

Hearing: House Armed Services Committee

06/09/2021 03:00 PM EDT

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Hearing of the various subcommittee of the armed service -- wait a minute -- excuse me, I got a countdown. Okay it's a -- is the media service video we're on. Ladies and gentlemen, I called order this hearing at the readiness subcommittee of the House Armed Services Committee without objection. My prior remarks will be read into the record about how we have to operate.

Now the council is happy or at least I'm going to be able to debate with them. I'm going to move directly to my opening statement. I don't see our ranking chairman on yet, but will be hopefully will be by the time I finish my statement. With that. Let's get us up and operating military readiness covers a vast breadth of topics, many of which we have covered in depth.

In other hearings, one of the through lines of this committee's work is finding the right balance between sustainment of existing platforms and facilities and the modernization necessary to meet the threats of tomorrow. Well, it's important that we invest in systems and equipment that will put us at the cutting edge.

We must never forget or ignore our current arsenal upgrading and updating these systems are a must if we are hope, if we hope to be successful in any near-term engagement. This balance is the very essence of readiness and our preparations for nuclear competition require nothing less. The same can be said about installation's. A major theme of my work as chairman over these last couple of years has been prioritizing installation resiliency.

For years, the services have taken considerable risk in the installation portfolio, deferring necessary maintenance and upgrades on existing buildings in order to fund new platforms and systems. Deferring maintenance is a chronic issue. We see this across the entire readiness subcommittees jurisdiction. The services consistently fail to fund sustainment and I look forward to hearing from each of the witnesses today. If your budget request reflects the status quo or if the necessary investments are being made so that when the next Hurricane Michael or Hurricane Florence hits are still hits, our installations will remain more resilient.

Another theme of the committee's work is to ensure that the military services continue to have the resources they need to effectively train our service men and women. Our personnel are the most important part of our armed forces and it's imperative that they have the proper preparation for whatever future they may encounter.

That includes the right investments in everything from basic training to flight hours and everything in between as well as what happens on our nation's ranges. As we look to the future, we know that the field of battle will change and will require the necessary training to ensure that our service members are ready.

As this committee in the military addresses these three principal concerns, we must be aware and vigorously address an overarching challenge that addresses and dramatically affects all three of these principal areas. That challenge is the fact of a rapidly changing climate. The Department of Defense is the single largest consumer of carbon energy in America and quite possibly the world therefore to meet the climate crisis.

Every service must seek to reduce energy consumption with conservation strategies and quickly move to non carbon energy sources. This has been and will continue to be the central theme of this committee during my chairmanship. I would appreciate each witness sharing with this committee how they intend to address this challenge as I scrutinize your budgets.

I do not see the necessary commitment and finally along these lines, over the past year and a half, the world has been forced to confront a challenge that is over a century, the covid-19 effect on every facet of our way of life and it has killed over 600,000 Americans, I look forward to hearing how each of US services have confronted this threat and whether the global pandemic more specifically how to covid-19 affect the readiness of our forces both in a tactical and strategic sense.

I see Mr. Lambourne has joined us to ask if you'd like. I could read that all again or we can move directly to your statement.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm prepared to make my statement as you've just made yours and thanks for having this hearing today. We will hear from the service vice chiefs of staff on the current state of military readiness and how the fiscal year twenty twenty two budget request will support military training, weapons systems maintenance and efforts to meet readiness requirements in alignment with the National Defense Strategy.

As DOD continues to shift its primary focus from countering violent extremist organizations to great power competition, our subcommittee remains very interested in how we are balancing current readiness with modernization investments. Unfortunately, the budget request did not continue the progress made under the Trump administration to rebuild our military by requesting a three to five percent increase over the inflation adjusted fiscal year.

Twenty one enacted level we cannot and should not ask our men and women in uniform to prepare to execute an array of missions and tasks and then fail to provide them with the resources necessary to accomplish those assignments. I strongly believe that we must continue to invest in our military as our adversaries grow, especially China.

If we do nothing over the next decade, China will fully modernize its military, potentially bringing it to parity with our own. I remain highly interested about the progress in standing up the new space force. This recognition of the importance of space as a warfighting domain is long overdue and is vital to the future readiness of the joint force.

I am also looking forward to learning more about ways our newest service intends to increase the lethality and resiliency of our space assets, especially in light of increased competition and confrontation with Russia and China. In January of this year. The Air Force selected Huntsville, Alabama as the preferred base location for the Space Force.

Since that time, both the GAO and the DOD IG have begun reviews about the process by which that location was selected. As you know, I do believe that Colorado Springs was the best option based on many factors ranging from location, civilian and military workforce and the range of expertise in space warfare and operations and the specifically the existing infrastructure and capabilities that are located there. In addition to quality of life for service members and their families.

So I eagerly await those reviews as we work to support and stand up this new service and rapidly reestablish spacecraft to confront the existing and growing threats in the space domain. I was happy to see that the fiscal year twenty twenty two operations and maintenance for the Space Force did include an increase of almost \$1 billion over fiscal year. 40 one enacted levels.

I look forward to hearing how the department is contemplating prioritizing readiness for its unique force design requirements as compared to the other services. I also look forward to hearing about any lingering or projected covid-19 impacts to training and readiness of the service departments. Covid presented challenges to training with many exercises being canceled despite reports that there has been no degradation in readiness and that readiness levels are at historic norms.

So there seems to be a discrepancy there that I would like to explore. One of our key readiness enablers is the organic industrial base. Our depots provide the capability to maintain warfighting capabilities throughout their life cycles, but recapitalization plans will require significant investment over many years. At a time when we continue to have a number of other major funding challenges.

I am committed to working with the chairman and the rest of the subcommittee to ensure that Depot recapitalization is prioritized. Finally, and as I mentioned last year, during our posture hearings, I'm concerned about people, air Force pilot shortfall numbers have held constant over the last few years. Unfortunately, the fighting -- excuse me, the fighter community is experiencing the largest gap both in active and reserve components is unclear to me how we will reduce this backlog without robust funding.

And I would like to hear more about that from the Air Force. So thank you, Mr. Chairman and I yield back.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you very much. Mr. Lambourn, I appreciate what you're saying and particularly share your concerns about the location for spaceports and certainly my view is that that entire process should be passed until we have those full reports from the two agencies. Now I'd like to introduce our witnesses General Joseph Martin, Army Vice Chief of Staff Admiral William Fleisher, Navy, Vice Chief of Naval Operations, General Gary Thomas, assistant commandant of the Marine Corps.

General David Albon, Air Force Vice Chief of Staff and General David D. Thompson, Spaceports, Vice Chief of Space Operations. With that, we'll go through and hear the opening statement from each of the presenters will start with Martin general Martin, and then we'll go through the list. As I just introduce them.

General Martin Europe.

Joseph M. Martin

Chairman Garamendi ranking member Lambourn and distinguished members of the subcommittee on the behalf of the Secretary of the Army, The Honorable Christine Warmth and the Chief of Staff of the Army General James McConville. Thank you for the opportunity to discuss the Army's readiness and thank you for your steadfast support of our soldiers, families and veterans.

The challenges of the past year highlight the importance of having a ready army. Our soldiers. Our soldiers answered the nation's call by distributing vaccines and medical supplies to combat. Covid-19 also supported local authorities during the civil unrest, responding to natural disasters and helped secure our southwest border abroad.

The Army has one hundred and five thousand soldiers deployed, one over and over one hundred and forty countries as we speak, combating transnational terrorism, deterring adversaries and strengthening relationships with our allies and partners. The Army is busy and our ability to meet these challenges demonstrates a high level of readiness rebuilt over the past several years.

We could not have done it without your steadfast support. However, readiness is fragile and relative to the challenges we face, our adversaries are achieving significant military advancements and now threaten many of our long held advantages. Technological progress is shifting the ground beneath our feet as we sit here and speak to each other.

The world is changing and the army must change with it to meet future challenges. The Army is undergoing the most significant transformation in the past 40 years. This transformation, the bedrock of future readiness will enable the Army to support the joint force with credible land combat power necessary for deterrence and decisive victory.

The next war will be in all domain fight history, warns us not to rely on a single domain or any new capability to win in combat. Victory in the future will require the application of combat power from all domains and the joint team. The size of the army is equally important. The army must maintain its own strength to meet the needs of the joint force even today or unable to meet all the global requirements asked of us in strength.

Reductions will further reduce our ability to provide the combat power requested by us and place excessive hardship on our soldiers and our families. I say the most important thing for last people are our number one priority and caring for them is a fundamental aspect of maintaining readiness. The harmful behaviors, the sexual assault, sexual harassment, racism extremism and the factors leading to death by suicide directly affect readiness.

And we must take them very seriously. We stood up the People's First Task Force to take a whole of army approach to stamping out these harmful behaviors. We're on a solid path to build and maintain readiness now and in the future, but readiness gains and the Army's transformation require timely, adequate, predictable and sustained funding to survive.

Again, thank you for the opportunity to speak today. I'm looking forward to your questions and working with you to ensure that your army remains ready to serve the American people. Thank you, Chairman.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you very much. General Martin, your full testimony will be into the background as well the full testimony of the other witnesses. I now turn to just plain lost my list here. Let's go to General Thomas and then we'll get back to the order on the list.

Gary L. Thomas

Chairman Garamendi ranking member Lambourn and distinguished members of this subcommittee. I'm pleased to appear before you today to discuss Marine Corps readiness and the FBI to budget well common conceptions of military readiness often center on availability of forces. We define readiness as the ability to create a warfighting advantage.

The mere availability of Marines and equipment does not equal readiness to deter aggression or defeat rapidly evolving threats. As such, our focus is not on simple and short term metrics of availability but instead on a readiness to impose significant risks on our competitors and adversaries. Both today and in the future, we must build a shared understanding of how we can best measure and achieve that readiness in order to prepare for the challenges ahead of us. We appreciate the support provided by this subcommittee as we made our initial force design changes and recovered readiness after years of steady combat deployments.

After twenty two budget requests supports our continued forces on efforts to enable naval and joint campaigning across the competition continuum in all domains. This force will be able to persist forward within the range of adversaries weapon systems while providing reconnaissance kind of reconnaissance and long range fires.

Well, we have made much progress toward this goal. Significant challenges remain in areas such as logistics, sustainment, communications, networks and energy solution. Let's try that through careful analysis and Morgan, we continue to implement the concepts, forces and capabilities that will be achieved for presence, credible deterrence and preserve our advantage and seek Congressional support in these areas will further our progress toward our unique contribution to the joint force.

Our modernization focus does not mean that we are neglecting the race or current equipment facilities and missions or flight to readiness accounts are fully funded and we are committed to maintain the combat credibility, safety and overall readiness of the force while we modernize staying ready today and Being ready for tomorrow will require consistent funding priorities and accelerated modernization and the willingness to divest of capabilities that no longer serve our best defense interests.

Your support and oversight of our readiness efforts will enhance and preserve the lethality of the Marine Corps as the nation's Naval Expeditionary Force in readiness. I look forward to answering your questions.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you very much. General Thomas, I think all of the members of this committee are aware there's a very, very significant change in the U.S. Marine Corps posture going forward. We're going to be spending considerable time on working with the Marine Corps as they deal with a very different structure in the days ahead.

I will come back to that admiral Luscher. I Lost my place here and you were the next steps. So with my apologies and with no offense to the Marine Corps, it's your turn.

William K. Lescher

Appreciate it, Chairman. Thank you. Good afternoon, chairman Garamendi Ranking Member Lambourn and distinguished members of the House Armed Services Subcommittee on Readiness on behalf of the sailors, the civilians and the families to the United States Navy. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on this important topic of readiness.

Are the -- and then we were sustain today strong readiness posture, but also to build on recent learning of best practices to drive improved readiness, performance and outcomes. We see a strong opportunity to accelerate learning the momentum across our major worker communities to improve the transfer function between the critical inputs in people and infrastructure and our key readiness outcomes.

As an example, I think the committee is well aware of our aviation enterprise has achieved and sustained 80 percent mission capable rates in our squadrons across the majority of our aircraft models. Scaling across naval aviation to key innovations, process changes and leadership behaviors that we learned. While improving Super Hornet readiness from the fifty five percent baseline in twenty eighteen.

We look forward to working with the Defense Committee to sustain and capitalize on these hard earned gains, improving left, holding the high end flight by balancing this increased mission capable rigs with the required increased flight hours for our pilots and our float force. We also are leveraging this fundamental learnings that get -- we'll get better tools and better than perform the plan and Navy sustainment frameworks to improve performance in our public and private shipyards and on how we manage the force.

Since twenty nineteen, the Navy's achieved positive trends and On-Time completion and reduced base of maintenance to working through significant covid impacts and 40 20 If clearly our voyage to drive substantial shipyard based performance improvement is at an early stage and I see much opportunity and work to Be done to close to the target of ships routinely completing maintenance on time at lifecycle maintenance plan design durations.

We look forward to working closely with our private shipyard partners in the sport to share systematic approaches for improving depot maintenance productivity with similarly focused on improving the manning of our surface ships. Since twenty sixteen, we've increased the billets assigned to surface ships by over eighty 500. 3,000 additional Sammeth operational to that increase in billets authorized for the near term decrease in the percentage of pilots killed.

As we assess, trained and deployed sailors to fill the new requirement what country code related pipeline friction, We're making strong progress today. We have the highest number of sailors on operational sea duty since twenty fourteen and that reduce gaps at sea by over forty 100 since last October.

It's not just about the inputs are also complimentary to the progress we continue with implementation of condition based maintenance with centers now for Bordentown before ships Circadian Rhythm Watch builds to counter and surface assignment policy. Building on what we learned with aviation means a different metric that helps sailors to float do their jobs better and more safely.

Overall, the Navy's F1 twenty two budget request funds are readiness accounts to an affordable level and builds on the recent gains and balances the need for future force readiness and modernization. I believe it's important to note that we will talk today about the consequence of the 22 requests which reflects a decrease in real terms of a larger fleet.

That is the context along with our peer competitor that drives many of the hard choices that you see in the request to maximize naval power. I'm going to do a quick way to accept that we drop off line. We heard all that you said, please continue. You were off for a few seconds, okay, just to wrap it up, but it does include major aviation and the accounting for infrastructure and the range training complex in particular as a critical link that required modernization to enable training both our in our adversaries newest capabilities.

And so we look forward to working with the communities and other stakeholders to ensure our team is able to maintain the competitive edge. With that training, we have funding for infrastructure optimization, the search optimization, revitalize those facilities and equipment for the fleet. And finally, to highlight our most important asset, the 700,000 sailors and civilians to provide a competitive edge.

Request includes critical investments in training, relevant training, laboratory construction training as well as investments increase the toughness and cohesiveness of our fourth increases in mental health, sexual assault prevention, inclusion and diversity and family care infrastructure to improve concentration area health care.

Overall, Chairman and Ranking Member and member of the Committee, I look forward to discussing these topics with the Committee today. And I thank the Committee for your leadership and your partnership and sustaining focus on the core issue of keeping the greatest maritime fighting force, ever ready to fight and win its.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you very much, Admiral Leisha, we appreciate your testimony and your written testimony forward and testimonial being without objection in the record. Let me just do that for all of you. I forgot to ask permission from my -- from all of you without objection, written testimony will be entered into the record.

So ordered we now turn to general Allen, Air Force vice chief of staff.

David W. Allvin

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, chairman, Garamendi Ranking Member Lambourn and distinguished members of the Subcommittee. On behalf of acting Secretary of the Air Force, John Roth and our chief of staff, John Siku. Brown Jr... Thank you for the opportunity to testify on Air Force readiness and for your continued partnership and advocacy.

Your Air Force mission is -- is to fly, fight and win to deliver air power any time anywhere our nation needs it. We remain committed to building the ready forces that can do just that both to deter and respond to the threats of today and to address the even greater challenges of tomorrow. This year's Presidential budget request builds upon our last four years of effort to restore readiness.

We're pleased to report that despite some of the early impacts from covid in many areas, our readiness has largely been returned to pre pandemic levels. To maintain the momentum on the progress that you made possible, we are focused on several key readiness drivers, all very familiar to this committee. First and foremost, we're focused on ridding our most

important weapons system, our airmen. Tomorrow's airmen will serve in some of the most challenging environments witnessed in generations to win.

It is critical that we ensure that nothing prevents them from reaching their full potential. This year's budget request sustains the Air Force's strong commitment to our airmen and their families, expanding funding for advanced training, ensuring ready access to safe and reliable family housing and investing more than an additional \$7 million in combating the deleterious behaviors such as sexual assault, interpersonal Violence and self-harm.

As an Air Force, we must pay particular attention to the health of our crew, many, which continues to be at risk given the global air crew manning shortages. This budget includes requests for continued retention measures as well as several new initiatives to grow pilot production to the target of 1,500 aviators per year.

At the same time, the PB 22 budget request invest heavily in our training infrastructure to ensure that our airmen are prepared for pier level combat. This budget funds the flying out program to the max executable level and upgrade several of our training ranges including notably both the Nevada Test and training range and the joint Pacific Alaska Range Complex.

To ensure and have ready equipment, we are continuing to invest in the weapons weapons systems sustainment with this year's investment on par with those made in FY 21 at fifteen point four billion. We must note however, that this program's funding is not keeping pace with the escalating costs. The total FFI, 21 requirements grew by more than \$800 million as we brought on new aircraft without retiring legacy platforms.

This year's budget includes several recommendations to scale back our investments in that force structure, which is no longer relevant to the future fight in order to affordably balance our weapons systems sustainment accounts. Finally, we were making key several key adjustments to our operational employment contracts to ensure our forces are optimally postured to build and sustain ratings for peer competition, including realigning the Air Force's fourth generation model back to the joint forces, reset ready and commitment standard.

This preserves our ability to execute more robust high end training required for peer competition while also enabling support of dynamic force employment taskings as envisioned by the National Defense Strategy. Again, thank you for your support. We remain committed to accelerating the readiness recovery.

This committee makes possible and working together to secure the highest returns on the considerable investments you make in our Air Force. Thank you and I look forward to your questions.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

I thank you very much. General Wood will now turn to General Thompson space for space chief of space operations.

David D. Thompson

Chairman Garamendi ranking member Lambourn and distinguished members of the subcommittee. Thank you for the opportunity to testify today in my capacity as vice chief of space operations on behalf of the chief of space operations, Gen.. Jay Raymond and our service sector. Acting service, Secretary of the Honorable. John Roth and joined by the other service chiefs vice service chiefs.

It's a pleasure to provide you details on readiness for the newest US military service. I'd like to begin by expressing my gratitude to Congress for its bipartisan support in establishing the US based force on December 20th, twenty nineteen and for your leadership in addressing the threats and challenges the nation faces in space.

You're one of the space forces existence has been focused on standing up to news service in collaboration with the services represented here DOD staff in Congress. The US based force has made tremendoUS progress in this endeavor. This includes a mission focUSED organizational structure, addressing forced design and forced generation models, new approaches to talent management and the initial design and establishment of a field command solely focUSED on training and readiness.

The Space Training and Readiness Command colloquially known as Starcom chief right Raymonds direction to the US based force in year two is fundamentally readiness focUSED and includes integrating the space force into combatant commands and with allies and partners and training and developing guardians as war fighters. And effective joint force partners in executing this guidance to space forces doing the following.

First, the space forces developing and refining operational models for presenting forces to combatant commanders command. An important first step in this effort is US based forces participation in US Indo-Pacific Command's upcoming Pacific Century twenty twenty one exercise which will be the First major combatant command exercise with a space for service component.

Second, the space forces in the process of standing up in this new field command, Starcom, we'll have which will have responsibilities to recruit, develop, train and retain guardians to protect the high ground of space. Starcom will be instrumental in inculcating a body of knowledge, expertise and experience.

Required of those guardians to conduct operations and protect US interests in the high ground of space, a very unique operational domain. This approach was first encapsulated in the inaugural doctrine publication Space, Power Space Power or Doctrine for Space Forces issued in AugUSSt of 20. One additional activities include more threat focused unit training syllabi programs to develop elite cadres of operators, cyberspace, warriors and intelligence and acquisition professionals increasingly challenging and sophisticated training exercises like space flight and a continuation of our Schriever wargame series. That's been a key element for allied and partner engagement for many years.

Third, the space forces placing major emphasis on modernizing our infrastructure and the space, installation, readiness and executing a space for unique weapon system sustainment portfolio that ensures we maintain readiness of existing space capabilities even as we begin fielding the advanced capabilities required to meet the evolving needs Of the joint force in the face of the growing threat.

This approach approach also recognizes that our people, our guardians are as vital as the space systems they employ to meeting current and future readiness needs without Guardian standing at the ready, the nation's space systems cannot operate in the manner required to effectively provide for our security.

The Guardian approach adopts new and innovative capital management and talent management methods for civilian and military, members like under the authority granted by and with the assistance of Congress. And as documented in our -- our vision for a digital service released earlier in May, it builds digital fluency into the workforce to ensure the space force is able to function effectively effectively in the digital world of today and far into the future.

Finally, I my son categorically state that our success today could not have been possible without fully committed partners in the departments of the Air Force and Defense that begins with our closest and most committed partner of the United States Air Force and extends to the sister services Represented here today who are currently and actively engaged in working with us to transfer functions and resources to fulfill critical missions and ensure we provide capabilities that they need for the joint.

In this, we share a common goal that is to maintain mission execution and meet Warfighter needs without any adverse impact, any personnel or to the missions of the other services. On behalf of General Raymond and Secretary Roth. Thank you again for the opportunity to appear before you and I look forward to addressing your questions today.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you very much, General Thompson and we appreciate having you will be the first of an annual review of the work of the face of the spaceports and congratulations to you and the men and women of the force for standing up and operating what is now almost Two year period of time. So we thank you for that.

There are many, many questions that need to be asked. Many of those are probably answered in your -- over in your lengthy written testimony. But just a couple of things come immediately to mind. I said earlier that the central theme of this putting a subcommittee last year and as we move into this year is that the military be prepared for the contingencies of the future.

Certainly that one contingency is the possibility of conflict with a entity somewhere around the world. We talk about Nyrup here and that's important. But there's also a other another contingency out there and that's climate change. We've driven resiliency into much of what we hope you are doing with regard to your installations.

And so I would like each of you and we'll go in reverse order here. So I'm not sure General Thompson has a whole lot to do right now. But if he ever has a specific base, whether it's Colorado or Alabama or some other place, the resiliency issue will be on your shoulders, at least insofar as the base is. So let's go -- let's talk about resiliency, how you're addressing that. And then along the way, efforts that you're making to reduce the consumption of greenhouse gas.

Along the way, General Thompson.

David D. Thompson

Chairman Garamendi thanks for that and I will -- I will let you know there are in fact space for spaces and it's under our charge today on the order of a dozen, I won't go through the entire list. I will tell you there are responsibility, but our -- our partner, the United States Air Force is joining with us and they are operating those bases on our behalf just as the Air Force, the civil engineers, security forces personnel and others have for four decades.

But they are our responsibility in terms of climate change. I'll address a few things and save a few of those features for General Allen to address. But first of all, as you noted, space bases are our power projection platforms. In fact, we operate space systems from those platforms. We do the command and control the data dissemination data lands at those locations and that provided the joint force.

And so the resiliency of those bases is incredibly important to us in conjunction with the Air Force and especially as we look at lessons learned over the past several years as we examine our infrastructure, primarily in our case, our facilities and our power infrastructure as we go through the modernization statement and in sustainment, the activities we look for means by which we can take those current facilities today and improve their energy and their installation resilience in the face of many of those climate issues.

In the case of ours that often is hurricanes on the Florida coast, earthquakes and other natural disasters to include blizzards on the front range. And so as we upgrade and sustain those systems, we look for all of them, especially from the standpoint of power resiliency. We ensure that the power is clean, the power's conditioned the power is sustainable across any sort of natural disaster.

And in fact, if in fact we have to sustain ourselves for twenty four, seven mission, we build that into our plans for our future capabilities, our future installations from the design, from the beginning. We build energy resilience into -- into those designs from the beginning as well as new methods and new standards for energy efficiency and effectiveness.

And let me stop there and allow the other service chiefs to join us.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you. General, I agree with you not spend a lot of time talking about resiliency in space. I know that's an issue of the Strategic Forces Committee as well. I don't know that I want to get into Mr. Cooper's turf, but we might -- since you've focused on the Air Force, let's go to General Albon and you pick up the question from there, if you would, please.

I hate your thank you.

David W. Allvin

In the interest of time, I'll really add to what Joe Thompson said and try not to repeat specifically will narrow in on the area of climate change, as you know, to our -- to our installations where so we fell victim to natural disasters that were impacted from the Climate, the hurricane that hit Tindale and then the massive flooding that was it off?

And so as we look at to learn from those, we are learning the lessons learned in reevaluating our uniform facility. So we're looking at adaptation and then the idea of resilience as well, but the adaptation to the effects of climate into the future. We are integrating into our -- as we're rebuilding those -- those installations, making sure that we understand not only what today's floodplain is, but the potential trend of those flood plains and ensure that we're building above those.

In the case of AFET, looking at what the rising water levels may be in the case of Tindale. And so those are the immediate lessons that we're learning to be able to put into the development of the installations of the future. But in the maintenance of our current installations, understanding that it's not only hurricanes and floods, but there are natural disasters, fire and high winds et cetera. As we're looking at our sustainment requirements across all of our facilities, looking to harden our utilities area against wind against fire. And that sort of thing.

And so we are looking that at the adaptation of what the climate is doing to our current installations. But we need to build in and are looking at in our future design, building digital models to fully understand how we might be able to build that into the installations that we're going to upgrade and update into the future.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

But General, thank you very much. I noted that there was an evacuation at Beale Air Force Base yesterday because of a fire. So you don't need to talk about that in detail. But it's an example of the problem that you're facing perhaps around the world certainly here in the West. Okay let's turn now to General Thomas Marine Corps resiliency.

We can go into some detail about about this issue, if you could talk to us about this and also about the survivability of some of your bases. If you could specifically, I'd like to hear how both Camp Lejeune and your induction center nearby can survive in the face of climate change and existing hurricanes.

Gary L. Thomas

Thank you, Chairman. Let me begin with some of the resiliency initiatives that we have undertaken, including making a Marine Corps logistics Albany, for example, our first net zero installation, which produces as much electricity from renewable energy. Now as it -- as it consumes from utility providers. We've also installed two smart grids that Marine Corps recruit Depot, San Diego and Marine Corps Air Station; Miramar, which enables continuity of critical infrastructure functions in the event of a power outage.

And of course, all of our new Milken projects will be in accordance with new code, which takes all of these into account. You mentioned chairman of Parris Island in October of last year. We completed the Marine Corps first climate change adaptation and resilience plan that addresses sea level rise and climate change.

We're going to take that same approach and apply it to some of our other installations including camp of.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

I'm going to drive a little bit deeper on this general in discussions. I've had actually three, three years ago now it appeared as though Parris Island could not survive a Category three, erkan and I therefore raised the question about. So where's the next induction center? When that one gets wiped out, it won't get wiped out once it'll be a continued garden with sea level rise.

I'd have you as the Marine Corps thought about how to -- what to do about Parris Island, either in a different location or what might be done given the fact that I say the fact that Parris Island is in jeopardy.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

Based on the climate challenges that you articulate, in addition to the steps forward that we're taking with integration of recruit training, we are evaluating our facility requirements for recruit training across the board for the reasons you use particular, we have not yet made any decisions related to Recruit training facilities or particular locations?

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Very good, I raised this question as a heads up not only to you General, but also to the committee that this issue is going to be before us in the months ahead, perhaps this year, but probably maybe certainly the following year. And we'll be dealing with this with this issue hopefully and prayerfully that will not be a hurricane that will make this an even more immediate issue.

Thank you very much. General, there's a whole series of questions that I mentioned before having to do with the Marine Corps of the future and we'll want to get into those in detail in the days ahead. And Melissa, same set of questions. Climate change issue waivers for Northfork.

William K. Lescher

Sir, thank you for the question. The focus that we're bringing very similar to the other services I would highlight, first of all of course is safety of the workforce, resilience of the mission, the ability to execute the mission operationally and then to preserve our natural resources. And as you highlight with Norfolk and elsewhere, we're laser focused on sea rise as well as the -- the -- the severe weather.

And a classic or recent example being Hurricane Sandy, which impacted Pensacola Whiting Field, Panama City, the tools we bring to this. This work I think in some respects premature in some respects are reflecting the 20 NDAA language bringing

them into isolation master plans we have across our seven major installations and using the mission assurance assessments which comprehensively look at all hazard threats to include cyber flubs earthquake damaging Winds those type of elements analyzes probably impact and then proposes mitigation based on that.

And then in compliance with the 20 NDA, this year we'll have completed five installation development plants that have incorporated those mission assessments. And we and we think will be on a vector to complete all of them by the end of twenty two. That's really an overarching look at how we go into the planning and the development plans and then use that to drive choices on mitigating.

You also asked about other elements of energy efficiency and there's many of that. San Diego is a classic example of a tremendous amount of solar power that's been put in place. And then operationally as well, we have initiatives on advanced battery development, propulsion efficiency, energy efficient engines for our audience and other elements that we can certainly highlight more detail with the.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Good and well, thank you very much. I would expect one of my colleagues will pick up the issue of the shipyards and questions around the shipyard. So I see Mr. Golden there looking at a quarter of a billion dollars general Martin.

Joseph M. Martin

Thank you, Chairman. So over the past two years, the Army evaluated all one hundred and sixteen installations using what we call the Army climate assessment tool. We are on a glide path to evaluate all Army installations and complete the installation, energy and water use plan in accordance with the NDAA by 22 for all of our installations.

So no issue there, last year was the fifth year in a row we continue to grow our -- our renewable capabilities and our installation. As I speak to you seven point, seven percent of the Army's energy is generated by renewables, but resilience is really important, a great -- I just -- I got to talk about the Fort Hood example where they have that ice storm last winter and a good part of the Mid to north Texas is relying upon a mixture of renewables and and natural gas generated power.

And when that ice storm came that there was power, but it came at a very high premium because they could not rely upon the renewables for about about a week. And so we've thought through that and understanding that you can't rely just one hundred percent on renewables. But they need to be a part of your power generation to be responsible in your power generation and your power requirements.

Since two thousand seven, the Army's decreased its use of water by twenty eight point two percent. We're in the process, it's not something that's in the program yet, but we are actively planning the grid that will need the infrastructure will need to be able to host what we anticipate to be a one hundred percent GSA electrified fleet.

If that happens so that we're not -- we got the cars, but we can't charge them and that we just approved about a month ago. An effort to electrify, it's really -- it's a hybrid, it's the third is the third. It's the most -- it's the best form of a hybrid, the jail, the joint light tactical vehicle and so we're looking at that.

That's the first big vehicle that we've taken a look at doing with that, but those are some of the efforts that we're doing to decrease our reliance on carbon fuels.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

General, thank you very much. Just remembered a conversation with a Major Marine Corps, major, a tanker, we were talking about hybrid vehicles, you said if I could have a hybrid tank, you know what it would mean to be. I said no. What are you talking about? I said, well, most of the time we sit around, we got the air conditioner going, we got the communications going and the turbines are going to set up, that was a hybrid.

It would probably be another 15 minutes of fuel and that means I live so food for thought and thank you for the comment on the GSA hybrids and electric vehicles. We're moving to -- we're going to -- we would like that to take place. You raised an important question and that is okay, what do you plug them into?

And so thank you for your work on that. I've gone through a series of questions having to do with the installations, the work that we've been doing over the last couple of years. And I'm going to now turn to my colleague, my ranking member. He has on the screen Dale Anderson, who I think must be one of his staff.

Mr. Lambourn, you're up.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

That's right. We've had some technical difficulties. Mr. Chairman tried to switch over to the screen of one of my staffers like you just said my -- my chief of staff to be precise. And thank you for having this hearing. General Thompson, I have a question for you on spaceports, can you describe to us the need for and the advantages of a reserve component for space force and what that would do for readiness?

David D. Thompson

So Representative Lamborn thanks so much for that. I will tell you, let me start by saying today that the -- the National Guard and the Reserves are a vital part of our space missions. Today. We couldn't execute the missions we do every single day without they bring, as you noted, a vital search to war, support and other sorts of support that have served the entire armed forces well over the years.

At the same time, we've got an opportunity to look as a twenty first century at what a twenty first regular Reserve and Guard construct might look like for brand new service. And we have done exactly that. We spent about a year now inside of the US base force with our counterparts in the Air Guard and the Air Reserve and with OASDI. And I think we've developed a proposal that we believe will -- will serve our needs in the future, but also take advantage of the most important features of the current Guard and Reserve.

We owe a report on Congress to that through the Secretary of defense. It's in its final stages of approval and we expect it to be submitted soon. And as I said, I can't share details until approved by the Secretary of defense. But what I'll tell you is we think it's an innovative approach that preserves some of the outstanding features of the Guard and Reserve, but still looks at it through the twenty first century lens.

We look forward to delivering that report and then working with you on Congress on the features related to it and the changes that may be required.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

OK, thank you, General. I look forward to seeing that report and helping to make sure that we do enter that next century and into the future with the best reserve and Guard component possible general Martin. We were talking the other day and you mentioned that in with the potential, you know, God forbid, but the potential of great power competition concerning the army.

And this is for General Martin, that there would still be a role for the army even in like at the Indo-Pacific theater. Could you explain a little bit what do you elaborate on what you meant by that?

Joseph M. Martin

Congressman, thank you so much. As I said in my statement, we hope to prevail in the future to be able to respond to crisis, to win and competition and prevail in a conflict you're going to need in all domain capability to do that. You're going to need the entire joint force. It's not going to be one single service.

It's not going to be a couple of services. You're going to need everything from the space to the information environment, to the cyber environment, to the air, to the sea, below the sea and on the land, you're going to need all those capabilities combined. And so as it pertains to the land domain, most of the partners, the potential partners and you need a partnership to be able to prevail against a threat like China.

Most of the partners there live on land and most of the partner nations, they're -- their largest component of their security apparatus is land forces. And so to build relationships with those land forces matters in a future fight because we don't want to do that in a crisis or God forbid in a conflict. And so it takes time to do that.

And so that's where the Army with its security force assistance brigades and its various units in their exercises can build upon those relationships that will allow us to achieve access presence, temporary episodic presence, but also influence on the development of their military forces, making them better than they were before and increasing opportunities for not only for the Army to posture capability there to deter but also for our partners in the joint force to posture capability, dynamically employed capability to those countries that we continue to build relationships with.

So the land, the land domain matters and the army is at the center of building multinational partnerships there and we believe we're a valid component of that as we look to the future both in the Indo-Pacific and also Europe.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

OK, thank you. That does help elaborate on what we were talking about and what you were referring to admiral Lescher you've touched on and we've had certainly a lot of questions things about the recapitalization of the Navy shipyards. Could you elaborate on where we stand currently with the recapitalization plan and where that stands in terms of the years needed to do that and what we're going to need each year in the budget?

And is that included in this year's budget to achieve that goal?

William K. Lescher

Yes, sir, thanks for that question. It is included in this budget and as well a five year plan and a year plan chairmans as well. But let's have some specificity with that. In this budget, there's \$830 million that specifically focused on shipyard infrastructure optimization and that's really focused on two specific dry dock improvements, one Portsmouth and one in Norfolk.

And as well there's ongoing work in terms of doing digital twin modeling of each of our public shipyard in area master plan development. The digital twin models are forecast to be complete across all four of the shipyards in point. 22 in the digital twin models are core to being able to do the optimization piece in the five year plan.

I would say what's most consequential is immediate work on six dry docks. So basically you're going after that element is important up front. There's also capital equipment investment as well as R.M as well the -- the overall level of investments. I would expect it to be north of \$4 billion from the five year plan and certainly that's work that's going to be done.

There's some learning taking place on this. I had a chance to chat with the professional staff about a bid that came in well above what we expected for the Portsmouth Drydock Project three, 80 one. And there's some strong learning for us in that, both in terms of current market conditions driving volatility in raw materials.

The complexity of these projects because of a pacing element is not just funding, it's the ability to also preserve and do maintenance our recapitalized shipyards. And we also saw that we didn't have the competition that we would have expected and it's a well proven unhappy fact when you come down to a single bit of these type of projects, there's a price premium.

So I've asked our naval facilities team to take a very hard look at that must be a learning organization. This project is still in negotiation, but then we have to bring insights into what that means for our five year plan as well and adjust and adapt which to want to bring a sense of urgency to this.

We want to bring a clear sense of prioritization to this. So then in a nutshell is what's taking place in the five year plan. The 20 year plan will really reflect that learning from the digital twin model and modeling the optimization approach that we see as well as continue to prioritize recapitalization of specific infrastructure.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

OK, thank you. I appreciate that. And General, Alvin, this is my last question and you already have talked about this in your opening statement, but when it comes to the fighter pilot shortage, you gave some good and specific measures like I believe retention bonuses and so on. And those are good steps, is it too early to tell whether this is being successful or not and driving some higher numbers or is it still prospective in the future?

And we're just waiting to see how it comes out.

David W. Allvin

Thank you Representative Lamborn, I would say more the former than the latter. And the reason why I would say this is, is we are looking at six specific initiatives. So first of all, we'll talk about the retention. The retention is great because right now we're at a current pilot shortage of 1,925 pilots give or take of what we think we need.

So we targeted 1500 pilots a year production to be able to get there. Unfortunately, we haven't met that in the last couple of years. We expected it to be a little bit worse through 19 because of covid. And as it turned out, we only produced or will produce 13 less than the year before, still not satisfactory because we hadn't hit 1,300 yet.

So it says that the bathtub didn't get worse, but that was the only real good news. So the initiative, the six separate initiatives that we're looking to increase pilot throughput to get more production in there are all -- each one of them could provide a significant uplift. And I would go over them very quickly.

First is there's -- we're understanding that you not have put everyone through the same pipeline. We're learning more about the capabilities outside of the Air Force and how to do proper risk management in assessing potential pilot candidates. So on the right path, the wings, we're doing a small pilot group and evaluating them and taking them just through the Tier one only program and then assessing them as they go through the First few years in their follow on actual weapon system.

So to your point of do we know if we've actually got the right solutions yet, I think we'll gain confidence every year as we see them perform down the line because the most important thing we can put quantity through, we can never sacrifice quality. So we evaluate each of those -- these -- these increased pilot production through the T1 path to wings.

We're going back to just sending potential aviators right to helicopter training. We did that in years past when we started putting them through fixed wing, we're going back to the future. We're evaluating their performance. As you can see that's less time in the training pipeline. That's more pilots on the line.

We're also looking at ensuring we can put instructor pilots on the line doing instruction flying instruction. We're doing that through some increased civilian incentives for civilians doing simulation, doing the simulators, overseeing the simulator instruction and also maybe incentivizing remote simulator instruction because some of the places are hard to attract from the civilian workforce talent to ensure we can fully manned the simulators with Civilians, so we can put the instructor pilots back on the line so we can move more pilots for the pipeline.

So both of those are ways that we're looking at increasing production. Also looking at through civilian path to wings, assessing people early on and looking at their civilian experience and see if we might be able to shorten their pilot training. In the past, it didn't matter, didn't matter if you're -- you are an experienced pilot or brand new, you went through the same pipeline.

Didn't really make sense as we're looking at each of those, they offer the opportunity when you put them all together to really produce about 1 additional basis worth of pilot production per year and our -- our target for knowing that will be about 5, 24. But we want to make sure we're assessing each of these and figuring out where we might want to put more emphasis.

And as we do that will put more pilots through the pipeline, but then we also have to manage them throughout their career to make sure the bathtub doesn't move just from company grade officers to feel great officers. So we need to manage them through their entire life cycle and that will be a challenge going forward.

But we have several irons in the fire that are starting to produce some outputs. We're going to evaluate to see which ones are the most lucrative of an investment.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

OK, these sound like good plans and I want to and the committee would love to see the results as you go forward. It is somewhat tentative. So I'm not convinced yet that this is going to succeed, but I'm hopeful that it will and I appreciate you keeping us abreast of this as we go forward. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I yield back to you.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Mr. Lamborn, thank you very much for your questions. The next two on the gavel this hour. Mr. Court Day by Mr. Wilson and Mr. Courtney, I'll get the following two after that. So go ahead, Courtney.

[Representative Joe Courtney](#)

Great, well, thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you to all the witnesses and militia. As I think you know, before the budget came out, this subcommittee had a hearing on the backlog in ship repairs for both submarines and surface ships. And your update regarding the funding for the public shipyard improvements?

I think it shows a real effort, but on the other hand, it certainly shows that's still going to be a long game and that we -- we obviously still have to deal with what's happening in the -- in the immediate present as far as particularly the Los Angeles class Submarine to, as we heard previously, is sort of at the -- at the end of the buffet line in terms of getting help.

So I did notice on page three of your testimony that MOISY is now fully funded to go into Newport News and the Hartford is fully funded to go into Groton, which is good. I guess if maybe we could just talk for a second about whether or not hopefully we're figure out ways to not only get them in, but also to get them out faster.

And I know the smart start approach, which is to try and get some of the public yards and the private yards sort of talking to each other and working together about getting materials and design plans to move the process. Why it is that. Hopefully you can get these -- these boats turned around faster than we've seen in the past.

William K. Lescher

Sir, it's a superb question and it has to -- and it's not just those elements, the smart start, the other elements, we're going to put a strong premium on sharing the lessons of learn the learning, the body of knowledge that we're bringing into the public shipyards with our Private shipyard partners as well.

And I see elements when it comes to the private shipyard leadership that we believe we need to have a public conversation on this dimension. For example, when I see their assessment of the new work work work is substantially different from the public shipyards in the same way. I think we need to look at the picture on that plan and there and more of that in the contract that as New Port Arthur or shipyards goes under the leadership of local leaders and executive director Gulfam during a strong hat, what we call Naval Sustainment Shipyard To provide productivity increases in ways that I think are profitable and brought into the service, the private sector and our private sector, everything from production control as well.

You see first and second line supervisors, they are an opportunity to have the more and more and and so on there. But I have the same attitude which is we need to strengthen that coordination, strengthen the learning together and and get after bringing these private sector. But we're certainly prepared to do that.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

And I mean, clearly, like I said, you know, I think there's strong support across the board for boosting the public gardens. But I think in the meantime, it's just the handwriting on the wall. I mean, we're still going to have to sort of use the one shipyard approach for the private and public sector. I'm General Thomas.

Last time you were with us, you know, we talked about the devastating a, the accident in San Clemente. And I was just wondering whether you could sort of talk a little bit about whether you know what's in the budget is going to address in terms of training or the equipment and lessons learned from that accident?

Thank you, Congressman. There are a couple of key aspects of that that are in the 2 budget. First, of course is the sustainment of the vehicle, which will be fully funded through the end of the service life of 25 or six, but it also includes some key investments for systems that did not perform well in communications and some of the lighting onboard. For example?

And then also significant investment in training where we're adding egressed as well as the underwater egress training to ensure that our Marines and sailors are fully prepared, should they find well. You know, again, thank you. I know both of these issues which I've raised are something that are going to be an ongoing enduring issue.

[Representative Joe Courtney](#)

For the subcommittee and certainly I am glad that there's space in this budget to follow up with, again, a lot of comments particularly addressed to the families after that accident. And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back. Thank you. Mr. Courtney, Mr. Wilson, you'll be up next followed by Goldman and Scott. Mr. Wilson?

[Representative Joe Wilson](#)

Thank you, Chairman, John Garamendi and ranking member Doug Lamborn to your leadership and we are all inspired by the witnesses today. Their commitment, their service on behalf of the American families defending American families and this should and will be bipartisan working together to back you up in every way that we can.

Along with that, I'm really grateful that I represent Fort Jackson, South Carolina where Brigadier General Millford Biegel and his team have just been masterful in adapting and overcoming the challenges that the human virus attacks and trains more than 50 percent of the Army's new warriors. And I commend the Army on maintaining 100 percent capacity of its training capabilities despite the pandemic.

My concern is the impact on readiness and this is what General Martin with above the tactical level. The pandemic cost. The cancelation of numerous partnered exercises including Exercise Maple Resolve Panama, twenty twenty one command post exercise and the Allied Spirit 12 Just the FBI Twenty two budget general request provide for sufficient funding to reschedule the training events and to regain the interoperability readiness.

Joseph M. Martin

Congressman, thank you for the question. And so it was very unfortunate with covid and the impacts on our ability to be able to train with our multinational partners. That being said, we did do Defendor Europe and we did a smaller Defendor Pacific coast exercises, smaller scale. And the training with our partners in those various exercise was a direct byproduct of what they were allowed to do and what we were allowed to do given that protecting our -- our soldiers and protecting their soldiers during the conduct of those exercises.

We've learned a lot through the course of this year. The twenty two budget has as many multinational multinational training opportunities in it. In fact, in 22 we've got project convergence twenty to this year as you well know is going to be a joint campaign of learning where all of our joint partners are going to participate.

We've got multinational partners that are actually going to come and watch and discuss what they see as far as the developments in Project Convergence this year and then next year it's going to be in twenty two. It's going to be a multinational event working on the mission partner environment and the multinational interoperability capabilities.

And so we've got lots of exercises programed in twenty two ready to go anticipating that we will be well beyond the vacs, the herd immunity for four for covid and our partners will have made progress. We shouldn't have any problems with that. So we look forward to those opportunities and I can tell you, I talked to our partners often and they miss those opportunities and they miss the progress that we missed because we had to protect our soldiers.

But we've learned and we're moving forward and the program includes a robust multinational experimentation and exercise scheduled for your army.

[Representative Joe Wilson](#)

And I'll show you appreciation of travel with Karimnagar on Monday throughout Central and Eastern Europe and to see our allies, our new allies there, how much they appreciate Novoselov IMK to be working together. And so I'm grateful this will proceed. General Elvan and your written testimony. I appreciate your recognition of the importance of our nuclear recapitalization efforts to the credibility of our nuclear deterrence and the FBI Twenty one National Defense Authorization Act. This committee recommended a two site plutonium production plan to recapture our nation's ability to build and maintain nuclear weapons to provide deterrence for peace.

What is the Air Force doing to modernize its nuclear triad And specifically what are the costs implications of another potential Minuteman life extension?

David W. Allvin

But sir, thank you very much for the question. I think fundamentally, we really believe that the cost of the recapitalization of the nuclear fleet is actually something. It's -- it's an imperative that we're trying to drive down costs, but we go against what we believe the threat is. This our nuclear triad has been the -- the foundation of strategic deterrence for well over half a century.

And so the recapitalization is something that is necessary. There have been several independent assessments on the cost of doing anything other than that. And to your point about the cost of another recapitalization of Minuteman three, there are several studies that show that it becomes increasingly expensive to the point of the diminishing the diminishing parts.

And the capability would almost require building a brand new Minuteman three. And the idea is if you're building capability to provide a credible deterrent, you'd want to have that deterrent to be against the threat that you see coming. And so therefore are our BSD, which is as a -- as a matter it is not inexpensive. But it is one of our programs that through our new digital acquisition approach and our way of doing our -- our modeling and and baking in sort of a long term sustainment cost and all those things into it and holding the requirements for it is actually meeting schedule. On cost in a way that very few programs have ever in the history.

So it is not -- it is not inexpensive, but it is unaffordable not to have that sort of a nuclear deterrent in the world that we find ourselves now and into the future. Thank you for your input. I yield back.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you, Mr. Wilson. This last subject will be debated going forward. Let's see. We have Mr. Golden. You're up next.

[Representative Jared Golden](#)

Thank you, Mr. Chair. I'm sure I'd like to talk about the readiness impact of the Navy's F to budget request. I'm concerned that despite making clear to this committee that it requires additional anti air and ballistic missile deFense capability in order to operate in a contested security environment, particularly in the PaciFic region that the current request beFore the committee cuts a Flight three GDG. 50 one destroyer in contravention ofF not only the Navy's stated shipbuilding plan and guidance, but also the current DG, 50 one multiyear procurement contract.

And I am of course concerned that this proposed cut in d.g fifty one production which is the backbone of our nation's front line surface combatant is occurring at a time when our Navy requires more and not less capabilities, particularly anti in ballistic missile defense capabilities to address The increasingly lethal capabilities including advanced anti access area denial capabilities of our potential adversaries most prominently China.

The Flight three dig's unique capabilities including strategic plan strike, aircraft, GANTI surface ship and anti submarine warfare are crucial for keeping pace with China's evolving military capabilities in the Pacific region. I would say in particular the Flight three spy six radar system is crucial for addressing the Chinese anti access area denial, ballistic missile threat to our forces in the Pacific and the current ballistic missile threat as well as the proposed retirement of seven Ticonderoga class guided missile Destroyer, as makes the potential error, ballistic missile defense impact of a cut in the DG program.

Even more concerning these proposed cuts impact not only the readiness of our current naval force structure and capabilities, but also the readiness of our sailors to gain necessary experience in addressing Air Defense Command vessels. As these cuts would eliminate potential Air Defense Command opportunities with no foreseeable alternatives.

I believe these ships are vital in providing necessary command opportunities for naval career officers. So could you please describe both the impact of these cuts on the Navy's anti air and ballistic missile capabilities, particularly our ability to be ready to operate in a contested environment in the Pacific?

But also what is the Navy's plan for maintaining large surface combat and command opportunities?

William K. Lescher

I appreciate the question. Representative, I think it for sure is worthy of a strong and ongoing conversation about highlight as a couple of elements of context and then getting some details behind that as time permits. CNO and the Secretary of the Navy have been very clear with this budget that the first principle that drove many of these hard decisions and as you well appreciate this isn't the only difficult decision in this balance.

The first principle is to provide the most ready and lethal navy achievable within the resources provided and this was a very deliberate decision and very analytically founded. We briefed the committee some elements of that analysis in the future for study integrated naval force structure assessment and related analysis.

Mission level analysis within that first principle provide the most ready and lethal navy within the resources provided the fiscal context is relevant. I highlighted that briefly in my opening statement. I'll just highlight as another element the context. In FY 18, we had a budget that supported a fleet of 286 ships. And then for 20 to do we are submitting a budget that supports a fleet of 296 ships and it's essentially the same level in terms -- in constant dollars than percent because that's not a row continue to grow the Navy and it requires the Type of hard decision.

So the fundamental question on the second half of twenty two is not, is this a valuable ship? The question is what would come out of the balance we have that we would say would lead to resource to the second ship and this highly if a Of To to get the urgent need, say no plan for the -- the priority would be reduced. Had no, of course to get after and close gaps in many.

What about ship that may want to drive and are committed to not having a hollow force, What about spares and ordnance? Again, our choices to not pull parts off the shelf or put ordnance on a -- to buy capacity that can't be fully balanced restored. From a readiness perspective, in terms of networks, in terms of infrastructure, the same sorts of things apply including the imperative of investments in infrastructure.

And then there's modernization as well. We could look at our site picture there is across a DDT.X. and X next generation air dominance. All of those elements are critical in this budget. And so I'm sketching for you just an awareness of the hard choices, but the very deliberate choices, the very analytically based choices that led to the balance you see there.

So hopefully that's helpful to -- to answer that question, I'm out of time. So Mr. Chair, I'm certainly sitting back. I appreciate the response and look forward to.

[Representative Jared Golden](#)

Continuing this conversation in future hearings.

[Representative Austin Scott](#)

Thank you, Mr. Gordon and appreciate your awareness of time. Mr. Scott, thank you, Mr. Chairman and at the end of my questions, I'm going to have to step out for another armed services meeting. I do want to mention just briefly and I know the admiral brought up bids coming in higher than expected. I do think that um and would be interested in written responses but will not have time for responses.

Or we hear that the supply chain disruptions that we're seeing throughout the world, the increased cost of steel and the other things along those lines that are going to create constraints with regard to procuring new equipment and repairing old equipment. I mean even down to the cost of -- of wire today being significantly higher than it was just a few months ago.

Interested in any comments that you may have on that time permitting or in writing if you so see fit, but not necessary, but just want to make sure we're paying attention to that as we push forward. But General Allen, I want to focus on the advanced battery management system with my first question. It's obviously critical to the readiness of the force and in the future to defeat our peer competitors.

Can you explain ABM's in a concise and simple way and just describe how it's central to our future force design?

David W. Allvin

Yes, thank you very much, Scott, for that. I believe I can -- I think sometimes we -- that the terms become very complex, but the idea is very simple. It's command control, it's as old as warfare. There's always been the need for senior leadership in the -- in the execution of a battle to have better situational awareness than the adversary to understand what the adversary is doing.

So ancient warfare, they sent out scouts and they would run the fastest scout would find out and get the information and they would send them in different directions and they would come back and they would aggregate that information to help the commander make the decisions about about Battle you go through warfare and then was on horseback and it was carrier pigeons.

But the idea was you wanted to be able to connect and be able to have the information aggregated in a way that paints a picture for you that advantages you in that battle. And in its essence, it's really not that much different when you think about the advanced battle management system and how it feeds into joint all domains.

Two is that now there are many sensors everywhere. So the important part is to be able to bring these sensors together that all these centers and platforms that were designed as individual platforms and not designed to be as part of a network. We need

to spend the time, the money and the effort to connect them to put them together with the massive computing processing power in order to take that sensor information, turn it into decision quality information and then use that across all domains to help the commanders decide.

Where we should prosecute to fight what we need to defend what we need to attack the things that we're going after, are they going to be there in five minutes In two minutes In one minute. And so it's that speed that advanced bowel management system connects all of the sensors together, connects them and makes sense of the environment and provides the commander with the information he or she may need to prosecute the that.

And that's as simple as concise as I can make it.

[Representative Austin Scott](#)

One of the big debates right now and the decisions that Congress and the leadership of the military is having to -- to make decisions on is, is the maintenance of legacy systems versus new technology. And I've been a little taken back at what we pay to maintain some of the legacy fleet for what, 40 simple parts, just not readily available.

The Air Force has an advanced technology and training center in Warner Robins, Georgia. It is using new technologies like 3D printing. What are investments in these new technologies like 3D printing and robotics and artificial intelligence that you've included in the fiscal year to budget? What are they helping us do to maintain the Air Force's commitment to those legacy fleets and those Air Force maintain the three depots strategy?

David W. Allvin

A Congressman answer the last question first and is the easiest one. Yes, we are -- we're committed in the 2010 budget reflects our commitment to a three deposes strategy. I like I like that you brought up the idea of some of these new and exciting technologies and advanced manufacturing 3D printing and the like. Because they are offering opportunities for us. As we transition to the force that we need in the future to be able to make that more of a graceful transition because we understand that the capabilities that we have today are things that combatant commanders are asking for today.

But if we solely focus on just servicing that need, then we'll have a perfectly ready force today and we'll be broken tomorrow and we can't give that to the next generation. So those sorts of technologies and capabilities allow us to sort of gracefully move as we can to provide resources to invest in the new while.

We are sort of gracefully aging out the old and I would say two point, twenty two we have in the manufacturing science and technology, we've got an additional 12 million and another ninety 1 million. Looking at some of these product applications and how we characterize materials. I think so we've got over 100 million just in -- in that particular space because we see that is critical on our path to transition to the force.

We need to be ready in the future as well, sir.

[Representative Austin Scott](#)

Thank you, General. Ultimately I think it saves us a lot of money, oh my time's expired and I have to step off to talk about what we're going to name Gen martin Space's.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Well, before you go, it may be useful for this committee to ask the services to have an advanced manufacturing seminar at one of the -- one of the depots and invite all of the folks out there that have new ideas about how to do manufacturing to come. And strut their stuff, I know I hear and I suspect all of you do also different concepts, different ideas about how you can make something that's no longer available in the market.

Chairman, love to have you at Robins Air Force Base with volunteer. Well, we're going to take bids and we'll see who provides the best ice cream moving on here next better get this computer up, not Miss. Elaine Laurie followed by Mr. Green.

[Representative Elaine Luria](#)

Well, thank you. I'm sure I'd start off by saying I'm very disappointed by the Navy budget submission and I assume you are too. Firstly, I want to say this is not yours or I will Gildas fault because honestly you've been handed a bag of what from your predecessors going back 20 years. There's lots of things wrong with the budget.

I don't have time to cover them all. So I just wanted to start with the DIVESTS to invest strategy, noting that in the 20 seven budget we also use the DIVESTS to invest words in order to build the US, the 1,000 and the Ford. And I hope that we're not heading towards the same mistakes today. I noted in this budget that you cut weapons procurement, you cut aircraft procurement, ship procurement and education, but increased R & D by twelve point four percent including continued R & D for the for twenty five years after the CVN 21 program office was established.

Looking back in FY nineteen, you said that you would build 11 ships in FY 20 to then in FY 20 You dropped that to nine ships and 22 and 21. You had drop that to seven, but with an ending overall fleet size of 306 today you have a present budget that cuts one day, become seven cruisers and results in a fleet size of 296.

That's a change of ten from just last year. So when I was a kid, I used to love to watch that cartoon popeye and honestly this budget reminds me of the character Whimp who says I'll gladly pay you to stay for a hamburger today. So what I say is this budget does not advance our near-term realities of China.

And I've heard many Navy leaders saying we'll just wait for a twenty three submission and yet we see a memo yesterday from Secretary Harker saying that you're only going to get to pick one major program and we know that the priority maintain the Columbia. So I wanted to focus on something that you gave in your testimony.

You said that the Navy steamed twenty three thousand days last year at first that sounded like a lot and then I started thinking 23,000 divided by three hundred and sixty five days. That equals 63 ships per day on average across the year under with a twenty one percent of the fleet.

In the budget book you submitted, it says that average daily deployed ships is one hundred and ten in FY 21. So that's a difference of about 50 ships and more of what's getting mask in there is that there's a very small number of ships doing the lion's share of the work and many others that can't deploy.

So if you could comment on the delta between that number of the twenty three thousand days and the budget book that says 110 underway per day.

William K. Lescher

OK, thank you for the questions and the many elements there for me to respond to. So I'll just work for the order. I'm confident that this is the strongest balance in alignment with the strategic guidance, the facing threat with the resources we have said it's very deliberate choices very and we've arrived and eager to continue to work with the committees to show that underpinning in this balance.

You highlighted the -- the twenty three memo from the secretary, I'll just highlight that that's obviously very early in the employee three process, but to this point that we have to make choices about freezing assets in the X next generation air dominance. That's not a new concept and I've seen some of the media interpretations that perhaps pick one.

I believe the secretary said that pick one to prioritize, but fundamentally it's the conversation that we had both in this budget cycle and we'll continue to have, which is we have to prioritize within within affordable levels how to create not only current readiness but the future overmatch. And that's for sure the lens that is being brought.

And then then how much putting this ready to fight and you're absolutely ready to fight tonight versus how much we need to advance capability for -- for advantage in the future is essentially the tactics you see in this budget. It's why you see the R & D and the proportion that you observe and I think that's the right the right moment in terms of the figure in the budget versus we'll have -- we take that for the record and reconcile the differences that you know.

[Representative Elaine Luria](#)

OK, well, thank you and I would look forward to knowing that and having further conversations about this balance, but something we did talk about in our conversation yesterday that I found very encouraging. You mentioned something called

Task Force Greyhound, something I had been talking about in reference to the offer to optimize fleet response plan potentially using more of an F.F. model for some of our forces based in. I was wondering if you could elaborate a little bit on that and how this budget would support that for sure.

William K. Lescher

First, observe from a budgetary perspective, it's essentially neutral to perhaps some slight increase costs over outside the current budget year. The concept that you talked about is to respond to an operational need for readiness in our cruise ships to make war with a small pilot that will be for 40 days to field to a destroyer ready to your point with an excursion from the ultimately responsible.

More at the end of life, would you say More frequent smaller availability, so incremental availabilities and continuous maintenance availability to the sea bass that you're well aware of. So we will move forward to do this tailored maintenance to do this again, this excursion from physical therapy both to generate some increased a feasible operational availability intruder's and then to learn and to see it. As I told you in our conversation, it's not a complete, no brainer.

There is some learning to be involved in terms of what does it mean to execute a military commitment, but we think it's a strong approach and it reflects to your point much of the conversation that you had about other excursions off of our people.

[Representative Elaine Luria](#)

Well, thank you. And I just wanted to note that I think it does, like you said increased operational availability which in effect can increase the effective size of the fleet. So in fact if we can get more out of the ships, we have used them more efficiently. It's as though we have a larger fleet, so I'm very encouraged by this idea.

And Mr. Chairman, thank you, Larry. Now turn to Mr. Green.

[Representative Mark Green](#)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate your leadership and to the ranking member, your leadership and for putting this together. And I want to thank all of our witnesses today. It's great to get this chance to hear their perspectives. My -- my question is going to start with the oldest of the services.

General Martin, I'll start with you if that's okay. I represent Fort Campbell, Kentucky, which happens to be about eighty five percent in Tennessee. I guess the Senator at the time had a little more power in the flagpole in Kentucky. But most of those individuals, a good portion of them live in my district.

And it's important to me, 101st Airborne Division, one hundred and sixty Sword, First Special Forces Group. As I look at the budget, it doesn't appear to me that there are any significant cuts to those units and to that installation. I just want to confirm from you that in this budget there aren't significant cuts to Fort Campbell.

Congressman there are -- there are no significant cuts to Fort Campbell that I'm aware of. Thank you for that. And I really appreciate, I think Fort Campbell strategic footprint, particularly with its airfield, the size of its airfield and its deployability because of that, really appreciate the wisdom there.

We've got some significant problems with our barracks and the First Brigade mold and they move the troops out and clean it up. They put them back in mold reappears. It's really time for those barracks to go. We keep pushing it to the top of the list. DOD keeps pushing it to the bottom of the list. I'd like to ask if you would just take a personal interest in that.

For me that would be important. We've got to get those barracks replaced. My next question, you know, obviously our brigade combat teams or the fighting force of the United States Army in 101st here with three Infantry Brigade combat teams and then aviation assets, et cetera. Can you kind of describe for me how the Riham program is going to work to make sure they're ready to fight and fight a near peer?

Joseph M. Martin

Thank you for the question. Congressman, what -- what rearms going to do for the Army is it's going to allow us to create an environment of predictability while we to maintain a ready Army now regionally align our various units with regions of the world unless of course they're part of the global response Force?

And we can't talk about that on this particular network as to who is who. But it will provide each of our units purposeful direction, purposeful timing and allow them to, to train for future deployment requirements, be ready to deploy limit for this deployment. But unlike with our fortune, which we all knew from the past where in our fortune, if you were going to modernize, you had to -- you had that.

You had to do that simultaneously and it had to compete with your time for training or when you're resetting the unit after coming back from combat. Well, in this particular case in these eight month blocks that we're going to allocate for modernization. That's all you're going to do. You're going to divest old equipment and you're going to draw new equipment and the army synchronizing all of its activities in terms of modernization and the activities of our operational units to synchronize to a level that we have never seen before.

And it's going to -- it's going to literally drive activity, we'll make decisions based on who we want to have, what, when and so that our units will -- that are more likely to have to deploy next will be the most modernized units in the army. So we really look forward to it. I appreciate the question because it's something we've been working on really hard.

It'll be a full operational capability by twenty twenty two and I know you wanted to move on to the question, but I do -- I do commit to taking a look at Fort Campbell to see what we can do to help with the infrastructure there as we continue To make our investments with our facilities invest our infrastructure investment plan.

[Representative Mark Green](#)

Well, thanks for that. And one last question because it looks like I'm running out of time and I'll ask it very quickly. It looks like the PACOM commander is really demanding a lot from the Army. Can you tell me how those assets are being utilized and -- or is it on a rotational basis, Is it going to be And then what's the downstream effect to the Army as a whole?

Joseph M. Martin

Congressman there's -- there are units that rotate on a -- on a predictable cycle and there's units that rotate there as as they exercise. And then with this dynamic force employment, we are actually deploying units there to practice our emergency deployment readiness exercises and what have you. And so there's a whole -- there's a multitude of different ways that the combatant command asks for and we support with our forces there.

I'm told that we make up about 50 percent of his joint requests during the course of any given year with the rotational exercise and other like joint requirements requested by -- by the combatant commander.

[Representative Mark Green](#)

My time has expired. I'll submit a couple of other questions in writing and I appreciate everyone being here in the testimony.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Mr. Green, thank you very much. Also you proved what I know is a truism and that is all politics are local. Every one of us have mentioned our own districts. You did mention something that applies to all of us I believe and that's the barracks situation. We are investigating the possibility of a public private partnership, a significant improvement on the base housing program in which a barracks could be built as a modern apartment building might be built by an apartment developer.

We're looking at that, the army did this some time ago, probably maybe a decade or so ago. We're looking at that as a possibility and it would probably be across all the services that are here at the end. It might solve this funding problem. It does provide a specific but unknown and presumably a well behaved tenant.

So we'll move on here. I believe we have a spare your next.

[Representative Jackie Speier](#)

Thank you, Mr. Chairman ranking member. I'm going to ask three questions at the outset and then ask Admiral Luscher, General Albana General Martin to respond unless you're -- my question to you is the Navy is seen failed acquisitions, cost overruns and major products, chronic delays in routine maintenance.

And I'm finding it hard to understand why the Navy has already started reassigning 200 employees of the Naval Audit Service to non audit jobs as it reduces headcount to 85 auditors when you compare it to the Army audit agency of 458. And the Air Force at five thirty one.

So my question to you is why is the Navy decimating its internal audit function without consulting Congress To General Albon. We all know the flight hours are very important to pilots how if ever the cost to operate the F-35A is much higher than expected. It's more like seven million dollars per tail as compared to about 4 million as it was originally planned.

The Navy and Marine variants are also more expensive to operate, but the difference between actual and projected cost is far greater in the Air Force. What explains the extraordinary overruns in the cost of the F-35 to run? And finally, General Martin, what we found at Fort Hood was a toxic command climate that was -- that went through every aspect of the installation.

And a damning report that followed you referenced high risk formations. I don't think Fort Hood is the only one and I'd like to know what you're doing to ensure a command command climate. Data is taken seriously and the commanders are held accountable for fixing the situation to admiral.

William K. Lescher

Parvanova thanks for the question. I highly doubt that the Navy strongly believes in the spotlight on issues and that transparently and the conversation taking action to correct and this was more than happy talk is central to much of the trajectory we've seen and improved performance over the past three years.

I touched on it briefly in my opening statement when I talked about the get -- we still get better the audit function as it is core to our get real understand what our baseline performance is, then use that to understand how to improve performance. But the case of the audit service the site before and when second was also the system come forward very thoughtfully, looked at the scope of work that's being done to illuminate these elements of oversight, monitoring and remediation.

They look at the scope of the work across Navy, NCIS, Independent Public, Auditor Management, Internal Control Program, what we see to look at that and fundamentally the drive here is to get this in the best aggregate place to drive outcomes. The first thing I sort of is that I.

[Representative Jackie Speier](#)

Have to -- I'm going to have to cut you off because I want to make sure those other two questions that I just want you to know that I'm going to be watching because I think that what's happening with this audit function is very disconcerting. And I'll now move to General Abernathy's.

David W. Allvin

Yes, ma'am, on the question of the difference in the cost per tail per year, I think is what you're referring to the 4 million versus the 7 million, because as it turns out the cost per flying, our -- actually our projections are very close to what the other Services are and they're bearing out actually a little bit less.

But I understand your point about that up to seven point, one million dollars, just overall cost of ownership rattach per year and that frankly was a -- an underestimation we made a long time ago. When we -- early on, we're looking at the comparison. We thought we had a good reference model, this is you know, 10, 15 years ago with the F-16 and the F-16 was single engine multi role et cetera.

And so we frankly underestimated what the overall cost per tail per year was as the years went on. We continue to look at how we can drive down sustainment and on'em costs. And that is another story that that has a lot of details to it. We have not been able to bring down those costs as we look at that.

And so as we try and come up with what the new estimate for the cost per tail per year as we're finalizing that, we are going to readjust that because those -- that was just a poor underestimation early on in the program. And that's really one of the reasons why when we look at that as we look at the overall, the technology study and the future of the fighter force, we are looking at what those -- what the real world costs are and how that's going to affect our overall Fighter force of the future.

But it was an underestimation early on in the program in general, Martin?

Joseph M. Martin

Congresswoman I'll start because I know the time short that I'll offer the opportunity for myself or my staff to come briefed your staff or you on everything that we're doing. But we took what happened at Fort Hood as a wake up call. I can tell you commanders across the board didn't say who that wasn't me. They said hey, this could be us, let's take a look at ourselves.

As you probably already know, OSD has launched a new command climate survey and there's that instrument and many other instruments that we have in the army that we've combined into a data set that we're developing because we believe that big data is going to allow us to be able to see formations and potential problems in advance and in terms of harmful behaviors or counterproductive climates and cultures and those organizations.

I got a lot to say on this and not much time to do it. I'd love to come talk to you about this because I think we're making a lot of headway. Thank you. Let's do it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Yield back before you leave a sphere, an issue that came up at a joint hearing with you a month and a half ago was the tragedy of the AP. And I'm going to turn to General Thomas. I thought that I was waiting to do this until you came. There's been an additional decision made by the Marine Corps concerning that accident.

And General Thomas, if you could brief us on it and that brings us not to a conclusion of that earlier hearing, but to one of the issues that was raised at that hearing record regarding command responsibility.

[Representative Doug Lamborn](#)

Thank you. Chairman, you're referring to see leader accountability with the investigation still under review, but the bottom line is, is that the cabinet has the tone, he has enough information.

William K. Lescher

To hold them accountable.

Gary L. Thomas

Now that action those actions are ongoing will end up with final adjudication with the Secretary of the Navy. The specifics of that we'll share with this committee committee once that process is complete. Mr. Chairman, can I just make a comment?

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Yes, I'm doing this out of order here, Mr. Moore, you'll be next.

[Representative Jackie Speier](#)

But this was the subject of a.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Major hearing and this was one of the elements that was left open and there's a moving towards a closure of this element. Please go ahead.

[Representative Jackie Speier](#)

Thank you. I guess my only comment would be what we need to get to the bottom of was why this senior leader was elevated to an inspector general position after he did such a terrific job in allowing those Abbe's with with sailors in and I guess a soldier that Was ill prepared to make it so that the real question becomes why was he elevated where?

I think we're all in agreement that he shouldn't be serving in that capacity and that there was a real loss of leadership there. But I continue to have that question to you about.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you. We will -- we will pick this issue up again at a future hearing and all of the committee will be notified of the specific situation. I understand that there was a 3:00 p.m. I assume East Coast time a release of information, which I believe General Thomas summarized that an action is being taken against General Castelli as to what exactly it is, it's unknown.

Is that correct, General?

Gary L. Thomas

That's correct. You know, it's just from a due process standpoint, a chairman still has to go up to the Secretary of the Navy. But I'm happy to address either now or later date comes from Spears' concerns and be happy to come talk with her or in any form that you desire.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Please inform the entire committee and certainly the committee on the personal side of it has a specific interest as do we. Thank you, Mr. Moore. We appreciate you standing by for a few moments that short term.

[Representative Blake Moore](#)

No worries, Chairman, I've got a particularly loud unit behind me. Can you hear me? okay, Speak as long as you can keep going. Thank you. Let me continue on with the trend of talking about our districts and making politics is local as possible. I also welcome the depot work and doing something about nature and sharing the depot caucus.

And so just a quick non shameless plug because it is a topic of utmost importance and would welcome that. I've spent a lot of time this district work period actually visiting a lot of advanced manufacturing in our area near Hill Air Force Base. And there is an amazing amount of of expertize and efficiencies that are -- that that these -- these individuals, these these companies are finding.

So I welcome that and and I also look to that as a productive way to talk about the F-35 and what we need to do there. I've been equally pushed on as many different angles as possible to get into to -- to what we need to do to, to reduce that cost per flight. Our -- I've appreciated the Air Force, appreciate it every airman and every pilot that I've spoken with about this. And I know there is -- there is the right effort and awareness that's going on and I welcome that opportunity to continue to -- to dove into that.

I found to be very productive, individuals that are -- that are willing to dig in and in my office is also at the ready to -- to help bolster that and -- and be a part of the solution instead of just talking about the problem. So I open them to -- I just again highlight that need for depot work, there's a lot of solutions in that side of things and we'll continue to push that field.

My questions today will be mostly for General. Alvin, I want to talk just workforce briefly again, the question is, is is do you feel or does the Air Force lack qualified candidates to -- for the ability to hire what they need And then they only need the witness a little bit. And if you don't mind that really good.

You know, we've had some success in the maintenance community, but there does remain a gap in experience and in order to get to a journeyman role, it takes sometimes upwards to three years. And I'm -- I'm concerned about some of the replacement deficiency gap. Could you -- could you speak to that just as far as general workforce and in hiring what you need?

David W. Allvin

Thank you for the question. Congressman, it certainly is a challenge in this particular environment. It is a competitive environment. We are making headway on that. It continues to be a challenge, as I said, but the idea that it's not only just the skill set that we need, but we're working on our outreach programs to find areas in which those for a propensity to serve and I serve.

It doesn't necessarily mean in uniform, it means serve our nation and serve our air force in these capacity. So we are reaching out looking for those maybe the nontraditional areas also on our path to include the diverse increase, the diversity of our workforce. There may be talent out there that we hadn't accessed through the traditional sort of pipelines through which we get a workforce.

So I would -- I would commend you to the fact that it's not only just our STEM outreach and that sort of the efforts that we're doing to reach them in nontraditional and community colleges in areas where we have direct access to where they can see and be a part of the Air Force early on and then once they can see what -- what they're a part of, they're hooked in many cases.

And so we're reaching out through those sort of apprenticeships as well, but also in many of the underserved colleges, the historically black colleges, universities and some of the other diverse parts of our nation where we haven't traditionally looked before, it will be. It's a competitive environment because technology is doing nothing but increase.

But -- and that's where this is more, it's not your traditional engineers, you know. So we're reaching out with a lot more outreach to be able to do that. We can -- we think it's a challenge. We think the Air Force has a lot to offer and so we're being a little bit more creative about where we go.

[Representative Blake Moore](#)

Excellent, thank you. Some of the statistics that I'll throw out quickly and to the extent that you that the Air Force is using this, these these measures of these statistics to to adequately plan. I think it's very important and I would love any thoughts you had on that. But by twenty twenty three 30 percent of the Air Force Sustainment Center, federal wage grade employees will be eligible to retire.

And by twenty twenty eight that'll be well over that will be over 50 percent. Is that all being taken into consideration with regards to replacing that workforce?

David W. Allvin

It is -- and those, as you mentioned them there, those are sobering statistics because much like we've had issues with -- with in areas such as aircraft maintenance in the past and we got a significant uplift in order to recruit new maintainers. But how long does it take to train a seven year mechanic, Seven years?

So the idea of being able to also look at not just ingesting from the very youngest level, but be able to attract those in industry as we see industry is so much more mobile these days. The opportunity to serve. And we're looking at the permeability of our force, the opportunity to be able to serve for periods of time.

And that's a little bit more accessible in the civilian community. So we're looking at those opportunities to take in mid career level folks and be able to have that level of expertise. So we don't just take out the old and have a huge experience bathtub with brand new, young and energetic, but less than experienced technicians on that.

So we are looking at our mid career and the permeability of inviting them into the force as well.

[Representative Blake Moore](#)

Thank you, General and my time is up, will submit a question just General Thompson to flag for you your thoughts on space force and a National Guard component reserve component for that type of work. Great. Great topic would love to get into it maybe next time. We have an opportunity, but we'll submit it for the record.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Thank you, Mr. Moore, one of our colleagues raised that question early on I Mr. Lambourn and we'll share that response with you in more detail. We've now completed as far as I know looking at the screen and from the staff. The first round of questions, I'm going to forgo another round of questions because I might have to leave at any moment to go off and vote on the 29th transportation surface transportation. Bill?

But I'm going to be here for a while, so I'm going to forego questions. Mr. Lambourn, do you have another round of questions? No, Mr. Chairman, I do not -- it's either a. you're shaking off a fly or mosquito moving on here. Let's see, Gloria, you're still there. Would you like to Follow up Mr. Chairman? I'll pass.

Well, boy, this is working out. Let's see the only other person on the screen that I can see is Mr. Courtney, who is not there at the moment. So I go to Mr.. Mr. Chairman. I think my questions can be answered in private meetings with.

[Representative Jackie Speier](#)

The very good. All right then Mr. is back.

[Representative Joe Courtney](#)

Sorry, are you asking if I need to have any other questions, A second round, that's correct. Yeah, I'm good. Thank you. I'll pass.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

Well, that brings us back to Mr. Moore, where we started this.

[Representative Blake Moore](#)

You knowing that knowing that the reserve question was highlighted in Lammert, I was in the middle of traffic at the time I -- I can -- I can look to that and work with my team on it. I think it's a great topic and appreciate it. Sorry been asked. So I am good and we'll pass for any further questions. Thank you, Chairman.

[Representative John Garamendi](#)

OK, well then I'm going to do two things. First of all, I want to compliment Window White. I don't see his face on the screen, but if he wants to pull up his face, he turn on his television. If he can't, he is new to our professional staff. This is the first full committee in which he's taken the responsibility and whether he did a great job.

I'll applaud you and the rest of us will recognize the good work that you've done and thank you so very, very much. Also there's ongoing questions, many of which were not raised in this hearing, but will come back on those sets of questions. I want to thank the presenters, General Thompson, General Thomas, General Martin General, Alvin and Admiral Luscher.

I thank you very much, not only for this but also for the individual meetings that you've taken a great deal of time to do with members of the committee. It's most helpful. We know that we will be working together to deal with the national security issues. We may or may not see things the same way you do, but you have really an opportunity and in fact a requirement to persuade us that the view of the world that you have is the correct one.

And I suppose we have the same opportunity and responsibility and so the discussions go on and on really appreciate working with all of you look forward to a continuation of our work. And with that, this readiness subcommittee is adjourned. Thank you all very much right now.