

**DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE**

**PRESENTATION TO THE COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES  
UNITED STATES HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**SUBJECT: Future Total Force Plan**

**STATEMENT OF: Lieutenant General Stephen G. Wood  
Deputy Chief of Staff, Plans and Programs  
United States Air Force**

**July 20, 2005**

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION UNTIL RELEASED  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

Good morning, Mr Chairman, Congressman Skelton, and members of the Committee. I am glad to be here today to discuss the Air Force Future Total Force (FTF) initiative, and I am proud to appear before you with my two partners in this endeavor – Lt. Gen. Steven Blum, Chief of the National Guard Bureau and Lt. Gen. John Bradley, Chief, Air Force Reserve and Commander of the Air Force Reserve Command. I've met with many members individually as well as countless professional and personal staff members, and I am excited to now have the opportunity to update your Committee on our efforts.

I must also offer my thanks to Lt. Gen. Daniel James, Director of the Air National Guard, whose support is so vital to what we're doing. His staff has been absolutely terrific. In fact, countless members of both the Guard and the Reserve have served as integral members of our FTF team, providing the invaluable Citizen Airman perspective and leadership that is critical to building the Future Total Force.

Finally, I would like to acknowledge the contributions of three state adjutants general – Major General Mason Whitney from Colorado, Major General Bruce Tuxill from Maryland, and Major General Mike Haugen, from North Dakota. These gentlemen serve on our FTF General Officer Steering Committee and have ably represented the Adjutant Generals' (TAG) perspective and interests in this process. In addition, these TAGs have served as a vital link to the Adjutants General Strategic Planning Committee since September 2004.

Mr Chairman, I think one of the best reasons for us to be here today is to dispel many of the myths that have surrounded the FTF in recent months. Change isn't easy ... we know that. But we also know that change is a necessary part of moving forward ... The Air Force, including all of its components, is at a crossroads right now and the decisions we make today will define

our future as well as impact what capability our Air Force offers to the Nation, both here and abroad.

As we move into the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the United States Air Force faces increasing modernization and recapitalization challenges, an adversary increasingly hard to define, and constrained budget realities. While we possess weapons systems to meet today's challenges and are investing in cutting edge technology and highly capable, highly trained personnel, we must make transformational changes to maximize the capabilities these advances offer us. These changes will lead to a force that can meet DoD's vision of a joint force to meet future irregular, traditional, catastrophic, and disruptive strategic challenges while continuing to wage the Global War on Terror (GWOT), transform, and strengthen joint warfare capabilities.

First, let me offer you some of the basic facts regarding the FTF plan. I will tell you what it is, and, as I stated before, I will tell you what it is not.

There are two primary facets of the FTF plan: 1) a well-analyzed, cost-constrained force structure and 2) innovative organizational constructs that synergize the strengths of our active duty and Citizen Airmen.

Right now, we've got a fiscally responsive plan to divest older weapons systems that are not only increasingly expensive to operate, but cannot provide the capabilities the Combatant Commanders are asking for. We *must* shift our investments into newer, more capable systems and platforms that are leveraged by higher crew ratios to deliver maximum warfighting and Homeland Defense capabilities. Our plan includes new missions in a security era that places a premium on persistent and effective Command and Control, Information, Surveillance and Reconnaissance (ISR) missions and capabilities for the joint warfighter and includes a greater

role for the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve serving side by side with their active duty partners.

I can't stress this enough: the FTF plan takes us through the divestiture of legacy aircraft and sunset missions to fund critical capabilities found increasingly in unmanned aerial vehicles, space assets, information operations, and intelligence units and the Total Force warriors who will serve as the foundation of these capabilities.

The other critical part of the FTF plan defines innovative organizational constructs. The Air Force has always operated as a seamless Total Force. In fact, the Air Force Reserve and active duty have utilized the associate model since 1968. Under our plan, we'll take this integration to the next level by expanding both the scope and number of associate units, using the lessons learned over the past 40 years.

One of the most exciting things we're doing is dramatically increasing the number of active associate units. This means that the active duty will move to Guard and Reserve locations, not just the other way around! By doing this, we can leverage the tremendous experience levels we have in the Guard and Reserve, as well as provide the ability to utilize the active duty airmen to sustain increasing levels of deployment necessitated by our expeditionary role. Active associate units also demonstrate the tremendous respect the active duty Air Force has for its reserve components presence and connections to communities across America.

I want to be very clear: FTF is not an effort to marginalize the contribution of our reserve components. The Air Force has *always* operated as a seamless Total Force -- in peacetime as well as war. Under FTF, we will attempt to include all components in every Air Force mission. By taking down legacy systems that have traditionally "cascaded" into the reserve components, we can ensure they are full participants in newer, more relevant missions. These missions

include unmanned aerial vehicles, operating space systems, and processing and analyzing critical, and real-time battlefield intelligence that directly supports the joint warfighter. Some have stated that the FTF plan takes the Guard and Reserve out of the flying business altogether. To the contrary: the Guard and Reserve will be full partners in assuring joint air dominance with the next generation of fighter, tanker and mobility aircraft, to include the F/A-22, the JSF, the KC-X, the C-17 and potential future light cargo aircraft. In fact, the Air National Guard is going to fly the first F/A-22s as members of an associate unit at Langley AFB ...The Guard has one pilot and two maintainers in F/A-22 training as we appear before you today. And the Air Force Reserve is currently exploring ways to participate in the Raptor mission, both in schoolhouse and operational roles.

Let me address another myth: FTF is not BRAC, nor does BRAC serve as an enabler to FTF. FTF is solely about force structure and organizations and will be implemented regardless of BRAC. FTF determines the right number and combination of aircraft to provide the capabilities that current and future threats dictate. BRAC's focus was purely about infrastructure and basing these aircraft to meet Department of Defense goals to:

- Transform by maximizing warfighting capability of each squadron;
- Transform by realigning Air Force infrastructure with future defense strategy;
- Maximize operational capability by eliminating excess physical capacity; and
- Capitalize on opportunities for joint activity.

I'm not here with you today to discuss BRAC, but it is important to point out that BRAC law (in addition to the previous QDR) required the Air Force to submit to Congress its optimal future force structure from now until 2025. We know how difficult it is to project that far into the future, but we did that through over two years of analysis based upon the most current data

and threat projections made by the experts. This included closely following the guidelines laid out in the National Defense Strategy as well as the National Military Strategy, and also took into consideration threat analysis of external agencies such as the CIA, NSA, DIA and others. The result was a well-thought-out, rigorous review conducted by the Air Force Studies and Analysis Agency (AFSAA), which provided the optimal force structure to provide the capability to meet future threats.

AFSAA analysis included 16 different force structure scenarios against these requirements. It's important to point out that while capability was the main driver, we also conducted this analysis through the lens of a constrained budget: we had to, or this force structure would end up being more of a "wish list" than a realistic plan for the future.

I'd like to address another prevalent myth head-on: the FTF plan, in no way, will negatively impact the capability assigned to protect the skies over America. Nor will this plan take away from the capabilities required by the states during times of emergency or natural disaster. The Air Force considers Homeland Defense its most important mission, and was the first of the many requirements to be addressed and accounted for. General Blum stated it best when he said it must be "capability number one for the Air National Guard."

During FTF analysis, all force structure required to conduct aerospace warning and control of North America was taken out of the equation, i.e. it became "untouchable." If an aircraft used for the air sovereignty alert was close to the end of its service life, another, newer aircraft was taken "off the table" to replace that capability. When this force structure was fed into the BRAC process, as required by law, it was fully vetted through NORAD and U.S. NORTHCOM. In fact, Admiral Keating, the commander of NORTHCOM, stated that the combatant command "worked closely with our DoD counterparts to ensure BRAC 2005 would

not create unacceptable risk to our mission accomplishment. In our review we noted that current and future capabilities needed for homeland defense, defense support to civil authorities, and aerospace warning and control of North America missions were full considered...”

Mr Chairman, the Combatant Commander whose mission is to ensure the United States is protected from future threats was key in assessing the force structure required for Homeland Defense. And rest assured, the Air Force will continue to work closely with the National Guard Bureau, the Air National Guard and NORTHCOM to ensure Homeland Defense capabilities remain sufficient and strong.

Which leads me to the next issue that has received a lot of attention recently. The creation of “enclaves” is a BRAC issue, but I believe one that needs to be addressed in relation to FTF. After the Department’s recommendations were submitted to the Commission, I asked the Air Force’s uniformed BRAC leader, Major General Heckman, how the decision to create these enclaves came about. He informed me that the Air National Guard representatives in the BRAC process suggested the creation of enclaves to preserve important dual federal/state capabilities. In fact, Lt Gen Blum recently emphasized the importance of the expeditionary combat support (ECS) capabilities that will reside in these enclaves, which include Airmen expert in medical, civil engineering, communication and security areas. He characterized these enclaves as “hugely essential” in providing support in a federal role, as well as giving governors the capabilities they need during state emergencies. But he drove the point home when he said he had just returned from Southwest Asia and had met with many Guardsmen performing these missions overseas. In reference to criticism that the ECS role wasn’t essential, Gen Blum said, “Tell them [the ECS personnel] what they do isn’t important.” And, in the words of General Jumper, the Air Force Chief of Staff, “You only think enclaves are bad if you think ECS is not a mission.” Well, Mr

Chairman, I'm here to tell you today that the Air Force would be unable to execute its mission without this critical base opening and base sustaining capability.

I've been asked many times about the timing of the FTF plan. Why devise a Future Total Force Plan now instead waiting until after BRAC decisions are finalized and after QDR further clarifies DoD roles and missions? First, as I mentioned earlier in my statement, we were required by the previous QDR and BRAC legislation to come up with a 2025 force structure. We realize there may be substantive changes coming out of QDR; we realize the BRAC Commission may make changes to DoD realignment and closure recommendations and that annual budget deliberations may result in new considerations. But we want to be proactive, to "lay the foundation," and to have in place a rigorous but adaptive process that would guide us to best respond to the many potential changes. FTF is an evolving plan, an iterative process; we will adjust as necessary. As I've said to my staff many times, the only thing I know 100% is that we don't have it 100% right! The important thing is to recognize this and be responsive to the changing landscape around us.

As you may remember, General Jumper approved six initiatives designed to test various FTF organizational constructs, and introduced them to the public in December 2004. Let me give you a brief update on our progress:

- In **Virginia**, the association between the Virginia Air Guard's 192<sup>nd</sup> Fighter Wing and the 1<sup>st</sup> Fighter Wing at Langley AFB is quickly becoming a reality. As I stated previously, the first Guard pilot and two maintainers are in training, and the concept of operations and memorandum of understanding between the two units is signed and sealed.
- In **Vermont**, the first active duty maintainers have arrived at their new duty station with the Vermont Air National Guard, where they will test the community-basing concept.



These young airmen will gain a wealth of knowledge from the highly experienced and highly skilled airmen and NCOs of the Guard's 158th Fighter Wing. We hope this will be a template we can expand upon and shorten the time it now takes us to upgrade these Airmen to five-level status.

- In **Texas, Arizona, New York, Nevada and North Dakota**, the Guard is preparing to stand up new Predator unmanned aerial vehicle units, and the Reserve is working closely in an associate partnership in the Predator mission with Air Force Special Operations Command. One pilot from the Arizona Air Guard is in training and six will start in October. We are also in the final phases of determining the proper unit size and mixture of full- and part-time personnel, as well as the location of the Texas and Arizona units.
- In **Nevada**, we're making terrific progress integrating the Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve into the dynamic missions at the Air Warfare Center, to include Predator operations, advanced adversary flying training and even the Thunderbirds aerial demonstration team.
- In **Utah**, all stakeholders have approved the memorandum of understanding between the active duty and Air Force Reserve units, so we're getting one step closer to making this F-16 classic Reserve associate unit a reality.
- And finally, in **Hawaii and Alaska** we're moving forward to create classic associate wings with both the Air Guard and Air Force Reserve, respectively. They will share flying duties when the Air Force's newest C-17 Globemasters arrive at Hickam and Elmendorf Air Force Bases.

We are very excited with the progress of these initiatives. Not only are they creating exciting opportunities, they have allowed us to further strengthen the working relationship between all components, which will allow us to move forward together. In fact, we have a cross-functional team working throughout the summer, with representatives from the ANG, Major Commands (MAJCOMS -- including Air Force Reserve Command), and functional experts across the Air Staff. As soon as BRAC recommendations were released, we launched the process of considering future missions for Air National Guard and Air Force Reserve and asked them to tell us what they *wanted*, and what they *could* do. As this team works through these issues, we are also looking at the impacts the active duty/air reserve component mix, pilot absorption and many, many other factors. Most importantly we are focusing on training pipeline issues to ensure a logical, well thought out plan as we grow in new, evolving mission areas. One example is the dramatic increase in Predator training requirements due to the high demand for the capabilities these UAVs provide to the joint warfighter. The Air National Guard stepped up to the plate and offered personnel necessary to augment the Predator training facility. This is just one example of new synergies ... the “goodness” of FTF.

I'd like to move on now to a subject that, frankly, has left me somewhat puzzled: the concern regarding the lack of participation of the Guard in the FTF process. Please let me offer some historical insight on the matter. When the Air Force was in the early stages of creating the FTF plan, back in early 2003, deliberations were intentionally maintained at the highest levels due to the sensitivities surrounding changes of this magnitude. But I assure you that Air National Guard (as well as Air Force Reserve) leadership played a key role in these discussions. As the plan progressed, it was taken to the MAJCOMs, via their plans and programs shops ... The ANG participated at this stage as well. As the force structure proposal matured, it was

introduced into the Air Force Corporate Process. In essence, this allowed participation at all levels, ranging from the AF Board (action officers) to the AF Council, comprised of the most senior leadership, including that in the ANG and AF Reserve. Things kicked into high gear with the stand-up of the Future Total Force office. Since September 2004, we have had numerous working group-level meetings involving all stakeholders, as well as meetings of our FTF integrated process team and General Officer Steering Committee.

This brings me to the question of the TAGs' involvement in the FTF process. As I stated, the Air National Guard was included at all stages, at various levels. When it came to the TAGs, we relied heavily upon the National Guard Bureau, but more specifically the Air National Guard, to communicate with the 54 Adjutants General and to speak on their behalf. Not only is this required by Title 10 (Section 10501), but it has always been the expressed method of "doing business" by both NGB and ANG leadership. The Air Force did respond quickly, however, to requests from the ANG to speak to the TAGs, to include the Secretary and Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force spending a Sunday morning with the TAGs at a meeting of the Adjutant's General Association of the United States back in July 2004. Since then, there have been three TAGs sitting on our General Officer Steering Committee as well as two TAG-appointed representatives serving as integral, fully participating members of our FTF staff. There were other venues at which Air Force leadership discussed FTF, but I want to highlight a meeting that took place on 15 April, hosted by the ANG and held in the Pentagon. I personally briefed the TAGs on the FTF plan and "opened the books" in a classified venue to show them the in-depth analysis behind the FTF 2025 force structure and then entertained any questions they may have had. We have also included the TAGs in our mailings of periodic updates on the status of current and future FTF initiatives, as well as other items of interest. I know that we will never be able to

meet the desires of 54 respective Adjutants General, but I feel confident, as does Air Force senior leadership, that we have done our very best to keep them informed.

Let there be no doubt: we all know changes of this magnitude are tough, but we're forging ahead because this is the right thing to do to provide America with the most capable Air Force ever. We are confident we will take our Total Force to the next level because the Air Force Reserve, the Air National Guard and the active duty are in lock step as we move forward. We have been partners in this effort from the beginning and believe allowing all stakeholders to be fully involved will give us a result that will ensure all three components remain ready and relevant, well into the 21st century. I'd like to take this opportunity to express my gratitude to Generals Bradley and Blum for their participation and support in this significant transformation.

It's important to restate, however, that there will never be a "final" Future Total Force plan. Like the evolutionary nature of our Air Expeditionary Force, we must retain the ability to adapt our plan. For example, as BRAC moves forward, we will be responsive to changes the Commission may make to DoD recommendations as well as follow-on Congressional action. As QDR decisions are made, our plan will adjust to address new strategy and capability requirements. We believe we have a transformational and fiscally responsible process in place to handle these changes. And we will continue to work together: active duty, Air National Guard, and Air Force Reserve to reach our goals without ever compromising the capabilities we bring to the fight.

With that, I'd like to offer Generals Blum and Bradley the opportunity to say a few words and then address your questions.