issue. If we gave you additional flexibility, would that substantially alleviate the impact of the sequester on the hollowing out of the force?

Mr. DONLEY. Flexibility comes in a variety of flavors and colors. So, first of all, with respect to fiscal year 2013 and the way it has to be implemented this year and what we experienced, it came almost 6 months into the fiscal year. So it forced a very mechanical spread of dollars across all the accounts, but it forced that to happen in essentially the last 6 or 7 months of the fiscal year. So it has had devastating impacts really on our ability to execute the budget that you all approved.

Looking forward, there is no question in our minds that more flexibility is better, that being allowed to make choices about where to put emphasis in our defense planning and programming, to favor certain programs, to promote the strategic interests of the United States even as defense resources go down is an important goal. It is an important flexibility to have.

But I would also offer that in doing this work, we need time. We need time to do this right. As you give us the flexibility, we also need to have the collaboration and the cooperation of Congress so that you understand the choices that we will be making and you will be comfortable with those as you approve our defense plans and budgets. It will not help if we make tough choices internal to DOD which Congress does not agree with or is not ready to make and you reverse or block those changes. So it is very important that we collaborate in this work going forward regardless of what the level is. But we need time to do it right.

Senator KING. But are you suggesting then that we can go ahead with the 10-year sequester and you can manage okay if you are given—I was under the understanding that you said transfer authority will not really help. Was that only for this year or in the future? This is an important question.

Mr. DONLEY. Just to be clear, transfer authority for fiscal year 2013 will not help us out in this sense. What you are giving us when you give us transfer authority is the ability to move dollars from one account to another account inside the fixed constraints of sequestration. So in order to meet all our O&M requirements, for example, to fix all the OCO shortfalls and O&M shortfalls, we have to cut into modernization programs that right now we are not quite prepared to cut into yet. So we would have to start breaking contracts and doing other significant damage to modernization programs to pay operational bills for this year. That is not a good trade for fiscal year 2013. We could set up those decisions for 2014 and 2015 if we were given the time to do that.

Senator KING. But are you saying that the figures you would get in 2014 and 2015 under sequestration are adequate if you have the flexibility to plan and move the funds around?

Mr. DONLEY. No. My view is that the dollars implicit in the BCA, which involve a trillion dollars in cuts over 10 years, will have a devastating impact on our security policy and programs going forward.

Senator KING. Regardless of flexibility and transfer authority.

Mr. DONLEY. You cannot take a trillion dollars out of the defense program and not have an impact.

Senator KING. The impact you just characterized as——

Mr. DONLEY. Devastating. It will be force structure. It will be readiness. It will be modernization. To get a trillion dollars out will do significant damage to our military in my opinion.

Senator KING. The phrase you used earlier was, “significantly degraded readiness posture.” Is that the characterization?

Mr. DONLEY. That is how we are going to start fiscal year 2014 most likely.

Senator KING. I am out of time, Mr. Chairman. I am going to submit some questions for the record on the long-term plans for the KC-46 and refueling, where that is going to go.

I appreciate your testimony. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator King.

Senator Chambliss.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Let me say to Secretary Donley, this being your last hearing, again as I alluded earlier to you privately that we thank you for your service and I particularly do. I have a major Air Force presence in my State. You have been very open to dialogue with respect to all the issues that we have had with regard to not just the facilities but with weapons systems and a broader range of issues that we have had to engage on. Your service is very much appreciated and I also appreciate the friendship that we have shared during your tenure. So we are going to miss you, but we certainly wish you the best.

Gentlemen, I want to talk for a minute about JSTARS. I am very concerned with what I see the direction in which this weapon system is going. The E-8C aircraft is the military’s premier and wide-area ISR aircraft with ground targeting capability. Secretary Donley, you and I have talked about this any number of times over and, General Welsh, you and I have had this conversation too, that every time I go into theater, which is often, and I mention to our combat commanders on the ground the word “Joint STARS,” their eyes light up because of what this weapon system has done from the standpoint of being able to address the enemy in whatever part of the theater they exist.

The President’s budget request cuts \$10.7 million in R&D funding from the program and recommends the test aircraft, the T-3, be put into what I understand as preservation storage because the developmental program has concluded. However, there are multiple upgrade programs such as the National Guard’s multi-agency upgrade that will require flight testing, and the Air Force is proposing in your budget request to place JSTARS test aircraft into preservation storage, again due to the conclusion of the develop-

ment programs. But the Air National Guard continues their development programs and modernization efforts, funded and planned, which will require flight testing.

How will the Guard complete flight test requirements for these programs without the T-3?

Both the Air Force and the Guard have future plans for additional modernization programs for JSTARS. How will these programs complete flight test requirements without the T-3?

Lastly, what are the costs associated with placing T-3 in preservation storage?

Mr. DONLEY. Senator, I would like to get back to you on the record with a comparison of what is funded in the Active Air Force versus what is planned on the Guard side going forward for the E-8.

[The information referred to follows:]

Joint Surveillance Target Attack Radar System operational jets will be used to support test requirements when not providing their primary function of supporting combatant commanders and training forces for initial qualification and combat readiness. The cost of placing T-3 in storage is \$57,000 for induction and \$52,000 for re-preservation every 4 years.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Okay.

Any comments, General Welsh?

General WELSH. No, Senator. I do not know the details of the Guard program. I agree with the Secretary. We need to get you the right answer.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Okay. I really am concerned that this program may be headed towards whatever preservation storage may be, and I am truly concerned about it.

Mr. DONLEY. Sir, if I might, I would just offer too that this is a concern for us in the sense that we have done an Analysis of Alternatives (AOA) that suggests for this set of missions, the ground moving target indicator mission, going forward among varying levels of options and capabilities, the best solution is probably a business jet type aircraft with a new radar. That was the result of the AOA a couple of years ago.

The issue for us is it is not funded. We simply do not have the resources. It is one of several programs where we know pretty much what we want to do. We pretty much understand the requirements, but the dollars are not there to fund those programs going forward. There is even more pressure on the modernization programs ahead, as I indicated.

Senator CHAMBLISS. In your response to Senator King, you talk about readiness being impacted in a big way, and this is another one of those areas where we are not going to be ready if we do not have the resources under sequestration.

Let me move to another issue, G-222. There is a lot of conversation around the Hill these days that the Air Force has a \$600 million program of airplanes that we purchased for use in Afghanistan and that those airplanes are sitting on the ground in Afghanistan not being used now and that they are going to be chopped up and thrown away versus some other more useful disposition being made. My understanding is that that is not really the case, but I want to give you an opportunity to address that issue and let us set the record straight with respect to, number one, what are the

circumstances surrounding the termination of that contract, and number two, what is the Air Force's intentions relative to the disposition of those aircraft that are on the ground in Afghanistan today.

Mr. DONLEY. Senator, as you suggest, the G-222 has been a troubled program for the Air Force. This was an early version of the C-27, procured on the used aircraft market to meet an urgent need for the Afghan air force. As those aircraft were delivered, they had sustainment problems from the very beginning. First it was propellers. A year later, it was supply chain issues. They faced a number of spare parts and performance-related materiel crises over several years. Again, after working with the contractor, we simply concluded that this was not recoverable. We were not delivering—the contractor was not delivering the ready aircraft required under the contract.

So we have worked with the Afghans. They have identified a C-130-like aircraft as the best option for them going forward. The G-222 was actually always intended as a bridge to a future capability, and the cancellation of the G-222 program will get us to the C-130-like capability more rapidly.

So Secretary Carter and the rest of the defense leadership has us focused on making this transition as quickly and as effectively as we can. We have no plans for the disposition of the G-222 at this point. So there is simply no good option in front of us at this point.

Senator CHAMBLISS. As you proceed down the decision-making process route, I hope you will keep this committee informed of what you do intend to do there because, obviously, that was a lot of money to be spent. I understand the problems that existed, but we just need to know what is going to happen with the resources that were used there.

Mr. DONLEY. We will keep you posted.

Senator CHAMBLISS. Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Chambliss.

Senator Donnelly.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

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

I am a dad. I have a son and daughter, and moms and dads all over the country put their most precious resource, their most precious treasure in our hands. We have to get this right in the area of sexual assaults and sexual harassment. We have to have zero tolerance. I believe that you will work nonstop to make sure we get this right and look forward to your efforts on that. We will be watching closely to make sure that happens.

I was with a group of Senators and Representatives that just returned from Afghanistan a few days ago. While we were there, there was a discussion about the need for the Afghan troops to continue to have air cover after we are gone. One of the discussions that took place was that there is a contract dispute right now over planes that are going to go to the Afghan air force. This dispute continues. I am very concerned about making sure that the Afghan army, the Afghan police have the ability to have the same kind of quality air coverage that we provide to our soldiers as we step back. I was wondering what are the plans to solve these disputes

and to get this in place because the Afghan soldiers themselves said, look, we are concerned about the Medevac piece. If we are out there fighting, we need to get back. We need to have cover. So I am interested in your response.

Mr. DONLEY. Just a couple of points, Senator. I will also ask the chief to chime in.

This is the light attack support program, to which you referred, which we had a misfire on in our acquisition process over a year ago. We restarted that competition. We made a contract award earlier this year. It was protested, and that is currently being reviewed by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) currently. That usually takes about 100 days. The 100-day clock will run out in the mid-June timeframe, I think.

In the meantime, though, we have sustained the contract award that we made earlier this year to get the program started. This was an extraordinary action on our part. Normally we would have suspended that while waiting for the GAO to rule on this matter, but we decided to go ahead because of the commitment we had made to the Afghan air force to get this capability to them next summer. We are already behind in that work, and we are dedicated to doing that.

They will not have the same kind of capability that we are exercising over Afghanistan today. I do believe they are on track to building a small but effective air force. One of their backbones right now is the MI-17 helicopter, and they have been doing casualty evacuation work in this regard and stepping up into that mission.

Chief?

General WELSH. Yes, Senator. I would just add that nobody anywhere has the kind of air support that we give our troops on the ground and they never will.

The Afghans will get what they need from the A-29. It will provide them the capability they need to be successful in the battlefield, I believe, if we can deliver it on time. The plan is still to deliver it by the end of calendar year 2014, and that is what the Commander of International Security Assistance Force, General Dunford, is expecting us to do.

Senator DONNELLY. Great.

In Syria, in regards to a no-fly zone, whether it is—20 percent has been discussed. 100 percent of the entire country has been discussed. How difficult is that to put in place? How many airmen, soldiers, marines, Navy are required to do that?

General WELSH. Senator, I think the number is completely dependent on the plan itself, and I am not privy to the detailed planning that is going on for options in Syria.

I will tell you that the forces we have that are not flying right now will be likely required to maintain a no-fly zone over time. A lot depends on where you can actually base the aircraft which are enforcing the no-fly zone. You cannot do it all from carriers in the Levant. We do not have enough. You will have to do land basing. If they can base in countries nearby, you need less tanker support. If you have to move farther away, you need more tanker support. There are a lot of variables that will drive the size of this operation.

Senator DONNELLY. When you look at that, does a no-fly zone over 20 percent of the country—is that effective? Does that change the game at all?

General WELSH. Senator, I think that is completely dependent on the objectives you are trying to accomplish. As I said, I am not in that discussion.

Senator DONNELLY. In regards to unmanned air systems, can you talk to us about the future of the unmanned air systems in the Air Force? What role in the Federal Aviation Administration's (FAA) task of integrating the unmanned aircraft systems (UAS) into the National Airspace System (NAS) by September 2015—what role is the Air Force going to play in that, sir?

Mr. DONLEY. Sir, we are members of the NAS review process. We have Air Force staffers, Air Force officers assisting FAA in this work. Their choice about which locations to choose for demonstrating, I think it was, six different locations across the Nation—that is an FAA decision that we are not privy to. But they did come to us and ask for advice on how to set up that process.

RPAs have a future in our Air Force. There is no doubt about that. We have new career fields and capabilities that we did not have 10 years ago that we are going to maintain into the future.

Senator DONNELLY. One of the proposals out there is a joint proposal between the States of Indiana and Ohio to be one of those six UAS test sites.

As you look at the fiscal year 2014 budget, it requests approximately \$90 million for Air Force research, development, test and evaluation, human effectiveness, applied research for trusted autonomy. Do you think that that level of funding is sufficient for the study of the UAS autonomous systems?

Mr. DONLEY. Sir, I am not familiar with the details of that particular proposal, but I will get you an answer for the record on that.

[The information referred to follows:]

The total Air Force research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) budget request for research in trusted autonomy is sufficient. The \$89.483 million request for Air Force RDT&E, Human Effectiveness Applied Research (Program Element 0602202F), contains a broad portfolio of human-centered research in the areas of airmen training, airmen system interfaces, bioeffects, deployment and sustainment of airmen in extreme environments, and understanding and shaping adversarial behavior. Of this amount, \$3.1 million is specifically targeted to work in the area of trusted autonomy for unmanned aircraft systems. The Air Force Research Laboratory has a well-coordinated investment in trusted autonomy research as it relates to integration of remotely piloted aircraft in the national airspace. The research investment in this area is balanced across multiple technology areas and program elements to develop and demonstrate technology options to our warfighters in the time-frame they require. The Air Force is also leading a cross-Service effort, called the Priority Steering Council for Autonomy. This group has identified two technical challenge areas related to trusted autonomy: (1) human/autonomous system interaction and collaboration; and (2) test, evaluation, validation, and verification. There are many shared goals in these technical challenge areas that have resulted in ongoing, collaborative cross-Service research efforts focused on this issue.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator NELSON [presiding]. Senator Gillibrand?

Senator GILLIBRAND. Thank you both for your extraordinary service and for the hard work you do every single day.

I want to continue the line of questioning that was started by Senator Levin concerning sexual assaults in the military, and I want to start with you, Secretary Donley.

You said that you believe the chain of command needs to retain its authority to make determinations of whether or not a sexual assault charge should go to trial because you believe that that authority is necessary to maintain good order and discipline within the ranks.

Now, fiscal year 2011 had 19,000 cases of sexual assault and rape, 3,192 reported, 190 convictions. The fiscal year 2012 report has come up with higher numbers, 26,000 cases and barely more reported, 3,374.

Obviously, this is not good order and discipline. So are you saying that every commander in the chain of command is failing in our military today?

Mr. DONLEY. No, I am not, and I would say that the changes in the numbers that we are seeing are a matter of some debate and we are not really sure whether the numbers of increasing reporting reflect a higher incidence or they reflect more confidence in the system so we are getting more reporting of incidents that had already been taking place—

Senator GILLIBRAND. Secretary Donley, take the lower number. Let us not even take the supposed cases of 19,000. Let us just stick with the 3,000 reported cases. If that is too high for you, let us stick with 190 convictions from last year.

Mr. DONLEY. The numbers are too high. We agree with you on that. The issue that you asked about is whether or not commanders ought to be involved in this work, and I guess in my judgment—and I will defer to the chief to chime in here—commanders need to be part of the good order and discipline for their units. If they are cut out in some specific way, it is not good. It kind of separates them—

Senator GILLIBRAND. They are failing in this regard, sir. This is a regard in which there is clearly insufficient training, insufficient understanding. If the man in charge for the Air Force in preventing sexual assault is being alleged to have committed a sexual assault this weekend, obviously there is a failing in training and understanding of what sexual assault is and how corrosive and damaging it is to good order and discipline and how it is undermining the credibility of the greatest military force in the world. This is not good enough.

Now, General Welsh, in answer to the same question from Senator Levin, you said you did not know what we would be fixing by removing the authority from the chain of command. You cite as proof for that the chain of command does not disregard the recommendations of the lawyer.

Do you have a sense as to why, if there are 19,000 or 26,000 or some unknown number of sexual assaults and rapes within the military every year, such a fraction are reported? Could you surmise that it may well be that a victim has no faith in the chain of command on this issue, on sexual assault? Because going back to the gentleman whose job it is to prevent sexual assaults was just alleged to have committed sexual assault. Do you think perhaps that a victim does not believe he or she will receive justice because

the chain of command is not trained, does not have the understanding of what sexual assault and rape actually is?

So I do not think you should pat yourself on the back that your commanders have acknowledged and accepted the recommendation of their lawyers in a good percentage of cases. I am highly concerned that so few victims feel that they could ever receive justice that they will not report. So what I would like you to consider—and I would like thoughtful consideration of this—if we remove it from the chain of command, perhaps more people will report these cases because they are reporting them to a trained prosecutor who understands the nature of sexual assault and rape and will not discount their allegations.

Already you are willing to agree that Article 60 is no longer needed because we see time and time again that after a jury's verdict, commanders are overturning that verdict. Imagine you are the assaulted victim who has just gone through a trial and because a commanding officer has said let us overturn the jury's verdict, you then have to salute the person who assaulted you. That seems to be a lack of justice.

So I would like you to think this through because I have now heard from nearly everyone that somehow removing this one judgment—this one judgment—would unwind the discipline and order within the armed services. We are not taking away the commander's authority over almost everything else. I think there is a lack of understanding and training for this specific type of crime that is continuing to rise. So do you understand, General Welsh, that there is something that needs to be fixed?

General WELSH. Senator, you referred to several different things. Let me try and break them apart just a bit because I have given this a lot of thoughtful thought.

The number 800 is the one I focus on because I know there are 800 victims last year in the U.S. Air Force—792 people came forward and said they were victims, and we know an awful lot about that set of victims.

I also know that in the last 3 years there has been one sexual contact case, one case out of 2,511 court cases, where a commander decided not to prefer it to court when a lawyer, well-trained, educated in the law, said he should. One case. We do not have commanders routinely overturning sexual assault convictions. There are two in DOD in the last 5 years that we can find. This does not happen all the time.

The facts are critical as we try and figure out how we move forward to solve the problem because it is very easy to get distracted and derailed and focus on things that will not make this better.

My concern is ensuring, if that is ever humanly possible, that no one else suffers from this crime. You know well, because you work this very hard, that there are lots of pieces to that. One is prosecution. I do not know if you were in the room when we had this conversation earlier, but I sat down with my JAG. We took our Air Force statistics because my concern is if we are seen as not prosecuting, people will not report.

Senator GILLIBRAND. I heard your .05 percent. That is not what I am worried about.

General WELSH. That is not the point I am making. RAINN took our data, put it in their model, and for 2012, according to their statisticians, we are 1-something percent below their prosecution rate and 3 percent above their conviction rate. So a fact on the table is that we do not have a very different problem than district attorneys' offices around the country have. It is a horrible problem, but it is the same problem. So that is not the critical issue that makes the military different.

Senator GILLIBRAND. If one in five women say they are serving in the military and they are receiving unwanted sexual contact, that is a huge problem regardless of what you are looking at in the public sector.

General WELSH. I am not comparing us to anything, Senator. I am trying to get at the problem that we have to fix. In the civil sector, there are people who can help us look at this. They have the same problem. We are reaching out to them. It is the same problem in universities, on Capitol Hill, and industry. It is the same problem. We should be working together to identify those things that help us resolve the problem in a meaningful way. That takes a very careful analysis of the data.

Senator GILLIBRAND. One of the reasons why I am concerned that you are so focused on retaining this authority, if it is used in so few instances, why do you need to retain it? Because the reality is because it is in the chain of command, I believe—and this is what victims have told us time and time again—that it is why they do not report. So if you want to increase the number of reported cases, as opposed to these numbers that are unsure, vague, not sure if it is precise, whether it is 19,000 or 26,000 a year but only 3,000 approximately are reporting, you have to remove it from the chain of command. The commander is not using the authority to overturn what the lawyers are recommending in hardly any cases. You have just said so. It is only a handful of not taking the recommendations to go to trial, and it is only a handful that are overturning those cases.

But I think because it is in the chain of command, because this is what our witnesses have told us, people are not reporting. They do not feel that there is an atmosphere by which they can report safely. They are afraid of retaliation. They are afraid of being treated poorly by their commanders, being treated poorly by their colleagues. There is not a climate by which they can receive justice in the system. That is why I want the decision not to be part of the chain of command but be done entirely by trained professionals who may not have a bias or may not have a lens that is untrained.

General WELSH. We did a survey recently in the third Air Force in Europe. 79 percent of the respondents said that they would report sexual assault if it occurred to them. That ends up not being true once they become victims. We find that 16 percent of our victims report. So what changes when you become a victim? I think we all know. The things that cause people to not report primarily are really not chain of command. It is I do not want my family to know. I do not want my spouse to know or my boyfriend or girlfriend to know. I am embarrassed that I am in this situation. It is the self-blame that comes with the crime. That is overridingly

on surveys over the years the reasons that most victims do not report. I do not think it is any different in the military.

Prosecution rates in the Air Force for this crime—

Senator GILLIBRAND. I think it is very different in the military. I think you are precisely wrong about that. Everything is about the chain of command. How you are seen by your peers and your commanders is the essence of whether you will have a successful career in the military.

General WELSH. Ma'am, I am just relating what we get on surveys from our members. I cannot attest to the veracity with which they take the survey. I will take the data at face value until we have something better to work on.

Our prosecution rate for sexual assault in the first quarter of this fiscal year—we have more cases referred to court than were referred in the entire year of 2011. It is 50 percent higher than any quarter last year. We are working this hard.

Senator GILLIBRAND. Thank you for your efforts, and I do appreciate what you are doing. I know every aspect in the military is trying very hard to address this scourge, and I appreciate your leadership on that.

My time has expired.

Chairman LEVIN [presiding]. Thank you, Senator Gillibrand.

Senator Nelson.

Senator NELSON. I think what you are hearing here is this is coming to the fore because a lot of people are beginning to speak out. This Senator had hearings on this not among the military but among the military contractors in Iraq, and I had these hearings 6 years ago. We had women who had been raped come forward and explain how everything was shuffled under and swept under the rug, how rape kits were not available, how there was always the pressure not to report. I think that what has happened is that there has been sufficient agitation now as being expressed by a number of the women Senators here on the dais that it is finally coming out. Of course, things need to change.

What I found was that we could not even—this is the hearing 6 years ago—that we could not even get the U.S. attorneys to prosecute because they could not get the evidence because the evidence was never there when in fact we had a number of testimonies that would just tear your heart out.

So thank you for what you are doing.

Mr. Secretary, I want to personally thank you. You have served extraordinarily well. I remember when you were selected by Secretary Gates to come in and clean up a problem in the Air Force, and that was 5½ years ago and you have done that exceptionally well. I want to thank you for your service.

Now, let me just ask a couple of quick questions. There is talk about another round of BRAC, and of course, that makes Senators nervous. But why is there not real concern about a BRAC in Europe? Why do we need the forces there that, in large part, were put there as a result of the Cold War? Why is that not a logical place to look?

Mr. DONLEY. Sir, I would offer that the U.S. Air Force footprint in Europe is much smaller than it was during the Cold War. We can possibly make it a little bit smaller yet, and those discussions

are underway with our joint partners and with OSD. But I will let General Welsh, who knows this theater like the back of his hand, address this in more specifics.

But I will also offer that despite the range and speed of airpower and the flexibility it provides from the CONUS to go east or west in support of combatant commanders or worldwide commitments, geography matters. Geography matters, and so the collaboration that we have, the presence that we maintain in Europe provides throughput to the Middle East and other important areas and to North Africa as well.

But I would let the chief talk about his experience in Europe.

Senator NELSON. General, can you speak outside the Air Force as well?

General WELSH. Senator, I think so. The U.S. Army did a very big reduction in Europe a couple of years ago. The Air Force has actually come down about 75 percent of its force structure in Europe over the last 20 years. There has been a significant lowering in force structure and size.

We believe we can still streamline the footprint. We believe we can consolidate, we can realign some things and save money and close some infrastructure in Europe. We are in the process of putting that plan together. But as the Secretary said, there are some things that the United States will always want to have in Europe to support options for the Nation.

Senator NELSON. Mr. Secretary, I just want to echo the commentary from Senator Chambliss' concerns regarding the grounding of the test aircraft in JSTARS, and he has already made that statement. General, I would address that to you as well.

Tell me. Replacing the A-10—would something like the A-29 help fill the gap in close air support?

Mr. DONLEY. Again, I would offer the chief the opportunity to speak in more detail.

But the F-35 is our preferred air-to-ground capability going forward. It is intended to replace the F-16. It is a multi-role aircraft, likely to replace the F-16 in numbers. I think it has the capability to replace the A-10 as well. But I will let the chief talk to this more specifically.

One problem with the A-29 is its inability to operate in a highly contested environment. But I will let the chief respond.

General WELSH. Senator, we have no requirement for the A-29 in the U.S. Air Force. The environments that we are training for for the future—we need an airplane that can both operate in a contested environment and then swing to an uncontested one when able because we are, as Senator Inhofe mentioned earlier, the smallest Air Force we have ever been, and I think that downsizing will continue, which means we are having to make decisions like single-capability, single-mission airplanes are not as valuable to us as multi-mission airplanes.

The F-35 can do the close air support mission. I think we will have to look at optimizing weapons for it for that mission in the future potentially, but the weapons that are currently in its projected inventory will allow it to do the job very well.

Senator NELSON. I did not have the opportunity to hear Senator McCaskill's comments. She has put a hold on a promotion of an Air

Force general, and as reported in the Washington Post, this was a general that overturned a conviction of a military court. Is that what it is? Can you cite something about the history of whether or not this is something that is done frequently?

Chairman LEVIN. Let me interrupt your answer on this. I am going to run over and vote and come back. Senator Shaheen is over voting and is going to come back. There is a vote on, I should have started by saying. So when you are done, Senator Nelson, if you would recess this until either Senator Shaheen or I or other members come back.

You folks may have a 5- or 10-minute break, in which case it is purely by chance, not by design. So do not thank me for it. We are punishing you here a little bit this morning.

Anyway so, Senator Nelson, excuse the interruption.

Senator NELSON [presiding]. Thank you.

General WELSH. Senator, this was a case, one of only two in DOD in the last 5 years, where a convening authority has reversed the finding of guilt on a sexual assault charge. This was a case where there were actually two allegations of sexual assault against an individual and then some other lesser charges. On the principal charge of sexual assault, the subject was found not guilty. Or the second charge, he was found guilty, and he was found guilty of the lesser offenses that were not directly related.

So the convening authority, reviewing the case in accordance with the UCMJ and our rules of court martial, made the judgment call that the evidence presented—after she considered the record of trial, the evidence presented and matters presented for clemency, which included other things, that the evidence presented had not met the burden of proof in her view. So she set aside the court conviction on the second charge of sexual assault and set aside the court on the other lesser charges and took those four charges and handled them all under nonjudicial punishment through Article 15 action. So she did not set aside with no punishment, but she set aside the court finding on that case. That is the case.

It has only happened twice, that and a recent case at Aviano. That is it in all the Services in the last 5 years.

Senator NELSON. Can you describe the facts in the Aviano case?

General WELSH. In that particular case, sir, there was an allegation of sexual assault by a military member on an Air Force civilian. The convening authority convened the court. The court found the subject guilty of sexual assault, and sentenced him to prison. In the review process, the standard review process, again according to the UCMJ and the rules of court martial, the convening authority again reviewed all the evidence presented at trial and some additional information presented in the clemency package that was not available to the jury at trial. The convening authority decided again that they had not met the burden of proof in trial in his view, and he set aside the court martial findings.

Senator NELSON. In this instant, the case that Senator McCaskill was involved in, was there any additional evidence that came in such as in the Aviano case?

General WELSH. There was input from the victim through the victim's counsel included in the matter of clemency, and then I do not know exactly what was in the entire clemency package. I know

roughly what it was. I have scanned through it all. But I do not remember how many letters of support, et cetera, were presented. I did not review all of the evidence presented in trial on this case. It happened a couple of years ago, and so I do not know if there was other evidence that the judge in that trial had not allowed in court that was presented to the convening authority. I do not know the answer. We can find that out for you, sir.

Senator NELSON. I think this ought to be handled, but you have a Senator, Senator McCaskill, who is concerned about the convening authority and the convening authority's ability to proceed with a promotion. I would assume that that might be something that the Chief of Staff would want to review with regard to any additional evidence presented, as opposed to letters of support. As you just stated, in the Aviano case, there was additional evidence that had not been brought out at the trial. That would seem to me to be something that the Air Force at the highest counsel would want to know.

General WELSH. Senator, we are in very close contact with Senator McCaskill. She has the complete record of trial. She has the justification from the convening authority. She has everything we have on this case. My JAG has spoken with her staff multiple times. I believe she has all the information she needs from us on this case.

By the way, just to clarify, this is not a promotion. It is a lateral move that we have requested for this particular officer.

Senator NELSON. If it is not a promotion, why does it have to come through the Senate Armed Services Committee?

General WELSH. It is another three-star position, sir. She is in a three-star position currently and moving to another one.

Senator NELSON. I see. Okay. Thank you.

The committee will stand in recess, subject to the call of the chair. [Recess.]

Senator SHAHEEN [presiding]. Thank you, everyone, for coming back in.

To Secretary Donley and General Welsh, thank you both for your stamina this morning, for coming back so I can ask my questions as well, and especially thank you for your service to the country. Secretary Donley, I very much appreciate all of the time, energy, and expertise you have provided in your role as Secretary of the Air Force. I know that the country will miss you.

Gentlemen, I am going to change the subject for a minute. I know my colleague from New Hampshire, Senator Ayotte, has raised this issue, and I would be remiss if I did not begin with asking you about the KC-46A basing decision. Now, I will spare you my talking points about Pease's great location in the northeast Atlantic and the success we have had integrating our Active Duty and our National Guard and the competence of everyone who is stationed there. But I do want to ask you if the decision about the basing of the new tankers is still on track and when you expect that to be announced.

Mr. DONLEY. It is on track, ma'am. We do expect it later this month.

Senator SHAHEEN. Great. Thank you.

I know there have been some questions about the contract for the new tankers, but can you explain what the impact of continued sequestration might be, if there is any, and we have to renegotiate the contract for the KC-46A?

Mr. DONLEY. We think that the current program is on track, 179 aircraft, first developmental aircraft by fiscal year 2015, and I believe it is 8 aircraft by fiscal year 2017. We think the contractor is a good one both for the taxpayers and for the warfighter.

One of my favorite reports to sign to Congress, which I do on a quarterly basis I believe, is that there have been no engineering changes to the KC-46 contract and there have not been since that contract was awarded. It caps the Government's role in this development contract at \$4.9 billion. There is some cost and schedule—cost risk, I would say, not schedule risk that we know of, but cost risk to the contractor at this point. There is a minor impact from sequestration as we have to move dollars around to make sure that the KC-46 contract can be and is funded. We will continue to do that going forward.

Senator SHAHEEN. So what would the impact be should we not address sequestration in the next fiscal year or the following fiscal year? Will we still be able to go forward with the contract?

Mr. DONLEY. It would make it more difficult to do so. Depending on the flexibility provided by Congress to move dollars around various appropriations, that could impact our ability to meet contract obligations. But we are doing our utmost not to reopen this contract.

Senator SHAHEEN. That is very good to hear. I certainly hope that we will do our utmost in Congress to address those automatic cuts from sequestration and to come up with a long-term plan that means that not only will the military but no one within Government will have to have the impact of those cuts.

But while we are talking about contracts, can we also talk about what impact that sequestration and furloughs might have on the JSF?

Mr. DONLEY. Again, the JSF remains a very important priority for us. It has taken its share of reductions in sequestration. We have been able to accommodate those to some extent, but we are losing probably 3 to 5 tails out of our planned procurement for the Air Force of 19 aircraft in fiscal year 2013. Some of that will go to pay for continued development of the program which we are prioritizing. So the focus is on making sure the F-35 development program closes out before fiscal year 2018, and that is a firm commitment that the Joint Program Office is holding to, that the Services are holding to. There is no more money being provided to this program. So tradeoffs between procurement and development are an annual process, and sequestration forces us to take a couple of more tails in 2019 to support development.

Senator SHAHEEN. Will that affect the long-term cost of the F-35?

Mr. DONLEY. It will. We have made adjustments to the program in the last several years where we have pushed airplanes outside of the FYDP, and those would need to be made up at the end of the program. That does increase unit cost a little bit, extends the

program out. So these are deliberate choices we are making. They do extend the life of the program a little bit longer and add cost.

Senator SHAHEEN. So that even though we may see some short-term savings, we are going to see some long-term increased cost.

Mr. DONLEY. Yes, but hopefully marginally. As long as we stick to our current procurement plans and we maintain strong partnerships with the international partners that are part of this program and we do not take any action to substantially reduce the size of the program, then the cost per aircraft increase from these delays will be smaller than if we take these other actions.

Senator SHAHEEN. Good. Thank you.

Finally, gentlemen, I do want to raise my concerns, even though I know they have been raised by many of my colleagues here, about sexual assault in the military. We heard in my office last week not from a woman who had been sexually assaulted but from a man who had been sexually assaulted and not only once but over a period of time.

So, General Welsh, you talked about the comparison between what is happening in the military and what is happening in the civilian world. As you pointed out, this is unacceptable regardless of where sexual assault happens. But can you talk about how you are making use of what has been learned on the civilian side about how to address sexual assault?

This is an issue that I have worked on for probably 30-plus years in various capacities, and the things that I have learned from my experience that have worked have been opportunities to support victims of sexual assault, to make sure that they can be removed from the perpetrator, to ensure that there is a swift response on the part of law enforcement and that people understand what the punishment is going to be and that that is clear and swift and an awareness about why this is unacceptable among the general public.

So can you talk about how you are making use of some of the lessons in the civilian world as you try and address this issue?

General WELSH. Yes, Senator, I can. We have worked very hard to review both literature and to invite experts in, experts in the fields of prosecution, experts in the field of victim care, experts in the field of psychology, experts in the field of developing cultures and environments. We have been doing this for several years in the Air Force now and in DOD. We have made many changes.

We do not know what effect they are having, but they are not having enough of an effect is the big point I would raise. We have to keep working this and we have to find a different set of things that may be game changers in battling this problem. That is why I stressed that we have to unemotionally assess this to the extent possible so that we can work together on the things that can be game changers, not the things that are not really at the source of the problem.

For example, I have a dinner at my home later this week with a group, an industry group, that actually does work on building cultures and climates. The intent is to ask them if there is a way to put together something that we integrate into our training programs across the Air Force that helps develop focus on diversity, inclusion, and respect. We will not call it sexual assault training

because that might not get us the result we want. We just change the way people think from the day they walk in the door. How do we take that wide spectrum of behavior and thought in society and bring it down into what we think is an acceptable spectrum of behavior when you are serving in this business. If we can start to make progress in that area, we can extend it throughout the course of a career.

Now, we are trying to do all those things, find the areas where we gain traction, and then exploit those. The SVC, in my mind, is the one that has done that. Some of the things we have done differently are investigative processes. We have a new Office of Special Investigations special investigator course that we have now run three classes through, designed curriculum approved by initial attendees from outside the Air Force who are special victims prosecutors in the civilian world. So we have counselors, psychiatrists, special victims' prosecutors from the past who are helping us, and we are going to continue to do everything we can.

Senator SHAHEEN. Did Lieutenant Colonel Krusinski have the benefit of some of those education programs before he was assigned to his role?

General WELSH. Let me speak generally because I have not seen specifics of training completions that he has done. As I said, I just have not had time to look at that since we heard of this yesterday.

He has completed all the standard Air Force training. We have annual training. We have recurring training. He has been a squadron commander in our Air Force. There is training that is required in squadron commander training before you take that role where this is included. He was a Force Support Squadron commander, and sexual assault response coordinators, et cetera, work under the Force Support Squadrons in our Air Force. So he is clearly familiar with the program. I do not know how far back his training record goes. Obviously, he had just completed his sexual assault response coordinator training and victim advocate training for this job last week.

Senator SHAHEEN. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN [presiding]. Thank you very much, Senator Shaheen.

Just one quick question. You have given us some indication of the very few number of cases where fact findings by courts martial panels have been overturned by the convening authority. Could you, for the record, tell us—those related just to sexual assault case. So if you could tell us for the record whether there are any other cases and if so, what cases in the last same number of years—I think you were going back 5 years—there were set-asides of findings.

General WELSH. It is about 1 percent, just so you know. We will get you the details.

Chairman LEVIN. If you could get us the actual numbers, that would be helpful.

[The information referred to follows:]

From 1 March 2008 to 28 February 2013, convening authorities disapproved findings in a total of 40 cases, 35 of which were not sexual assault. During that same timeframe, 3,713 cases were tried in the Air Force.

Chairman LEVIN. There will be many questions that will be sent to you about either proposed legislation or legislation that has already been introduced asking for your opinion. There has been some legislation already introduced, which I understand has already been sent to the general counsel. There have been letters that have been sent to our chiefs, but there will be some additional letters that will be sent by me, other members of the committee. What we would ask you for is—we know we are going to get thoughtful responses, but we also need prompt responses because it is my plan and expectation that there will be legislation that will be taken up as part of the defense authorization bill's markup, which begins in June. So you could be getting letters regularly between now and then, but we would very much appreciate prompt responses to those letters.

Nothing that was said here today by any of us was intended to affect or influence any judicial proceeding. Nothing that was said by any of us here today was intended to have any effect on any either pending or future judicial proceeding. I think we were careful to make that clear. But in any event, that is the position of this committee and our members to a person that we do not intend to influence any judicial proceeding by any comment that we make here because you have a responsibility in the military to dispense justice. We count on you to dispense justice for victims, but also for people who are accused of crime.

We are going to do the very best that we can to see if we cannot bring our UCMJ up to date because there are some things that have happened since those provisions on the power of the convening authority were written, particularly in the area of appellate rights for defendants. So, we will be working hard on that and we will need your cooperation.

We are very, very grateful to both of you for your testimony here today. It is very important to us that we have your views on not just the issues of sexual assault but also on the problems that you face in the Air Force, which are there in large numbers. So we are grateful for your service. Particularly, I say to you again, Mr. Secretary, you will be missed. You have been a really true friend, not just of the Air Force, but of our Nation, and we are grateful for that. We will see much more of you, General Welsh.

We will stand adjourned.

[Questions for the record with answers supplied follow:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR BILL NELSON

F-35: REPLACING THE A-10

1. Senator NELSON. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, the Joint Strike Fighter (JSF) program is designed to replace the F-16 and A-10 in the Air Force inventory. As you know better than anyone, the A-10 is designed to be low and slow in order to provide close air support (CAS) to ground forces, and it is heavily armored to protect the pilot and vital systems. How confident are you that the will the F-35 will be able to replace the core mission of the A-10?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The Air Force is very confident in the F-35s' capabilities as an A-10 replacement.

The F-35A in the CAS role provides increased survivability and lethality, and while stealth may not necessarily be required to conduct CAS in low intensity conflicts, F-35's fused sensors, precision weaponry, large payload, and data-link capability will offer distinct advantages.

Selecting the appropriate CAS asset must take into account the threat, ground situation, target effects required, and a host of other dynamic factors. As the threat of advanced, mobile, surface-to-air missiles proliferates, the F-35's unique survivability may make it the best available fighter to conduct CAS in certain high-threat situations.

2. Senator NELSON. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, would something like A-29 help fill the gap left in CAS?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. In the near- to mid-term, the Air Force believes it will be able to fulfill COCOM CAS requirements with acceptable, but increased risk. With declining budgets, the Air Force is emphasizing aircraft capable of performing multiple missions, rather than those uniquely optimized for CAS. Aircraft like the A-29 are optimized for precisely the kind of low-intensity, large-scale, sustained operations that the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance de-emphasized, saying "U.S. forces will no longer be sized to conduct large-scale, prolonged stability operations." While the DSG does emphasize irregular warfare, presence missions and counterinsurgency operations, the Air Force believes that multi-role systems can successfully perform these missions at acceptable cost for short durations.

As long as the President expects the Air Force to be able to deliver global reach, power and vigilance anywhere in the world at the moment of our Nation's choosing, airmen must be equipped and ready for that call. We remain committed to bringing decisive airpower to combined arms warfare campaigns, but budgetary realities mean we cannot afford platforms efficient at one end of the spectrum of conflict and unusable at the other. Fiscal pressure is forcing the Air Force to make difficult choices, such as not pursuing as much CAS capacity as we may like—and that the A-29 may deliver—in order to ensure we can deliver the forces needed to prevail in most consequential scenarios with a near-peer aggressor.

The Air Force will continue to support the A-29 filling a building partnership mission. Should the demand signal for CAS, sustained stability and engagement operations, building partnership, or Department of Defense (DOD) strategic guidance change, we will continue to seek optimal weapons systems to fulfill our warfighting mission.

JOINT SURVEILLANCE AND TARGET ATTACK RADAR SYSTEM

3. Senator NELSON. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, Joint Surveillance and Target Attack Radar System (JSTARS) aircraft have proven themselves in all recent conflicts, including Libya. The decision has been made to terminate the re-engining program and the Air Force has indicated a need to upgrade the avionics sensors, as well as other systems to keep the aircraft viable. In light of the current budget environment and the need to recapitalize the fighter, bomber, and tanker fleet concurrently, do you believe it makes sense to modernize the JSTARS platform or to replace and invest in upgrading the platform?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The Air Force considers the JSTARS mission areas of battle management and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance, critical for combatant commanders' operations worldwide. In the fiscal year 2014 President's budget, the Air Force continues to fund modernization of JSTARS computer and radar processing equipment. Further, emerging requirements in command and control and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance make a compelling case for JSTARS recapitalization, even within today's challenging budget environment. To meet these emerging requirements, the Air Force is evaluating several options, including JSTARS recapitalization, in accordance with the recently completed analysis of alternatives (AOA), modernizing the existing E-8C fleet, or maintaining the status quo.

4. Senator NELSON. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, why is the Air Force preparing to ground the test aircraft for a year?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Due to the conclusion of developmental programs and no significant testing currently planned, the JSTARS T-3 test aircraft will be put into preservation storage. In fiscal year 2014, the National Guard Bureau's Multi-Agency Communications Capability integration will only require two test sorties on an operational aircraft.

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR KAY R. HAGAN

HIGH SPEED WEAPONS

5. Senator HAGAN. General Welsh, given the pivot to the Asia-Pacific region, one of the unique challenges the military must face is the long distances involved between our bases and potential areas of action. In order to cover long distances in a relatively short amount of time requires higher speeds for both aircraft and weapons. DOD is focusing on high speed kinetic strike weapons and pursuing programs like the Conventional Prompt Global Strike program and the Air Force has the High Speed Strike Weapon program. What specific investments is the Air Force making in its research, development, testing, and evaluation (RDT&E) infrastructure and workforce to be able to effectively and affordably develop, test, and field these high speed weapons?

General WELSH. The Air Force has made RDT&E investments for ballistic missile defense and hypersonic research (such as the X-51) that to a great extent can be translated to support programs such as Conventional Prompt Global Strike and the Air Force's High Speed Strike Weapon. Currently funded Air Force upgrades to our related infrastructure are being completed and we continually evaluate the operational and technological requirements of this emerging high speed kinetic strike technology against the RDT&E needs. The Air Force also makes it a point to promote partnerships with other government agencies such as Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency and the National Aeronautics and Space Administration Langley Research Center to maximize our opportunity for any future investments in this field.

The Air Force RDT&E community is engaged across the relevant technical areas to effectively utilize personnel with experience in the high speed tactical concepts (supersonics, hypersonics) and ensure the next generation of workforce carries forward this expertise. The Air Force has previously developed a Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics (STEM) Workforce Strategic Roadmap, called Bright Horizons, which we've been implementing over the past 2 years to assist in our RDT&E workforce planning. We are confident our current workforce approach will make certain we have the right skill sets in place as this technology matures into the operational realm.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOE MANCHIN III

SEXUAL ASSAULT IN THE AIR FORCE

6. Senator MANCHIN. General Welsh, the arrest of Lt. Col. Jeff Krusinski was an embarrassment to the Air Force. With the gravity of the Air Force's sexual assault problems, it is perplexing to understand how—with over 200 general officers—the Air Force would appoint a Lieutenant Colonel as the face of the program. The Air Force's decision to assign a field grade officer to manage its sexual assault prevention program suggests the program was not a high priority. Given the importance of this issue, why did the Air Force not assign a general officer to lead its sexual assault program?

General WELSH. The Air Force Sexual Assault Prevention and Response (SAPR) program was under the Air Force Services Directorate led by a Brigadier General at the time of Lieutenant Colonel Krusinski's arrest. The lieutenant colonel branch chief was responsible for SAPR policies and procedures. Following the events that have transpired over the last year to include the arrest of Lieutenant Colonel Krusinski, the Air Force has worked on creating a new directorate that reports directly to the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force. In June, this directorate was officially stood up under the direction of Major General Maggie Woodward. The new structure is significantly different than our previous structure as it will consist of over 30 functional experts across the SAPR spectrum to include medical, legal, personnel, law enforcement, public affairs, and research. This new headquarters SAPR structure will have a much greater capability to comprehensively address the crisis facing the Air Force. Four and three star commanders, wing, group, and squadron commanders, command chiefs, and supervisors are all charged with executing and enforcing our Air Force SAPR program. I have overall responsibility for the Air Force SAPR program and Air Force leaders at all levels.

7. Senator MANCHIN. Secretary Donley, how are you addressing sexual assault involving servicemembers in the Air National Guard that are in a Title 32 status?

Mr. DONLEY. Any servicemember who is sexually assaulted while in Title 32 status is encouraged to report the assault to the Sexual Assault Response Coordinator

(SARC). The member will be assigned a Victim Advocate. Because Air Guard facilities and services are limited, we ensure these victims are provided information on civilian services. A line of duty determination may be accomplished to establish whether the assault occurred while the member was on active duty. All members assaulted while on duty will have access to medical care and spiritual counseling. They are also eligible for expedited transfer to a new unit if desired. If local law enforcement or the Air Force Office of Special Investigations declines investigating the title 32 sexual assault on/off orders, the member's Adjutant General is able to contact the Office of Complex Administrative Investigations to request an investigation in accordance with Chief National Guard Bureau Manual 0400.01.

8. Senator MANCHIN. Secretary Donley, are you comfortable that sexual assault is being adequately addressed in all three Air Force components?

Mr. DONLEY. The Air Force recognizes we will not win our war on sexual assault until we have everyone on board to fight; Guard, Reserve, Active Duty, and our civilian workforce. We have taken great strides in the last year in working with the Total Force (Guard, Reserve, and Active Duty) to address sexual assault in the Air Force over a wide front of prevention, investigation and response. One example of this close teamwork was our Guard and Reserve components training alongside Active Duty members for Bystander Intervention Training. Additionally, our Total Force airmen now benefit from the many enhancements we have made in care and training for SARCs and Victim Advocates (VAs) who help AF members regardless of their title.

Further, our Special Victims Counsel program is a pilot which empowers all Total Force airmen to come forward and ensures the legal process is better understood and not so daunting. We completed a Total Force Health and Wellness Inspection of over 200 installations and over 700,000 AF military/civilian personnel ensuring that no materials were in the workplace which could be perceived as contributing to an unprofessional environment that tolerates sexual harassment or assault.

Recently, we created a new AF SAPR directorate which is aligned directly under the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force and is led by a Major General. This new structure is significantly different than our previous structure as it will consist of over 30 functional experts across the SAPR spectrum to include medical, legal, personnel, law enforcement, public affairs, and research. This new headquarters SAPR structure will have a much greater capability to comprehensively address the crisis facing our Total Force and will work closely with Guard and Reserve leadership as we map out SAPR policies and procedures.

However, there is a need for improvement as we identify our Total Force manning requirements and shortfalls. Currently, our Air National Guard bases do not have "dedicated" full-time SARC positions. These duties fall under the Air National Guard Wing commander executive officer. We are working with our Air National Guard leadership to address this problem. Lastly, we are able to offer only limited support beyond SARC/VA services to Res/ANG airmen who were assaulted outside of a duty status.

CONTRACTORS

9. Senator MANCHIN. Secretary Donley, please provide the approximate number of contractors the Air Force presently has in its inventory. Has this figure gone up or down since last year?

Mr. DONLEY. The Air Force reported approximately \$26.5 billion in obligations which equated to 141,300 contractor full-time equivalents (CFTEs) to Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) for Personnel and Readiness (P&R) and OSD for Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics for inclusion in the DOD's fiscal year 2012 Inventory of Contracts for Services (ICS) pursuant to section 2330a of Title 10, U.S.C. (fiscal year 2012 data is the most recent and is due to Congress by 30 Jun 13). This is a gross reduction of 25,200 CFTEs from our fiscal year 2011 ICS that identified approximately \$33.6 billion in obligations which equated to 166,500 CFTEs performing these same type services.

Note: Approximately 21,400 CFTEs of this reduction is directly attributable to a change in methodology when the data is normalized between the last 2 years. This change captured service obligations embedded in supply and equipment contract actions (18,300 CFTEs) and excluded supply and equipment obligations embedded in service contract actions (39,700 CFTEs) based on the object class definition of the funding source identified in the initial stages of our ICS review process.

IMPACT OF THE SEQUESTER ON AIR FORCE END-STRENGTH

10. Senator MANCHIN. General Welsh, if the current budget control caps remain in place, will you propose reductions to the Air Force's authorized end strength? If so, what are those reductions by component?

General WELSH. The Air Force will program military, civilian, and contract support end strength to perform required capabilities consistent with the National Military Strategy and fiscal constraints.

If Sequester remains in place for the next 9½ years the Air Force will look different. If the gross effect is to take 10 percent off everything then that would translate to about 33,000 Active Duty airmen separated and about 700 aircraft taken out of service. Similar reductions in the Guard and Reserves would equate to a loss of 10,000 and 7,000 positions, respectively.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR KIRSTEN E. GILLIBRAND

INTRA-THEATER AIRLIFT

11. Senator GILLIBRAND. General Welsh, the National Defense Authorization Act (NDAA) for Fiscal Year 2013 provided the Air Force with the authority to decide the type of intra-theater airlift aircraft to retain. The Air Force made the strategic choice to divest the C-27J and maintain the C-130 as the single airframe in the intra-theater airlift inventory. I fully support your decision; however, I am concerned that you provided C-130 aircraft back to units as predominantly back-up aircraft. These aircraft did not come with personnel or flying hour allocations. While I understand your rationale to maintain force structure at a reduced cost, how will units maintain the scheduled and unscheduled maintenance on these airplanes without the personnel allocations to do so?

General WELSH. Back-up aircraft are typically assigned to units over and above primary inventory to allow for scheduled and unscheduled depot level maintenance, modifications, inspections and repairs. The 2013 NDAA placed aircraft into units that previously did not have back-up inventory and only placed one aircraft per unit. Although the additional total inventory comes with an incremental cost increase in Weapons System Sustainment, the additional aircraft should benefit the gaining units with additional operational and scheduling flexibility.

12. Senator GILLIBRAND. General Welsh, do you believe this lack of resources will hurt unit morale?

General WELSH. The addition of one back-up aircraft to selected C-130 units should not adversely affect morale. The intent of back-up aircraft is to offset depot level maintenance, modifications, inspections and repairs. Although every back-up aircraft placed into service comes with incremental increased costs at the enterprise level, a single back-up aircraft can actually be a benefit to units by providing greater flying and maintenance scheduling flexibility and increased ground training opportunities.

CYBERSECURITY/NATIONAL GUARD

13. Senator GILLIBRAND. General Welsh, the fiscal year 2014 budget indicates a large investment in our military's cyber capabilities. DOD approved a major expansion of the U.S. Cyber Command (CYBERCOM) to include growing its ranks from around 900 to 4,900 personnel, or cyber warriors, which I understand will fortify DOD's own networks, help plan and execute offensive attacks, and protect critical infrastructure like power grids and power plants. The fiscal year 2014 budget asks for a large increase in offensive and defensive appropriations for Air Force cyber projects. Is this investment mostly for technology development, or does it include personnel training and recruitment as well?

General WELSH. This investment is for both technology development and personnel. About \$74.7 million of CYBERCOM's funding increase went toward research and development and another \$74 million went toward personnel-related activities. This includes plus-ups in Air Force civilian and contractor pay, information technology costs, supplies, travel, and security clearances. Additionally, the Air Force increased funding to its cyber hunter teams that provide security for Department of DOD networks by \$3.6 million in fiscal year 2014. Lastly, the Air Force sourced its initial military manpower requirement for CYBERCOM's Cyber Mission Forces, a total of 39 officers and 130 enlisted.

14. Senator GILLIBRAND. General Welsh, what is the Air Force doing to recruit the best and brightest cyber talent?

General WELSH. The Air Force targets potential airmen with cyber skills through national advertising campaigns highlighting STEM requirements as opposed to targeting cyber specifically. The Air Force also advocates and supports cyberspace and computer training and education programs nationwide to encourage high school and college students towards technical career fields. For example, we support national competitions such as the Air Force Association's CyberPatriot competition for high school students. Additionally, the Air Force Institute of Technology's Center for Cyberspace Research hosts the Advanced Cyber Education (ACE) summer program for Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets from all Services who are studying computer science or computer/electrical engineering. Unfortunately, ACE has been canceled for 2013 due to funding constraints as a result of sequestration but we hope to be able to hold ACE again in future years.

15. Senator GILLIBRAND. General Welsh, what mechanisms do we have in place to encourage cyber studies at the U.S. Air Force Academy (USAFA) and in Reserve Officers' Training Corps (ROTC) programs across the country?

General WELSH. All USAFA cadets learn about cyber fundamentals and Air Force cyber operations during their first year in the core Introduction to Computing course. The cyber operations content of this course was recently increased from 5 to 16 of the 40 lessons and now includes many offensive and defensive cyber operations exercises conducted on USAFA's virtual Cyber Training Range. In the summer, between their first and second years, USAFA cadets have the opportunity to take the week-long basic cyber operations training course. This training is taught by upper-class cadets who have excelled in cyber and many who compete on USAFA's world-class Cyber Competition Team. Approximately 200 cadets per class attend this training and earn the cadet Basic Cyber Badge which they may wear on their uniforms. This exposure to cyber takes place before most cadets select their academic major in their second year.

USAFA cadets who decide to pursue cyber studies in depth typically major in computer science-cyber warfare or computer engineering. In addition to earning an Accreditation Board for Engineering and Technology (ABET)-accredited degree, these cadets have opportunities to expand their knowledge in cyber. Each year about a dozen of the sharpest students in these majors get a top secret security clearance and spend 6 weeks working at the National Security Agency or the National Reconnaissance Office. Cadets also have the opportunity to conduct state-of-the-art cyber research in the Intel Corporation's anti-malware lab located at USAFA. Cadets who demonstrate exceptional cyber skills can earn a position on USAFA's 12-person Cyber Competition Team and compete against the best cyber teams around the world. The record-high enrollments in USAFA's computer science and computer engineering majors, over 200 cadets this academic year, are a good indication that cadets are encouraged and motivated to study cyber at USAFA.

Air Force Reserve Officers Training Corps (AFROTC) enrolls cadets to meet Air Force cyberspace operations career field requirements which include a degree in Computer Science or 24 hours in 200 level or above STEM courses. AFROTC produces computer science, computer engineering and other engineering degrees that exceed accession targets. ROTC accomplishes this primarily through the scholarship program. There are currently 197 computer science and 173 computer engineer majors on scholarship and 293 more non-scholarship cadets in our program.

Additionally, the Air Force Institute of Technology (AFIT) hosts the Advanced Cyber Education (ACE) program to encourage ROTC cadet cyber studies. ACE is a summer program for ROTC cadets studying computer science, computer engineering and electrical engineering. The program consists of an instructional component and cyber war games, hands-on internships and cyber officer development days that focus on the study of cyber as a revolution in military affairs. Unfortunately ACE has been canceled for 2013 due to funding constraints as a result of sequestration but we hope to be able to hold ACE again in future years.

16. Senator GILLIBRAND. General Welsh, is the Air Force considering an incentive pay system that helps in the retention of military members with high-level cyber skill sets?

General WELSH. Of the eight enlisted cyber Air Force Specialty Codes (AFSC), seven are currently receiving Selective Reenlistment Bonuses (SRB) in at least 1 year group. The SRB program is updated biennially, at the start of the fiscal year and mid-way through. As additional manpower authorizations are identified, we will be able to increase and adjust the bonuses as needed to mitigate low retention.

17. Senator GILLIBRAND. General Welsh, leveraging citizen soldiers who work in the cyber industry every day and also serve their country in uniform through the National Guard and Reserve is imperative. Senator Vitter and I have introduced a bill to create and leverage a Cyber Guard. I received a positive letter from General Alexander and the National Governors Association about the idea. At the DOD posture hearing, I asked General Dempsey about the bill and he was also supportive. I'd like to work with you to ensure that we implement every available tool to recruit and retain a capable cyber force. Does this sound like legislation the Air Force will support?

General WELSH. The Air Force recognizes the urgent requirement for high-end expertise as we build our cyber forces to meet future missions. To meet this need, the Air Force is actively participating in DOD CIO, OSD(P), OSD(P&R), and CYBERCOM working groups to address broadening the recruitment pool for all services. Currently the Air Force screens members based on test scores and educational achievements. Future plans include targeted recruiting and testing for cyber aptitude. In addition, the Air Force provides full-spectrum cyber training for the Total Air Force encompassing net ops, cyber offense/defense, and exploitation for officers, enlisted and civilians alike. We have some concerns that, if enacted, the Cyber Warrior Act of 2013 would actually hinder the efforts of DOD to build and strengthen cyber forces for two primary reasons.

First, establishing 54 National Guard Cyber and Computer Network Incident Response Teams would limit the available recruiting pool. We recognize that the National Guard provides a great opportunity to recruit personnel willing to serve their country while retaining their civilian careers and service in National Guard cyber forces, combined with equivalent civilian experience, presents a great value for the Nation. Accordingly, we expect the Air Force Reserve to leverage the same advantage to develop cyber forces for the Total Air Force.

Second, this bill would divert DOD resources that should be invested in creating skilled DOD cyber forces—from all Reserve components—to perform national defense missions and support Federal partners. Distributing cyber forces across 54 Cyber Teams could provide flexibility in response, and equip the Guard to respond in the wake of a cyber attack just as they do for natural disasters. Yet the inherent fluidity and flexibility of cyber technology permits cyber forces to use remote access to achieve their objectives. It is this flexibility that will allow the Air Force to partner with other Services and Federal agencies to build the world-leading cyber force by consolidating resources where possible, recruiting among all Reserve components, and distributing forces in appropriate locations, to serve all 54 States and territories.

UNIFORMED SERVICES EMPLOYMENT AND REEMPLOYMENT RIGHTS ACT

18. Senator GILLIBRAND. Secretary Donley, the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2012 included a provision which amended the Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) of 1994 to include full-time National Guard members who are serving under Title 32 status for more than 5 years. This new provision ensures servicemembers who exceed the 5-year statute of limitations receive the same protections under the law as servicemembers serving on title 10 orders. Thus far, DOD has failed to issue any guidance for implementation of this new law. What is the status of the provisions implementation and why has it taken DOD so long to ensure our National Guard members are protected under this law?

Mr. DONLEY. Section 575 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2012 amended section 4312(c)(4) of title 38 to add a new subparagraph (F) that exempts full-time National Guard duty (other than for training) under section 502(f)(2)(A) of title 32 when authorized by the President or the Secretary of Defense for the purpose of responding to a national emergency as declared by the President and supported by Federal funds, as determined by the Secretary concerned. In accordance with the law, when an operation is authorized by Secretary of Defense under section 502(f)(2)(A) of Title 32, the Air Force will ensure that airmen receive a statement on their orders citing the authority under Title 38 exempting the period of service from the USERRA 5-year limit.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR RICHARD BLUMENTHAL

AIR FORCE MILITARY CONSTRUCTION

19. Senator BLUMENTHAL. General Welsh, in order to bed down C-130 aircraft at the Bradley Air National Guard Base, the aligning and training of personnel for the

new mission along with the movement of the new aircraft must be considered. Given all these moving pieces, and as you have visibility through coming fiscal years, what are the necessary infrastructure projects—like hangar space and fuel cell size—that will facilitate a seamless changeover in aircraft type and maintain mission tempo?

General WELSH. The National Guard Bureau conducted a Site Activation Visit (SATAF) at Bradley Air National Guard Base on 18–21 Jun 13. The Air Force, the Air National Guard, and the base are integrating existing base assets; user facility needs; perceived facility modifications required, and environmental considerations to develop both their project list and the Description of Purposed Alternative Actions (DOPAA) for the Environmental Impact Analysis Process (EIAP) required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). To expedite our efforts, the contracts needed to complete the EIAP actions have already been awarded. As briefed to base leadership, the Air Force and the ANG plan to include the alternative project lists and the proposed timing of those projects developed as a result of the SATAF in the formal public release of the DOPAA, so we may comply with NEPA. There are several critical considerations that must be assessed and adjudicated including ramp configuration, hangar capacities, fuel cell requirements and other facility considerations. If existing situation cannot meet the requirements for the new mission, the ANG will propose facility projects to address the new weapon system requirements. Projected resource constraints will make it difficult to achieve current conversion timelines.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

20. Senator BLUMENTHAL. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, does the Air Force Inspector General treat the SAPR program as an item of special interest when conducting inspections of organizations and activities with responsibilities regarding the prevention and response to sexual assault as explained in Section 1611 of Public Law 111–383?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Yes, the Air Force Inspection System has included the SAPR program as a mandatory inspection requirement within the inspection system since 1998. The new Air Force Instruction (AFI) 90–201, The Air Force Inspection System, continues to designate SAPR as a mandatory inspection item by Major Command IGs. The Air Force is implementing a new inspection system that increases compliance reporting and external oversight. In an early test of the new system in 2013, Air Force wing commanders inspected and reported over 99 percent compliance with Sexual Assault Prevention & Response (SAPR) requirements.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ANGUS S. KING, JR.

AERIAL REFUELING MODERNIZATION

21. Senator KING. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, what is the long-term plan of the Air Force to sustain its aerial refueling capabilities, to include the fielding plan for the KC–46 and modernization plans for the KC–135 fleet until they can all be replaced?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Replacement of the legacy KC–135 fleet is planned to take place in three stages, KC–46, KC–Y, and the KC–Z. The initial increment fields 179 KC–46s by 2028, replacing roughly a third of the current capability. The Air Force will continue to evaluate the health of the current tanker fleet and invest, as required, to meet objectives outlined in the Defense Strategic Guidance and keep the legacy aircraft viable to the projected service life of 2040.

22. Senator KING. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, what is the plan for the second and third—KC–Y and KC–Z—phases of the tanker replacement plan, and is that on schedule?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The Air Force intends to begin the Next Generation Tanker (KC–Y) procurement in the mid/late 2020s as the current planned KC–46 procurement concludes. We are in the early stages of developing an initial capabilities document for KC–Y and plan to undertake an AOA by 2017. This AOA will explore several options including a continuation of the current KC–46 production line, a different commercial derivative effort, or a new development effort. KC–Y and KC–Z will conceptually explore a smaller, tactical complement to the KC–46 combining the capabilities of a penetrator (range, speed, signature technology, advanced avionics, defensive systems, and automated air refueling) with smaller size and lower infrastructure requirements to support advanced strike, special operations forces and combat search and rescue missions. KC–46A is on schedule and

development of the KC-Y is awaiting approval for the Advanced Air Refueling Capability Concepts Developmental Planning effort.

23. Senator KING. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, how many refueling aircraft does the Air Force have in its inventory today, and how many does it anticipate having in the inventory after the KC-135 and KC-10 fleets are replaced?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Based on approved retirements in the fiscal year 2013 President's budget, the Air Force will have 456 refueling aircraft in the inventory (397 KC-135s and 59 KC-10s) at the end of this fiscal year. The future refueling force structure will be based on current fiscal constraints and the Defense Strategic Guidance.

24. Senator KING. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, will KC-46, KC-Y, and KC-Z aircraft replace the KC-135/KC-10 fleet one-for-one, or will the capabilities of the new aircraft allow the Air Force to meet its refueling demands with less total aircraft?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. KC-46 is the first of a three step recapitalization strategy for air refueling. Its capabilities allow for a one-for-one replacement with the KC-135 tanker. Air refueling capability requirements involve not only "fuel offload," but "booms in the air" as well. KC-46A will only replace approximately one third of our Nation's air refueling fleet, leaving approximately 220 "Eisenhower-era" KC-135s still in the inventory. KC-Y and KC-Z, steps two and three of the recapitalization process, are planned to replace the remaining KC-135s and KC-10s. However, an analysis of air refueling requirements must be accomplished prior to beginning each recapitalization step. For example, to determine capabilities required for a follow-on to the KC-46A (KC-X), Air Mobility Command, in collaboration with Air Force Material Command, are initiating a developmental planning effort in fiscal year 2014 to examine advanced air refueling capability concepts. Given the size of our legacy tanker fleet and the length of the current DOD acquisition and procurement processes, the Air Force must begin to examine future air refueling capability concepts now to ensure uninterrupted recapitalization of the tanker fleet.

25. Senator KING. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, do you foresee the need for any further consolidation of air refueling units or aircraft?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. As the fiscal and strategic environments evolve, the Air Force will continue to evaluate its air refueling enterprise and field the most operationally effective, fiscally-informed force structure ready for the Nation today and modernized to the support the Nation in the future.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JAMES M. INHOFE

READINESS AND FLYING HOUR CUTS

26. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the Air Force had to cut approximately \$10 billion over the next 6 months of fiscal year 2013 due to sequestration. This includes a reduction of 94,000 flying hours, resulting in the grounding of combat coded squadrons that started on April 9. Please provide a complete list of Air Force flying squadrons/units that have been, and those who have had, their readiness status reduced. Please include numbers of aircraft and personnel impacted by each squadron/unit grounding or reduced readiness status.

General WELSH. Sequestration forced the Air Force to implement actions to flying units which forced some Regular Air Force units to cease flying operations while other units flew at reduced rates. The Air Force is continually adjusting unit flying rates to meet global operational commitments and deployment timelines within fiscal constraints. Due to the fluidity of these adjustments, the status of certain units may differ from what is listed in the chart below.

The Air Force can also provide a detailed assessment of unit readiness status in a classified forum as needed.

Air Force Flying Hour Program FY13 adjustments to Combat Air Forces due to Sequestration

Squadrons whose flying was reduced to Basic Mission Capable (BMC) rates:

| Wing | Squadron | Aircraft Type | # of Primary Aircraft | Base |
|--------------------------------|---|---------------|-----------------------|--------------|
| 1 st Fighter Wing | 27 th Fighter Sq | F-22 | 21 | JB Langley |
| 3d Wing | 962d Airborne Air Control Sq | E-3 | 2 | JB Elmendorf |
| 20 th Fighter Wing | 79 th Fighter Sq | F-16 | 24 | Shaw AFB |
| 18 th Wing | 961 st Airborne Air Control Sq | E-3 | 2 | Kadena AB |
| 18 th Wing | 44 th Fighter Sq | F-15 | 24 | Kadena AB |
| 18 th Wing | 67 th Fighter Sq | F-15 | 24 | Kadena AB |
| 35 th Fighter Wing | 14 th Fighter Sq | F-16 | 18 | Misawa AB |
| 388 th Fighter Wing | 421 st Fighter Sq | F-16 | 24 | Hill AFB |
| 23d Wing | 75 th Fighter Sq | A-10 | 21 | Moody AFB |

Squadrons which ceased flying operations:

| Wing | Squadron | Aircraft Type | # of Primary Aircraft | Base |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|-------------------------|---------------------|
| 1 st Fighter Wing | 94 th Fighter Sq | F-22 | 21 | JB Langley |
| 4 th Fighter Wing | 336 th Fighter Sq | F-15E | 24 | Hill AFB |
| 20 th Fighter Wing | 77 th Fighter Sq | F-16 | 24 | Shaw AFB |
| 31 st Fighter Wing | 555 th Fighter Sq | F-16 | 21 | Aviano AB |
| 48 th Fighter Wing | 494 th Fighter Sq | F-15E | 24 | RAF Lakenheath |
| 355 th Fighter Wing | 354 th Fighter Sq | A-10 | 24 | Davis-Monthan AFB |
| 366 th Fighter Wing | 391 st Fighter Sq | F-15E | 24 | Mountain Home AFB |
| 388 th Fighter Wing | 4 th Fighter Sq | F-16 | 24 | Hill AFB |
| 2d & 5 th Bomb Wings | Equivalent of 2 bomb sqs | B-52 | 0 (only crews affected) | Barksdale/Minot AFB |
| 28 th Bomb Wing | 34 th Bomb Sq | B-1 | 11 | Ellsworth AFB |
| 552d Air Control Wing | Equivalent of 2 squadrons | E-3 | 0 (only crews affected) | Tinker AFB |
| Active Association | 158 th Fighter Wing | F-16 | 18 | Burlington IAP |
| Active Association | 169 th Fighter Wing | F-16 | 23 | McEntire ANGB |
| Active Association | 187 th Fighter Wing | F-16 | 18 | Dannelly Field |
| Active Association | 442 nd Fighter Wing | A-10 | 24 | Whiteman AFB |
| Active Association | 917 th Fighter Group | A-10 | 24 | Barksdale AFB |

| Squadrons which ceased flying operations (continued): | | | | |
|---|-------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------|
| Wing | Squadron | Aircraft Type | # of Primary Aircraft | Base |
| 57th Wing | 8th Weapons Sq | E-8/RC-135/EC-130 | 0 assigned | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | 14th Weapons Sq | AC/MC-130 | 0 assigned | Hurlburt Field |
| 57th Wing | 16th Weapons Sq | F-16 | 20 | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | 17th Weapons Sq | F-15E | 5 | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | 26th Weapons Sq | MQ-1/9 | 4 assigned | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | 29th Weapons Sq | C-130 | 0 assigned | Little Rock AFB |
| 57th Wing | 34th Weapons Sq | HH-60 | 3 | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | 57th Weapons Sq | C-17 | 0 assigned | JB McGuire-Dix |
| 57th Wing | 66th Weapons Sq | A-10 | 6 | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | 77th Weapons Sq | B-1 | 0 assigned | Dyess AFB |
| 57th Wing | 325th Weapons Sq | B-2 | 0 assigned | Whiteman AFB |
| 57th Wing | 340th Weapons Sq | B-52 | 0 assigned | Barksdale AFB |
| 57th Wing | 433th Weapons Sq | F-15C, F-22 | 6 | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | 509th Weapons Sq | KC-135 | 0 assigned | Fairchild AFB |
| 57th Wing | 64th Aggressor Sq | F-16 | 18 | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | 65th Aggressor Sq | F-15 | 8 | Nellis AFB |
| 57th Wing | Thunderbirds | F-16 | 8 | Nellis AFB |
| 354th Fighter Wing | 18th Aggressor Sq | F-16 | 18 | Eielson AFB |

27. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, are these grounded squadrons tasked to fill combatant commander (COCOM) operations plans?

General WELSH. Almost all of our mission-ready units are already tasked to Secretary of Defense-ordered missions or forward-based, so the ability of the Air Force to provide requisite numbers of ready forces for emergent requirements is severely limited and will continue to become more difficult the longer we operate under these conditions. The flying hour reductions due to sequestration have caused the Air Force to continually adjust unit flying rates to meet deployment timelines and ensure global operational commitments are filled within fiscal constraints.

Detailed descriptions of taskings and ability to meet operations plans are classified, but the Air Force can provide more details in a classified forum as needed.

28. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what is the impact of our ability to fill all COCOM operational requirements, and what is the impact on conducting additional combat operations?

General WELSH. Almost all of our mission-ready units are already tasked to Secretary of Defense-ordered missions or forward-based, so the ability of the Air Force to provide requisite numbers of ready forces for emergent requirements is severely limited and will continue to become more difficult the longer we operate under these conditions. The flying hour reductions due to sequestration have caused the Air Force to continually adjust unit flying rates to meet deployment timelines and ensure global operational commitments are filled within fiscal constraints.

If non-mission ready forces are sourced for combat ops, the risk of higher casualties and collateral damage increases. The lack of ready forces limits strategic choices and increases risk.

Detailed descriptions of taskings and ability to meet operations plans are classified, but the Air Force can provide more details in a classified forum as needed.

29. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how many additional hours will have to be dedicated to bring all these units and their aircrews back up to mission ready status, and how much will that cost?

General WELSH. In order to bring units back to pre-sequestration, sub-optimal readiness levels, it is anticipated the stood down units would need an additional 10 percent over the requested fiscal year 2014 budget for flying hours and would require 3–6 months.

Bringing the Air Force back to full, mission readiness goals requires one full training cycle (approximately 2 years) and an additional \$3.2 billion increase above the fiscal year 2014 budget request for both fiscal year 2014 and fiscal year 2015, as well as a reduction in the number of current deployments.

30. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, is that cost factored into the fiscal year 2014 budget?

General WELSH. The fiscal year 2014 President's budget submission does not factor in the cost of restoring the readiness of flying squadrons that have stood down due to sequestration. The Air Force is working to mitigate readiness impacts in fiscal year 2013. Through prioritization, efficiency efforts to make every dollar count and congressional reprogramming actions, the Air Force is working to increase funding to the flying hour program. As our opportunity to buy back additional flying hours comes closer to an end, a more accurate picture of 2014 impacts will be possible.

31. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, as the Air Force focuses its flying hours on getting the grounded aircrews mission-ready again, what is the impact on the rest of the force?

General WELSH. Since flying hours are contained within our operations and maintenance budget, additional flying hour funding will reduce critical base operating support or facility maintenance. Overall, the Air Force does not have sufficient operations and maintenance funding in fiscal year 2013 and will not in fiscal year 2014 if the 2014 budget request is sequestered.

32. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how will the student pilot pipeline be impacted?

General WELSH. Under our current plan, we have allocated sufficient flying hours to enable our basic student pilot pipeline production to continue. However, we expect impacts if there is a civilian furlough because Air Education and Training Command maintenance and simulators are largely run by government civilians.

33. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what are the safety risks associated with reduced flying hours?

General WELSH. The Air Force designs our flying hour program model to provide requisite hours for aircrew to accomplish each unit's mission in a proficient manner. Diminished flying hours put these pilots at higher risk if they are called upon to execute operational taskings in a diminished readiness state.

34. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how will the groundings impact the readiness of other mission-essential personnel, such as munitions, maintenance, and life support?

General WELSH. The skill sets and training opportunities of our munitions handlers, maintenance, and life support personnel will erode in units where flying is curtailed. This will slow progression in skill level training for our maintenance personnel and contribute to challenges in readiness recovery.

READINESS AND DEPOT MAINTENANCE CUTS/DEFERMENTS

35. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, constant deployments over the past 20 years have taken a toll on all Air Force aircraft. Fortunately, we have the best depot maintenance in the world, but it comes at a cost. Sequestration will result in deferring 60 aircraft and 35 engines into depot maintenance which will result in the grounding of some aircraft, further reducing the overall combat readiness of the Air Force. How will civilian furloughs affect depot maintenance, and what are the possible long-term consequences on the depots and the fleet?

General WELSH. The overall depot maintenance requirement from fiscal year 2013 moving into fiscal year 2014 currently stands at 24 aircraft and 84 engines. Internal mitigation and requested reprogramming efforts would decrease impacts; however a bow wave into fiscal year 2014 remains. In the near term, civilian furloughs are expected to reduce depot maintenance productivity by 25 percent for each week of furlough. This loss of productivity will increase flow days and depot possessed time impacting availability and readiness. With adequate sustainment funding, the Air Force anticipates a 2- to 3-year recovery for the impacted fleets.

36. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what are the safety risks associated with reducing depot maintenance?

General WELSH. There are no safety risks with reducing depot maintenance. The depot maintenance reductions are a result of fewer depot inductions, but do not affect the quality of maintenance. The aircraft and engines that are not inducted will be grounded (not flown) until the required depot maintenance can be performed.

37. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, like flying hours, the Air Force starts fiscal year 2014 with a bow wave, or backlog, of depot and maintenance requirements, but the fiscal year 2014 budget does not include extra funding nor does it factor in sequestration. How much of the force can the Air Force return back to mission-ready status in fiscal year 2014, given these budget impacts?

General WELSH. Internal mitigation and proposed reprogramming would reduce aircraft availability impacts in fiscal year 2013; however a bow wave of requirements into fiscal year 2014 remains. The Air Force will seek to minimize fiscal year 2014 near-term risks to readiness by making tradeoffs within weapon system sustainment to minimize the impact to those requirements that most directly impact readiness, including aircraft and engine overhauls. The Air Force will make adjustments throughout fiscal year 2014 to optimize funding to ensure aircraft are available to meet mission requirements.

38. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how does that impact long-term time and cost to recover the fleet back to required mission-ready status?

General WELSH. With adequate sustainment funding, the Air Force anticipates a 2- to 3-year recovery for the impacted fleets. The Air Force will continue to minimize risk by making tradeoffs within weapon system sustainment. However, the trade space for these tradeoffs will decrease as workload accumulates resulting in impacts to aircraft availability. Targeted force structure adjustments may decrease the recover costs and the length of the recovery period.

F-35 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER PROGRAM

39. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, while the overall press on the F-35 continues to be negative, positive changes have been made in the program to include decreasing cost of each lot buy for the aircraft, lower than project concurrency costs, timeline milestones being met, flight tests surpassing goals, and a recent assessment by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) that is the most positive I have seen in the entire history of this program. The first operational squadron stood up at Yuma, AZ, in November 2012, and the first delivery of aircraft to Nellis Air Force Base (AFB) occurred at the end of February 2013. How many F-35s have been delivered to the Air Force and are they all currently flying?

General WELSH. To date, 22 production F-35A aircraft have been delivered to the Air Force. An additional four F-35A aircraft were procured using system develop-

ment and demonstration funds and are being used exclusively to support developmental testing at Edwards AFB. All 26 F-35As are currently accruing flight hours.

Of the 22 F-35As delivered to the Air Force, 12 are stationed at Eglin AFB, 4 are located at Nellis AFB, and 6 are located at Edwards AFB. To date, production F-35As have flown over 700 sorties and accumulated over 950 flight hours. In addition, the F-35A has flown over 1400 flight test sorties and accumulated 2,733 total flight test hours. The Air Force gains increased confidence in, and knowledge of, the F-35 weapon system with each sortie.

40. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the Marine Corps is planning to achieve initial operational capability (IOC) of the F-35B next year. When is the Air Force planning to achieve IOC with the F-35A?

General WELSH. The Air Force has recently established its IOC criteria for our F-35As, and based on the current program schedule, we have set an Objective date for achieving IOC of August 2016 and a Threshold date of December 2016. This IOC criteria is capability-based and is defined as 12–24 F-35As, with airmen trained, manned, and equipped to conduct CAS, interdiction, and limited suppression and destruction of enemy air defenses in a contested environment. Logistics and operational elements should also be in place, and the air system and personnel should be capable of deploying and performing the assigned missions. Should capability delivery experience additional delays, we will need to revise our timeline estimate.

This criteria provides sufficient initial capability for the threat postulated in 2016. However, to meet the full spectrum of Joint warfighter requirements in future years, the Air Force requires the Block 3F capabilities delivered at the completion of the program's system development and demonstration (SDD).

NUCLEAR MODERNIZATION

41. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the Air Force is responsible for two legs of the strategic nuclear triad: bombers and intercontinental ballistic missiles (ICBM); and tactical nuclear weapons delivered by fighter aircraft. Development of a replacement for the 31-year-old nuclear Air Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM) is 2 years behind schedule, no decision has been made for a follow-on to the Minuteman ICBM which we hope can be maintained until 2030, and a life extension program (LEP) for the B-61 bomb, an average age of 27 years—the principal nuclear weapon on the B-52, B-2, and fighter aircraft—has been delayed by 2 years from 2017 to 2019. Does the Air Force continue to support development of the Long-Range Strike Bomber (LRS-B), a nuclear long-range stand-off weapon, a new ICBM, and future tactical fighters capable of carrying the B-61 nuclear bomb?

General WELSH. Long-Range Strategic Bomber (LRS-B): The Air Force continues to support development of the LRS-B. The “Strategic Guidance for a 21st Century Defense” reaffirmed the requirement for a new, survivable bomber by highlighting its critical role in projecting power and deterring adversaries. LRS-B will be built with features and components necessary for the nuclear mission, ensuring nuclear certification within 2 years of conventional IOC. The President requested \$8.8 billion in fiscal years 2014 to 2018 for the development of the bomber. Further programmatic, technical, and operational details are subject to enhanced security measures to protect critical technologies and capabilities.

- Long-Range Standoff Weapon (LRSO): The Air Force continues to support development of the LRSO program. The 2010 Nuclear Posture Review directed the Air Force to conduct a study to inform decisions about replacing the current air-to-ground (AGM)-86B Air-Launched Cruise Missile (ALCM). The Air Force conducted an AOA between August 2011 and December 2012, and its conclusions were validated in May 2013. The LRSO program was fully funded in the fiscal year 2014 President's budget. It will be compatible with B-2, B-52, and LRS-B.

- Ground Based Strategic Deterrent (GBSD): The Air Force continues to support the GBSD program. The Air Force will sustain the Minuteman III ICBM through 2030. The Air Force programmed \$21.1 million during fiscal years 2013–2014 for a materiel solution analysis phase (including an AOA) to identify potential follow-on ICBM solutions. The GBSD AOA will be complete in late fiscal year 2014, in time to inform the President's budget, facilitating replacement of the Minuteman III ICBM in the 2025–2030 timeframe.

- Future tactical fighters capable of carrying the B-61 nuclear weapon: The Air Force continues to support carrying the B-61 on the tactical fighters. The Air Force is pursuing two new lines of effort to incorporate the B-61

into the F-35, while remaining committed to ensuring legacy aircraft are modernized and sustained to carry the B-61 for decades to come. The fiscal year 2014 President's budget funded R&D efforts specific to preparing the F-35 to integrate B-61s, and the Air Force supports the Joint Program Office (JPO) timeline to deliver nuclear delivery capability as part of the F-35's Block 4B configuration.

42. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what are the military risks for the Air Force nuclear deterrence mission should the B-61 LEP encounter further delays?

General WELSH. The Air Force plans Life Extension programs with some margin to enable success through the transition. Delays that decrease that margin are cause for concern and require careful attention and planning to ensure requirements are met. The B-61 supports the strategic nuclear mission performed by the heavy bomber force and also supports the United States national commitment to the extended deterrence mission performed by our European-based dual capable fighter force. Additional delays in the fielding of the B-61 Mod 12 would increase the risk of aging issues in the weapons that currently support STRATCOM requirements and would undermine both the strategic and the extended deterrence mission, which is a central element of the U.S./NATO alliance.

43. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, why is the B-61 bomb an important capability? Why not arm our bombers only with nuclear cruise missiles?

General WELSH. To hold all targets at risk, the Air Force requires both nuclear gravity weapons and stand-off cruise missiles. These capabilities are complementary, not redundant. As the primary nuclear gravity weapon employed by United States, long-range bombers and dual-capable aircraft, the B-61 plays a central role in meeting STRATCOM requirements and providing extended deterrence and assurance to our allies. The B-61 is the only U.S. nuclear weapon capable of employment from U.S. Dual-capable aircraft (F-16/F-15E), bombers and NATO dual capable aircraft. Limiting the inventory to just nuclear cruise missiles will minimize our military capability to cover a wide variety of targets. Also, the B-2 will not be able to employ a nuclear cruise missile until the long-range stand-off missile is operational.

44. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, why hasn't the administration made a decision about a follow-on to the Minuteman ICBM?

General WELSH. The Air Force is continuing to modernize the Minuteman III ICBM to sustain the weapon system through 2030. We are currently pursuing an AOA for the GBSD. The study is expected to begin August 13 and will define options for a Minuteman III follow-on providing capability well beyond 2030. The final AOA report is expected late fiscal year 2014 with a Milestone A decision expected in fiscal year 2015. The GBSD AOA will examine the following system approaches: (1) Baseline: sustain current capabilities, (2) Current Fixed: improved baseline to address capability gaps, (3) New fixed: a new, hardened silo-based system, (4) Mobile: ability to disperse upon warning and launch from various locations. Also considered will be a hybrid concept, a mixture of fixed silos and mobile based systems.

45. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, it can take up to 15 years to develop a new ICBM. If the Minuteman III comes out of the force in 2030, we need to begin a new development next year. What options are being examined?

General WELSH. The Air Force is continuing to modernize the Minuteman III ICBM to sustain the weapon system through 2030. We are currently pursuing an AOA for the GBSD. The study is expected to begin August 13 and will define options for a Minuteman III follow-on providing capability well beyond 2030. The final AOA report is expected late fiscal year 2014 with a Milestone A decision expected in fiscal year 2015. The GBSD AOA will examine the following system approaches: (1) Baseline: sustain current capabilities, (2) Current Fixed: improved baseline to address capability gaps, (3) New fixed: a new, hardened silo-based system, (4) Mobile: ability to disperse upon warning and launch from various locations. Also considered will be a hybrid concept, a mixture of fixed silos and mobile based systems.

OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS FUNDING

46. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, I am concerned that this administration is losing the ability to accurately budget for overseas contingency operations (OCO). Each of the Services has been required to expend base budget money to fund OCO requirements. Is there an OCO funding shortfall for fiscal year 2013? If yes, what is it?

General WELSH. The Air Force has an ~\$1.8 billion fiscal year 2013 OCO shortfall in the Operation and Maintenance appropriations.

47. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, will DOD's upcoming reprogramming budget request eliminate the OCO funding shortfall?

General WELSH. Yes, if fully supported by Congress, the upcoming reprogramming request eliminates the Air Force's fiscal year 2013 OCO funding shortfall.

48. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, will the Air Force fiscal year 2014 OCO request include funds to address the fiscal year 2013 problems in both the OCO and the base budget for readiness shortfalls?

General WELSH. The fiscal year 2014 OCO request does not include funds to cover fiscal year 2013 OCO or base readiness shortfalls resulting from sequestration. The fiscal year 2014 OCO request was formulated with input from CENTCOM, the Joint Staff, and OSD and is based on the best available estimate of operational requirements for fiscal year 2014.

49. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, did the Air Force get fully funded for its fiscal year 2013 OCO expenses? If not, what was the shortfall?

General WELSH. The fiscal year 2013 OCO submission was based on budgetary assumptions made at the time of the submission. Congress made a variety of reductions to the request which, combined with operational reality has resulted in ~\$1.8 billion shortfall in the Operation and Maintenance appropriations.

50. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what is your fiscal year 2014 OCO request?

General WELSH. The fiscal year 2014 OCO request for the Total Force is \$13.9 billion.

51. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, do you expect to be fully funded? If not, what would be the impact to readiness?

General WELSH. Yes, the fiscal year 2014 flying hour program was built upon a fully funded fiscal year 2014 OCO request. If the OCO request is not fully funded, additional units will be required to reduce and/or cease flying to ensure continued OCO operations. This will have a detrimental and long-term readiness impact.

SPACE LAUNCH CAPABILITY

52. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the Air Force fiscal year 2014 budget seems to indicate it will save the Air Force \$1 billion over the fiscal years 2014 to 2018 budget from doing a block buy of rockets from the incumbent Evolved Expendable Launch Vehicle (EELV) provider. Is that correct? Please explain your answer.

General WELSH. Yes. As a result of the new acquisition strategy, which was validated by the OSD Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation independent cost estimate, the program has achieved \$1.1 billion in savings over fiscal years 2014 to 2018. The new acquisition strategy incentivizes the incumbent to order material from vendors in quantity sets allowing for maximum economies of scale savings.

53. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, does the Air Force current launch capability meet the full spectrum of launch requirements by the Air Force and its users?

General WELSH. Yes, the EELV can launch the entire National Security Space manifest to all required orbits.

54. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, does demand exceed current launch capabilities?

General WELSH. No, the United Launch Alliance is capable of meeting the National Security Space launch capabilities.

FORWARD PRESENCE

55. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how critical is a forward-deployed presence in U.S. European Command (EUCOM) and U.S. Pacific Command (PACOM)?

General WELSH. Our forward-deployed presence in EUCOM and PACOM supports our national interests and is an essential element of our alliances in both theatres. Although the formal makeup of the alliances differ, the presence of United States capabilities in theatre demonstrates our commitment, provides opportunities to develop alliance interoperability, and keeps our forces trained for employment anywhere in the world. Our combat-ready forces are a deterrent to potential adver-

saries, enhancing regional stability. In the event of a humanitarian or contingency operation overseas, our forward stationed forces are capable of responding with minimal support from our limited and aging fleet of refueling aircraft. We have programmed to recapitalize our tanker fleet, but even with the complete package of new tankers, in some scenarios an overseas force gives us options and responsiveness not possible from CONUS. That said, our stewardship of national resources demands a continuous review of our posture. We are engaged with OSD and our Sister Services in a comprehensive review of U.S. facilities in Europe to identify efficiencies. We fully expect this European Infrastructure Consolidation will enable us to return some assets to our host nations and consolidate certain operations with a foot print that supports an essential level of forward presence while eliminating that which is not additive to the national defense.

56. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, current Air Force force structure is reportedly the minimum required to rapidly respond to crises in the European and African areas of responsibility (AOR) and dictate a permanent forward presence. Missions include contingency, presidential support, aero-medical evacuation, airdrop, and training missions, as well as significant Joint Chiefs of Staff (JCS)-directed and COCOM-requested exercises. Current events in Northern Africa and the Middle East exemplify the need to permanently forward-base forces to execute phase zero operations and preserve strategic flexibility in times of crises. What is the requirement for C-130s in EUCOM, and what missions do they support?

General WELSH. There are 14 C-130Js assigned to EUCOM. They support operational missions for EUCOM and U.S. Africa Command as well as Theater Security Cooperation (partner capacity building) missions with partner nations. In addition to COCOM operational missions, these aircraft use training sorties to support U.S. Army Europe (USAREUR) and U.S. Navy Europe (USNAVEUR) airborne qualified units (approximately 20 percent of all training sorties). USAREUR and NAVEUR do not possess organic capability to maintain their required airborne currency.

A portion of the U.S. Air Forces in Europe-based C-130 force remains on heightened alert status to support U.S. Government and partner nations' interests throughout both theaters. Removal of forward-based C-130 support puts these interests at risk.

57. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, have timelines for requests for forces been met in the past?

General WELSH. Although every effort is made to deliver forces on the timeline requested by combatant commanders, there are occasions when delays are inevitable. In most cases, the delay can be attributed to shortages in the requested forces or individual circumstances (e.g., insufficient dwell, personal hardships and other situations). In every case we work with the requesting combatant commander to establish an acceptable delivery date.

58. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how would NATO be impacted by cuts to force structure?

General WELSH. Cuts in the U.S. Air Force force structure could call into question NATO's ability to achieve the Level of Ambition agreed by the heads of state of the member nations. It would require the North Atlantic Council to reevaluate its strategic goals and would most likely reduce its ability to influence destabilizing activities both inside and outside its traditional borders.

Much of the planned force structure supporting the NATO Strategic Concept comes from the U.S. Air Force: high demand, low density forces such as air-to-air refueling and intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance platforms are just two examples of critical resources we provide. The United States provides more than half of the NATO requirement for these capabilities. For ballistic missile defense of NATO member nations, we provide an even higher percentage.

We have always stated that, in principal, the United States may make the political decision to provide all our resources for defense of the NATO Alliance, to the degree that is consistent with our worldwide commitments. Given current and potential operations and standing treaty obligations, further cuts in our force structure would severely constrain the resources that could be available to NATO under any scenario.

MUNITIONS

59. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, are you experiencing any shortfalls in ammunition for training, base, and operational requirements?

General WELSH. The current Air Force ground munitions stockpile is adequate to support all current Air Force training, base and operational requirements for fiscal year 2013 and fiscal year 2014.

60. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, do you have any inventory shortfalls in air-to-air and air-to-ground weapons, such as advanced medium-range air-to-air missiles (AMRAAM), joint direct attack munitions (JDAM), and high-speed anti-radiation missiles (HARM)? If so, how do you plan to address such shortfalls?

General WELSH. Yes, AMRAAM and JDAM inventories are short of their objectives. The Air Force will address these weapons shortfalls by competing these requirements against all other high priority procurements within the Air Force and make the tough trade-offs on what we can afford to buy. The Air Force plans to continue procurement of both AMRAAM and JDAM at a rate determined by the results of the trade-off with the intent to meet combatant commander objectives. HARM inventory currently meets its objective. High-speed anti-radiation missiles modernization efforts are currently underway to increase the lethality of the weapon system against emerging advanced surface-to-air missile systems.

CYBER SECURITY

61. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the Air Force is uniquely situated to support cyber-related missions. This capability is critical to ensuring national security interests. What is the Air Force doing to recruit and train airmen with cyber skills?

General WELSH. The Air Force targets potential airmen with cyber skills through national advertising campaigns highlighting STEM requirements as opposed to targeting cyber specifically. The Air Force also advocates and supports cyberspace and computer training and education programs nationwide to encourage high school and college students towards technical career fields. For example, we support national competitions such as the Air Force Association's CyberPatriot competition for high school students. Additionally, the Air Force Institute of Technology's Center for Cyberspace Research hosts the Advanced Cyber Education summer program for Reserve Officer Training Corps cadets from all Services who are studying computer science or computer/electrical engineering. Unfortunately, ACE has been canceled for 2013 due to funding constraints as a result of sequestration but we hope to be able to hold ACE again in future years.

Air Force cyberspace training programs develop Total Force cyberspace professionals from numerous career fields. Core training includes Undergraduate Cyberspace Training and Cyberspace Defense Operations at Keesler AFB, MS, and Intermediate Network Warfare Training at Hurlburt AFB, FL. We have also developed an Intelligence Cyber Analyst course at Goodfellow AFB, TX, to train our digital network analysts. This analyst training is complemented with a 6-month follow on Joint Cyber Analysis Course at Pensacola Naval Air Station, FL. Cyber personnel attend further joint cyberspace and related courses based upon positional requirements and work roles. In addition, the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, conducts graduate-level cyber curricula and professional continuing education as well. Growth and change is constant in the cyberspace domain and these schools adjust as technology and tactics evolve.

62. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what type of training do these airmen receive?

General WELSH. Air Force cyberspace training programs develop Total Force cyberspace professionals from numerous career fields. Core training includes undergraduate cyberspace training and cyberspace defense operations at Keesler AFB, MS, and intermediate network warfare training at Hurlburt AFB, FL. We have also developed an Intelligence Cyber Analyst course at Goodfellow AFB, TX, to train our digital network analysts. This analyst training is complemented with a 6-month follow on Joint Cyber Analysis Course at Pensacola Naval Air Station, FL. Cyber personnel attend further Joint cyberspace and related courses based upon positional requirements and work roles. In addition, the Air Force Institute of Technology at Wright-Patterson AFB, OH, conducts graduate-level cyber curricula and professional continuing education as well. Growth and change is constant in the cyberspace domain, and these schools adjust as technology and tactics evolve.

63. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how are you retaining these airmen after such training?

General WELSH. To retain our cyber airmen, seven of the eight enlisted cyber Air Force Specialty Codes (AFSC) are currently receiving a Selective Reenlistment

Bonus (SRB) in at least 1 year group. Also, all eight AFSCs are currently identified on the Chronic Critical Skills for Promotion List that increases the number of promotions given to a career field to support noncommissioned officer (NCO) and senior NCO manning. Finally, cyber AFSCs were shielded from some of the force management programs such as voluntary separation programs and accession cuts.

64. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how are you ensuring that these airmen will get opportunities to advance in their career progression?

General WELSH. Cyberspace airmen have multiple opportunities to advance in their careers. They are deliberately force managed to acquire breadth in their career fields and depth in the cyberspace field. For example, certain specialties will serve consecutive operations tours in cyberspace positions at different locations to build depth as they progress through their career. This experience is coupled with continuing professional cyberspace education to build cyberspace experts.

BASE REALIGNMENT AND CLOSURE

65. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, GAO released a report last year noting that one-time implementation costs for the 2005 Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC) round grew from \$21 billion to \$35 billion, an increase of \$14 billion, or 67 percent. As a result, the 20-year value DOD expected to achieve from the 2005 round decreased by 72 percent and the annual recurring savings has decreased by 10 percent. In addition, GAO determined that 75 out of the 182 recommendations, about 41 percent, are now expected to result in a negative 20-year value. Has the Air Force actually conducted any analyses to quantify the extent of its excess infrastructure? If not, how can the Air Force predict with any confidence how much will be saved by a BRAC round?

General WELSH. The Air Force has not conducted an updated capacity analysis. Our current estimates of excess infrastructure are based on the 2004 OSD report to Congress, required under BRAC 2005 legislation, which stated the DOD had approximately 24 percent excess infrastructure at that time. BRAC 2005 eliminated very little Air Force infrastructure in BRAC 2005 and since then, the Air Force retired approximately 500 aircraft and reduced its total active duty manpower by approximately 8 percent without reducing infrastructure accordingly. If legislation is enacted authorizing another round of BRAC for U.S. installations, the Air Force will base its analysis on an approved force structure plan and will evaluate all bases equally to determine what bases may be candidates for closure or realignment.

The Air Force knows from past BRAC rounds that savings from BRAC are real; 40 installations have closed saving \$2.9 billion per year. However, it is premature for the Air Force to predict the amount of savings that can be garnered prior to completing the BRAC analysis.

The Air Force effectively controlled BRAC 2005 costs through a disciplined military construction and training approval process with senior leader oversight. The Headquarters Air Force staff screened and budgeted for major command requests within the first year. Subsequently, all major command projects were reviewed biannually, tracking both status and cost management. Requirements that arose from site surveys were justified and well supported.

TRICARE

66. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, in the President's budget request, DOD proposes to increase TRICARE Prime enrollment fees and pharmacy co-pays yet again, institute new enrollment fees for TRICARE Standard and TRICARE for Life beneficiaries, and increase Standard deductibles, among other things. Within the last 2 years, Congress authorized DOD to increase enrollment fees and pharmacy co-pays each year by the amount of the annual retired-pay cost-of-living adjustment. Hasn't that helped you control healthcare costs? Why do we need to go down this road again?

General WELSH. Congress' recent support for increases in the TRICARE Prime enrollment fees for working age retirees and adjustments to retail and mail order pharmacy co-pays are an important step to managing costs, but they are not enough to sustain the benefit in the long term. Managing health care costs is a shared responsibility among the government, providers and the beneficiaries. In addition to seeking reasonable beneficiary cost share reforms, the Military Health System is undergoing comprehensive change to be a progressive health system for the beneficiaries into the future while aggressively gleaning efficiencies to control cost.

By following a holistic approach to addressing the rising costs of health care, the military health benefit will continue to be a rich reward for those who have served our country. Without beneficiary cost share reforms, sustaining the health benefit will require diversion of funds from other critical accounts to make up the shortfall.

67. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, if Congress doesn't agree with your TRICARE fee proposals, what is your back-up plan to make up the large deficit in your health account?

General WELSH. If Congress prohibits the proposed TRICARE fee changes and does not restore the budgeted savings in fiscal year 2014, the Department will likely be forced to make additional reductions to readiness and modernization accounts. The TRICARE fee proposals are an important piece of the Department's approach to balanced drawdown in defense spending. The fee changes in conjunction with the governance changes in progress for the Military Health System are necessary to put the military health benefit on a path to long-term fiscal sustainability as well as to lessen the impact on readiness and modernization.

HARDENING FACILITIES

68. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, Admiral Locklear testified to this committee that; "the United States requires a more geographically-distributed, operationally-resilient, and politically-sustainable posture that allows persistent presence and, if needed, power projection." The Air Force has proposed construction of hardened facilities on Guam to protect certain assets to provide operational resilience. Do you support the hardening of facilities on Guam to preserve a second strike capability?

General WELSH. Yes, the Air Force supports the "selective hardening" of facilities on Guam for a number of critical reasons, both unclassified and classified. Selective hardening increases our warfighting capability and demonstrates our commitment to operational resiliency to our partners and allies as well as our potential adversaries. This effort stems from the requirement to be resilient against enemy attack, ensures the availability of airpower to the Joint Force Commander, and enables the ability to generate airpower in the face of multiple attacks. The Air Force is currently working on a Pacific Airpower Resiliency study built on the premise of previous analyses that recommends the construction of two large hardened hangars to protect national assets deployed to Guam. Since the submission of the fiscal year 2012 President's budget, all major stakeholders have determined and agreed on the importance of these two structures. The NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013 provided funding for one unhardened hangar, and the Air Force requested funding in the fiscal year 2014 President's budget to harden the first hangar and construct a second hardened hangar. The Air Force will continue to pursue selective hardening, increased airfield damage repair capabilities, and a number of other efforts in concert with the other Services, including development of a new plan beyond the two proposed hangars.

69. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, given the large numbers of Chinese missiles projected in 2020, what makes you believe that you can protect enough infrastructure to be able to launch a second strike?

General WELSH. This question cannot be adequately answered at the unclassified level. However, there are combinations of approaches that work in concert to help mitigate the threat represented by a large missile inventory. These include, but are not limited to, dispersal, selective hardening, rapid repair and other passive and active defense measures. All efforts stem from the requirement to be operationally resilient against enemy attack, guaranteeing the availability of airpower in support of the Joint Force Commander. It is not about simply preserving a second strike, rather it is about ensuring a continuous ability to generate airpower in a contested environment.

70. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, hardening a facility approximately doubles the cost of a facility—can we afford that cost in this budget environment?

General WELSH. Yes, we have determined we can afford hardening of selective critical infrastructure on Guam and have included these requirements in our fiscal year 2014 budget request. We are only requesting to selectively harden facilities and infrastructure that are critical to ensure we can accomplish our missions in all threat scenarios. The United States has done virtually no hardening for some 30 years, and there are no hardened facilities currently on Guam.

Selective hardening is one of four distinct methods of mitigating risk in PACOM's resiliency strategy, which also includes redundancy, rapid repair, and dispersal. In

many cases, hybrid solutions will be used that incorporate two or more of the mitigation measures. Without the selective hardening of key infrastructure, our commitment to overall Defense Strategy in the Asia-Pacific theater could be called into question by our partners and allies as well as our potential adversaries.

C-130 AMP

71. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, at last year's Air Force posture hearing, General Schwartz said that: "the Air Force C-130 Avionics Modernization Program (AMP) provides military capability equal or greater than alternative programs and at less cost than those programs." The U.S. Government performed four independent studies on the C-130 AMP solution between 1998 and 2008 and found it was the most cost-effective solution to modernize the C-130 fleet, and at the same time, consolidate the multiple configurations and increase equipment reliability and availability. It appears from the fiscal year 2014 President's proposed budget that a new start effort, the Minimize CNS/ATM option, has been identified. Could you explain the Minimize CNS/ATM option?

General WELSH. The Minimize Communications, Navigation, Surveillance/Air Traffic Management (CNS/ATM) program is a less-costly, smaller-scope program, compared to AMP. The Minimize CNS/ATM program primarily upgrades communication and navigation equipment enabling the C-130H to meet navigation mandates into the 2020s.

72. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what is the cost of the new approach and what will it truly save after considering the termination liability, and after other life-cycle cost savings are removed from the solution?

General WELSH. The fiscal year 2014 Presidents' budget requests \$476 million for the Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM program for 184 aircraft. The Air Force expects the Institute for Defense Analyses (IDA) study directed in the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013 to provide life cycle cost comparisons for C-130 AMP, the fiscal year 2014 Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM program, and the fiscal year 2013 Optimize Legacy C-130 CNS/ATM program. Planned delivery date of the IDA study to Congress is October 2013.

73. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what requirements or missions changed that would allow for a change of direction of this magnitude, specifically cancelling the program of record, AMP, and executing a new start, Minimize CNS/ATM?

General WELSH. Significant fiscal reductions to Air Force funding drove difficult strategic choices. One of these difficult choices was C-130 modernization. We were compelled to pursue a less-costly, smaller-scope modernization program that meets mission requirements and ensures the C-130H fleet remains viable into the 2020s.

74. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, less than 2 years ago, the C-130 AMP was the best solution and at a lower cost than all other capable alternatives. How can AMP now be too expensive?

General WELSH. The constrained fiscal environment forced us to make difficult strategic choices. The decision to terminate the C-130 AMP was driven by the first phase of the 2011 Budget Control Act. Full implementation of the Budget Control Act—or sequestration—eliminated budget resources that might have been available to fund the C-130 AMP program. Acquiring the capability afforded by the C-130 AMP became untenable under these fiscal constraints, especially when compared to other more compelling investment opportunities.

75. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, why is the Air Force choosing to end a program that is over 99 percent complete with development activities and with very little risk going forward?

General WELSH. The constrained fiscal environment forced the Air Force to make difficult strategic choices. The decision to terminate the C-130 AMP was driven by the first phase of the 2011 Budget Control Act. Full implementation of the Budget Control Act—or sequestration—eliminated budget resources that might have been available to fund the C-130 AMP program. Acquiring the capability afforded by the C-130 AMP became untenable under these fiscal constraints, especially when compared to other more compelling investment opportunities.

76. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, as directed by the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013, have you begun the IDA study for a cost benefit analysis, and what is the current status and projected completion date to report back to the committee?

General WELSH. DOD placed the IDA study on contract on March 1, 2013. The IDA study is currently progressing according to schedule, and IDA plans to deliver initial study results to the Air Force in August 2013. The Air Force plans to deliver the study to Congress in October 2013.

77. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, has there been any analysis of long-term cost savings the current C-130 AMP provides versus the proposed fiscal year 2014 Minimize CNS/ATM capability?

General WELSH. The Air Force has not completed an official life-cycle cost analysis for the proposed fiscal year 2014 Minimize C-130 Communication, Navigation, Surveillance/Air Traffic Management (CNS/ATM) program. The Air Force expects the IDA study directed in the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013 to provide life cycle cost comparisons for C-130 AMP, the fiscal year 2014 Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM program, and the fiscal year 2013 Optimize Legacy C-130 CNS/ATM program.

78. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the fiscal year 2013 appropriations reduced the C-130 AMP program of record in fiscal year 2012 by \$118 million, leaving \$90 million and identified \$20 million for fiscal year 2013. What is the expenditure plan for fiscal year 2013 appropriations identified for the C-130 AMP?

General WELSH. The Air Force has not expended any of the fiscal year 2013 C-130 AMP funds, or any of the fiscal year 2012 production funds. We are continuing to conduct fiscally responsible and prudent program actions while the IDA completes the cost-benefit analysis on C-130 AMP directed by the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013. Based on the outcome of the IDA study, the Air Force will provide a spend plan as appropriate.

79. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, can the current C-130 AMP be scaled down and still retain its certification? If so, have you thought about doing that instead of starting over?

General WELSH. No, significantly scaling down C-130 AMP would drive a program redesign and retest.

80. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, with a reasonable learning curve, what is the current cost of a fully installed C-130 AMP system and what would the estimated cost be for the alternative system?

General WELSH. The C-130 AMP Office currently estimates the C-130 AMP per aircraft cost to be \$15.4 million. The Air Force expects the IDA study directed in the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013 to provide life cycle cost comparisons for C-130 AMP, the fiscal year 2014 Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM program, and the fiscal year 2013 Optimize Legacy C-130 CNS/ATM program. Planned delivery date of the IDA study to Congress is October 2013.

81. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the current C-130 AMP eliminated the navigator position, which essentially paid for the upgrade through personnel savings. Will the Minimize CNS/ATM require a navigator, and if so, what is the impact on availability, training, and life-cycle costs?

General WELSH. The Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM program requires a navigator. While the navigator savings of approximately \$500 million (then-year dollars over a 15-year life cycle) offsets the Operations and Support costs of C-130 AMP, it was never intended to recover the full cost of the AMP modification.

The Air Force expects the IDA study on C-130 AMP to analyze the impact of availability, training, and life-cycle costs of the three C-130H combat delivery fleet modification alternatives: C-130 AMP, the fiscal year 2013 Optimize Legacy C-130 CNS/ATM program, and the fiscal year 2014 Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM program.

82. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, will the Minimize CNS/ATM new start provide more or less capability than the current program of record, the C-130 AMP?

General WELSH. The Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM new start is a less robust avionics and sustainment solution than the C-130 AMP. The legacy C-130H combat delivery fleet will continue to maintain global access and global engagement to support the Joint Warfighter regardless of which AMP is adopted.

83. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what other upgrades/capabilities previously included in the C-130 AMP will not be done and which of these will be addressed at some future time?

General WELSH. The C-130 AMP modernizes C-130Hs across three variants (H2, H2.5, H3) with a common avionics suite and standardized cockpit configuration. AMP provides substantial system integration to reduce crew workload, thus elimi-

nating the navigator. AMP also addresses future issues with obsolescence and diminishing manufacturing sources.

The fiscal year 2014 Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM is an airspace compliance only program to meet the Federal Aviation Administration's January 2020 CNS/ATM airspace mandate for an Automatic Dependent Surveillance-Broadcast system. Therefore, the Air Force will continue to analyze the Legacy C-130H fleet's avionics systems' reliability, maintainability, and sustainability issues, and would pursue options to address any shortfalls.

84. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, is the current IDA study evaluating the C-130 AMP against the Minimize CNS/ATM identified in the fiscal year 2014 President's budget document?

General WELSH. Yes, the Air Force tasked the IDA to evaluate all three C-130H combat delivery fleet modification alternatives: C-130 AMP, the fiscal year 2013 Optimize Legacy C-130 CNS/ATM program, and the fiscal year 2014 Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM program.

85. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, has an acquisition strategy been developed for the fiscal year 2014 Minimize CNS/ATM new start option?

General WELSH. The Air Force, in compliance with section 143 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013, has taken no action to develop an official acquisition strategy on the fiscal year 2014 Minimize C-130 CNS/ATM program.

86. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, is there an intention to have some level of commonality between the large platform CNS/ATM solutions for the Air Force?

General WELSH. Yes, it is our intention to maximize commonality in the CNS/ATM equipment used in the large platforms. However, every aircraft is different, which limits the extent of commonality. Since cost savings is a concern, we plan to take advantage of proven and available commercial off-the-shelf options for CNS/ATM compliance equipment when these solutions lower our cost to equip or sustain.

C-130 RE-ENGINEING

87. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, I understand that there is an upgrade for the T56 engine, the engine enhancement package (EEP), that would improve fuel efficiency of the current engines. What is the status of the modification?

General WELSH. Rolls Royce Corporation, the T56 engine manufacturer, developed a more fuel efficient upgrade to the current C-130H aircraft engines using internal company resources. This upgrade is known as the T56 Series 3.5 engine configuration.

Although the T-56 Series 3.5 engine modification is expected to provide improved fuel efficiency and reduced maintenance costs, the Air Force has not funded a program of record due to higher Air Force funding priorities in the current fiscal environment.

88. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, has the EEP been tested, and if so, what were the results?

General WELSH. The T56 Series 3.5 has successfully passed engine qualification testing. Additionally, the prototype engine was flight tested on a C-130H at Edwards AFB, CA with all operational requirements being met during that effort.

89. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what is the estimated cost of the modification, and for how many aircraft?

General WELSH. A June 2011 Air Mobility Command Business Case Analysis (BCA) forecasted a requirement for 200 C-130H aircraft (184 Mobility Air Force and 16 Air Combat Command), which will require 941 engines including required spares. The study estimates the modification would require a total investment of \$969 million (calculated in 2011 constant year dollars) from fiscal year 2014-fiscal year 2024, and \$414 million would be required from fiscal year 2014-fiscal year 2018. This funding is based on a modification profile of 20 engines in fiscal year 2014, and 100 engines in each of the remaining years until fiscal year 2024 when the remaining 21 engines would be modified.

90. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how long will it take to modify the fleet?

General WELSH. For the Air Mobility Command BCA forecasted requirement of 941 engines, if the modification begins with a profile of 20 engines in the first year,

and 100 engines in each of the remaining out-years, it will take 11 years to modify the fleet.

91. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what is the expected fuel savings from making the modification?

General WELSH. The Air Mobility Command BCA expects \$240 million in fuel savings (7.9 percent) over 25 years of operations.

92. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, has the Air Force independently verified those savings estimates?

General WELSH. The predicted \$240 million (7.9 percent) fuel consumption improvement, at the current equivalent engine power setting, was validated through Air Force ground and flight testing.

KC-46A

93. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, February was the 2-year anniversary of the KC-X contract. Since that time, both the Air Force and Boeing have delivered on their commitments by meeting all contract milestones on or ahead of schedule. At this point in the program, to what do you attribute the success of the Air Force?

General WELSH. The keys to the program's success have been requirements and funding stability, backed by the diligent efforts of our professional acquisition workforce. The Department led a contract with well-defined requirements and both parties have held each other accountable to the agreement. Additionally, the Department has not subjected the program to budget-driven changes in schedule and content. This creates an environment where our engineers and program managers, government and contractor, can focus on executing the program on time and on schedule.

94. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, how do you see leveraging the lessons learned in the tanker acquisition to other Air Force acquisitions?

General WELSH. The lessons learned from the tanker acquisition are being implemented in policy and in practice. Multiple components of the Air Force's Acquisition Improvement Plan and DOD's Better Buying Power (BBP) initiatives and policies have roots in the successes and failures of the broader tanker acquisition program. In practice, the source selection lessons learned are being propagated through the leadership and working levels of the Air Force Life Cycle Management Center (AFLCMC) and Space and Missile Systems Center through policy, procedures, training, directed communications, and the Air Force's Lessons Learned Program. As the Air Force approaches new acquisitions, the policies and processes that have grown out of the tanker acquisition will be implemented as appropriate with the nature, scope, and risks inherent in each new program.

LONG-RANGE STRIKE BOMBER

95. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, DOD is pivoting to a strategy that focuses on the Western Pacific. To accomplish this, the strategy says we must maintain the ability to operate in Anti Access/Area Denial (A2/AD) environments and that the development of a new stealth bomber is, therefore, needed. How does the development and fielding of a new LRS-B help satisfy the requirement to operate at great distances in an A2/AD environment?

General WELSH. Current bombers are increasingly at risk to modern air defenses; the LRS-B will be able to penetrate modern air defenses to accomplish combatant commander objectives despite adversary A2/AD measures. The LRS-B will be usable across the spectrum of conflict, from raid to campaign levels and will provide broad geographic coverage (ability to operate deep and from long range). Additionally, it will carry a wide variety of stand-off and direct-attack munitions for increased flexibility. Once fielded, the LRS-B's long range, payload, and survivability will provide the President with the option to hold targets at risk at anywhere on the globe, as well as provide operational flexibility for Joint commanders.

96. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, in light of the extremely high total cost of ownership numbers that have been identified with the JSF program, what steps is DOD taking to incentivizing bidding contractors to design for control of those costs?

General WELSH. With regards to the LRS-B program, the Air Force is considering an array of options for incentivizing the contractors to design the weapon system in manner that reduces total ownership costs.

97. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, would it make sense to increase the emphasis on procurement and sustainment costs in the evaluation of competing offers?

General WELSH. Yes. The LRS-B program is considering an array of options to place an appropriate amount of emphasis on the evaluation of the projected procurement and sustainment costs of competing offers.

C-17

98. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the ability of the U.S. industrial base to support the production of large military aircraft is a growing concern. The U.S. educational system is producing fewer people with the requisite technical skills to build highly integrated and sophisticated weapon systems. More and more U.S. manufacturing facilities are shutting down, and U.S. corporations are depending on overseas companies to provide major assemblies and parts for U.S. products. What are you doing to maintain the U.S. industrial base and to ensure it retains its technology and capability edge in supporting and winning future wars?

General WELSH. The national budget turbulence has caused not just the Air Force, but also each organization in DOD, to carefully consider priorities and make adjustments in plans and budgets. While sustaining a robust national technology and industrial base is a concern, it is one of many subject to the realities imposed by the current fiscal situation.

Our top three modernization programs, the KC-46, the F-35, and the LRS-B, highlight the Air Force's current investments in the industrial base. Other modernization efforts such as our space programs also support the Nation's industrial base. However, the Air Force does not have resources to sustain industrial capability or capacity beyond that required for funded programs. In a key area, such as turbine engine development, the Air Force collaborates with industry on a shared-cost basis to advance the state of the art and maintain a cadre of engineering and design expertise.

The Air Force is working with the other Services and OSD to develop a deeper understanding of our mutual dependencies on the complex web of suppliers that produce and sustain our air, space, and cyber capabilities.

99. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what is the Air Force doing to ensure that mobility—and particularly airlift—are part of that enduring industrial base?

General WELSH. In the current fiscal environment, the Air Force has few choices beyond those to support our airmen, maintain readiness of key units, and continue our top modernizations efforts. I fully appreciate that the Air Force's air, space, and cyber capabilities are sustained by the products and services purchased from the national technology and industrial base. Without the support of both the organic and the commercial components of the industrial base, the Air Force would not be ready to respond to the needs of the Nation. The result of the difficult choices imposed by the current budget situation is that the Air Force has reduced our demands on the industrial base.

As far as the current state of industrial base supporting airlift, the C-17 along with the C-130J, remain in production and are still some of the youngest fleets in our inventory. The Air Force also benefits from the very healthy commercial aerospace sector of the economy. For example, the KC-46 is a derivative of a commercial aircraft.

100. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what alternatives do you see for future airlift production if the C-17 line shuts down?

General WELSH. No alternative is needed at this time since the Air Force's current airlift requirements will be met upon delivery of the final C-17 and completion of C-5 RERP modification. After the delivery of the final U.S. Air Force C-17 (third quarter of calendar year 2013), the future of the C-17 line is fully dependent on Foreign Military Sales (FMS) and/or direct commercial sales orders. As of now, the remaining firm C-17 FMS orders will keep the production line going until the fourth quarter of calendar year 2014. We remain committed to our allies and partners to help them through new FMS orders should they require additional airlift capability and capacity.

JOINT DIRECT ATTACK MUNITIONS

101. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, in fiscal year 2012, Joint Direct Attack Munitions (JDAM) constituted over 98 percent of all air-to-ground gravity bombs employed in combat (85 percent if Hellfire is included) according to U.S. Air Force Cen-

tral (AFCENT) data. The JDAM weapon system on an annual basis drops approximately 7,000 units a year in the support of training, test, tactics development, and combat operations. What is the impact on the strategic weapons stockpile/war reserves, when training, testing, and combat operations are consuming more than the annual planned procurement?

General WELSH. The strategic weapons stockpile/war reserves inventory levels decrease when training, testing, and combat operations expenditures outpace annual procurement. Since Joint Direct Attack Munitions inventories are already short of inventory objectives, continuing to expend more weapons than we procure increases risk over time. This shortage will drive the use of secondary weapons that decrease warfighter effectiveness and result in increased time accomplishing the combatant commander's objectives.

102. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, has DOD conducted an analysis for what levels should be maintained and the assumptions that have pushed JDAM procurements to such low rates?

General WELSH. The Air Force conducts an annual analysis to determine the required inventory levels to accomplish the combatant commanders' objectives. Annual procurement is then set in an attempt to meet those inventory objectives, but balanced against Air Force budget constraints to meet the highest priorities of the Air Force.

103. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, there was a tremendous surge in JDAM production after September 11. As production rates drop dramatically, what are you doing to sustain the U.S. industrial base and to ensure it retains the capacity to surge again, when required?

General WELSH. This is an important issue that applies not just to the Air Force and not just to the Joint Direct Attack Munitions. The demands on that sector of the national technology and industrial base producing and sustaining munitions are very closely tied to the tempo of our combat operations. For that industrial sector, there isn't much of a middle ground. When the Nation's forces are not engaged in combat, the only demands are for training, maintaining operator proficiency, sustaining war reserves, or sales to our allies. When the Nation decides to send forces into combat, demand can rise rapidly with the potential for production surges.

The Air Force works closely with the other Services and OSD on a variety of issues concerning the munitions industrial base. For example, we have participated in reviews to help identify requirements for and development of critical energetic materials, to support development of fuzes and monitor the health of that subsector. We have looked across the industry to identify critical suppliers and capabilities. The Air Force is also looking beyond the current systems with research programs to develop technologies for future munitions.

104. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, the Libyan conflict demonstrated that NATO inventories of JDAM are not sufficient to conduct even a small operation effectively. What is the United States doing to encourage our NATO allies to increase their JDAM inventories significantly?

General WELSH. The Air Force is working with the Offices of Defense Cooperation to stress to NATO allies the importance of keeping sufficient weapons inventories. The Air Force is also working with DOD to investigate options, such as expedited acquisition and multi-national munitions pooling.

T-X PROGRAM

105. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, given the impacts of sequestration, what priority is the Air Force acquisition plans for the T-X program, and will the Air Force continue with recapitalization plans for the T-38 Talon, which has been in service for over 50 years?

General WELSH. Current weapon-system recapitalization efforts and operations took precedence over the T-X program in the fiscal year 2014 budget. However, the Air Force does intend to recapitalize the T-38 fleet. At this time, the objective IOC date is undefined.

106. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, is the T-X program still planning to keep this a bundled effort, to include jet, simulator, and courseware, all tied to the Family of Systems (FoS) to save the warfighters and taxpayers by reducing the cost of flight training?

General WELSH. Yes, the Air Force still plans to acquire the T-X as a single Family of Systems rather than as separate acquisitions for the aircraft, ground training devices, and courseware. We believe this to be the most efficient course of action to provide a robust training capability at the most effective cost.

107. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, has the Service defined T-X requirements in a manner that mandates that the T-38 replacement aircraft must accommodate the full spectrum of male and female pilot candidates (JPATS 1-7), just as you did in the T-6 Texan and other new platforms?

General WELSH. The T-X is still in an early stage of requirements development, but as the requirements are developed, the Air Force will try to ensure that they accommodate the full spectrum of male and female pilot candidates.

CIVILIAN FURLONGHS

108. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, I am concerned about the potential impact of civilian furloughs on critically important Air Force family support programs. If furloughs do take place, do you expect any cutbacks in your operating hours at commissaries, exchanges, and child development centers, or curtailment of: morale, welfare, and recreation (MWR) programs; Department of Defense Education Activity (DODEA) programs; Transition Assistance Programs (TAP); or military spouse employment programs?

Mr. DONLEY. Civilian furloughs will have a negative impact on our ability to provide, and maintain, a variety of services to our airmen and their families. Specifically, Commissaries will close one additional day per week and MWR programs are projected to experience reduced hours of operation and/or closed facilities. Additionally, budget reductions will have a negative impact on our ability to timely transform our activities to make our services more efficient.

Utilizing the 1,645 direct child care employees that have been excepted from the furlough, we will continue to provide child care operations and minimize the impact to airmen and their families. Additionally, we do not anticipate Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES), TAP or Military Spouse Employment to be affected by furloughs.

109. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, in response to sequestration, if civilian furloughs impact the mission of the Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS), what options does the Air Force have to ensure your recruit accessions are not disrupted?

Mr. DONLEY. Approximately 80 percent of Military Entrance Processing Command (MEPCOM) employees are civilian. The 11-day furlough (as announced on May 14, 2013) will have a significant impact on MEPCOM's ability to process recruits and manage military accessions testing programs. MEPCOM will reduce applicant processing from 5 days down to 4 days to accommodate the civilian furloughs.

There are no options to overcome recruit processing disruptions as a result of the MEPCOM furlough. No alternatives exist for MEPCOM processing to qualify youth for military service. MEPCOM is the sole entity for enlisted accessions. The Air Force will adjust to the reduced processing capacity by tightly managing the available processing slots. Slots will first be used to send fiscal year 2013 recruits to Basic Military Training, and then whatever slots remain will be prioritized to best meet fiscal year 2014 needs. These restrictions will force the Air Force to delay processing motivated applicants until slots become available at a later date.

INTEGRATED DISABILITY EVALUATION SYSTEM

110. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, it is unconscionable that servicemembers must wait many months to receive a disability determination from the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA). While DOD and VA have made some progress in decreasing the amount of time it takes to get disability claims completed in the Integrated Disability Evaluation System (IDES), more work must be done. Do you believe the VA is doing all that it can do to decrease the amount of time for disability case reviews and claims adjudication?

Mr. DONLEY. DOD and VA have implemented several improvement strategies to improve the IDES Physical Evaluation Board (PEB) timeliness.

1. VA has added 109 personnel to reach 264 full-time equivalents for claims adjudication, and consolidated Army claims at Seattle Disability Rating Activity Site to reduce processing times.

2. VA has proactively engaged DOD to expedite adoption of Disability Benefits Questionnaires (DBQs) within the IDES Program.
3. To better support DOD and members of the Reserve components (RC), VA implemented a process to perform IDES Compensation and Pension examinations closer to the residence of RC servicemembers.
4. VA's Chief of Staff conducts bi-monthly internal Video Teleconferences (VTC) with Central Office and Field Executive staff to review IDES performance metric and discuss process improvement measures. VA also has joint monthly VTCs with both Army and Navy/Marine Corps to discuss site performance and general collaboration opportunities.
5. VA's IDES leadership conducts weekly meetings with IDES leadership from OSD, Warrior Care Policy, and the Military Services. These meetings have been occurring since July 2011.
6. VA Central Office personnel conduct periodic site visits to identify best practices and provide assistance.
7. VA and DOD routinely collaborate to improve and refine policies and procedures.

The Air Force continues to collaborate with DOD and VA to improve the overall disability evaluation process. Despite improvements, challenges still remain and all of the DOD is committed to working diligently with VA to continue streamlining and improving the overall disability process.

111. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, does the VA need additional resources to hire more claims adjudicators?

Mr. DONLEY. The Air Force cannot address the resource requirements of the VA. However, our Service continues to collaborate with VA to improve the overall disability evaluation process. Despite improvements, challenges still remain, DOD and the Air Force are committed to working diligently with VA to continue streamlining and improving the overall disability process.

PROTECTING PROSPECTIVE RECRUITS

112. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, a recent tragic case in Maryland appears to have been a murder/suicide involving a prospective recruit and recruiter. What guidance has the Air Force provided to ensure that prospective recruits and their parents or guardians are fully aware of the limits for relationships with recruiters?

Mr. DONLEY. Air Force Recruiting has instituted an aggressive and comprehensive program to inform and educate recruits and their parents on the subject of inappropriate behaviors, to include unprofessional relationships throughout the recruiting process. This program employs video, talking points, "Applicant Rights/Responsibilities Cards", and signed statements. The program clearly defines what constitutes an unprofessional relationship vs. professional relationship between recruits and their recruiters, and advises the recruits of their right and obligation to report suspected or actual cases. The program also outlines sources of assistance and steps to be taken to address concerns.

113. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, what information does the Air Force require to be provided to prospective recruits to ensure that they have immediate access to assistance and intervention, if necessary, if they believe a recruiter is intending to take improper advantage of them?

Mr. DONLEY. Air Force Recruiting Service (AFRS) personnel are required to provide all applicants with an "Air Force Applicant Rights/Responsibilities Card" as early as practical in the application process before Military Entrance Processing Command (MEPCOM) processing. This card clearly defines professional relationships to potential applicants and provides guidance on how to report any violations. Recruiters are directed to discuss and train Delayed Entry Program (DEP) recruits on expectations.

In addition, each applicant views a video discussing professional relationships—what is professional and unprofessional, as well as expectations of recruits as Air Force members and what they can expect from their recruiter and the recruiting process. By defining what is and is not acceptable, the applicant knows what is expected and what is expected of the recruiter. This enhances the Rights/Responsibilities card—if the recruit notices unacceptable behavior, he/she can then act on it by contacting local Air Force leadership or the contacts listed on the card.

Each recruit has the opportunity to discuss potential misconduct when they visit the Military Entrance Processing Station (MEPS) for the first time. Here, away from his/her recruiter, our MEPS liaison completes a survey with each recruit and asks

if there were any instances of misconduct or action/words that made the recruit uncomfortable. If so, leadership addresses the concerns with the recruit and investigates allegations further to determine if additional action is necessary.

Applicants will also receive periodic briefings from supervisors and squadron leadership during their time in the DEP. These briefings will further emphasize rights, roles, and responsibilities of all members as well as ways to report suspected or actual cases.

The survey process completed with the MEPS liaison in the recruiting process is repeated both in basic military training (BMT) and technical training. Essentially the survey becomes a cradle to grave document within the accessions and training continuum.

DEFENSE SEXUAL ASSAULT INCIDENT DATABASE

114. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, DOD has told us they have achieved full-deployment of the congressionally-mandated Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database (DSAID). Is the Air Force providing data to populate the database?

Mr. DONLEY. Yes, the Air Force was the first Service to implement the Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database (DSAID) to streamline data collection efforts and reporting.

115. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, specifically, what information is this database providing Air Force leadership concerning sexual assault incidents?

Mr. DONLEY. Defense Sexual Assault Incident Database (DSAID) is a centralized, case-level database for the uniform collection of DOD Military Service data regarding incidents of sexual assaults involving persons covered by Department of Defense Instruction (DODI) 6495.02. DSAID includes information when not limited by Restricted Reporting, or otherwise prohibited by law, about the nature of the assault, the victim, the offender, and the disposition of reports associated with the assault. DSAID is available to the Sexual Assault and Response Office and the DOD to develop and implement congressional reporting requirements. Unless authorized by law, or needed for internal DOD review or analysis, disclosure of data stored in DSAID is only granted when disclosure is ordered by a military, Federal, or State judge or other officials or entities as required by a law or applicable U.S. international agreement. DSAID is a valuable tool that Air Force leaders can utilize to identify the extent and trends of reported cases either at their location or the Air Force as a whole. It helps leaders to plan strategies for combatting sexual assault.

DSAID includes the capability for entering records and interfacing data; generating predefined and ad hoc reports; and conducting case and business management. Specifically, the system is a warehouse of sexual assault case information; has the ability to run queries and reports; provides the SARC with the capability to interface and manage case-level data; includes victim, subject, and case outcomes in connection with the assault; and allows for SAPR Program Administration and Management.

SEXUAL ASSAULT

116. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, before this committee, DOD witnesses described the recently revised DOD-wide policy on Sexual Assault Program to standardize prevention, health care, victim safety, training, and response efforts, and to clearly convey the role of servicemembers and employees in sexual assault prevention and recovery. This committee is concerned that medical care providers were not fully aware of their obligations concerning restricted reports, including the obligation to withhold disclosure to the chain of command. What actions have been taken to ensure standardization with response to protecting the sanctity of restricted reports?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. DOD and the Air Force have established policy concerning restricted reporting cases as detailed in DODI 6495.02 and AFI 36-6001. Sexual assault policy pertaining to medical care is listed in AFI 44-102. If a victim first reports to a medical provider without having consulted with a SARC, the victim is referred to the SARC, after completion of immediate medical care, to ensure the victim is advised of all reporting options. Sometimes, the SARC is able to report to the medical facility to advise the victim of reporting options. If the victim elects restricted reporting then Air Force medical personnel do not report the assault to command authorities and documentation of the medical assessment is flagged to prevent unauthorized release. Although some local jurisdictions require medical personnel to report certain crimes to local law enforcement, the Air Force respects the

choices of our victims and does not pursue a military criminal investigation for those victims who elected restricting reporting. If the victim elects to file an unrestricted report, then the SARC, victim, and medical providers as a team ensure that the victim reports to the Office of Special Investigations and/or his/her chain of command.

117. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, what additional challenges do you see in attaining the required level of standardization?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. To attain a level of standardization we first need to clearly identify the root causes of sexual assault and ensure our airmen understand what behavior is acceptable and what is not. Once we have a firm grasp on those two issues we must establish a standardized SAPR training and education program throughout the Air Force. This is necessary to affect the positive cultural change we are striving to achieve. This training and education program should be firmly ingrained throughout the life cycle of our airmen, starting at basic military training and officer accession training programs through technical training and senior officer and NCO schools. A key element throughout the life cycle of training is combining the understanding of what is acceptable and what is not with the need to internalize and live by our Air Force core values. Our new SAPR office under the Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force and led by Major General Maggie Woodward provides us the means to attain the proper level of standardization. The new SAPR office includes functional experts across the SAPR spectrum. Their expertise and the assistance we are receiving from subject matter experts from the civilian sector will help us take our Air Force SAPR program to the next level.

118. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, what additional tools does the Air Force need in order to continue to reduce—with the goal of eliminating—sexual assault?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. We appreciate your continued support for our ongoing efforts, with the understanding that results will not be immediately apparent. Over the past year, we have taken great strides to improve our prevention and response program through the development of numerous initiatives and tools. We enhanced our education and training programs, implemented a Special Victims Council (SVC) pilot program to assist victims, brought on additional SARCs to assist victims and developed a specialized Judge Advocate/Office of Special Investigations training course designed to train Special Victims investigators and prosecutors for sexual assault offenses. Additionally, we expanded the Leaders Toolkit on the Air Force Personnel Center SAPR website and created a new Chief of Staff of the Air Force and Chief Master Sergeant of the Air Force video for our airmen.

Furthermore, we recently stood up the Air Force's new SAPR directorate aligned directly under the Vice Chief of the Air Force and led by a Major General. This new SAPR office will grow the old four person office to over 30 functional experts across the SAPR spectrum. This office's mandate is to develop a comprehensive multi-pronged campaign plan to combat sexual assault and harassment in our force. Once this office has progressed in its analysis of root causes, trends, and prevention strategies the Air Force will engage with your office and other key members of Congress on our planned way ahead and additional tools we may need.

119. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, some have suggested that it would be appropriate to incorporate standardized assessments of commanders' performance in prevention, investigation, accountability, advocacy, and assessment of sexual assault response and prevention lines of effort. What is your assessment of the feasibility of implementing commanders' performance in service-specific performance appraisals?

General WELSH. DOD is currently evaluating the methods used to assess the performance of military commanders for establishing command climates of dignity and respect and incorporating SAPR into their commands to ensure standardization across the Services.

120. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, the annual report on sexual assault at the Service Academies revealed that many people who enter the armed services have experienced and reported sexual assault or unwanted sexual contact that occurred before they entered the Service Academies or the armed services. What could the Air Force be doing to improve support to men and women in the accession process, to identify whether individuals have experienced sexual assault?

Mr. DONLEY. In both officer and enlisted accession processes we identify our definition of sexual assault, provide a description of our prevention and response program, and allow the recruits to speak with SARCs should they have any concerns or questions. We have hired additional SARCs/Victim Advocates at some bases due

to increased workload driven by training requirements and caseload due to more reporting. Additionally, we are creating a voluntary course focused on prevention for those with prior victimization that includes coping methods and skills.

COMMAND CLIMATE ASSESSMENTS

121. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, what percentage of your commands conduct command climate assessments?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. All Air Force units have the opportunity and are encouraged to conduct climate assessments by the Equal Opportunity (EO) Office. EO Offices, on behalf of the commander, administer Unit Climate Assessments (UCA) on organizations that have 50 or more personnel (both military and civilian combined). For those organizations with less than 50 members, commanders are not afforded the Unit Climate Assessment; however, they are able to utilize other forms of EO climate assessment such as out and abouts, focus groups, and interviews. In addition, the Defense Equal Opportunity Climate Survey (DEOCS) is available through the Defense Equal Opportunity Management Institute (DEOMI) to gauge the climate of the organization. The difference between the UCA and the DEOCS is that contractors are permitted to be survey participants in the DEOCS.

The UCA is required every 2 years or upon commander's request. With the passage of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013, the new requirements necessitate annual climate assessments and they must be completed within 120 days upon assumption of command. The Air Force is currently revising Air Force regulations to reflect the new requirements.

122. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, what is the Air Force doing to improve the regularity of command climate assessments?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The overall Air Force climate assessment is conducted annually. Current regulatory guidelines require units to conduct climate assessments in units once every 2 years and upon request by a commander. The NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013 has a requirement to conduct a climate assessment annually and within 120 days upon assumption of command by a new commander.

The Air Force is considering several courses of action on how to increase the regularity of command climate assessments with existing resources, including increasing the use of focus group interviews and various other survey assessments.

123. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, what are you doing to evaluate the results of the command climate assessments to ensure necessary follow-up action?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The Air Force Climate Survey is conducted biennially and the results are out-briefed to the Secretary of the Air Force and released to the units. Commanders with ten or more respondents are provided survey results along with a guide developed by behavioral scientists from the Air Force Personnel Center, Directorate of Manpower containing specific recommendations and lists of resources to improve their unit climate. Leaders that use previous survey results to make improvements with the organization have yielded higher levels of agreement in all areas.

In addition to the Air Force Climate Survey, the Air Force has Equal Opportunity (EO) subject matter experts that conduct Unit Climate Assessments (UCA), analyze the results, and provide an out-brief to unit commanders. During the out-brief, EO professionals discuss recommendations and strategies for problem resolution and offer follow-up services to help resolve EO or managerial related problems. With the passage of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013, UCAs will be conducted annually, rather than biennially, and within 120 days upon assumption of command.

FEDERAL VOTING ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

124. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, what is your assessment of the performance of the Air Force Federal Voting Assistance Program (FVAP)?

Mr. DONLEY. The Air Force FVAP is a successful program within the department at all levels of command. In 2012, the Air Force Major Command (MAJCOM) inspection teams reviewed 134 Voting Assistance Programs at squadron, group, wing and command levels with just 12 discrepancies reported. All discrepancies were classified as "minor deficiencies" by the SAF/IG. As a result, the Air Force is confident we have an effective FVAP in place and military members have the resources to exercise their right to vote.

125. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, what Air Force-specific initiatives have you implemented to improve compliance with FVAP and to maximize the opportunity for servicemembers to exercise their right to vote?

Mr. DONLEY. The U.S. Air Force (USAF) Voting Assistance Program initiated several initiatives to improve compliance with FVAP and Title 42, U.S.C.

1. The USAF made a change to Air Force Policy Directive (AFPD) 36-31 which effects the requirement for an Installation Voting Assistance Office (IVAO) in the Military and Overseas Voter Empowerment (MOVE) Act, establishing the office as a voter registration agency within the installation headquarters organization reporting directly to the installation commander
2. USAF moved ahead quickly with changes to the AF Voting Action Plan in December of 2009, implementing various requirements of the MOVE Act prior to OSD and FVAP releasing any guidance (i.e., service requirements for moving members and deployers immediately implemented).
3. USAF implemented the "Core Unit Voting Assistance Officer (UVAO)" position which is authorized by the installation commander's appointment letter for the IVAO. IVAO are given the authority to appoint up to four Core UVAOs to assist in the manning and workload of the IVAO, which remains an unfunded mandate to date. Special training is required for IVAO and Core UVAO positions.
4. USAF produced an "IVAO Handbook" supplement to the "FVAP IVAO Handbook" on 30 Aug 2010. To date, seven versions have been published. In May 2013, the Handbook contents are being incorporated into the AF Voting Action Plan so that IVAOs and other IVA Office workers have a single document for the execution of the AF Voting Assistance Program.
5. USAF established an effective communication dissemination system from Service Voting Action Officer (SVAO) to IVAO to UVAO to all Squadron members and their voting age family members. Any voting news items generated by FVAP were immediately passed on to voters through this streamlined network.
6. USAF IVAOs are required to be clearly marked and advertised on base, giving voters a visible office; and UVAOs were not forgotten. 85 percent of voting assistance during the past quarter was done at the unit level by UVAOs.
7. USAF SVAO scripted a Public Service Announcement which the USAF Chief of Staff released in January 2012, encouraging military members, DOD civilians and their families to vote.
8. USAF SVAO implemented a new Staff Assistance Visit (inspection) requirement for IVAOs to perform on all assigned UVAOs between Feb and March of every even-numbered year.
9. IVAOs are instructed to partner with military and civilian personnel offices to have the IVAO included on in/out-processing checklists for Permanent Change of Station (PCS) and deployment processing as well as for address changes.
10. USAF maintains an online website that allows IVAOs and UVAOs to access all current documents and guidance; search for and submit "best practice" documents; and communicate via the forum.
11. USAF IVAOs are encouraged to work with local election officials (LEOs) during biannual Armed Forces Voters Week and Absentee Voters Week events to invite the LEOs on base to assist in the booth for local voters.
12. USAF IVAOs are provided an intuitive, stand-alone, forms-based "IVAO's Database" for easy management of UVAO manning and training requirements as well as documenting UVAO "due-outs" (tasks), voters week plans and after action reports. Reports are generated at the push of a single button.
13. The USAF Voting Action Plan provides IVAOs and UVAOs multiple tools to use in the execution of their voting assistance duties. These include instructions for ordering forms, posters, and banners online at no cost to their units; template voting assistance information forms; and a biannual chronological sequence of events.
14. Various other measures were taken following the passing of the MOVE Act: (a) IVAO voicemail and email is answered within 48 hours (24 hours if within 60 days of a Federal election); and (b) USAF SVAO hosted a webinar to train IVAOs on establishing and running IVA Offices (three webinars done to ensure time zones around the world were supported).

OPERATIONAL TEMPO OVERSIGHT

126. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, what is your assessment of the Air Force's operational tempo (OPTEMPO) reporting, and how well are we meeting our OPTEMPO requirements to reduce stress on our servicemembers and their families?

Mr. DONLEY. OPTEMPO for an individual away from home on an operational deployment is managed by unit commanders and tracked through the individual's electronic personnel records. In turn, this information is transferred to the Defense Manpower Data Center in accordance with DODI 1336.07, Reporting of Personnel tempo events. We believe this process provides an accurate record for reporting.

Due to the number of operations and locations the Air Force is currently supporting, we have not seen a significant reduction in requirements. We are, however, working closely with Air Force component staffs to reduce deployed footprint and leverage reach back capability.

LANGUAGE AND CULTURE TRAINING

127. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, military members with language and culture training are essential to a U.S. global force. The NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013 authorized the Secretary of Defense to transform the National Language Service Corps (NLSC) from a pilot program to a permanent program, and also to enhance the ability of our Federal agencies to hire people with strategic foreign language skills and as National Security Education Program (NSEP) awardees. What are the goals of the Air Force with respect to the capabilities represented by the NLSC?

Mr. DONLEY. The purpose of the NLSC is to have a pool of language-capable individuals available to support sudden and short-term requirements. The NLSC construct is not currently used to support the type of exercises and operations conducted by the Air Force. Rather, the Air Force meets its language needs by deliberately developing individuals to meet its requirements. The Air Force intends to encourage separating and retiring airmen who have existing language skills to join the NLSC.

MARKETING AND ADVERTISING

128. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, one effect of sequestration was that the Services quickly moved to end advertising, marketing, and outreach programs that have been used to aid in recruiting. What is your assessment of the value of funding these programs, and the projected impact to recruiting if these programs are not funded?

Mr. DONLEY. The Air Force advertising, marketing and outreach programs are a critical component to our mission—to attract the best and brightest youth of America. Reduced funding for these programs will jeopardize the Air Force's ability to meet career field and DOD quality requirements. Even though the Air Force has greatly benefited from historic highs in the quality of accessions in recent years, initial indicators are signaling a potential shrinking market for high quality recruits per Joint Advertising Market Research and Studies "State of the Recruiting Market," briefing April 2013. That same study indicates that 47 percent of new recruits were undecided about a career path and were influenced within a year of joining the Service. The Air Force must continue to strategically advertise, market, and maintain outreach programs to target the highest quality recruits and to convert applicants that are less likely to serve.

INTEGRATED ELECTRONIC HEALTH RECORD

129. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, DOD and VA have been working on an integrated electronic health record (EHR) for a number of years with very little progress being made towards a truly seamless transition of health information between the two Departments. In January 2013, VA decided to use VistA, its legacy system, as its core health record despite the findings of a recent study commissioned by the VA that identified many VistA deficiencies. We've been told that DOD has been evaluating existing solutions to determine the appropriate core health record to use. Has DOD coordinated its proposed EHR program with the Air Force?

Mr. DONLEY. We fully support the Secretary of Defense's decision to proceed with a Request for Proposals for a core Electronic Health Record for DOD that will enable full interoperability between DOD and VA health care. The Air Force Surgeon General's Chief Medical Information Officer has been involved in the AOA between VistA and other commercial electronic health records. Additionally, the Air Force

Deputy Surgeon General has been a regular participant in DOD and Veterans' Affairs meetings regarding validation of requirements and evaluation of solutions. The Surgeon General has kept me appropriately updated.

130. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, how much will it cost for the Air Force to field a new EHR?

Mr. DONLEY. DOD's electronic health record cost estimates must be redetermined under the acquisition strategy directed by the Secretary of Defense. Prior cost estimates were based on a previous DOD and Veteran Affairs' strategy that was determined by both Departments to be infeasible.

131. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, what impact do you anticipate for Air Force medical readiness?

Mr. DONLEY. With a new electronic health record, data and documentation pertaining to individual medical readiness will be better integrated into clinical processes, enhancing our ability to provide timely health measures to sustain readiness, forecast deterioration in health status earlier, and proactively restore the health of the servicemembers under our care.

132. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, do you believe the EHR must be deployable?

Mr. DONLEY. In the initial capability document approved by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council, the electronic health record should be deployable in Theater and support the mobility requirements for enroute care. The solution would eliminate the need for three separate theater electronic health record solutions and enhance continuity of care, even in "low-communication/no-communication" environments.

133. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, what input has the Air Force had on the EHR program?

Mr. DONLEY. The Air Force Surgeon General's Chief Medical Information Officer has been involved in the AOA between VistA and other commercial electronic health records. Additionally, the Air Force Deputy Surgeon General has been a regular participant in DOD and Veterans' Affairs meetings regarding validation of requirements and evaluation of solutions. The Air Force Medical Service and Air Force Communications communities have provided more than 100 clinical subject matter experts for the functional and technical requirements process.

BENEFITS FOR SAME-SEX PARTNERS

134. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, recently, former Secretary of Defense Panetta announced that DOD will expand benefits to unmarried same-sex domestic partners who declare a committed relationship, but will not extend those same benefits to unmarried heterosexual domestic partners. Do you agree with former Secretary Panetta that when it comes to benefits paid for by hard-working American taxpayers, that DOD should favor same-sex domestic partners over heterosexual partners?

Mr. DONLEY. As a result of the June 26, 2013 Supreme Court ruling on the Defense of Marriage Act, the Air Force is working with OSD to extend health care and other benefits to same-sex spouses of military members as quickly as possible.

135. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, was the Air Force consulted to determine the cost impact of extending these benefits to same sex partners?

Mr. DONLEY. Benefit subject-matter experts were consulted during the OSD-led Joint Benefits Review working group. The Air Force provided input via this working group and various other senior leader briefings and discussions leading up to the announcement of benefits extension. From a fiscal perspective, the benefits that are being extended are of negligible cost. Some are cost neutral and self-sustaining such as Morale, Welfare and Recreation Programs, and commissary and exchange privileges.

TOTAL FORCE MIX

136. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, in his hearing testimony, General Dempsey said that DOD needs flexibility to keep the force in balance and, that everything must be on the table, including the mix among Active, Reserve, and National Guard units. In view of the heavy wartime demand on the forces, including the Reserve

and Guard, what do you envision as a viable option to change that force mix for the Air Force?

General WELSH. For the Total Force Air Force, numerous options are on the table. To preserve the capability and capacity to win our Nation's wars, enhance readiness, and modernize our warfighting capability, the Air Force must have the flexibility to balance between all three components—Active, Guard, and Reserve. In today's fiscal environment, this is a daunting challenge, and the leaders of all three components are fully engaged to meet this challenge.

All three components are working diligently to appropriately size the Total Force Air Force mix to meet the demands of the Defense Strategic Guidance, geopolitical environment, and combatant commander requirements. The Air Force uses Force Composition Analysis (FCA) to provide senior leaders a range of force mix options, providing insight into the optimum active component/reserve component (AC/RC) mixes for various scenarios. FCAs are an enterprise-level analysis of a given weapon system or career field. These FCAs examine mission feasibility across a range of force mix options, based upon the associated outputs, costs, benefits and risks. The force mix in a specific mission area normally favors the AC when: (1) deployment must occur rapidly, or in a very short period of time, (2) steady-state demand requires rotational forces exceeding current policy, or (3) permanent (non-rotational) overseas presence is high. On the other hand, the force mix in a specific mission area normally favors the RC when: (1) deployments occur at a pace that allows the RC time to mobilize the force (normally 72 hours after notification), (2) anticipated steady-state and/or forward presence requirements do not exceed deploy-to-dwell policy, or (3) cost savings and retaining capability/capacity are sought by moving force structure to the RC.

MILITARY COMPENSATION

137. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, our Nation's historical experience of pursuing cost savings by cutting military compensation has demonstrated that periods of designed reduction in overall compensation levels resulted in retention problems. Those retention problems, especially in the context of generally improving civilian employment opportunities, meant Congress was required to come back and authorize catch-up increases to help us keep the highly trained talents and skills that we need. What is your assessment of the impact of the President's proposed slowdown in military compensation on retention and recruiting in your Service?

Mr. DONLEY. At this time, the Air Force does not foresee significant challenges to our recruiting and retention efforts as a result of the proposed slowdown in military compensation. Our Force Management program is a tailored multi-year strategy focused on sizing and shaping the total force with the right balance of skills to meet current and emerging joint mission demands. The Air Force's strategy over the past few years has been aggressive, allowing us to meet congressionally mandated end strength requirements and maintain a high quality force by leveraging voluntary programs first, offering incentive programs where needed, and implementing involuntary actions when required. Due to the expected improvements in the economy and the importance our airmen place on overall compensation, our recruiting and retention will be increasingly challenged, particularly as the Air Force addresses the need for its highly technically-skilled force. These compensation challenges may require increased recruiting and retention incentives for our future force.

FAMILY SUPPORT PROGRAMS

138. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, General Dempsey testified that unsustainable costs and smaller budgets require DOD to examine every warrior and family support program to make sure we are getting the best return on our investment. How do you assess the investments our Nation has already made in family support programs, and suicide prevention in particular, in moving the needle with demonstrable positive return on investment?

Mr. DONLEY. We have multiple forums that enable us to monitor the delivery of family support programs. Within our Airman and Family Readiness Centers, we have a very robust computer management system that provides us with real time data for our supported populations—service codes are used to record the type of support sought (e.g., financial management) and the system allows the provider to make notations of the visits. Additionally, the Air Force conducts biennial Community Assessments, through the Air Force Surgeon General, that provide valuable data on our ability to meet individual needs, and also collects information regarding

behaviors that may place an individual at risk. Further, the Air Force Community Action Information Board (CAIB), convened at the installations, major commands, and Headquarters Air Force, identifies community issues to emphasize the importance of taking care of airmen and their families. Since 1996, the CAIB process has focused extensively on monitoring, managing, and implementing suicide prevention best practices for use by commanders. Additionally, the CAIB provides detailed actions and discussions on sexual assault prevention, child and family maltreatment issues, and resilience. A significant outcome from the CAIB process has been the development and implementation of the Comprehensive Airman Fitness concept that concentrates exclusively on developing our airmen and families to become more resilient and better prepared to meet the unique challenges of military service.

TUITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

139. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley, I am pleased to learn that DOD has now reinstated the TAP, previously cancelled by the Army, Marine Corps, and Air Force, in response to the administration's failure to plan for sequestration. How does TAP enable your Active Duty Forces to meet the professional development requirements described by General Dempsey to establish the Profession of Arms as the foundation for the Joint Force?

Mr. DONLEY. Military tuition assistance provides the financial means for our airmen to pursue higher education. In turn, higher education provides the educational background crucial in developing the critical thinking skills needed for practitioners of the profession of arms. This means our airmen are more able to work in the dynamic climate of today's conflicts. Additionally, higher education allows airmen to develop the critical ability to make connections between seemingly unrelated events or information and develop holistic solutions quickly and accurately. Military tuition assistance will continue to be integral to the recruiting, retention and readiness of our airmen. However, competing funding requirements will necessitate changes in fiscal year 2014 and beyond to ensure the financial health of the program.

SUICIDE PREVENTION

140. Senator INHOFE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, our force is exceptionally well-trained on suicide awareness and prevention, and yet we still experience the tragedy of suicide at an unacceptably high rate. What is your assessment on whether the current level of training and leadership engagement is sufficient or whether it has inadvertently created a climate in which some vulnerable individuals may have contemplated suicide because we talk about it so much?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The current level of training on suicide prevention and leadership engagement in the Air Force is appropriate and the Air Force has been proactive in managing its messages regarding suicide.

The Air Force has maintained emphasis in training and messaging on elements of resilience and the importance of seeking help early. Our leadership training cautions against dramatizing suicide. The AF Suicide Prevention program (AFSPP) is an effective evidenced-based, leader-led, community program that relies on 11 overlapping elements. The core of these elements is leadership involvement.

Enhancements were made to the AFSPP as part of the Air Force response to the 2010 Suicide Task Force and the RAND reports. One of the most critical enhancements was the development of a strategic communication plan to promote responsible reporting of deaths by suicide, encouraging help-seeking behaviors among all airmen, and removing barriers to seeking care. This was done to ensure that in our efforts to prevent suicide, the Air Force was not inadvertently promoting suicide. The culmination of these efforts was the development of the Air Force Public Affairs Guidance (PAG) on Suicide Prevention that is consistent with the World Health Organization media guidelines and the OSD Public Affairs media guidance. The Air Force also supports the joint VA/DOD Military Crisis line campaign.

In addition, the Air Force has ensured that this message emphasizing the importance of seeking help early is reflected in suicide prevention training courses and has worked hard to balance the amount of suicide prevention training. Current training includes annual suicide prevention training for all airmen, focusing on identifying risk factors and warning signs how to intervene using the Ask, Care, Escort (ACE) model. Supervisors of personnel in at-risk career fields receive a one-time 4-hour training session to supplement their supervisory skills with knowledge of resources and referral procedures. Leaders receive training within professional military education courses with suicide prevention messaging and information appropriate to their level of responsibility. As a result, we have achieved a balance that

ensures leadership is engaged and all airmen understand their responsibility to look out for one another, identify warning signs, and seek help.

C-27 TRANSFER

141. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, what is the status of the transfer of 25 C-27 aircraft currently possessed by the Air Force?

General WELSH. The Air Force has purchased 21 C-27J aircraft, of which we currently possess 16. The remaining five aircraft are in various stages of production, all anticipated to be delivered to the Air Force by the end of calendar year 2013.

Currently, DOD is determining: (1) the number of C-27Js that are excess to DOD needs, and (2) the appropriate transfer priorities, in light of existing DOD policy regarding the disposition of excess defense materiel and the fiscal year 2013 Appropriations and Authorization Act requirements. Interested agencies will be notified this summer regarding allocation plans. In the end, the Air Force intends to transfer these aircraft to a new owner(s), or induct them into long-term storage at the Aerospace Maintenance and Regeneration Group G) by the end of this fiscal year.

142. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, is the Air Force factoring in the gaining agency's ability to operate and sustain the aircraft as part of its transfer decision criteria?

General WELSH. No, the excess aircraft disposition procedures outlined in the Defense Materiel Disposition Manual (DOD 4160.21M Chapter 4) do not contain such criteria. Transfer is based on the priority for allocation of the requesting agency. The Air Force has shared with the agencies who have expressed interest in receiving C-27J aircraft our historical operations and sustainment costs in order to help them build their transitions plans to accept aircraft. The Air Force will coordinate the transfer of C-27J aircraft with each gaining organization, but the ability to operate and sustain the aircraft, post-transfer, is the concern of the gaining organizations.

143. Senator INHOFE. General Welsh, is the Air Force considering transferring all 25 C-27s to one agency to minimize cost of operating and maintaining these aircraft?

General WELSH. The Air Force has purchased 21 C-27J aircraft, not 25. Excess aircraft disposition procedures outlined in the Defense Materiel Disposition Manual (DOD 4160.21M Chapter 4) do not contain such criteria. Transfer is based solely on the priority for allocation of the requesting agency. Aircraft may be transferred to other agencies after the Secretary of Defense declares them excess to DOD needs. Section 1091 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013 outlines the parameters for these transfers to include the number of aircraft a non-DOD organization (in this case, U.S. Forest Service and U.S. Coast Guard, with first priority given to the Forest Service) can receive.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

C-27J

144. Senator MCCAIN. Secretary Donley, as the Air Force implements the C-27J divestiture, what is the current status of the screening procedure outlined in DOD 4160.21-M, Defense Materiel Disposition Manual, as amended by section 1091 of the NDAA for Fiscal Year 2013?

Mr. DONLEY. Currently DOD is determining the number of aircraft that are excess to its needs and the appropriate transfer priorities in light of existing DOD policy regarding the disposition of excess defense materiel and the fiscal year 2013 Appropriations and Authorization Acts. Interested agencies will be notified this summer regarding allocation plans.

145. Senator MCCAIN. Secretary Donley, have any C-27J been identified for allocation to: (1) another military Service; (2) another DOD agency; (3) the Forest Service; (4) the U.S. Coast Guard; (5) Federal/State law enforcement (per the NDAA for fiscal year 1997, section 1033); (6) security assistance needs; or (7) other Federal civil agencies through the General Services Administration?

Mr. DONLEY. No, not yet. Currently DOD is determining the number of aircraft that are excess to its needs and the appropriate transfer priorities in light of existing DOD policy regarding the disposition of excess defense materiel and the fiscal

year 2013 Appropriations and Authorization Acts. Interested agencies will be notified this summer regarding allocation plans.

146. Senator MCCAIN. Secretary Donley, what number of aircraft has been requested by the Forest Service or the Coast Guard at this time?

Mr. DONLEY. The Secretary of Agriculture has requested seven aircraft for the U.S. Forest Service. The Secretary of Homeland Security has requested 21 aircraft for the Coast Guard, but will accept no fewer than 14 aircraft. The Coast Guard has stated that their analysis shows that they need a minimum of 14 aircraft to make a C-27J program cost-effective.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR ROGER F. WICKER

GLOBAL HAWK SYSTEM

147. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, how much money has been invested in sustaining and modernizing the U-2 fleet over the past 5 years? Please include all sources of funding, including appropriations and reprogramming, both above and below threshold.

General WELSH. The investment in sustaining and modernizing the U-2 fleet over the last 5 years is in the table below:

| | Fiscal Year | | | | | Total 5 Years |
|---------------------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|
| | 2008 | 2009 | 2010 | 2011 | 2012 | |
| Operating Costs (No Mods) BY | \$513,546,387 | \$543,238,188 | \$513,804,668 | \$534,965,623 | \$555,256,038 | \$2,660,810,904 |
| Mod Cost | 31,192,000 | 61,360,000 | 34,452,000 | 138,340,000 | 61,257,801 | 326,601,801 |
| Operational cost w/ Mods | \$544,738,387 | \$604,598,188 | \$548,256,668 | \$673,305,623 | \$616,513,839 | \$2,987,412,705 |

\$57.4 million in fiscal year 2011 procurement was invested for capability enhancements supporting combatant commander urgent operational needs, not modernization costs incurred fixing aging equipment, or solving diminishing manufacturing sources and vanishing vendor item issues.

148. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, how much funding is needed to support the U-2 until 2040? Please include all anticipated sustainment and modernization costs. Please include all costs, including pilot training, special pilot food, special food development, chase cars, aircraft upgrades, infrastructure improvements, etc.

General WELSH. Total U-2 funding for the next 27 years (2040) is approximately \$16 billion, or about \$600 million per year in today's dollars.

149. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, if the Global Hawk could carry every sensor carried by the U-2, would there be a need to retain the U-2?

General WELSH. Yes. The Air Force's assessment of U-2 sensor superiority is based on a number of factors. The U-2 aircraft maintains a substantial advantage in size, weight, and power, allowing for heavier payloads and more electrical power to enable a wider range of mission systems. Additionally, the U-2's operational altitude extends the maximum range of its imagery and signals intelligence sensors beyond the Global Hawk, enabling the U-2 to operate at increased standoff range. Finally, the U-2's highly capable defensive system and anti-jam data links permit the U-2 to operate more effectively in contested environments, which are increasingly prevalent in potential combat theaters.

A review of current Global Hawk Block 30 performance highlights the impact of previously assessed limitations. The Global Hawk does not have an effective capability to operate in areas of known or forecast thunderstorms or icing conditions, resulting in significant mission impact. Further, the lack of an effective capability to sense and avoid air traffic continues to drive a requirement to mitigate risk by employing other airborne assets in an overwatch role in selected AORs.

The Air Force's decision to retain the U-2 also considers future applications consistent with Defense Strategic Guidance. Operations in contested environments require ISR weapon systems able to stand off at greater distances from contested boundaries and yet still collect against targets well inside the adversary's border. This mission demands ISR platforms with defensive systems to maintain an effective presence as tensions rise and then protect the aircraft from attempts to disrupt

or defeat navigation systems and data links. In our assessment, a technical solution allowing U-2 sensors to be carried by Global Hawk still does not resolve the capability gap between platforms and thus the Air Force's intent is to retain the U-2.

150. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, how much funding could be saved over the next 20 years by retiring the U-2 in fiscal year 2014?

General WELSH. Air Force long-range plans provide approximately \$13 billion funding for U-2 sustainment and operations over the next 20 years. However, divesting the U-2 in 2014 would create a significant operational and sensor capability gap. Transitioning those capabilities to another platform would require significant additional investment and time. In fact, no other current platform can match the altitude and weather capabilities of the U-2. In the current resource environment, continued investment in RQ-4 Global Hawk Block 30 operations is unaffordable given the lower total cost and proven sensor capabilities of the U-2 fleet. The most economical choice is represented in the President's fiscal year 2014 budget.

151. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, please provide the average age and remaining service life of the Global Hawk fleet and the U-2 fleet.

General WELSH. The average age of the Global Hawk fleet is 2.7 years. The best means to measure service life is in flight hours. The flight hour average of the Global Hawk fleet is 1,193 hours. The certified service life for Global Hawk is 40,000 flight hours. The fleet average of 1,193 represents 3 percent of certified service life.

The average age of the U-2 fleet is 31 years. The flight hour average of the U-2 fleet is 12,677 hours. The certified service life for the U-2 is 75,000 flight hours. The fleet average of 12,677 hours represents 16.9 percent of certified service life.

152. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, please provide the: (1) total number of U-2 aircraft; (2) number of deployable U-2 aircraft; (3) number of currently deployed U-2 aircraft; (4) number of U-2 aircraft dedicated solely for training; and (5) type and number of all U-2 sensors and their current locations.

General WELSH. (1) There are a total of 32 U-2 aircraft; (2) number of deployable aircraft is 27 U-2 model aircraft with three U-2s in depot at any given point in time; (3) there are 12 U-2 model aircraft currently deployed; (4) we have five two-seat TU-2 trainers dedicated solely for training; and (5) the types and numbers of U-2 sensors are classified and will be provided under separate cover (and will include locations).

153. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, please provide the cost of an hour on station (over target, collecting data, not training or transiting) for both the Global Hawk and the U-2 aircraft. Please consider all costs for both systems.

General WELSH. The fiscal year 2012 (last full year) cost per hour on-station (over target, collecting data, not training) or transiting for Global Hawk is \$68,234. The on-station cost for U-2 is \$73,206. Because the two systems have been operated in different ways, these comparisons depend on multiple complex assumptions and will vary from year to year.

154. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, please provide a thorough accounting of all missions flown by the Global Hawk fleet over the past 24 months, including hours flown, types of missions, quantification of data collected (type and quantity of intelligence data), and locations of operations. Please provide similar data for the U-2 fleet. A classified response is acceptable, but please provide an unclassified overview as well.

General WELSH. Due to the sensitive nature of the missions and complexity of the data requested we would be unable to provide an unclassified overview. We will provide information that addresses the request within 60 days.

155. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, how much has been invested in the Global Hawk enterprise to date? How much specifically for the Blocks 20, 30, and 40 aircraft?

General WELSH. The total baseline funding for the Global Hawk program through fiscal year 2013 is \$10,733.5 million. The \$10,733.5 million is broken down as: Research Development Test & Evaluation: \$3,257.1 million; Procurement, \$5,116.4 million; Military Personnel, \$482.8 million; Military Construction, \$122.9 million; and Operations and Maintenance: \$1,754.2 million. Funding cannot be broken out by specific Blocks. Funding is based on the December 31, 2012 RQ-4, Global Hawk Selected Acquisition Report. The funding for RDT&E does not include MP-RTIP and Airborne Sense and Avoid (ABSAA) costs, nor does it include fiscal year 2013 President's budget congressional adds, rescissions, and sequestration reductions.

156. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, the Air Force Global Hawk is planned to be based jointly with the Navy Triton program. Presumably basing costs will be shared between both systems. Please provide an accounting for how basing costs are distributed between these systems and what costs would be shifted to the Navy program if the Air Force program were to go away.

General WELSH. The Navy elected to base the MQ-4C Triton at Point Mugu Naval Air Station, California. The change in strategy was based on the fiscal year 2013 President's budget proposal to divest the Global Hawk (GH) Block 30 fleet. Consequently, basing costs are not shared between the two programs. However, the Navy continues to leverage lessons learned from the GH program to incorporate system improvements and establish a system support infrastructure. The Air Force and the Navy will continue to develop joint synergy opportunities that will lead to reduced operations costs over the life cycle of the GH and Triton programs.

157. Senator WICKER. General Welsh, I understand the Global Hawk Block 40 system will be deployed to U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) in May to provide ground-moving target-indicator support to deployed forces. I applaud the decision to deploy the Block 40 system to support the troops and hope the deployment will demonstrate the value of this uniquely capable system. I hope the Air Force is doing everything necessary to ensure the deployment is well supported and postured for success. Please provide a list of key deployment milestones and a detailed assessment of the resources necessary to facilitate a successful deployment.

General WELSH. The Air Force is postured to respond quickly to a decision to deploy the Block 40 capability. Once a fielding recommendation has been made, there are a number of factors that CENTCOM will consider before a deployment decision is finalized. Key pre-deployment milestones include:

- Mid-July: AFOTEC delivers final operational utility evaluation report describing the effectiveness, suitability, and mission capability of the system to the Commander, Air Combat Command (ACC) who will determine the final fielding recommendation
- End of July: CENTCOM provides ACC deployment decision for Global Hawk Blk 40
- Subject to Commander ACC recommendation and CENTCOM approval, a deployment is possible within weeks

GLOBAL STRIKE COMMAND

158. Senator WICKER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, I understand you are considering a Common Support Helicopter to recap your UH-1N fleet of aircraft. I believe there are existing and affordable replacement systems available to meet Global Strike Command's nuclear missile security mission during the decades to come. Please provide the current requirements for all current UH-1N missions.

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The Air Force's UH-1N is flown by five major commands, which include multiple mission sets: Air Force Global Strike Command's ICBM helicopter security support, the Air Force District of Washington's National Capital Region Mass Passenger Transport, Pacific Air Forces' Operational Support Airlift, Air Education and Training Command's Air Force Survival School, and Air Force Materiel Command's flight test support.

The current requirements for the various missions of the UH-1N are documented in the Joint Requirements Oversight Council's approved Common Vertical Lift Support Platform (CVLSP) Capability Development Document. Although these requirements are no longer tied to a specific acquisition program (i.e., the CVLSP), the requirements for the UH-1N mission set remain valid.

159. Senator WICKER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, could you tell me whether the Air Force requirements have been reviewed and validated since these missions were separated from the Combat Rescue Helicopter program?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The current requirements for the various missions of the UH-1N are documented in the Joint Requirements Oversight Council's approved CVLSP capability development document. Although these requirements are no longer tied to a specific acquisition program (i.e., the CVLSP), the requirements for the UH-1N mission set remain valid.

Air Force Global Strike Command will continue to sustain the existing UH-1N fleet for the foreseeable future, and look for opportunities to acquire excess aircraft from other DOD organizations at low or no cost to the Air Force.

160. Senator WICKER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, please provide the findings and recommendations of the Air Force's Request for Information (RFI) on UH-1N modernization with regard to the costs of UH-1N modification versus replacement cost.

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. In the case of the UH-1N, as stated in the original Request for Information, "in terms of mission capability rates the UH-1 remains one of the most reliable platforms within the U.S. Air Force inventory." The purpose of the Air Force's RFI on UH-1N Modernization was to determine the feasibility of sustaining and making modest modernization enhancements to the platform via low cost options. The Industry Day presentations reaffirmed that the robust helicopter industry and the large number of UH-1's operating globally will enable the Air Force to effectively sustain the UH-1N until such a time that it can be replaced with an aircraft that provides all required capabilities.

161. Senator WICKER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, please provide the current operational availability of the UH-1N fleet and the Air Force assessment of any risk regarding the maintenance and adequate availability levels.

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The current UH-1N average aircraft availability for fiscal year 2013 is 73.7 percent, meeting the Air Force Global Strike Command-established standard of 73.7 percent. The future aircraft availability rate is projected to continue to meet or exceed the 73.7 percent requirement. We expect to maintain adequate readiness levels for the foreseeable future.

162. Senator WICKER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, please tell me whether the Air Force has evaluated potential replacement aircraft for any of the missions performed by the UH-1N.

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The CVLSP was cancelled due to cost considerations in this constrained economic environment after determination that the Air Force could assume manageable risk in this area. Air Force Global Strike Command is no longer pursuing a Combat Rescue Helicopter option to replace the UH-1N fleet for similar reasons. Instead, Air Force Global Strike Command will continue to sustain the existing UH-1N fleet for the foreseeable future, and look for opportunities to acquire excess aircraft from other DOD organizations at low/no cost to the Air Force.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR KELLY AYOTTE

F-35 JOINT STRIKE FIGHTER PROGRAM

163. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, why is the F-35 one of your top acquisition programs?

General WELSH. It is a fundamental truth of the modern battlefield that to win the fight, you must "own the skies." This means protecting your own forces, while also holding the adversaries' dearest targets at risk. This is a hard lesson learned during World War II, Korea, and Vietnam, and used to our advantage in Operations Desert Storm, Allied Force, Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom. Without it, our troops in combat, whether in the air, on the ground, or on the seas, are put at undue risk, and our chances of ultimately achieving victory are diminished. "Owning the skies" is difficult to achieve, and requires vigilance in maintaining this advantage through continued investment and development in more capable aircraft, weapons and mission systems. This is more than something simply tasked as requirement within the Defense Planning Guidance, it is something our joint warfighter expects from their Air Force.

Our potential adversaries know this truth as well, and continue to seek ways to prevent us from achieving it. Applying lessons from our previous conflicts, they are investing in advanced technology for their planes, weapons, and air defense systems that rival our own capabilities and in some cases surpass them. We are also faced with operating a fighter fleet that is smaller and older than in any time in our Services' entire history. With the threat getting more capable, and our own fleet at its oldest and smallest, the challenges to our ability to control the skies in any future conflict continue to grow.

This is why the F-35 is one of our top acquisition programs. We are investing in a fifth generation fighter that ensures we field a fleet that supports the mission essential requirement to "own the skies." Fifth generation fighters like the F-35 have the capabilities needed to achieve unmatched levels of survivability and lethality required to maintain our air advantage against the most challenging threats. These capabilities include improved stealth, high maneuverability, ad-

vanced electronic attack and protection, fused sensors for enhanced situational awareness, advanced precision weapons, and multi-role capability. Together, they provide our airmen the best tools available to ensure they never have to face a “fair fight in the sky” against any future adversary, and will continue to own the skies in the mission to support and protect the joint warfighter.

164. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, what advantages does a fifth generation fighter like the F-35 provide over a fourth generation aircraft?

General WELSH. Our potential adversaries are continuing to develop and field systems to challenge our ability to “control the skies”. We are seeing planes being developed and fielded that are as good as, or better than, our legacy fleet, with improved speed and agility, equipped with the latest and most advanced radars, avionics, and electronic jamming, employing highly advanced and lethal air-to-air weapons, and levels of signature reduction never seen before anywhere outside the United States. We are seeing the proliferation worldwide of air defense systems with advanced early warning and target tracking radars that are digital and agile, with better protection against jamming. These advanced air defense systems are integrated into robust and networked command and control centers that can target and engage unprecedented numbers of targets at greater ranges. We are also seeing strategic and tactical surface-to-air missiles (SAMs) with increased range, maneuverability, target tracking capability and lethality. Ultimately, we are seeing these types of systems evolve in both complexity and capability, being sold worldwide, and being used together to form integrated air defense systems that challenge our air advantage.

While our legacy fleet, such as our F-16s, secured a generation of air advantage in previous conflicts, they now offer little margin in capability against the current high end threat, and will be severely challenged in future scenarios against these evolving threats. We are at the point where our conventional legacy aircraft risk both the forces they protect and our ability to secure victory. Our legacy fleet is also rapidly approaching the point where adding new capabilities will no longer guarantee success. These advanced threat environments require signature reduction (stealth) through proper design and materials to achieve required levels of survivability, which simply can’t be “added on” but must be inherently designed into the aircraft from the beginning.

While our legacy fourth generation fleet is unable to operate and survive in these high threat environments, they will remain a critical part of our inventory for many years, complementing our fifth generation fleet in reduced threat scenarios. Even these “reduced threat scenarios” need to honor advanced fourth generation threats currently being proliferated, thus requiring targeted investments to increase their lethality and survivability. This also means the Air Force is carefully choosing modernization efforts that maximize our cooperative capabilities between our fourth and fifth generation fleets in order to increase our ability to accomplish the mission.

165. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, in your prepared statement, you say that the “Nation will need them [F-35s] in quantity.” What is the current Air Force requirement for the F-35?

General WELSH. The Air Force is planning to purchase 1,763 F-35As to meet our Defense Planning Guidance directed requirements for Air Superiority and Global Precision Attack.

166. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, what influence will an increased ramp rate in the coming years have on unit cost?

General WELSH. In general, increased production rate will lower the unit cost of the F-35A. For the contract awarded in fiscal year 2011, the Air Force is buying 22 F-35A aircraft at an average unit recurring flyaway (URF) cost of \$120 million. For the contract scheduled to be awarded in fiscal year 2018, we plan to buy 60 F-35A aircraft at an average URF cost of \$85 million.

IMPACT OF SEQUESTRATION/BUDGET CUTS ON AIR FORCE READINESS

167. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, what are your leading readiness concerns?

General WELSH. The Air Force is the smallest it has been since its inception in 1947. A smaller force with less capacity requires greater attention to ensuring fully adequate personnel levels, availability of aircraft, and training to support the full range of mission requirements. These factors become more critical because shortages in aircraft availability or key personnel will have a larger effect on the overall readiness of the force. With a smaller force, including all Active, Guard, and Reserve ele-

ments, there is less marginal capacity to meet operational needs. The total force must be more ready to meet near-term contingencies, including those that may involve contested operational environments.

Over the past decade the ability of combat air forces to accomplish full-spectrum training has been hampered by operational commitments focused on very specific counter-insurgency missions and air-to-ground support. Training to establish and sustain air superiority and suppress air defenses has understandably received less emphasis. As we rebuild full-spectrum readiness, adding resources for more flying hours to support training must be matched with the resources for maintenance to ensure aircraft availability, and ranges to provide appropriate training venues. Additionally, the Air Force's operations tempo must be reduced to enable units sufficient time at home station to accomplish all required training.

Critical operations and maintenance activities currently being paid with OCO funding are especially problematic. Several funding lines for remotely piloted aircraft and other platforms should be retained as part of our future force, but are not yet part of our base budget. These activities must eventually migrate from OCO funding to an adjusted base budget. If the base budget is not adjusted, these capabilities will need to be retired or, alternatively, if incorporated without increasing the total budget, they will squeeze out other forces and capabilities.

Other threats to readiness include personnel and operational costs rising faster than the budget; savings from defense cuts not being adequately reapplied into readiness-related activities; and the inability to make or implement strategic choices, like reducing force structure or installations, that would help to consolidate resources and protect a quality force.

The Air Force must not be forced to resource some units for higher levels of readiness than others. Air Force skepticism of this approach is grounded in two strategic realities. First, we support several combatant command missions that require 24/7 support, including nuclear deterrence, various space operations such as missile warning, command, control and communications, and global positioning system operations. Cyber defense and intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance are also 24/7 missions that provide indications and warning of critical events and threats for our national leadership. Operational readiness for these units is a continuous requirement.

Second, the range, speed, and striking power of air forces make them among the most flexible, agile, and globally responsive elements of the joint force. In support of U.S. defense strategy, air forces are inherently capable of responding quickly and can be shifted on relatively short notice between critical theaters of operation. Intentionally posturing the Air Force for lower readiness and a long build-up to full combat effectiveness would negate an essential strategic advantage of airpower.

The Air Force must modernize its weapon systems. The average age of our fighter aircraft is now 23 years, rescue helicopters 22 years, training aircraft 25 years, bombers 37 years and tankers nearly 50 years. Satellites for missile warning, navigation, secure communications and other needs are also aging and replacements must be built and launched on a schedule consistent with the life expectancy of current constellations.

America's Air Force is the most capable in the world, but modernization can't wait. We have important production lines underway and development programs now maturing that are, or will soon be, ready for production. Cancelling programs to wait for a future generation of technology would be wasteful and, in many cases, would risk the loss of critical engineering talent.

America's Air Force must remain the most capable in the world; yet it is older than it should be and the need for modernization is growing while overall defense resources are diminishing.

168. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, what does the Air Force need most from Congress?

General WELSH. One of the most helpful things Congress can do is to return to regular order and to approve annual defense authorization and appropriations measures in a timely way. Throughout our history, this Nation has effectively dealt with strategic challenges and fiscal constraints, but our recent track record of repeated delay and uncertainty, Continuing Resolutions that disrupt programs and budget planning, and midyear cuts that impair readiness and threaten civilian fur-loughs must not become the new normal. We sincerely appreciate the ongoing commitment of this committee and its professional staff to return to regular order.

169. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, what have been the impacts of sequestration and budget uncertainty on readiness and training, so far?

General WELSH. Sequestration has forced the Air Force to make drastic reductions in readiness accounts. Flying hour reductions have forced some combat squadrons to cease flying operations while significantly reduced flying operations in other squadrons. The reductions in flying operations have further eroded already unacceptably low readiness levels.

Almost all of our mission-ready units are already tasked to Secretary of Defense-ordered missions or forward-based, so the ability of the Air Force to provide requisite numbers of ready forces for emergent requirements is severely limited and will continue to become more difficult the longer we operate under the conditions created by sequestration. The flying hour reductions due to sequestration have caused the Air Force to adjust unit flying rates to meet deployment timelines and ensure global operational commitments are filled within fiscal constraints. Additionally, flying units which provide advanced tactical training, including all of the Air Force's Aggressor squadrons have stood down. The Thunderbirds demonstration team was also forced to cancel all of its shows after March 1, 2013.

The reductions in weapons system sustainment funding due to sequestration, while not immediately felt by operational units, will impact units potentially for years to come as aircraft are unable to receive required depot maintenance in a timely manner, which will negatively impact unit readiness.

If the Air Force does not receive sufficient funding in fiscal year 2014, we may have to rotationally stand down units, or fly them at a reduced rate, similar to the actions we've taken in fiscal year 2013. This sequester-induced readiness posture will impact our ability to fill OPLAN and Secretary of Defense-ordered missions, as well as significantly erode our training and force development efforts, creating long-term readiness shortfalls.

Fixing Air Force readiness requires additional resourcing and reduced operations tempo to recover Air Force readiness levels. Along with additional funding, full depot workload recovery is expected to take 2 to 3 years. Increased funding would be required to recover deferred maintenance backlog as depot overhaul timelines would extend to accommodate additional aircraft inductions.

The Air Force can also provide a detailed assessment of unit readiness status in a classified forum as needed.

LONG-RANGE STRIKE BOMBER

170. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, in your posture statement, you stated that the LRS-B is one of the "Air Force's three top acquisition programs." Why is the LRS-B so important to the Air Force?

General WELSH. The LRS-B is crucial to the Air Force and joint forces because it will play a critical role in projecting power and deterring adversaries. The LRS-B's long range, payload, and survivability will provide the President with the option to hold targets at risk at any point on the globe, as well as provide operational flexibility for joint commanders.

Current bombers are increasingly at risk to modern air defenses, while the LRS-B will be able to penetrate modern air defenses to accomplish objectives despite adversary anti-access and area denial (A2/AD) measures. The LRS-B will provide broad geographic coverage (ability to operate deep and from long range) and will carry a wide mix of stand-off and direct-attack munitions for increased flexibility. Additionally, the LRS-B will be built with features and components necessary for the nuclear mission to ensure the nuclear certification effort completes within 2 years after IOC. The current bomber fleet will continue to provide a robust nuclear deterrent until LRS-B is fielded and certified.

The need for the LRS-B was reaffirmed in the Strategic Guidance for a 21st Century Defense as well as directed by the Secretary of Defense in January 2012 when he stated, "Accordingly, the U.S. military will invest as required to ensure its ability to operate effectively in anti-access and area denial environments. This will include developing a new stealth bomber."

171. Senator AYOTTE. General Welsh, in terms of our Nation's nuclear deterrent, what value does the bomber leg of the triad provide?

General WELSH. As recently demonstrated by the B-52 and B-2 flights to the Korean peninsula, bombers provide great flexibility in force posturing, signaling intentions and recall-ability. Additionally, these assets provide the President with the ability to hold at risk virtually any target on the globe. On a daily basis, this highly valuable, Air Force-unique capability, forces adversaries who consider threatening our national interests and those of our allies to confront the potential costs of losing what they hold most dear. Combined with the other two legs of the Triad, they com-

prise a robust deterrent capability that complicates a potential adversary's offensive and defensive planning and are a synergistic force that provides protection against the failure of any single leg of the Triad.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR DEB FISCHER

DE-ALERTING INTERCONTINENTAL BALLISTIC MISSILES

172. Senator FISCHER. General Welsh, some observers have suggested the Air Force de-alert its fleet of Minuteman III ICBMs and remove the warheads from the missiles. Does the Air Force have the capacity to store hundreds of warheads at its ICBM bases, or would such a policy require significant infrastructure changes?

General WELSH. No, the Air Force does not have the capacity to store hundreds of warheads at its ICBM bases without significant infrastructure changes. Due to limited storage facilities at the wing level, the warheads would have to be disassembled and transported to another storage facility located elsewhere for long-term storage.

173. Senator FISCHER. General Welsh, I understand that it requires a substantial amount of time to install a warhead on top of an ICBM and that, due to safety and security requirements, as well as limited maintenance crew availability, returning a de-alerted missile wing to alert status could take as long as 18 months. Is that correct?

General WELSH. Due to multiple operational variables involved, re-turning a de-alerted missile wing to alert status could take up to 36 months.

174. Senator FISCHER. General Welsh, separating warheads from missiles would appear to undermine the principle attribute provided by the ICBMs—their ability to instantly launch on the President's command. Do you agree?

General WELSH. Yes, the 2010 Nuclear Posture Review concluded that the current alert posture of U.S. strategic forces—heavy bombers off full-time alert, ICBMs on alert with “open-ocean targeting” and a significant number of SSBNs at sea at any given time should be maintained. As the most responsive leg of the Triad, ICBM alert forces underpin day-to-day stability and support America's leadership role in the international security environment. Nuclear alert forces also provide a highly visible commitment of assurance to support U.S. extended deterrence for our allies.

175. Senator FISCHER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, do you believe it is important that the President still have this responsive option?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Yes, nuclear alert forces underpin day-to-day stability and support America's leadership role in the international security environment. These forces are key elements of our national security policies of assurance, deterrence and dissuasion. They demonstrate visible U.S. commitments to maintaining strategic equivalency, deterring coercion and maintaining world order and their presence removes incentives for a first-strike by a potential aggressor while imposing a difficult and costly decision calculus on potential enemy planners.

CURRENT ARMS REDUCTIONS

176. Senator FISCHER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, as you note in your prepared statement, the United States will have to reduce its nuclear forces to comply with the New Strategic Arms Reduction Treaty (START). Do you believe it is important that the United States retain the ability to reconstitute its nuclear forces in the event of technological surprise or significant geopolitical change?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Yes, any course of action should preserve the capability to reconstitute nuclear forces, as a hedge against unexpected threats and geopolitical changes in our strategic security situation over the next 10–20 years.

177. Senator FISCHER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, would distributing any reductions in ICBM forces across the missile wings and keeping empty missile silos in warm status help preserve the ability of the ICBM force to resume its strength, if necessary?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Yes, keeping the silos warm would allow us to increase the number of deployed ICBMs if there was a need to do. Eliminating silos that are currently operational to achieve New START treaty limits would eliminate this option. The cost of eliminating a silo is more than keeping the silo “warm” but empty over time. Silo destruction carries a significant cost and is permanent.

178. Senator FISCHER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, are there are other benefits, such as in the maintenance of silos, which would be achieved by keeping empty Minuteman III silos in warm status?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Yes, keeping Minuteman III silos in warm status does have additional benefits. The Air Force plans on using any warm, non-deployed launchers to support ongoing test, evaluation, and sustainment operations. Additionally, the Air Force will allocate the nondeployed “warm” silos as necessary to support major maintenance at each unit creating an added benefit of spreading the workload on our maintenance forces.

READINESS OF NUCLEAR FORCES

179. Senator FISCHER. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, your prepared statement reads: “The Nation’s nuclear expertise must not be allowed to atrophy.” I understand that the readiness of our nuclear-capable bombers and ICBM forces have been largely preserved. How long can the Air Force protect our nuclear forces from the same readiness crisis building across its fleet?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. In the near-term, the Air Force has been successful at managing the impact of sequestration on nuclear deterrence operations—ensuring that our strategic forces remain safe, secure, and effective day-to-day. While challenging, we are confident in our ability to mitigate the remainder of the required reductions in fiscal year 2013 with negligible mission impacts. However, sequestration will put Minuteman III readiness in direct competition with modernization required to keep the capability viable beyond 2030. Beyond fiscal year 2013, the unknown effects of sequestration to the enterprise are cause for concern. Significant investment will be required within the Future Years Defense Program (FYDP) for propulsion, guidance, reentry vehicles and ground systems to continue providing a ground based leg of the triad. Over the FYDP, continued effects of sequestration will impact replacement of aging equipment used to maintain Minuteman III reentry vehicles and warheads, equipment used to periodically launch and test the Minuteman III weapon system to collect critical reliability and accuracy data, and equipment used to transport and protect reentry vehicles, warheads, guidance and booster stages. Since the risks of underinvestment are cumulative and have a compounding adverse effect on readiness over time, the magnitude of the impact will ultimately depend on the duration of the sequester.

Under sequestration, Air Force Global Strike Command has incurred a 10 percent reduction across its operations and maintenance accounts. While Air Force guidance implementing the reductions expressly prioritized flying hours directly supporting nuclear operations, the cuts are having tangible impacts elsewhere. Of particular note, the deferment of non-emergency facility, sustainment, maintenance, restoration, and modernization (FSRM) projects at missile alert/launch facilities, weapons storage areas, and aircraft hangars is exacerbating the existing backlog of critical capital improvements, raising safety and security risks that over time, may erode the ability of these facilities to meet mission requirements. Also, cancellation of most temporary duty assignments is limiting professional development within the nuclear career field. Additionally, the furlough of civilian employees is negatively impacting productivity and mission continuity. Should these and other sequestration-related impacts persist into future years, their combined effect will eventually lead to the deterioration of core readiness within our nuclear forces.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR MIKE LEE

F-35 PROGRAM

180. Senator LEE. General Welsh, as we recently discussed, the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) Record of Decision (ROD) for candidate bases to host the first operational wings of the Air Force F-35 was delayed again until this fall. The Air Force has stated, and you have assured me, that this delay will not have an effect on the scheduled delivery of these aircraft in 2015. I hope that this will be the last delay in the delivery of this decision, as we are shrinking the schedule margin for construction of facilities to house these aircraft when they are delivered to the wings. I believe the F-35 is of great importance to our national security; however, delays and cost-overruns continue to be a problem. A GAO report in March stated that the current outlook for the F-35 is improving, but long-term affordability remains a major concern. Have you identified places where the Air Force can improve efficiency and cut costs to increase the long-term affordability of this program?

General WELSH. The Air Force is proactively engaging with the JPO, OSD, and the Department of the Navy on multiple initiatives to improve efficiency and cut costs to increase the long-term affordability of the F-35 program.

Over the last couple years, the Air Force has supported the JPO on several affordability initiatives that have the potential to reduce program costs by a program office estimated \$2.3 billion (CY12\$). The Air Force will continue to partner with the JPO on these types of initiatives, to help make the aircraft more affordable.

The Air Force is also participating in the JPO-led BCA which is examining key sustainment functions such as supply chain management (SCM), sustaining engineering, fleet management, and field ops support to optimize contractor and organic mix. Analysis so far has found significant opportunities to reduce costs, while maintaining performance and mitigating risks. The final report is expected March 2014. Out of this study, the Air Force and Department of Navy have formed a Joint Organic SCM Team to develop potential options and an implementation proposal should the BCA recommend a full or partial organic solution.

The Air Force is also working with the Department of Navy on a Level of Repair Analysis. The purpose of this effort is to maximize cost effectiveness and fully exploit existing maintenance infrastructure by exploring potential to expand current F-35 program of record (2-level maintenance concept (operational/depot)) to include intermediate level.

Finally, the Air Force is participating in the development of the OSD McKinsey report. The goal of this project is to identify potential opportunities to reduce total F-35 operational and sustainment cost. Everything is on the table that contributes to generating F-35 sorties. The final report is expected September 2013.

181. Senator LEE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, are there any reasons for you to believe at this time that the arrival date for the first operational wings of F-35s will be delayed beyond 2015?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The Air Force is moderately confident, based on the F-35 JPO schedule, that F-35 aircraft will be delivered to the first operational wings on schedule.

Based on the current production profile, the forecasted delivery date of F-35A aircraft to the first operational site starts in 2015. These aircraft will be from low-rate initial production (LRIP) Lot 7. The baseline delivery dates will not be finalized until the LRIP 7 production contract is definitized. We expect that contract to be signed this summer.

PRESIDENT'S BUDGET AND READINESS

182. Senator LEE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, I am very worried about the Air Force's state of readiness under sequestration. Unfortunately, the President's proposed budget for the Air Force and DOD does not take sequestration into account for 2014, despite the fact that it is current law. Can you comment on how the Air Force is preparing for the real possibility of sequestration in fiscal year 2014 and beyond?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. Sequestration not only presents additional undue risk in our readiness posture, it also creates an unprecedented disruption to our planning process. While we remain hopeful that impacts of sequestration will be mitigated by legislative actions, we are engaged in planning efforts to best balance our ends, ways and means during this period of very intense fiscal uncertainty. The Air Force is employing a deliberative process to prioritize our ongoing and future initiatives and ensure a best effort at achieving full-spectrum readiness in a post-sequestration environment. We look forward to working with members of Congress to address any questions necessary to lead to a budget deal that eliminates sequestration and its damaging impacts. A return to regular order and timely enactment of appropriations and authorization bills will also help the Air Force to plan for whatever levels of resources are provided.

RELIGIOUS FREEDOM IN THE AIR FORCE

183. Senator LEE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, recent reports appeared in the media last week regarding religious freedom in the Air Force and DOD. I appreciate statements from DOD and Air Force representatives last week attempting to clarify these reports and stating that servicemembers can share their faith, or evangelize, but cannot proselytize, or force unwanted, intrusive attempts to convert others of faith or no faith to one's beliefs. My concern, however, is how the military is defining and drawing the line between evangelizing and proselytizing, and

communicating this to servicemembers. The First Amendment guarantees freedom of religion and freedom of speech. For many of our men and women in uniform, their faith is what sustains them through the enormous pressures and stresses of the battlefield, the months away from loved ones with little communication, the life-changing injuries, and the loss of close friends. If an environment is created where those servicemembers feel that expressing their religion, sharing their faith, or showing outward representation of their beliefs could be found in violation of military policy and grounds for reprimand, it will have an unsettlingly negative effect on military morale and undermine recruitment, retention, and cohesiveness efforts. Can you both describe how the Air Force defines the difference between evangelizing and proselytizing, and how these standards are communicated and explained to airmen?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The Air Force does not have a formal definition for “evangelizing” or “proselytizing.”

Standards regarding Government neutrality towards religion, free exercise of religion and religious accommodation are set out in AFI 1-1, Air Force Standards. AFI 1-1 was published on 7 August 2012. While the majority of AFIs are only available electronically on the Air Force e-Publishing website, CSAF directed that AFI 1-1 be made available both on-line and in a hardcopy booklet format. The booklet is referred to as “The Little Blue Book,” and is being distributed throughout the Air Force. A booklet is being provided to every uniformed airman, who can reference the booklet any time they have a question or concern. Collectively, commanders, first sergeants and judge advocates communicate the standards set out in AFI 1-1 to airmen assigned to their organization.

With regards to Government neutrality towards religion, AFI 1-1 states:

“Leaders at all levels must balance constitutional protections for an individual’s free exercise of religion or other personal beliefs and the constitutional prohibition against governmental establishment of religion. For example, they must avoid the actual or apparent use of their position to promote their personal religious beliefs to their subordinates or to extend preferential treatment for any religion. Commanders or supervisors who engage in such behavior may cause members to doubt their impartiality and objectivity. The potential result is a degradation of the unit’s morale, good order, and discipline. Airmen, especially commanders and supervisors, must ensure that in exercising their right of religious free expression, they do not degrade morale, good order, and discipline in the Air Force or degrade the trust and confidence that the public has in the U.S. Air Force.”

With regards to free exercise of religion and religious accommodation AFI 1-1 states:

“Supporting the right of free exercise of religion relates directly to the Air Force core values and the ability to maintain an effective team. All airmen are able to choose to practice their particular religion, or subscribe to no religious belief at all. You should confidently practice your own beliefs while respecting others whose viewpoints differ from your own. Your right to practice your religious beliefs does not excuse you from complying with directives, instructions, and lawful orders; however, you may request religious accommodation. Requests can be denied based on military necessity. Commanders and supervisors at all levels are expected to ensure that requests for religious accommodation are dealt with fairly.”

184. Senator LEE. Secretary Donley and General Welsh, how is the Air Force working to comply with section 533 of the NDAA of 2013 (Public Law 112-239)?

Mr. DONLEY and General WELSH. The Air Force is complying through the adherence of Air Force Instruction 1-1, Line 2.12, “Supporting the right of free exercise of religion” Additionally, the Air Force is updating the Free Exercise of Religion Course (ZZ133109) in Advanced Distributed Learning Service.

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