

Lieutenant General Stephen Hoog
Lieutenant General James Jackson
Lieutenant General Stanley Clarke

AFA - Air and Space Technology Exposition

"Total Force Panel"

18 September 2013

Moderator: Good afternoon. We're on the downhill slide or the uphill climb, I don't know which it is, but good afternoon. We've had some good sessions this morning. General Grass spoke this morning related to the Guard. This afternoon in our first session we are going to have a panel with the Director of the Air National Guard, General Stanley Clarke; the Chief of the Air Force Reserves, Lieutenant General JJ Jackson; and the Director of Staff for the United States Air Force Headquarters, Lieutenant General Steve Hoog. They represent our total force partnership which is engaged in our Air Force missions around the world every day.

The active Air Force and the Air Force Reserve component and the Guard, rely on each other to accomplish their missions and for the success of the overall mission.

I would like to say they have told me, and we'll see what happens, that they are not going to speak very long so you need to start writing down your questions right away or I'll be bored and have to ask them questions on my own. I'd rather ask your questions. There were a number of questions that didn't get answered this morning with General Grass, so you might want to re-write those. I don't have that stack with me.

Without further ado, let's begin our time. General Jackson why don't you start on the far end, and then we'll move up this way, and we'll go from there.

Lt. Gen. Jackson: Thanks, Jerry. I appreciate it very much. And of course thanks to the Air Force Association and the outstanding support they give us and the opportunity obviously to participate in this panel.

If you remember from last year, I've been in the seat for right about a year now. Sid Clarke and I were on a panel, the MAJCOM Commanders and the Four Stars and the table went all the way from down there all the way over there. It was my understanding that General Welsh wanted to have a dedicated Total Force Panel today so we can get to more questions that are on your mind so we can answer them directly. So I appreciate the opportunity.

If you remember also from last year's AFA speech, General Welsh talked a little bit about the Air Force Memorial and how it can epitomize and represent quite a few things, one of which could

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

be, some people look at it and say there's the three Air Force components. I want to say that I think the rejoin is underway and that we are migrating towards a better place, obviously, than we were after the PB13 submission and it's due to the outstanding leadership of General Welsh and the Acting Secretary Fanning, to go ahead and get us to where we are. And we do have some tough choices to make and we'll continue to make those.

On the surface I can say I think the rejoin is underway. One of the things I wanted to touch on today, and I'm sure there will be plenty more questions, has to do with this thing about the operational versus strategic reserve.

If you've heard me speak at all, I don't use those terms. I think there's a lot of baggage with them. What I like to say is that your Air Force Reserve provides combat-ready Airmen. That's our job. That's what the statute says to do, and provide those to the Air Force and the nation.

The way I like to bin things is that we provide operational capability every single day, and we'll get into that in just a minute; strategic depth for the nation; and also the surge capacity that the nation needs.

What that allows us to do as your Air Force Reserve, is to go ahead and bid missions and talk about appropriations, and talk about mission sets, and talk about manpower and people in each one of those three bins so that we can make impacts in decisions on where we're going to put things and make choices. Because once again, that's exactly what we have to do right now.

I think everyone in this room knows that the Citizen Airmen in our Air Force Reserve have been serving our nation for quite a long time. We've been in this war for at least 20 years now. They are very proud members of the total force team. These citizen airmen want to continue to serve, and I have no doubt given the sequestration and Budget Control Act and the fiscal pressures we're under now, that your reserve component can play a vital role in the future of what the Air Force provides to the nation.

We do a pretty good job of keeping our fingers on the pulse of our members. Obviously, we provide combat capability to the Air Force and the nation, but in addition we have to make sure that our reserve members are able to keep their lives in balance.

We have 75 percent part-time force and 25 percent full-time force. The recent surveys from DMBC and the data that we're still collecting shows that these Citizen Airmen want to continue

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

to participate. They're proud of what they do, and they're not worn out. They want to continue to serve.

There's plenty of work being done and a lot of brain bites being put together against this total force discussion. We've got the Total Force Task Force that General Welsh stood up with Secretary Donley. I'm sure we'll get some questions on that. The take-away there is that they're doing great work, they had [inaudible] 400, and I think they got some pretty good bites out of it. And we're going to have some choices and decisions and options for the Chief and Secretary to consider as we go into the '15, '16 and '17 POMs. That's going to be wrapping up in the October/November timeframe.

On top of that you've got the National Commission on the Force Structure of the Air Force which is going to [issue] its report in February. I've had the opportunity to testify in front of that Commission twice now, and I'm supposed to go back a third time. And they're asking great questions.

For those of you who know who's on that Commission, there are very few things I can tell General Johns and General Wyatt and Secretary Conaton and Secretary Peters and Chairman McCarthy things that they don't already know. So they're very focused on trying to make good options for the Air Force to consider and Congress to consider in the future. So I'm very happy with the team it's putting together and the work that we're doing.

We've got a study right now going on that's going to wrap up concerning military technicians. Both on the Army and the Air Force side. The Air Reserve Technician Program is under review and I'm happy to say that when the report comes out they will be supportive of the military technicians in the future, because I personally think, of course, having 10,000 air reserve technicians within the Air Force Reserve, and they being the backbone of my full time support, that I firmly believe that the Air Reserve Technician Military Program is good for the nation and the Department of Defense. We should see that as that report comes out.

Then probably the last one that we'll want to consider had to do with the Government Accounting Office, DoD is mandated by Congress once again to go ahead and look at overhead structure and efficiencies within the Air National Guard and the Air Force Reserve. That report's going to come out, I think it's going to be good news in that also because you do have three components of your total force. They all provide something uniquely different and the synergistic effects help provide the warfighting capabilities we mentioned. So you'll see from that report also that we're in a good place right now. We've made some

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

improvements in how we do some things, but the bottom line is that they're supportive also of the ability to do Title 10 and Title 32 types of missions.

The bottom line is, once again, I appreciate the opportunity to be here. I'm sure we'll get some great questions from the audience to go ahead and address some of these issues. Thanks for your time.

Lt. Gen. Hoog: Good afternoon, and Jerry, once again thanks, and to the AFA thanks for hosting this outstanding convention. It's the first time I've actually been in the city or stationed in the Pentagon, so as being a visitor in the past, it's been a great opportunity for me to figure out all the great things that AFA's been doing here.

Let me just start off by commenting on JJ's bomb burst comment. Being the relatively new guy and less than a month in the seat, there's a saying downrange that basically says the further you get from the Pentagon the more joint you get, and that same thing holds true in spades downrange. I think I've actually been downrange a couple of times with both these gentlemen, from the time in Iraq in '05 and '06, I remember Kirkuk and [inaudible] were basically run by the Guard and the Reserves respectively. They eventually stood up, we're going to run this installation. And every place we've been, and as the Chief said yesterday, you can't tell active, Guard, Reserve airmen apart once we're downrange doing the job. That's the beauty of what this Air Force really brings to the fight. And that I think is what makes us unique, definitely among many of the services, air forces around the world, and it is one of our big strengths.

As I walk into this, there are a lot of studies ongoing and I know just enough to be dangerous about all the assumptions that went into that. What I can bring to this discussion is a lot of time in the field as a commander for the last nine to ten years, both downrange and in the field, of TFI, TFI game, associated units, to see how we work day to day.

What I will tell you kind of up front is that some of the biggest challenges we've seen recently is money. What I mean by that is when we get forced into making decisions on what's OCO funded and what's not, and are man-days available or not, the ability for a unit to integrate across the board if you're a TFI unit, if you don't know if you have the man-days for the volunteers to step up, it changes the overall dynamics. The funding that goes with the TFI program is the grease that allows the gears to go without any issues. But when that becomes an unknown, a TFI unit has to come up with three plans. Plan number one is TFI, full mobilization; plan number two is TFI with the volunteers who want

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

to step up, have the man-days to do it; and plan number three is an active duty only plan.

Any time you put a unit into a position where all three of those have got to be contemplated, it just fundamentally changes the nature of the conversation. That's part of the [sanding] in gears if you will about the TFI units out there.

That's a thing we need to look at from an institutional level. So how do we do that? How do we make it easier?

Once again, I look forward to the questions. We are a total force downrange. You'll find no better Air Force in the world. And that balance, that synergistic relationship, and how do we make this work for the long term. Those are the issues that we're trying to get at.

Lt. Gen. Clarke: Good afternoon. I appreciate the introduction and AFA for putting on this panel. I think it's important that we have a total force panel to discuss total force issues. There are as many of you in here I think as for previous speakers so that shows we've got some interest in the total force, so we appreciate you being here.

I'm going to tell you, my experience with the total force extends all the way back to the first time I put on an Air Force uniform. Since that time I've been in all three components of the Air Force. I've been Title 10, Title 32, peace time wing commander, combat wing commander, opportunities to share through multiple capacities, different missions, different titles. Not one single time I was performing a mission did I ever ask myself what I was doing, what status I was in, what authority I was working under. I was an airman. Period.

The strength of this Air Force is the fact that all of us see ourselves as airmen first. I hope we always do.

We come to the mission set with a mind that we're going to do something that supports the Air Force and supports this nation. There are times when we do that to support the states. We're still airmen, though. We get our support and funding and everything for the state mission through our federal mission, closely lashed up many times. Sometimes not necessarily as tight as other missions, but oftentimes we're very closely lashed up.

One of our greatest strengths is our traditional Guardsmen. When they come to work for the National Guard, they come to work for the Air Force and they bring civilian skill sets, some of which you can't put a value on. And I try to make sure that we manage that correctly, that we ensure that they have appropriate

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

tasking, that they're not wasting their time out there on drill weekends, that they feel like they're a value-added member of this total force.

So my experience, my background and everything tells me that we have a great total force. Can it get better? Sure. We can keep changing things, tweaking things, getting better. But when you're downrange and you hear the comments about I can't tell the difference between the airmen, which component they came from, that goes to the credit of the United States Air Force. I'll say it right here. The senior leadership of the United States Air Force in years past and today made the decision to make sure that this was the best total force that the nation could have. So when we perform missions we are absolutely seamless. We stand side by side and work wonderfully together and we do a great job.

That total force relationship is very healthy, particularly in the field. The total force relationship in the Pentagon, I often get asked, how are you enjoying your job? And people are kind of plugging you for some little vignette or something like that. But I always tell people that in the total force I have a great relationship with the regular Air Force and the Air Force Reserve. Now I have a great relationship with my wife also. That doesn't prevent me from having heated discussions with her about things when it comes to finances or our parents or our children or whatever, but nonetheless, we have the discussion. At the end of it we shake hands, we move forward, we do what's right for the Air Force and for the nation, and we'll do that time and time again in the future.

So again, I think the total force is a wonderful concept. Can it use some tweaking? Maybe. TFI here and there as we go forward. I think the one thing we're going to do is continue to provide value to this nation. I couldn't be a prouder member of our Air National Guard and the Air Force as an American. Thank you.

Moderator: You gentlemen kept your word. I'm still scrambling getting the questions together.

Let me start off with one question and we'll go on to several others. There seems to be some general agreement that the cost of the Guard and Reserve are a little cheaper than active forces or a lot cheaper. Is that true? And how would you address that in terms of whether or not there should be a shift to any greater presence of the Guard and Reserve in the total force?

Lt. Gen. Jackson: I mentioned earlier that I testified twice in front of the National Commission. The second time they called me back had to do with one of the simulation models that the Air Force Reserve has worked in collaboration with the Air Force CNI,

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

the Air National Guard and the SAF/FM side of the house, trying to build upon the Reserve Forces Policy Board report that talks about the life cycle cost and the total cost of an Airman or a soldier.

We've done some great work over the last few years putting together what we believe will be something that should be value-added to the Air Force and the other services and they asked me to testify about it. It's called the Individual Cost Assessment Model, the ICAM model. Currently when the Department of Defense looks at what it costs for a member to be in the military service, there are no tables for the reserve component that addresses what the cost is. So if you're familiar with the Reserve Forces Policy Board report, that was a recommendation to the Secretary of Defense that we need to have an agreed-upon ability to look at the cost of manpower within the services and the components.

You've heard numerous discussions here from all our leadership about how the most important thing we have is our airmen. I totally agree with that.

On the other side when we get into a discussion about what the cost of a Reserve member or an active member is, or a Guard member is, we get stuck because we don't have an agreement that we can move past that discussion into the more important discussions of capability and capacity.

The 98.6 weapon system, our Airmen, is the most important thing we have and we wouldn't purchase an F-35 without knowing the total cost of that system and we need to do the same thing for our airmen. So I think that will allow us to move forward with the discussion once we can reach an agreement on that.

Moderator: Let's just talk for a moment about an initiative that's been out there a little bit, and that is the duty status reform that has been going on as a way to enhance the accessibility and maintainability of our Citizen Airmen. I'll just let any of you address that as you wish. Does that make sense to you? Duty status reform. If it doesn't make sense?

Lt. Gen. Hoog: Are you referring to like a dual-hatted commander or a --

Moderator: I'm not sure what the questioner had in mind, but one of the things that I have heard has to do with the redefinition for instance of what a weekend is. For pay, let's address that one first.

Lt. Gen. Clarke: I know there's a report of the 11th QRMC which is the Quadrennial Review for Military Compensation report has been published, and there have been discussions particularly from the Commission and also from the OSD side of the house trying to go ahead and make a determination on the multiple number of statuses we can be paid in as a Citizen Airman, whether that should be reduced or changed.

Lt. Gen. Hoog: Jerry, if you don't mind I'd like to go back to the question you asked you before in terms of the costing piece. I think what JJ mentioned is exactly right. Now we're getting into the next level of details about life cycle cost, total cost of the airmen, as he said, the most critical part of the weapon system.

One of the challenges we're having on the active side is as you do this projection forward and we start making more of a rotational presence forward versus more of a forward base situation, we're getting into the dynamics and the planning factor and the assumptions about how many forces are going to have to be available to rotate to make that happen.

So we get into this dynamic where when you make these assumptions you start talking quality of life, what you think your retention is going to be, how do you leverage the training, how much does it cost to give a typical aviator a flying hour? What does it cost to give him experience? How do we leverage across active? And how do we either flow that into the Guard and Reserves or how does the Guard rate some of its own organic combat capability through its own pipeline? All those balances are a key piece of this equation.

One of the challenges I've seen as I've gone out is, for example, one of the newest systems we fielded was the F-22. I've had the chance to be the Numbered Air Force Commander twice now with two of those units. When you have a fifth generation platform, the day it's fielded it's an LDHD asset. That's the reality of where we are in today's environment.

When you have that, when you make your planning assumption, you've got to make sure you have a robust training base to make sure you can support right out the door that three-to-one-planning assumption you're talking about and the five-to-one on the ARC side to make it happen.

So all of these things go into that overall planning model as we look to the future to make sure we have the right assumptions as we build that ratio. Because one of the things we absolutely positively have to have is that on the active duty side we need to keep the retention we have and the ability to flow from the

active side into our ARC components to make sure we leverage and have that synergistic relationship which is one of the reasons we've been I Think so successful today.

Moderator: General Clarke, this question is for you. To make the pivot to Asia real, PACAF needs more rotational presence. Can the Air National Guard truly meet this requirement?

Lt. Gen. Clarke: I think that's really a question not just to the Air National Guard but the total force we were talking about earlier.

When it comes to force planning decisions and things that we're going to do, the studies and what not, a lot of it is all based on assumptions. What your assumption about the rotational demand overseas will be either post-conflict, pre-conflict. It also has to look at what is the big war? And homeland defense, if you add that one in all at the same time, that kind of gives you an idea of what you're going to have. But it's all pinned on assumptions about what we believe about the future.

One of the things I know right now is that does the United States consider itself facing an existential threat, that which threatens the very survival of this nation? My personal opinion is no. We don't. My personal opinion is it takes a decade for a peer competitor to reach that level where they actually threaten the survival of this nation. So there may be an opportunity to talk about the force structure with regards to how quickly you have to get there, how much you have to bring, and how long you're going to stay there. This is all part of the discussions that we're having about the Total Force Task Force, the National Commission on the structure of the Air Force, internal studies that we do, the constant debates and dialogue between the MAJCOMs and the Air Staff. We're taking all that into account right now. So again, it's all pinned on assumptions

With regard to actual rotational demand, the National Guard Bureau policy is that we will do a one-to-five mobilization to dwell. That is one period overseas, five back at home. And if that requires involuntary mobilization of Guardsmen, we're in. Mobilize us. We're in. Period.

Moderator: Let's go to the elephant in the room that always seems to come out here and there, and that is why we need two organizations to make up one Air Reserve Component. What does AFRC do that the ANG cannot do and vice versa?

Lt. Gen. Jackson: I'll take that one on. First off, if you heard my little speech a couple of days ago I started off with this. We have three components for very good reasons. The Air

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

Force Reserve was stood up in 1948, one year after the Air Force was stood up because we as a nation knew that we needed capacity, capability in our air arm. We also knew there were some fiscal issues after the war that we were going to have to address. Kind of similar to what's going on now.

In addition to that, and Sid can correct me to 100 percent, the National Guard was stood up in 1903 through the Militia Act, and of course that ties back to the Minutemen, and they were put in place for a totally different reason. They were put in place in Title 32 status to support the governors and support the states and the nation and provide some of the same things I talked about earlier with surge capacity, operational capability, strategic depth.

So there are similarities where those missions align. What I would put on the table is that over the past 15 years during this conflict or 20 if you want to count Northern Watch and Southern Watch, people have kind of blurred the lines between the Title 32 Air National Guard and the Title 10 Federal Reserve, so they view us as one, which isn't true.

I joined the Air Force Reserve for a lot of good reasons when I came off of active duty after 14 years, and they were probably different reasons than Sid joined the Air National Guard. Though I do know that he was an [Okie] before I was, so he was in the Reserves, then he went over to the Air National Guard. He did that for some good reasons, but they're different reasons. The Air National Guard is a state-centered organization. Both for force development and force structure. The Air Force Reserve is a federal CONUS-centered organization. So as we move force structure, we're able to make some changes across state lines. You don't have the governor sometimes weighing into that.

So when it comes to accessibility and access and the ability to do different things, your Title 10 and your Title 32 components have two different lanes that they have to operate in and that is definitely one of the strengths that we have.

Lt. Gen. Clarke: I'd just add onto JJ's comments that the Guard perspective is we see the fact that we're tied to the governors and the senators and the congressmen as a part of the fabric of our nation. Indeed, we think that's a national strength that we have that offers a lot to the Air Force. In fact there are many places where the only representation across the nation of the Air Force is with the National Guard and possibly the Reserve. That's a big deal. We actually have a presence in a lot of locations across the nation. That ties us to the fabric of the communities across this nation in which no other organization does.

So when General Dempsey talks about reconnecting with America, we are America. We're connected. We're very proud of that goal.

What I'm trying to do is leverage the relationships that we have as an Air Force strength, bringing that to the attention of senior leadership in DoD and over at the Hill that we view ourselves as airmen, like I talked about at the beginning of the speech, but also the opportunity to represent the states at the same time. We see that as a value-added strength to what the Air Force needs and what the nation needs.

Moderator: That presence is so valuable, which as we close more and more bases that's just one of the realities.

But that brings up another little political hot potato, so to speak, and that is do the congressional representatives who have jobs and economic benefits at risk in their districts hear the same messages from the National Guard leaders that they hear from the active component? Just related to that, with this fiscal environment, and this is probably for you, General Clarke, is there some paradigm that's going to have to be changed in terms of the Guard mission that has to do with the balance of where we're going to put our money?

Lt. Gen. Clarke: If it goes back to a cost issue, take a look at our infrastructure and our bases. We operate those really cheap. A lot of our locations we rent the entire base for one dollar a year. A lot of them. One dollar a year. Now they get some benefit out of that because our firefighters might support their aviation interests at the civilian airport, but the low cost of operating these locations is something that needs to be taken into account when you talk about that.

When we talk about things like the Abrams Doctrine. We haven't visited that one in a while because we were smart enough not to repeat the mistake of Southeast Asia where we did not activate the Guard and Reserves in numbers. We didn't take America along with us in conflicts. In the future we think that's an important part of the decision, that we need to make sure that America's connected to this military, the Air Force is connected to America and when we move forward in things that take place that require action, there may be a heck of a lot more casualties and things than what we've seen even over the last decade, we better make sure that America's on board with that. I think being disbursed across these communities in multiple locations is a really good idea.

Moderator: What will be the role of the Guard and the Reserves in ISR in the future, and the same thing related to cyber? Are

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

you doing some more thinking on that? That's been addressed occasionally during the conference here, but I thought I'd bring that up.

Lt. Gen. Jackson: Just a couple of comments on the Air Force Reserve side of the house, Jerry. Over the last 24 months we've done some pretty significant planning on where we want to be as an Air Force Reserve in 2023. Part of that's to align with the Chief's vision. Where are we trying to be for an Air Force? But also based on the decisions and choices we all know we have to make, there's going to be a zero sum game, probably, when it comes to moving manpower and funding.

So what we've done is we've looked at every mission set. We're in every one of the service core functions of the Air Force. We've used our strategic and our qualitative analysis to make a determination on what is the best fit for the Air Force Reserve, what the nation and the CFLI (Core Function Lead Integrator) and the MAJCOMs need for us to do, and of course what the Strategic Planning Guidance tells us we need to do. That allows us to bin, once again I'm the guy with bins here, to put our mission sets into a top tier, middle tier and bottom tier and then as we went into the FY15 bill we had to make some choices and move some TOA from the bottom part of that towards the top. It's pretty significant when it comes to ISR and cyber because both those mission sets are in the top tier of where we want to be in 2023.

Sid talked about it a little bit, and I totally agree. There are civilian skill sets, particularly in in cyber that are hugely beneficial to our Air Force. If you've been to a cyber unit, a significant number of those members and airmen are enlisted, and they're working for other companies and they're getting their certificates with their civilian employer. And we're going to train all those folks and then they're going to jump ship because obviously they can do better things monetarily wise with another company than stay with the Air Force.

The Air Reserve Component can capture that and retain that Citizen Airman for life and that's where we think we should be able to fit in, and we can reduce costs for the cyber arm of the Air Force because of the civilian skill sets that transfer over.

You've got to stay on the cutting edge of this stuff and the only way you can do it normally is in the civilian sector where all of our parties out there are doing that every single day, looking for the best values.

Moderator: As you've noticed, we've had a great presence in our audience of Air Force ROTC and CAP collecting things, serving us

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

and being present. I hope many of you are talking to these folks because so many of them are the future of our Air Force.

But one question came up, where should the Civil Air Patrol fit into the total force? Or is anybody even thinking about it?

Lt. Gen. Hoog: In my previous job as the 1st Air Force Commander and Commander, Air Forces Northern, I had an opportunity to get a close working relationship with the Civil Air Patrol. The Civil Air Patrol provides several functions for the Air Force and I would say the nation. Again, tremendously passionate about the Air Force and consider themselves every inch an airman that the rest of us do.

When I was the Commander of the 1st Air Force, if an event popped like the flooding in Colorado today or New Mexico, I could pick up the phone and ask one of the people on my staff to get a hold of somebody at Civil Air Patrol and get us some images of what was going on so we could provide it to U.S. Northern Command. The quickest response you got was the Civil Air Patrol. They drop whatever they're doing in their lives. They might have been in a meeting, they might have been the CEO of a corporation and say got to go, get up, go out there, crank up their airplane, take off with the sensors firing and put those images out pretty fast. They have the authorities, they have the [inaudible], but the most unique thing is their passion for what they do.

So our relationship with the Civil Air Patrol is something that is somewhat undervalued, but I certainly appreciate what they do.

Moderator: This is a simple one, but perhaps some complex things going behind it. Can the Guard and Reserve save the A-10? Can the Guard and Reserve maintain an aircraft mission that the active duty is not planning to continue?

Lt. Gen. Clarke: I guess the fundamental question is when the Chief made his remarks yesterday he talked about cutting vertically. When you cut vertically, the Guard and Reserve are off the table just like the active duty is. It's not about part time/full time, it's about all the infrastructure behind it.

So taking a weapon system and putting it completely in the Guard and Reserve and saying that's going to save a lot of money, you're going to save someone the flying hours because you might fly less and the manpower to run it, but at the end of the day if you have the entire infrastructure tail behind it, I don't think you're getting anywhere near the savings that people think you're going to get out of that

Lt. Gen. Clarke: The question that you started off with about can we save the A-10, I used to fly the airplane. In fact I was a weapons school instructor and had a wonderful relationship with the airplane and the people who maintained it, a lot of fond memories. But the guidance out of DoD was to look at reducing single mission aircraft. The A-10's been a great aircraft. It served us in multiple ways many times. I know it's near and dear to the land warriors out there and the mission it accomplishes, but the problem that we face right now is one that goes beyond the Guard, the Reserve and the regular Air Force. With this whole thing coming out of the OCO money, getting sequestration right now on top of us.

If you've General Motors and you want to get to a certain place in the future with the latest, greatest pickup truck, you've got to make some kind of adjustment. You might get loans floated to you so you can get more money and then create R&D and everything that makes that happen. We're not getting any more money so that option's out. Your next option is maybe kill the Pontiac line, if you're going to have an analogy. So something's got to go if you want to get out there to 2023.

As members of the total force I think all of us share the view of the Air Force has to have a fifth generation force out there. And ensure over the years, the big support in fifth generation capabilities. But in the end, it's all about being the dominant Air Force of the future. So we're on board with moving towards Air Force 2023, at least I know the three of us agree with that.

Moderator: Just another thought that comes up from the audience here. What impact will the increase in civilian airline hiring, as they're going to now as I understand it ramp up on that, affect the number of pilots that you have available to you for retention in the Guard and Reserves, and the active duty for that matter?

Lt. Gen. Jackson: I think at least we're aware, and you all are probably aware also, that the Chief's going to have a Rated Management Summit this week to talk over this exact topic. It's something we've had at least two other senior summit meetings about, particularly for the fighter force.

The bottom line, I believe, is that, and some of you have heard this discussion. I've tried to make the point a few times, that every cockpit that the Air Force has to give up is another cockpit that we're not going to replace with an F-35 or another cockpit, that we're not going to be able to retain that Airman for life in the reserve component. Because they will be -- We had a meeting, the Secretary called me in with some senior vice presidents of the air carriers, and I was fortunate enough to be

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

in that meeting with JC Witham, the Deputy Director of the Air National Guard, and we had some of that conversation. How do we benefit from the shared resource.

What I want to say is that we need to be looking at ways that we can look at a total force solution for this and we're doing that right now. We've got policies in place so that we need to go ahead and decide so that we can allow our Airmen to go from the active component into the Guard and Reserve much more seamlessly, much more readily than we can now. As opposed to making the commitment on the active side, throwing money at it, and then now allowing that to come forward.

So we need to have the reserve component capture that investment for life. And every person in a blue suit out here is worth at least a half a million dollars. At least that's what we've determined through the simulation models. If you come in the Air Force for six years, we invested about half a million bucks in you. And of course pilots are above that. So we need to keep those folks and that's where the reserve component can help.

Lt. Gen. Hoog: To kind of piggyback along the same lines, I think we all went through that, what was it, the mid-80s period? I was at Luke in '85 to '87 and I think in that two year period the number of people that actually accepted assignments to another active duty position out of there was something less than ten percent. So there's a draw on the airline side.

But the other piece of it is, and this is why it's so critical when the Chief made his message about the impacts of sequestration and readiness training. I was a commander up in Alaska when we stood down the Aggressors and of course in ACC we stood down units all over the country. When you're standing in front of a captain or soon to be major who's just pinned on and he's trying to make a decision and he's looking at the potential of not having the flying hours to be properly trained to do what he knows he needs to do as a nation, that starts to put a seed of doubt into what the long term viability of that's going to be.

When we put out messages, for example, on the 11-F, no need to apply for some of the higher end special duty programs because we can't afford to let you go that sends a message itself about what the long-term career action on that is.

So we've got two or three things going on at the same time, and I think JJ's exactly right. How do we work that balance and how do we maintain it so that we capture the expertise, the long investment and training and cost to get somebody up to speed? And how do we do that to serve both the ARC forces as well as the active duty as we go into the future?

So there is no one clean answer, and I think at the end of the day we're going to have to look at it NDS by NDS, skill set by skill set, and even location by location because depending on where you are and where you do the mission set depends on your ability to recruit, train and have a viable unit.

These all go into the equation which is why I think it's fair to say it's not an easy answer. All is good. You really have to look at the each's of each one and figure out, as the Chief says, what are we trying to do with this TFI unit? What are we trying to do with this mission set? Where do we want to go in the future?

Moderator: I'd like to conclude with a question that I think all three of you should probably address. That is, and I'll form two questions together on this. One is how will the Guard and Reserve change as you come off the heavy call-up and rotation schedule of the last decade? And then accompanying that, is there a difference in how the total force will operate in the future? I think you addressed some of this in your initial remarks, but perhaps include some of the things you'd like to say now, let's just have some comments on the change for the future.

Lt. Gen. Clarke: JJ's right. In my experience, I came up with the four total force pillars and I repeat these often because I believe in them in my time-tested experience as a member of the total force. They come down to four.

The first one is standards. We all have to meet the same standards. You can't have a difference between our airmen, whether it's medical standards, PT standards, whatever. We're going to meet the same standards.

Two, we all have to take the same inspections. You can't be inspected differently. If you want to be an organization that can't work together, go inspect people differently.

Three, that's the operational engagement piece that I think you were addressing to a certain degree in the future and today.

Four is resourcing, to make sure those first three actually work. I would tell you the credit goes to the United States Air Force, again, the senior leadership who made the decision that the readiness of all three of these components would be as high as possible within fiscal constraints and the readiness levels are very good with the exception of this past year when we had to face the sequestration that was laid in.

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

We'll pull out of this. I heard General Hostage say yesterday, particularly the Air Combat Command, he sees it's months and months to get out of that hole and he's probably right about that.

When it comes to that third pillar, that operational engagement, I think it is keystone to what we do as a total force. If you want to see us kind of migrate back towards the strategic reserve, take us out of the operational game and don't let us do the deployments, don't let us do the big exercises, don't call us up when something kicks off around the world because you will not see the seamlessness that we've been seeing over the last decade, decade and a half.

This really started in my mind back when we got into the AEF. That really put the Guard and Reserve on the first string when we started doing our presence missions and containment operations over Iraq. We became I think more of a total force at that time than in previous years. It was largely because of the operational engagement piece.

Going forward in the future, I hope we stay as operationally engaged as possible. I think it's important to our total force seamlessness. I think it's important towards our seasoning of senior leadership both at the NCO level and at the officer level. And so in the end we have a common experience and we all can operate together regardless of what contingency happens in the future. People have heard me say this one before, as a nation we plan for a lot of things we don't do, and we do one heck of a lot of things we don't even plan for. But because of that readiness level, the seamlessness, everything I was talking about, we're able to do as the total force.

Lt. Gen. Hoog: Just to follow up on that. Some of the second order effects of the budget impacts and the messages we're trying to send versus the message you may see out in the field.

When Sid talks about the AEF, he's exactly right. The units we deployed downrange, what I saw during my tour as the [DCFAC], was completely similar.

When I came back at Shaw Air Force Base we had a situation where due to funding constraints and active duty unit that was supposed to go to Afghanistan and a reserve ARC unit that was supposed to go to Korea for a TSP mission, we ran out of money. Funding became an issue. Since one was OCO funded and one wasn't, we swapped the deployments of both units. The active duty unit went to Korea; the ARC unit went to Afghanistan. That's a great FM decision, but the message that sends to the active duty force was

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

that we can afford to send you to Korea but we can't afford to send you to the current fight in Afghanistan.

What happens is every time we do these things you have to be aware of the second order consequences of the message you're sending out there to the full time force. Because at the end of the day the leverage that we get as a total force and the seamlessness of working together all counts on us all coming to the same fight with the same skills, and as General Clarke was saying, being at the same exercise and fighting side by side.

So we have to make sure we don't set ourselves up that we're sending the wrong signals to the force out there as we go forward.

The other piece of that, obviously, is what the future holds in the rotational presence. If we're going to plan on a rotational presence we have to fund the rotational presence so we don't in the year of execution change our basing assumptions. When that happens we kind of break the contract across the board. Whether it's the ARC member who already bid a schedule that allows him to go TDY and support the fight, they can't go now, or vice versa, we have to make sure that whatever we commit to we fully fund as an Air Force so we let the seamless integration occur on an everyday basis.

Lt. Gen. Jackson: I guess I get the closing comments. Thanks, Jerry, for the opportunity once again.

The two points you brought up, first the rotational schedule. Once again, surge capacity, rotational capability, it's all tied together with the funding the boss has talked about.

Where I see the good news happening right now, and I'm optimistic about that, is through the last year and a half our leadership, our Chief and our Secretary have made decisions to say that we need to fill combatant command requirements using the total force. All 560,000 airmen should be part of the planning and the rotation at the one-to-three, one-to-five as a starting point the boss talked about. Every single one of our airmen should be part of that training. And we are just now doing that with the FY15 and beyond [inaudible].

That means a couple of things. First off, it's going to help the active duty dwell in some areas, but it's going to keep us in the operational engagement that Sid and boss have both talked about.

With that comes a bill. The bill is an O&M bill in most cases, or a MilPers, MPA bill. But in my view the good news is it used to be that if you're going to go ahead and bring up an ARC member

Total Force Panel - AFA - 9/18/13

on status the first question was, what's the MPA going to be with it? That's not the case anymore. We are planning '15, '16 and beyond using all airmen, determining what the requirements are for O&M and MilPers and making decisions using all of the total force, and that's a good thing, I believe.

The other part has to do with the operation in the future. One of the things that I didn't touch on but I'll do it really quickly has to do with the TFI and associations, and boss had talked about this previously. You've got to monitor those and make sure that you have set them up for success.

Within the Air Force Reserve there are about 120 Air Force TFI associations right now. We have approximately two-thirds of those within the reserve component. Classic associations and active. I was just able to deliver the last C-17 down to Charleston with Sid, and it was an outstanding event with General Shelton, and I was able to go ahead and visit the Charleston unit which is a classic association there on C-17s. And from day one, 20 years ago, flying this airframe they've been doing that mission together as one team, one fight; one team, no seam.

There are 53 C-17s supposed to be on the ramp at Charleston. I counted less than 20. It's because both of those wings -- the reserve wing and the active duty wing -- sharing that iron, being efficient, fixing airplanes on the weekends, provide significantly increased capability to TRANSCOM and we see that in the majority of our associations.

So we need to fix what needs to be fixed, but I think operationally that associations are good for the Air Force and we should continue to make sure we fix that construct.

So as we get off the stage here I want to say thank you once again from this panel. I believe I have the two wingmen here to support that. The Air Force Association has done a great job putting on this forum and the opportunity here has been outstanding. I just want to say that I believe all three of us and what we represent are proud members of the total force team and the Air Force that provides global vigilance, reach and power for the nation, and we do it better than anyone else. Thanks for your time.

#