TRANSCRIPT

Defense Writers Group

A Project of the Center for Media & Security
New York and Washington, D.C.

General Carlton T. Everhart
Commander, Air Mobility Command

April 5, 2017

DWG: Sir, let me begin with a question about the current operational situation that you're dealing with.

Obviously your command's been operating at a high, nearly surge level for quite some time now. But give us a little bit of a status report. You know, as of April 5, 2017 on your level of intensity supporting the operation against ISIS, and how does that affect your global responsibilities?

General Everhart: We can jump right into questions. I do have prepared remarks that would maybe get into some of this that we can make available to you. So I can do it either way. If I can jump into this, then I'll jump right into that question because I think that will give, you're asking basically about my OpsTempo and how it's affecting me.

DWG: Yeah.

General Everhart: If you just saw the news today about Peru with the landslides that are going on, I'm getting ready to send two C-130s there. So when we talk a little bit about what my OpsTempo is in my global AOR, I have a global area of responsibility. So we're right now not only conducting operations against ISIS, but we're doing Antarctica and I'll talk a little bit about this in just a second. But we're also doing humanitarian relief operations in Peru, to provide those critical supplies that are needed, and I'll talk a little bit about what I call gray tail diplomacy also.

I have more than 1100 aircraft and 124,000 airmen, and that's total force airmen in the Mobility Air Forces. So that's active duty, Guard and Reserve, and I include those civilian counterparts in that total also. We're at every corner of the globe from Asia to Africa to Antarctica to South America, and our primary mission sets include air

refueling, airlift, aeromedical evacuation and then the en-route support capabilities to ensure rapid global mobility and the kinetic effects which typically draw the headlines of the day.

Our operations run 24-7, 365, every day of the year, to the point where right now I have a takeoff happening once every 2.8 minutes anywhere around the globe.

I don't think many people realize the full extent of what air mobility operations involvement is in worldwide operations at any given moment.

If you look at our tanker sorties, and this is a little bit of what you were asking. If you look at our tanker sorties, they comprise more than 40 percent of what the United States sorties have flown in the contingency operations, Operation Inherent Resolve. Factor in all the mobility aircraft and that number shoots to more than 50 percent easily.

Mobility air forces have flown 90 percent of the 35,000-plus tanker sorties in support of the fight against ISIS. We provide global support touching all nine combatant commanders, and this means there's a lot of wear and tear on our fleet, and it's asking a lot of our airmen and our families.

Mobility airmen are typically the first in and the last out in any operation and we're on the ground first, and then we're conducting operations in the air, then we're back on the ground.

So metaphorically speaking, think about this table. Someone has to set this table. That's Air Mobility Command and air operations. Someone has to make sure the table is sustained, the food's coming out so you can eat. Fly, fuel, maintain, tools, those type of things. That's Air Mobility Command. And then when it's all done, someone has to scoop all this stuff up and take it back home so we can refit, refurb and get ready for the next operation. That's Air Mobility Command. And that is the pride of what we do in the support for the joint warfighter and the ability to conduct, like I say, those operations across the globe.

Today we face serious challenges within our fleet and our Air Force. The demand on Air Mobility Command is excessive, and I don't see that stopping. And we're also flying at higher program rates. Between fiscal year 2012 and fiscal year 2016, AMC's tanker fleet, the KC-135s and the KC-10s, over-flew the program flying hours by 237 percent and 178 percent respectively between those two airplanes.

The airlift fleet, the C-17s and C-5s, they over-flew their flying hours by 124 percent for the C-17s, and 105 percent respectfully for the C-5s.

The nation faces a resurgent Russia and a rising power in China, with new warfighting approaches and ultra-modern weapons. Yet we are projected to fly the KC-135 until it's at least 100 years old before I can get that airplane totally replaced with a new tanker.

As operations against ISIS and the numbers indicated, we are placing a lot of wear and tear on the fleet. We're being asked to fight the wars of tomorrow with the mobility equipment of yesterday. Investment and financing and the ensuring the persistence and the survivability of the fleet is required.

My command is actively looking ahead at studying our options and working with industry, hand in hand with industry to develop solutions to ensure our mobility air forces remain viable and capable for decades in the future. This includes addressing the impeding national pilot shortage you've heard of and discussed previously. And facilitating a smooth transition and transformation from our tanker fleet to our KC-46. From the pilot shortage -- and I'll be ready to have the initial conversations with the airlines, and we're getting ready to do that in May with, using my term, a summit with the airline industry, and I'll talk a little about that in just a second and I'm happy to answer any of your questions.

There again, we're working hand in hand with industry in partner areas for development and research, for new capabilities that are bringing on the aircraft, and we're also working with our Civil Reserve Air Fleet to make sure they're protected and where we need them.

As of January 2016, 23 carriers and 453 aircraft were enrolled in our Civil Reserve Air Fleet. The Civil Reserve Air Fleet, if you don't know, they provide about 90 percent of my lift for passengers and roughly about 40 percent of my total cargo lift, so they're a great shock absorber when I have to keep up with the OpsTempo. It helps me flex to keep people home so I can rely on the commercial industry to perform a part of the mission to relieve a bit of the OpsTempo.

We also need [the CRAF] to remain involved and enrolled as we know that the world would introduce the next and with the economy wise, and I can take no chances, so it's critically important that we maintain these carriers to the greatest extent possible.

So as you can see, there's a lot of issues. It's pilot retention, it's fleet modernization, there's the CRAF, there's ensuring persistence and survivability of our aged aircraft over defense environments. So those are just a few things that are on my mind.

So if you ask me about our OpsTempo, we are getting in action every single day. Just like I said, the demand for Air Mobility Command is just insatiable. And it's only going to go up.

If you look at, like today with Peru, we're already sending two C-130s out. It's interesting if you look at my fleet. If you go and look at the tail, and I call it the gray tail of diplomacy. If you go and look at the tail of an airplane, what do you see on it? You see the American flag. So not only are we bringing power in, but we're also bringing diplomacy, humanitarian relief, assistance. So when those NATO birds or the coalition birds come up to air refuel underneath a tanker, what do they see? The American flag. When you see those C-130s and the people of Peru are getting those supplies because they're feeding their families, they're taking care of their loved ones, and when we've got

medical assistance happening. What do they see on that tail? The American flag. When we go and we pick up aeromedical evaluation patients, what does that patient first see? He sees an aeromedical evacuation technician or a doc, and what do you see on the left shoulder? The American flag. Or if you see the POTUS, the President of the United States and he flies in on Air Force One as our Chief Diplomat or our Commander-in-Chief or our Chief Executive, what do you see? The American flag.

That's a pride thing for me. That should be a pride thing for all of us in this room because that is what we are as a nation. And my fleet, I believe, does that better than anybody.

So operations will increase. We're busy. As you know, we've been busy for the last 15 or 16 years. I came in, my first operation was Desert Shield/Desert Storm, and it hasn't slowed down since. It just hasn't.

So we do have some road blocks along the way. Pilot shortages, we're getting out there, and I'll be happy to answer any of those questions. But there are some other -- we never know when the next conflict is going to be and we're always prepared to respond where needed. We have to do it with limited dollars, and we can talk about the CR that's going on, how it affects me.

I'm happy to answer your questions.

DWG: Going back to the operations, can you talk about the ongoing mission supporting the Saudis in Yemen? What is the pace of operations for that? Has that stayed steady?

General Everhart: It has. If you watch what's going on in those operations, you know, I can talk to it from an Air Mobility standpoint. We're always bringing in supplies when needed. At least to the outer reaches. I can't really talk about, you know, ongoing operations. But we have done operations with C-17s where we were actually the support command. This happened a couple of years ago. Where we were actually the support command. I talked about this example the other day.

We were moving some forces out of Yemen, and we were doing it at night because of the contingency operations there and the DCFAC came in and he goes hey, what's the F-15s doing? How come they're facing north? This operation's here. And we got air cover over those C-17 operations and we also had ISR. So it really made my heart warm, because they were going to go conduct kinetic somewhere else, but they provided overwatch for us while we were extracting folks.

So a tremendously successful operation. And that was a couple of years ago and that was in the news. So that's been open. But we're constantly, in our core missions, bringing in supplies, doing those types of things. Maybe not physically landing in Yemen, but bringing them close to countries outside to where we can get supplies over.

DWG: And refueling operations?

General Everhart: Absolutely, with the refueling operations, you know, that whole CENTCOM AOR, we're all over the place.

It's interesting, if you talk to Jay Silveria or Lieutenant General Harrigian, the CFACC right now, he'll tell you that the war over there is a tanker war. And it's a tremendous capability, what our tankers provide, because you know, the troops in action, those fighters can roll in after loitering because they just refueled off a tanker. They just got their gas and they're ready to go for the troops in contact with [sage] lines, but they're also there to do it and strike targets that are listed and executing the air war itself. You can't do it without the support of the tankers. I'm sorry, but you just can't. It's not a boastful thing. It's a fact. You just can't do it without tankers. They'll tell you it's a tanker war out there.

Hopefully that answered your question.

DWG: Hi, I'm Charlsey with Air Force Times. Thank you for being here.

General Everhart: No, thank y'all.

DWG: You mentioned the KC-46, and last year you talked about how the Air Force is working on training maintainers for the Pegasus and [inaudible] them. So I was wondering how that was going and how many maintainers you have versus how many you need. And also what makes maintaining the Pegasus different from other similar aircraft.

General Everhart: The Pegasus itself, as you know, is built on the 767 platform. So it's not an airplane that's 60 years old, but it's a more modern airplane. So it brings those modernization pieces, particularly in the maintenance world, with it. Plug and play, for instance. You can have a black box, and if it looks like it's going to go out you can plug it in, another black box, and off you go.

It has the capability to report on itself, and we're exploring this and as requirements are set and we've continued to develop the airplane, I'm looking at Air Mobility Command to buy this capability. The commercial industry does this all the time. We do what's called predictive maintenance. So as the airplane flies it will report back on itself and hey, this box is ready to go, you know, needs to be replaced. This engine needs to be replaced in about 20 hours, for example. And if you don't land and do so, you either pay me now or pay me later. If that engine goes out and throws a blade, it can be a $10 million replacement. If I do preventive maintenance, it can be a $200,000 replacement. Do the math. It saves taxpayers dollars.

We're bringing on the airplane. We're selecting crews now. We're working through, we are, we do have, as you know, it's not only a national pilot shortage but we have shortages in our maintainers. So as we assess more people, bringing them on now that we're bringing up the population of the Air Force to 321,000, hopefully go up, with money, go up to 350,000. Where we're short on folks, particularly the maintainers as

we bring on the F-35. We're also bringing on the KC-46. So there is a demand for the maintainers to do their job.

We have initial cadres already set aside so I'm not really worried about overall having enough people to do the job to maintain the airplane. The airplane is a brand new airplane. If you look at just the airline industry alone, the airplane's going to be pretty capable which is going to help us get over the hump for our shortages in our maintainers.

So am I worried? No. Am I watching? Absolutely. And if I see a dip in my population I need in maintainers I will come up on the net pretty hard with the Air Force.

And General Cooper, our A4 who is responsible for logistics and responsible for maintainers, he at the Headquarters Air Force level, he's watching this closely and we're working hand in hand with him.

We're working with Boeing. We have a set schedule so we're looking for the first flight in 2017, in September. I'm looking forward to flying that first flight, bringing on the Pegasus. But it's interesting to note, everybody said well as you look at the budget, the KC-46, that's a brand new airplane. Why are you worried about modernization? Because there's 179 of them. I've got 300 other tankers to replace, roughly. So if you look at when I'm going to finally replace the last KC-135, the pilot to fly the last KC-135 to the bone yard hasn't been born yet. Oh, I'm sorry. Their child hasn't been born yet -- the second generation. So you're looking at an airplane that could be up to 100 years old. That's the reason why the KC-46 program is vital. So that's the reason why we're watching this program. And as I said earlier this week, I'm a very demanding customer. And I think you want me to be because it's our taxpayers' dollars and that's what we deserve. And America deserves this great tanker. It's a great program. It's a great acquisition program. I came through with the C-17, watched its growing pains. I flew the first C-17 in Charleston in '93 when they landed. Watched the program and then worked that program. And if you look at the KC-46 overall program, pretty successful.

It's going through a test right now. We're finding moments of discovery. That's what test is all about. But we'll have a warfighting airplane ready to go on day one because of the tests. And we're always working hand-in-hand with [inaudible].

DWG: You mentioned the other day that within Air Mobility Command we basically lost 1600 authorizations for maintainers and some of the challenges where we have the three-level maintainers. We have numbers, but not the experience. Can you elaborate a little bit on that?

General Everhart: Yeah, if that will help.

As we've gone through and we did drawdowns in overall population of the Air Force, you know, the preponderance of our Air Force is made of our enlisted corps. So when the drawdown happened, not only did it happen with our officers, it happened with our enlisted, which the preponderance did happen.

So when you look out there, you go okay, where do I need to assess new personnel on? It just so happens that it happens to be, if you look out, one of the critical areas are the maintainers.

As you bring on these young folks, they're at a level where they're just now starting to understand what the airplane looks like, smells like, learning procedures that I do to make sure that I get to whether it's avionics, hydraulics, those types of things.

As they gain experience, then they become supervisors. Where we're hurting right now is when we have supervisors and nobody in the middle and very young people coming on. They don't have so many supervisors. They'll watch everybody, but it really stretches out that fleet until we get that experience level up. And it's going to take, ball park, at least five years to gain that experience if not more. And it depends on how quickly someone learns, and how much touch time they get on. They've got to be able to touch and do. They've got to, what I call from a farmer's motto, learning by doing. So they've got to be able to touch the airplane, look at it, know how it works, those types of things.

DWG: And then as they get the experience then it's what you refer to as the domino effect, that they're leaving the services. So it's a perpetual state of trying to bring up and groom and train new maintainers which it's complicated when you have the KC-46 with 1600 authorizations, we have to use the force that we have today to address those challenges in the new fleet. Is that correct?

General Everhart: Yeah, and, is it 1600? I don't know --

DWG: Over the last three years. It's like 1582, I believe that's the total.

General Everhart: Hopefully that helps. That's a long way to answer that question. I'm sorry about building you a watch on this thing, but I want to get, and I do apologize. If you want me to just answer yes or no, -- [Laughter]. I'm trying to get the story out too, where it helps you out.

DWG: We'll get to the yes and no in the last five minutes.

DWG: Tara [inaudible], Stars and Stripes.

A follow-on to that. One Syria question and one pilot question for you.

On Syria, can you discuss the Air Force footprint in Syria right now? Is there a contingency response team looking at [inaudible] as a potential additional airfield?

General Everhart: First of all, Tara, as we go into operations I really don't want to go into those details, if I may. But our footprint in Syria, as it goes, is we need to have airfields opened up, we're in 77 locations across 23 countries. That's a vital part of my core function that we have to be able to open up those airfields. Those contingency

response groups, those contingency response wings, they allow us to be able to do those, open up those airfields, like [Qayyarah] West. They opened up that airfield and it became a major staging point for operations in Mosul as you know.

So as far as operations over Syria itself, yes. I said it's a tanker war. We're also doing resupplies through airdrop. Then as airfields start to open up, our operations start to maneuver, then we'll do air/land to bring in supplies needed to conduct operations.

DWG: But would it be helpful to have a second airfield for U.S. air assets in Syria?

General Everhart: From my perspective, it's always nice to have that but I have to wait for the requirements to come down from the Central Command commander. And you know, General Harrigian who is actually conducting that air war, of what it needed. That's what's great about our aircraft is that we are able to accomplish the distances. If we have to back away say in locations such as Incirlik, or another location in the AOR, we can project that power forward and bring that capability on so they can conduct air operations.

DWG: Switch topics to the pilot shortage, if I may.

The main thinking happening with the airline industry, could you talk a little bit about what you hope to get out of that as far as agreements? Either the 1500 hour rule or maybe pilot only track or [inaudible]?

General Everhart: That's good. [Laughter]. That's exactly what I've been talking about. The 1500 hour rule, where did that 1500 hours come from? That came out of some aircraft incidents that happened, and that 1500 hour rule is you've got to have 1500 hours before you can actually get hired on into a major airline. That's what it is. It's to make sure people have the experience to be able to fly.

DWG: Unless you're from the military.

General Everhart: Unless you're from the military, and then it's 750 hours. Which makes us a highly valuable commodity to the airline industry. That's the reason why you're hearing us go up, you know, talking particularly with you of the pilot shortage. The industry is trying to pull that commodity out. Because if you look at just pure supply and demand, we can't produce enough, but we have easily highly trained, capable pilots.

I stand to lose, potentially, I have 1600 pilots that are eligible to separate in the next four years. And if you just query the airline industry, I was just talking to an airline partner last week, who are the people that they're looking for? They like multi-engine airplanes with crew concept cockpits because there's usually two people in the front when you haul a passenger aircraft.

So let's talk about this meeting on May 18th. This will be the third meeting that we've had with the airline industry. The audience will be the Chief of Staff of the Air Force, it

will be Headquarters Air Force and Operations, it will be myself, it will be the major airline industries, the regionals. It will also include the Army, Marine Corps and the Navy. And it's also going to include our CRAF carriers and academicians from the aviation industry such as, for example, North Dakota who have schools. I don't know for sure, but Embry-Riddle may be there because they are in the business of producing civilian and military pilots. And then we'll also have representatives from our Civil Reserve Air Fleet. Folks like FedEx or OmniAir or UPS, those types. They'll be there also.

Because what we're finding out is, as I kind of laid this out, we have competing resources, competing needs for a limited resource, and if we don't watch it, we're going to hurt one another. It's going to hurt me if they pull them all away. I can't conduct operations. The Air Force can't. And if we can't supply, then obviously they can't do their operations either because the domestic product that is produced from the civil airline industry is enormous for our economy.

So how do we complement each other instead of competing against each other? And that's one of the objectives of this meeting.

We're also going to have Rand there because Rand has done a lot of studies with the background material that we need for airline hiring. And then what the projections are. Because the projection is in the near future.

I want industry to lead this meeting. I want industry to leave with the solutions. I can go out and fix it but it may be broke. I may break the overall situation and not complement it. So I'm trying to be very very careful with that. That's kind of the instructions we're going to lay out.

We've been letting industry lead.

Some of the things you talk about, public/private partnerships. This is only on the civilian side. So could the airline industry come into a consortium and go to a city somewhere in the United States or multiple cities and have a simulator complex that the pilot as it comes out needs experience, they'll go work at a job or they'll sign up for a job say with a corporation, an aviation corporation, and then on their spare time, on the weekend, they go to this complex and they fly their simulator hours to gain flying time experience. As you know as well as I do, when you're in a simulator you can kind of, we call it dial a disaster. You can kind of really make people sweat in that simulator, gain valuable experience. And guess what? If the unfortunate thing happens, they can walk away and go back in and dial another disaster in. It's valuable experience, but it also, with the quality of simulators that they have, they gain flying time. So that helps with that 1500 hours. Does that help me? No. But it helps create jobs and it also helps the civilian industry and it also helps the folks that are coming out of schools to make it more [palatable] for them to go into the aviation industry.

One of the things we're also proposing is how about debt forgiveness? If you look at foreign carriers, a commercial industry, major airline, may say if you'll come and work

for us and sign a contract, we'll forgive your debt when you go through aviation school. And then oh by the way, while you're there we'll help you get your flying time, get your 1500 hours. But we're going to work you in other jobs too, additional duties. Maybe that's the way to go.

Maybe I can have pilots that come on active duty, take a sabbatical like we're doing with some of the members right now, and they go on a sabbatical for five years and they work for the airline industry and after that sabbatical, they come back to me. Or they go to the Guard or Reserve, because they're hurting also. And we balance that around, that resource around, so it's always being used by someone but it's complementing instead of just going straight to the airline.

So we're looking at those types of options. I'm doing exit surveys right now. Why are you getting out? Why are you getting out of the Air Force? Is it because of pay? Most Air Force people, most people when I talk to them, they serve because it's what in their heart. They serve our nation because of our nation's needs. It has nothing to do with the pilot bonus. They don't care. Thirty-three years, the bonus was very nice. Don't get me wrong. It was very nice. Christmas presents for my kids. It was great. It wasn't the bonus that I stayed in for, it's because of what was in my heart and I love to fly.

So why are these pilots getting out? And oh, by the way, I had a suggestion last week, actually two days ago that said, well, you may be asking the wrong question. Why don't you ask the question of why did you stay and not get out? And then once you figure that one out, why don't you go and assess those people and bring them on so they stay, the chances of them staying is in your favor. I said, that's a great idea. Either do a psychological analysis or something like that to just figure out why they stay. Just to get the base line.

So we're working to complement with industry. Those are some of the solution sets that I've come up with. Now I'm wanting industry to come up with their solution set so we work hand in hand with them.

That's going to be the outcome. And then once we say we're all in agreement, hey, we need to further explore this, then we're going to explore it together.

The other thing is this 1500 hour rule. I asked industry, have you gone to Congress and spoke to people about this 1500 hour? Because it's a sensitive topic. And they'll say, no, because it's very sensitive. And then I push and I say well, have you even approached the topic? No, because it's very sensitive. Have you gone and at least started drinking the first glass of tea to open up the conversation? Because you need to have this conversation, because why is it so sensitive? Because I don't know where they came up with 1500 hours. They just did. They thought that was what you needed. But I would tell you, I've got pilots who fly 750 hours who at the 300 hour point were phenomenal. Just incredible. I've also got pilots at the 2000 hour point that I go, we probably need to keep you flying with somebody. Because people learn in different ways and accelerate in different ways.

So 1500 hours, is that good for flying? And who -- because I would submit to you there's probably people who can fly less than those times and be just as good.

So maybe in that simulated complex that we talked about, now you bring a check airman in and he goes I'm going to evaluate you at 1,000 hours. I'm going to see how you do. I'm going to certify you and then maybe you can go straight out to the airline industry and maybe you don't need 1500 hours. Maybe that's the solution. So we're looking at all combinations. These are some of the ideas that I have and then we'll work hand in hand with the industry to see what is palatable to them.

Again, I apologize, but I've been thinking through this topic now, working with industry and really trying to get the solutions moved out. Because our universities are getting killed right now as far as our aviation universities. Because the folks who actually fly those airplanes, they're being, they have hours so they're being hired. And then you have a student who comes through and he goes, or she, I'd like to go in the aviation career. That's great. Then I'm starting to rack up debt for a four-year college. Then I've got to use my own money to get 1500 hours.

Now after so much time, call it five, six, seven, eight years, I have, tossing out a number, $200,000 worth of debt. And oh by the way, when I talk to the airline pilot and I look at their closet I see three different uniforms because it is a cyclical market and they have three different uniforms because they got furloughed here, they got, that airline went down, no demand.

So they're looking at us, why would I want that? When I can go to the medical career field or the engineering career field, have a 200,000 debt and pay it back in 10 years instead of 20, knowing that I've got a job. I can't argue that. I really can't.

So we've got to entice that person to come in. We've got to entice that person that aviation, I knew when I was 12 years old I wanted to fly. I just did. I got very lucky. Painting a fence on the farm and watching two Navy fighters come across at 300 feet, and watch number two pull out and do an aileron roll. I didn't know that was illegal back then. [Laughter]. It's probably illegal now. It was pretty good watching. I was going to go in the medical profession with my dad. I liked that. My mom goes, do you still want to be a doctor like your dad? I said no, I want to go do that. She said well knock yourself out. I'll back you 110 percent. I'm just a rare breed. It's that love of flying.

I guarantee, I'll put you on an airplane, we'll hire you. I need you. I hope that helps.

DWG: Thanks for being here.

The Chiefs are up on the Hill today talking about the effects of a possible year-long CR, and some budget experts are skeptical that the effects would be as dire as they're being depicted. They say the investment shortfalls, you can get anomalies from Congress to start some programs or [inaudible] production. The end strength increase is supposed to take a lot of the money. It's not a requirement, it's just an authorization. And they

say that you can move money in the O&M accounts from say base maintenance to cover some of the training exercises that are talking about being happening. So what do you say to those people? Is there any merit to that? What's your response on that?

General Everhart: I can understand where they're coming from. I can understand why the skeptics would say that, but I would say to you, I believe, in my humble opinion, they're ill informed.

From my Air Mobility Command perspective, as we talked about the globe. It is my AOR. I'm not only supporting operations in, like I say, in Syria and Afghanistan and Iraq, I'm supporting operations in -- I'm supporting the National Science Foundation in Antarctica. What happens if that money dries up? Who supplies food down there? Wait for a ship? Hope it doesn't ice in? Got to do it by air supply.

So when you look at hey, I can trade money out of the maintenance accounts to the O&M accounts so you can fly those missions because, well, that's robbing Peter to pay Paul. What happens is that I'll go fly contingency operations. They'll say we have OCO funding. Well, how long is that going to sustain? They've been talking about doing away with OCO funding a long time and putting it in the base. That's that shifting of money. So if I'm flying an airplane really, really hard, what happens in the long run? It breaks really, really hard. It does. I've got a 60-year-old airplane called the KC-135. The C-17's 25 years old almost, the average fleet is 13 years old but there again, if you take, when I first flew the C-17 by the tail numbers, they're 25 years old. Planes break hard if you fly them very, very hard.

So I can shift money all I want to but when I'm down to maintenance, guess what happens? I'm not flying contingency operations. And if we cut money and I've got to move money around, I'm going to support the warfighter first. Exercises get cut. I've got a major exercise getting ready to come up in August. It's called Mobility Guardian. I'd love to see you there. And during those two weeks we'll practice every core function that we have, and that is a monetary amount that I'm willing to pay, and I'm going to pay it because I keep people honed in on their skill sets from on-loading airplanes to aeromedical evacuation to doing tactical in-fills. I will get after my readiness issues in about a two-week period, I will have them, a lot of requirements done. But if I have to do away with that, I'm going to have skills that atrophy.

So there's a lot of things that happen. End strength? I've got the end strength but I've got to bring those people in. Then I've got to train them. If the dollars go away, how will I train them? It's just like we talked about the other day. It's a spiral thing. It's all connected, and what affects one will affect the other. Yeah, I've got real world operations. We are the world's greatest air power. We are the world's greatest nation. Make no bones about it. That's who we are.

The reason why we are is because of the things that we do worldwide because we are a global power. You start keeping the CR happening. And oh by the way with CR, think about this. When you budget your money, you do it off your monthly paycheck. Is that what you all do? Or do you budget day to day? So if I've got a CR -- [Laughter]. I need

you to help me out, because when I have a CR, I'm basically equivalent. I'm not saying it's day to day, but it's kind of like that. I can't do acquisition programs. I can't bring new things on. I can't train like I want to because I don't know if the dollars are going to be there. So I just can't obligate the government.

There again, I hope that helps. It's all part of how it's tied into.

DWG: So you're robbing Peter to pay Paul. Obviously you're going to take care of the highest priority things, which --

General Everhart: The warfighting mission.

DWG: -- the warfighter. But robbing Peter, so what would be robbed would be things like base maintenance. What would be some of the lower priority things? What you're basically saying is you're robbing Peter but Peter's already kind of strapped, right?

General Everhart: Yeah. So what happens is, if we don't get this increase, my modernization programs that I need to keep an aged fleet up and running, I can't do. I can't be FAA compliant because I can't put the things I need on the aircraft. I've got an FAA compliance, airspace compliance. I have to put certain equipment on the aircraft by 2020. If I don't, that keeps me lower down, so what do I do? I burn more gas.

My fleet consumes the most gas across the DoD enterprise. I've got big airplanes and we're flying all the time. Six hundred sorties a day. That's takeoff, approach and landing. That's what I average, 600 sorties a day.

And so I can't modernize. I can't keep the maintenance up because of weapon system sustainment. What do we use to buy the wrenches, buy the ramp space to be able to do maintenance, keep those -- I can't train. Because I'm doing contingency operations and there's only so much money. I have to sit down my pilots, so what happens to my readiness? It spirals down.

And also I've got infrastructure that I need to improve upon that I can't improve upon, so my infrastructure gets older. So you go on a base, you go nice building. [Laughter]. Yeah, it's a nice building, it's what I've got. It's maybe falling down or something like that, but I've got an airplane in it because I can't keep it up.

Now would I allow that to happen? No, again, I'm move money around to the maximum extent that I have available. But that's just worst case. But it happens.

DWG: You say I can't do maintenance, I can't [inaudible], I can't [inaudible]. You can, you just can't do it to the degree that you want at least for the five months left in the fiscal year, assuming they get an FY18 bill which is, by the way, not a given.

General Everhart: The other thing that kind of scares me about that is that say they pass the budget, and I've heard figures of 2.7 billion. You've kind of seen that in the news. Well, I've got to be prepared to spend that. And we have to be careful. If you

throw a lot of money, and with the acquisition programs the way things happen, can you spend that amount of money effectively in that short period of time because you get cash infusion. So you have to be very very careful not to do --

I'm not saying there would be wasteful spending. I'm saying we have to be careful with the taxpayers' dollars. And then we may have to turn money back because we just can't get it that fast. Where if we had nine months or a year to plan for it, now I've got four months or five months left.

DWG: Is that too much money you're talking about now?

General Everhart: No, I need all the money I can get, to tell you the truth. I'll take all the money I can get.

DWG: I have to be up-front, as a Virginia Cavalier, I'm glad we are not having this conversation [in the fall]. Lots of bourbon to drown my sorrows and --

General Everhart: It's a nice spring, isn't it? [Laughter]. I went to Virginia Tech. He went to that other school. I went to "the" university. [Laughter]. My sister went to UVA, so it's all in the family.

DWG: Thank goodness.

It's not necessarily in your purview, but I'd like to get your opinion on this. You talked, you started a conversation off with talking about seeing an American flag on a tail of one of your aircraft, and when pilots are coming up for refueling, that's what they're seeing. Talking about 200 percent of the hours, or the missions that you had budgeted for or had predicted for, the KC-130s or something like that. Over-flying [inaudible].

I guess my question is, why are pilots not coming up for [inaudible] more French flags and British flags and German flags and other allied flags [inaudible]? Why is it that the allies that are involved in these coalition operations are just not investing in this capability? And how much influence do you have? How many conversations do you have with your contemporaries in other countries that, come on, you need to put some more planes in the air or --

General Everhart: One reason why is because they don't have the capability. In other words, the assets to be able to do that. They've always relied on us and they'll continue to rely on us. That doesn't mean --

DWG: -- sustainable though.

General Everhart: It doesn't. It doesn't.

If you look at other countries, they're buying other tankers to start bringing this on. They know how viable this is. Particularly as they bring on the F-35 fleet. The F-35 fleet, that's a very thirsty airplane. So as host nations bring this on, they're going to look

to us and our capability to be able to refuel them in a time of need. But also, they're looking at hey, maybe I need my capability to be able to do [inaudible] for my own fleet.

The other thing with nations, and this is more of a European conversation or an allied conversation, is the national caveats. Every time we go to coalition warfare, which we'll always do from now on.

It's the caveats that we have [and contend with]. We have certain, I see the look, let me explain this. We have this all the time. We'll go up and say refuel a country's fighters. Another country [may] go you just refueled that fighter so I need another tanker because I'm not going to refuel after that.

DWG: Like who?

General Everhart: Countries. [Laughter]. Caveats happen all the time, so we have to work -- it's happened ever since World War II. Look at Eisenhower and how he had to do with the different caveats between the French fighting forces versus the Americans versus the Brits and who takes over what battle and who doesn't? We fight, we struggle through. We have what's called a Chiclet chart to say yes, you can do this with this operation, with this aircraft, but you can't do it with this one, but you can with this one.

So it's easier for us to just go hey, for the United States we'll supply that capability. Come up and get your gas when you need it anyway. As long as we meet those caveats. But it's also landing in that country. There are certain caveats we have to go through. So it's just not air refueling. It's landing or it's conducting operations. Countries are sovereign territories, as you know, so they have conditions. So it's conditions-based, this is a new one. As soon as I say it you'll write it. But it's like conditions-based warfare. Give me this, if and, oh but, and then I can do this, yes, or no.

That's a long way to answer your question. It's just that we do it better than anyone else. That's the bottom line. And they're relying on us to be able to do so because we have 455 tankers. That's a lot of supply.

So if we have that many and we're always there globally, why would they want to buy another tanker? When they've got precious dollars on their defense. They've got to shrink the budgets also. That's the bottom line.

DWG: With our last 15 minutes we still have six reporters on the list, so we don't quite need to go to yes and no at this point, but we'll need to move into the speed round.

General Everhart: It's me, I'm sorry. It's not y'all. I'll be faster.

General Everhart: And I'm good, I can stay as long as you want to. And, oh by the way, I'll take some of that money too. [Laughter].

DWG: KC-46 money.

General Everhart: Yeah, [Laughter].

DWG: It won't get you far.

General Everhart: Well, thank you for your support for national defense. I appreciate it.

DWG: I have a follow-up on Syria. March 21st an offensive to capture [inaudible], and you provided the airlift for the department forces on the ground. Was it a one-off event? Or this is what they pretty much do now on a regular basis?

And then very shortly, if you can just speak about your Antarctic mission.

General Everhart: I can speak about the Antarctic mission, but in Syria your question? I'm sorry?

DWG: [Inaudible] Dam. The dam near [inaudible]. An offensive was launched March 21st --

General Everhart: So those operations I would be better off having the CFACC, General Harrigian, talk about those operations or General Votel. I'm not trying to, but --

DWG: Okay.

General Everhart: The Antarctica mission. Antarctica is, I had the privilege of going down there, and I'll make this really quick. It's a fascinating mission that we do a lot of scientific research. So we have scientists that go there, a couple of thousand people roughly, that go down, and support from the United States. But every nation there supports the scientific research. So our mission is at McMurdo Station, we supply our supplies, also building infrastructure. There's national rules for that [inaudible], that you can't have your garbage, your garbage you have to take away. We'll put it on ships, we'll bring that in, we'll bring in supplies, we'll bring in fuel to maintain the station so we can do experiments so scientists can come in.

It's a fascinating mission. If you ever get a chance, you have to work it through the National Science Foundation. It's cold. It's cold. But, yeah, it's minus 45. But that's what that foundation, that's what that mission's all about. It's to support scientific research. It's not about exploration, it's not about anything like that. It's about scientific research because it provides a pristine environment to deal with this stuff.

DWG: How many flights do you, annual flights?

General Everhart: It depends, but we'll usually do it, it's called, you know, in the spring, if there is a spring season opens up, it's usually about September to February is when we'll fly. And then we do have a winter fly. So when it's perpetual darkness for six months, we will go down, depending on the weather. You've got to be very careful

because it's extreme. It's hard on airplanes. It's very hard on airplanes. So we will have a couple go in in their winter time.

DWG: Thanks for doing this.

I wanted to get back to our air refueling of the Saudi coalition in Yemen. That's been fairly specific. I'm wondering if you're expecting any changes [inaudible]?

General Everhart: Am I expecting any? No. But warfare has a vote. So as the requirements come back, come to us, and it's a bonafide, validated requirement, if it increases, sure, we'll be there. If it doesn't, I'm supplying gas across that whole entire AOR. So I don't have a crystal ball, and I don't mean to be flippant about it. I just don't know.

DWG: I guess more big picture. How would you respond to critics, particularly [inaudible] air refueling in that campaign of Saudi jets, that they're [inaudible]?

General Everhart: Here's the thing. We go well overboard to properly plan missions when it's coalition warfare or when we're doing strikes, to make sure that civ cas does not happen. I mean we will plan and plan and plan. What the Saudis do, if they take our advice or whatever and strike their targets, you know, that's the different countries' caveats we were talking about. That's part of those caveats. But when we conduct missions, when we conduct operations, we do every single thing to the maximum extent that we don't have a civilian casualty. With the fog and [friction] of war, unfortunately you'll have people like ISIS who will do the despicable thing and will take a human, a civilian, and put them as a shield. Just to make a point because they're terrorists. And they're, in my humble opinion, that's the lowest form of life that we've got that we're fighting right now because they do those things. Just so they scare an entire population.

But what we do, we meticulously analyze, we meticulously surveil, we make sure that that target set is clear, but we don't know over the night, you know, or when we're trading out ISR, did they slip someone in the back door just to prove a point? And I don't put it past them, that's what they do.

So it doesn't quite answer your question. And the reason why is I'm not really, yes, I support operations across that entire AOR. But when national caveats happen or when I say national caveats, but when a nation conducts its war, we're watching, we have a say-so, but they're conducting their operations. And we advise, but really it's that nation that --

Voice: And CENTCOM has key leader engagements where our expectations are communicated and shared on a routine basis, so they understand precision by which we fight, and those expectations are shared throughout the theater we're deployed to, the Combined Air Operation Center, I left in October so I can tell you those conversations do take place.

DWG: On Monday, the Pentagon said the force management levels are being reconsidered in Iraq and Syria. How does that affect you? And did you all lobby to get the FML changed? Because it seems like it's hitting maintainers on a large level which would be the guys and gals who would be fixing airplanes. And does that fit into what you were saying about [inaudible] poses a problem even forward deployed in places like [inaudible], maybe [Awasad], places like that in the future.

General Everhart: If there's a need to forward deploy and that airfield's open, it's safe to do so, and the requirements there, obviously I would, you know, look at those airfields and do an assessment, do a threat assessment to them. Not saying that that's even a requirement right now. We're just looking.

To get to your point, we constantly look at the number of tankers, the number of aircraft that are needed to fly and support a certain area of responsibility. And we'll challenge in a very polite way that requirement to say is this what you need, or are you hedging your bet? Is there excess capability there that we can pull back to keep our Ops Tempo down so I can work in my deploy to dwell ratios? Right now, I'll tell you, the most heavily demand asset that I have is my air refuelers. There is just an insatiable need for gas. [There] just is. And that's part of keeping that table sustained, so to speak.

Now if I don't need the number of aircraft or if they do, is there ways that we can do, we're looking at methodology. So maybe in this month you don't need as many tankers so I can bring them back, and that brings back their maintainers and it brings back the overall support. But then you have surge operations, I don't know. Pick spring, winter, summer, whenever you need it. Can I surge tankers back in? Or can I surge airlift back in to support those operations? Sure I can. I have that flexibility to be able to do so. Because I'm a global enterprise. And that gets validated through the Joint Chiefs of Staff when those requirements come in.

So we're working with that and we want to make sure that we do it collaboratively. Just like with the pilot shortage where we don't hurt each other but we do it complementary to each other.

DWG: So do FMLs, as it currently stands, does that inhibit your operation, your forward operation? And will a change in FML allow the Air Force to potentially do more downrange?

General Everhart: If you change it, you change it to less, yeah, it allows me to do more in other places. But that's my number one objective right now is support that warfighter that's conducting operations. So if he need it, General Votel needs it, I'm there. Period.

But I still, from organize, train and equip from my Title 10, I'm still watching the deploy to dwell rates, how much of the tankers is used, how much airlift is used, et cetera, etcetera. All that goes in my calculus so I can form the overall system and say do we need this many? Do we not? So it's always balancing. It's always balancing.

Does that help?

DWG: It does.

DWG: Sir, I have a couple of kind of technology questions and also force structure questions. One is [inaudible] been talking about the need for keeping the KC-10 around. It was going [inaudible] at some point in the budget. It's frequently cited as [inaudible], save some money by [abandoning] that fleet and putting them in the bone yard. What's your opinion on that? How long do you need the KC-10 fleet?

And then also, is it sustainable to be procuring [inaudible] at a rate of 12 per year? [Inaudible]. Do you need to go higher than that to start getting [inaudible] tanker recapitalization?

General Everhart: The tankers right now, they're with the lot three, starting at 15 a year and they'll go 15 all the way out to 2028. If I had the money and we negotiate with Boeing to produce more, that's a lot of if's. Sure, I'll take more tankers faster. But it's a set program, and I'm not going to change the requirement. So that's what's made, that's what's actually driven down the fixed cost because I didn't change the requirement.

The KC-10. Let's talk about that a little bit. We're looking at retiring the KC-10 between '19 and '23, over the FYDP, '24, excuse me. Over the FYDP. And so when I retire that aircraft just because of the contract logistical support, I save $1.4 billion over a five year period. A lot of people will go, well aren't you not hurting in your capacity? No, because what I'm doing is doing proper planning so I'll get my tankers up to meet warfighting needs based on what's in the operational plan, and then I'll start retiring aircraft.

If you look at certain circumstances, the KC-46 is actually a more capable aircraft than the KC-10. Based off of winds, weight, weather, temperatures, off-load. If the KC-10 is going to off-load immediately once it goes up, yeah, it can off-load a ton of gas. But if it's got to travel a distance to be able to do so, in certain circumstances the KC-46 provides greater capability.

So there again, just like I told John. I'm all about balancing that out. You've got to understand, when General McDew from Transportation Command. He's looking at yes, I'm going put as much gas in the air as I can because he's looking at it from a different lens. I'm saying based off the requirements that we have, I think we'll be able to meet those, I know we'll be able to meet those needs and be able to service that. Yes, I need that tanker on faster, because I'd rather get that older iron out. I tell all the folks, I believe I'm one panel away of opening up a 60-year-old airplane and looking at it and going I didn't see that [was] going to happen. Let's check this panel on this next airplane next door. It's got the same issue. Which forces the fleet to have to shut down. Then I worry. But with our maintainers that we have and the skill levels we have and depot maintenance we have, they're very, they work at that to prevent those type of things from happening.

DWG: [Inaudible], they said the Air Force is definitely trying to find a way to re-engine the B-52. That's a massive gas guzzler. To support that fleet, would that make a dent in, you know, the tanker capacity needs of the Air Force?

General Everhart: Yes. If you have more efficient engines, that then burns actually more efficiently, the gas that it uses. Look at the C-5 in our modernization. About $105 million to modernize that airplane with the new engines and the glass cockpit. I can now take off from Dover, Delaware and land in Incirlik, Turkey non-stop. I don't have to do air refueling. And those engines are B rated. Tremendous capability. I can fly from Japan to Travis in California, non-stop. That's a game-changer because of efficient engines. Very capable.

DWG: Will you talk about programs like KCY and KCB and the future beyond KC-46? I know you floated the idea that maybe either of those tanker fleets could just be a modified or upgraded KC-46 or something along those lines. But at the [ANB] demo on Friday it was brought up that maybe the KCY program is not out of the ruling of modified KC-46. Maybe it's going to be something else. Can you explain what that something else could be? And is that the possibility of the United States buying a foreign-made tanker?

General Everhart: First of all, all options will be on the table. Now we'll see if that survives first contact about three miles down that way, and it will be a white building. Not the White House, but the one with a dome on it. And I don't mean to be flippant or anything like that, I'm just joking. [Laughter]. Actually, I'm not. But it's true.

We're doing a capabilities-based assessment right now which will inform us what the future tanker needs to look like. And we're doing that capabilities based assessment to say could this also be what the next airlifter looks like? What is out there on the horizon that industry is looking at? I am very interested personally, and I'm not saying that it needs to look like this, but I just saw the Green Horizons program that NASA has put out. It's looking at two base design with very very long wings with trestle design as part of it. It's looking at hybrid wings. It's looking at bladed wings. I just talked to FedEx and they are looking at the same type of technologies that are out there in the future because of its fuel efficiency, its lift capability, and it allows us to fly faster, quicker, better.

Do you all remember seeing Six Million Dollar Man? If we can build it faster or better -- yeah. So those types of things.

That capabilities based study will say this is what will inform what we need that aircraft to look like. And then I'm going to put some more requirements on that.

For instance, I've talked to industry about I need to have persistence and I need to have it be survivable over an airfield, or over an airspace I should say, because I have, right now I have one generation, the first generation aircraft supplying fifth generation fighters. If you look at it logically, they don't have to look for the fifth gen, they look for the first gen. Take out the tanker, the fighters don't have gas, they win. Or if you make

the tanker have to run away for survivability wise and a fighter can't give you gas, they win. So that's going to inform that.

So changing wave forms, changing radar cross-sections, using other technologies that are out there, those are the things that [inaudible].

When does that take place? That's what this capabilities based study will do, will help inform me so I have budget maneuver space in the out years. We're looking at replacing the rest of those tankers around the -- The KC-46 goes to about 2028. We think we have maneuver airspace around the 2030, 2035 time frame. But that's also going to replace the C-130 and then in about 2045, time frame we're going to be looking at replacing the C-5 and the C-17.

So we're looking at all these requirements to come in. I'm allowing my folks to say [these are] the requirements we have. This is how much gas we need to put in here. Can we bridge, do we bridge -- that's the reason why you may look at a KC-46 Bravo. What are the survival capabilities of the aircraft? What are the requirements? And what do we project the requirements of the world to be as a nation to supply those requirements? Whether it's air refueling or whether it's airlift and resupply.

So there's a lot of things that influence this decision. And then once I get that capabilities based study we'll analyze it, I'm going to introduce it to industry, and I think I'm legal to do so. So they say hey, this is what we can do for you. Because I'm going to work hand in hand with industry, I really am, for the technologies that are out there. They're the ones that's going to know what's going to happen 30 years from now or 20 years from now. At least I think it will. So that's what drives that calculus.

DWG: Is that looking at something off the shelf or building something [inaudible]?

General Everhart: Yes and yes. Absolutely. If it's an off the shelf and it's already built, yeah, I'm going to jump right in to the commercial industry. So KC-46, for example. 767, two-seat. Maybe it's that. Maybe it's the 767 with a 300, with a 747 wing. Maybe something like that, with bigger engines that's more efficient to give me extended range and longer loiter time without such a large IR footprint. Those types of things.

So I'm exploring, everything is on the table. Like I say, with these new designs that are coming out, I'm just fascinated and I'm challenging industry all the time. Hey, give me some more of that. Give me some more of that. Give me some more of that. I want to know what you've got coming on the horizon. I'm watching industry, I'm reading your literature all the time. I'm going hey, this is the next thing that could be on the horizon. So yeah, it's going to definitely inform.

Competition breeds excellence. Competition also drives the price down. If I can have competitors, I don't care where they come from. So you asked me the question about a foreign tanker or a foreign airlifter, I don't know. Who's going to give me the best capability with the most bang for the buck for the precious taxpayer dollar? That's the key. So I'm open to all that. It matters if it survives first contact down the road.

DWG: I was wondering if you could talk about KC-135, what upgrades you're considering for the next block, as far as the time lines that you might need that in, what the budget for that might be.

General Everhart: The next things that we're looking at for the KC-135, we just put in block 45, so we're completing block 45 right now which gives us the new [autopilot], radar altimeters, the digital, more of the digital backbone. We're also looking at how do we get beyond line of sight radios, secure beyond line of sight? Because I've got to be able to move tankers around the world at a moment's notice, so it would be nice if I, instead of having a relay station, I could actually reach out and touch that airplane, to be able to reposition and base it off the nation's needs of whether to support the motherland, the homeland, or support other operations, those types of things.

So that's what we're laying in. We've also got to make them airspace compliant by 2020, so we're driving hard to meet that airspace compliance that we have to have by FAA, and also that gives us European compliance by June of 2020. So we've got that programmed in right now in immediate needs.

And then my next investment will be in weapon system sustainment and the survivability of that aircraft so I can keep it viable for the next about 30 or 40 years or so. That's part of the, weapon system sustainment is part of the modernization. Those types of things.

That airplane doesn't have an auto-throttles in it. If we had auto-throttles in it, that would be a whole lot more efficient, just because of the fact that the electronics are doing the work and it's not the fact that our humans aren't good, it's the fact that the anticipatory things.

So we're looking at that capability. We're looking at is that a possibility.

I'm also looking at the possibility of, across my entire fleet, of enhanced business systems. What's the possibility of putting a heads-up display? Do we need heads-up display? Are the engines holding up? Because CSM 56 [RF] is a phenomenal engine. But it's been on the wing now for a while. So do I need to look at the possibility of what that replacement is or that upgrade. We're doing what's called a CPUP, which is an upgrade to the engine right now, just to get its longevity and it's just improvement as technology comes out. It's just improvements to the core set of the engine right now. So we're looking at things like that.

But overall the form, fit and function of the airplane is pretty solid.

DWG: So what's the budget and the time line for that?

General Everhart: It depends, how much money are you going to give me? And we're looking at a time line, you know, for those types of things in the future, that's in future out years. And [inaudible] a requirement. The CPUP and block 45's going on

right now. The AESBC and SABSB for to get us airspace compliant, that is going on starting next year, because I've got to get those done across the entire fleet. So that's happening in the immediate.

In the future, as we look at the precious dollars, do I have the capability to expand [inaudible] required on the airplane to keep it flying? Now weapon system sustainment, that's always there. That's programmed. We've got to keep that airplane flying. We've got to keep that airplane going.

But you never know. Like I say, you never know when you're going to open up the next panel and go oh, okay, that's where that money's going. You just never know.

DWG: General Everhart, thank you for your time. We appreciate your insights, and we'd love to have you back again next year when thing will be just as tough.

General Everhart: And I promise I will start out an hour and a half earlier. [Laughter].

First of all, you know, thank you so much for your patience. Hopefully y'all got to eat prior to me being here so you had a warm meal. I'm sorry about the DC traffic. We did leave an hour earlier, we didn't know it was going to take us an hour to get here. It was 7.2 miles according to the driver.

But thank you for your patience.

If you have follow-ons, Chris will give you his card and we'll be able to answer any, through email, or clarification or something that you might not have, because of my southern accent you didn't quite understand what I'm saying.

But thank you for allowing us to be here. Thank you for telling our Air Mobility story. And if you need anything, we're there for you so just let us know. We have an open door. So thank you so much.

Voice: The number was 1,658 in terms of the reductions over the last three fiscal years for Air Mobility Command. So that's both active duty and civilian. For maintainers.

# # # #

Transcribed by: Professional Word Processing & Transcribing (801) 556-7255