

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2005

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 3, 2004

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met at 10:11 a.m., in room SD-192, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Hon. Ted Stevens (chairman) presiding.

Present: Senators Stevens, Cochran, Shelby, Hutchison, Burns, Inouye, Leahy, and Dorgan.

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY

**STATEMENT OF HON. LES BROWNLEE, ACTING SECRETARY OF THE
ARMY**

**ACCOMPANIED BY GENERAL PETER T. SCHOOMAKER, CHIEF OF
STAFF, UNITED STATES ARMY**

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TED STEVENS

Senator STEVENS. Good morning, ladies and gentlemen. I apologize for being late. I was presiding over the Senate. We have all got too many things scheduled these days.

Today we are going to receive the testimony from the Acting Secretary of the Army and the Chief of Staff on the Army's fiscal year 2005 budget request. Secretary Brownlee, we welcome you for your first time before our committee. We look forward to hearing your plans to modernize the Army. You are no stranger to this Senate or to the committee, even though you were on the other committee. We are pleased to welcome you back as a friend and a colleague.

General Schoomaker, we welcome you to our committee. We look forward to working with you in the coming years, and I thank you again for making the trip, the long trip to Alaska for the military appreciation dinner there. It is very important to our people.

The Army is now well on its way towards the future with its transformation plans. We are at war and this transformation to our future force is continuing. It is a huge undertaking to do both at the same time. We are also conducting a global war on terrorism, the war in Iraq, the war, ongoing activities in Afghanistan, and now Haiti. We are constantly reminded of the need for a strong, modern, prepared Army, and it is as important today as it ever was, more important probably, to have a military which has the re-

sources it needs and the support of the President and the entire country.

Today you are deployed all over the globe. We have 320,000 soldiers deployed or stationed forward, as I am informed. The Guard and Reserve are also sharing this burden, with more than 100,000 reservists and guardsmen mobilized and on active duty. The total force is a reality now.

There are many important issues facing the Army. One of the most critical decisions Congress will make this year is how to help the Army reorganize and equip itself for future threats.

I believe you have demonstrated to the Congress and the country that the transformation concept is not simply a new weapons platform, but a new doctrine, a new organizational concept for the Army, and it is a whole new way for the Army to fight and win wars. We appreciate your combined commitment to the Army and your willingness to serve to ensure that the Army remains on the right course.

It is the intention of this committee to give you the support you need to achieve your goal of modernization.

My distinguished friend from Hawaii is not here this morning because he is chairing another committee. He will be here soon. We do have other Senators. Do any of you have an opening statement to make before we listen to the General and the Secretary? Senator Shelby.

Senator SHELBY. Mr. Chairman, I look forward to the testimony. Senator STEVENS. Senator Hutchison.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON

Senator HUTCHISON. Mr. Chairman, I will make mine a part of the record. But I agree with what you have said. We do have boots on the ground in two very dangerous places and our own homeland is also now a focus for attack. So the Army is the one that is out there, obviously Guard and Reserve. I will be interested in hearing how you are going to handle the fatigue of the Guard and Reserve and ramp up our active duty forces, which you have already addressed publicly, but we hope to hear more about, and how you would finance that.

So you have a huge job and we are here to support you in every way. Thank you.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON

As a member of this committee, I have been privileged to visit with our soldiers who are fighting to free Iraqis and Afghans who for decades lived perilously under the oppressive regimes of Saddam Hussein and the Taliban. These same soldiers are proudly working to create an environment where people no longer fear the government under which they live and work. They are helping to rebuild and secure societies in which freedom is a right and not a quantity to be metered out by the few in positions of power.

Unfortunately, as I sit before you today, men and women of our Armed Forces are still deployed in harms way. And if statistics hold true, some will be either wounded or killed. With this in mind, I think it is appropriate and indeed necessary for us to ask difficult questions. Knowing how the Army is successfully confronting an adversary which does not wage open battle against the United States, but seeks less direct methods and means for achieving their objectives is important. Indeed, the threats to our security have transformed themselves into a decidedly unconventional threat. Our enemies pursue asymmetrical approaches to warfare, including

nontraditional threats to the homeland, the use of weapons of mass destruction, and modern forms of irregular warfare. Army transformation therefore must not only be designed to confront the enemy which the Stryker brigades are best suited for, but also an unconventional enemy utilizing asymmetric means and methods both abroad and at home.

The greatest challenge for the Army, including the Reserve and National Guard, may be organizing, equipping and training the force to serve in a more relevant role in Homeland Defense and Security. Ironically, the United States is less likely to enjoy the kind of sanctuary status from attack in the future than in the past. The global transportation network has made intercontinental travel more routine. Our borders are porous to both the illegal immigrant and the international terrorist alike. We now face an implacable enemy willing and able to attack the homeland. The increased focus on homeland defense and the growing requirement for the Army to divert resources away from the more traditional roles and missions of an expeditionary Army raise a very important question: How does the Army and the DOD intend to fund an on-going global war on terrorism, while reorganizing, equipping, and developing missions for the active, reserve, and National Guard to best defend the homeland against another attack the likes of 9/11?

While there is no shortage of challenges, I look forward to hearing how the Army will continue to overcome them. It is with deep gratitude and the utmost respect for the soldiers currently serving to defend this great country that I thank you for your service and look forward to our discussion on how best to prepare for the future.

Senator STEVENS. I apologize. Senator Dorgan, do you have any opening statement?

Senator DORGAN. No, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Cochran, do you have any opening statement?

Senator COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, I do not.

Senator STEVENS. Gentlemen, we are prepared to listen to your testimony and welcome you here. We all have an enormous task to assure that you have the funds and the authority you need to keep this modernization going. So, Senator Brownlee—Secretary Brownlee.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of this committee: Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you today along with my good friend and fellow graduate of the University of Wyoming Reserve Officer Training Corps (ROTC) program, the Chief of Staff of the United States Army, General Pete Schoomaker.

General Schoomaker and his family made a very difficult decision last summer to leave quite a comfortable and lucrative retirement to come back and rejoin the Army. The Army is benefiting in an enormous way from his marvelous leadership. I am especially honored to appear alongside this great soldier today and I am honored to work alongside him every day. I could not measure what he has brought to the Army. He has brought a new meaning to the word “transformation” and he has revitalized the spirit of our soldiers with his emphasis on the Soldier’s Creed and the Warrior Ethos. So it is a great honor for me to be here before the committee representing the magnificent soldiers of our Army along with the Chief of Staff.

We have a prepared posture statement, Mr. Chairman, and with your permission we would like to submit that statement for the record.

Senator STEVENS. We automatically submit all statements for the record in this committee.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Let me begin by expressing my gratitude for the tremendous support to our soldiers who are serving our country around the world, as well as to their families at home. This support comes from the members as well as from your dedicated professional and personal staffs. Your interest and involvement in the Army's activities has made a significant difference in our soldiers' welfare and their mission accomplishment. So to the members and staff of this very distinguished committee, on behalf of the United States Army, thank you all for what you have done.

I know that you are deeply interested in the great work our soldiers are doing, their training, and their morale and how we are equipping them. In the last 9 months I have visited our troops in Iraq three times and those in Afghanistan twice and traveled to our posts in Germany, South Korea, and here in the United States. I am grateful to have the opportunity to share what I have learned with you.

Underlying everything we are doing and planning to do is the most important point I want to make here today, and that is that we are an Army at war, serving a Nation at war.

To better cope with the demands of this war, we have proposed to grow the Army temporarily by 30,000 soldiers over the next several years, using the authority provided in Title 10 and to be paid for from supplemental appropriations. We will plan to use these resources to stand up at least 10 new combat brigades over the next several years and ask for your support in this endeavor. We are also restructuring our Active and Reserve forces to meet the challenges of today and to more effectively use the resources the Congress and the American people have entrusted to us. This is an ongoing process and we will keep the Congress fully informed.

Let me comment on a matter of grave importance to the senior leadership of the Army, sexual assaults on soldiers by fellow soldiers. Such attacks not only weaken unit cohesion and lessen combat power; they are wrong, they will not be overlooked, and they will not be tolerated. The Army is committed to identifying and holding accountable those who commit such actions as well as committed to providing proper care for the victims of such attacks.

We are dedicated to creating an environment and a command climate where these young women feel free to report these incidents through multiple venues: the chain of command, medical channels, chaplains, and their peers. We will properly care for those who have been assaulted and investigate and take appropriate action against those perpetrating these crimes. It is the right thing to do and we are going to do it.

Many of you have asked about the measures we are taking to protect our forces in Iraq. I would like to address two in particular. First, the number of up-armored high mobility multipurpose wheeled vehicles (HMMWV's) in the U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM) area of responsibility is now over 2,000, compared to about 500 last spring. When General Schoomaker and I testified before the Senate Armed Services Committee in November, we estimated then that we would be unable to satisfy the CJTF-7 requirement of 3,000 up-armored HMMWV's until May 2005. This was unacceptable. We have worked with industry to steadily increase pro-

duction of these vehicles and we will now reach a production level of over 4,000 vehicles by August 2004.

We will ramp up from 185 vehicles this month to 220 by May and continue to increase until we reach our requirement. I have talked to the chief executive officers (CEO's) of the companies that build these up-armored HMMWV's and visited their production lines. They are committed to and capable of increasing production rates to up to 450 per month to help us fill our requirement even faster. While this will require additional resources, we are working within the Army budget and with the Office of the Secretary of Defense (OSD) so that we can achieve this accelerated production level as quickly as possible.

Second, there has been concern about every soldier having the best available protection against bullets and explosive fragments. To provide this protection, we increased the production of Interceptor body armor last year and are currently producing and shipping 25,000 sets monthly to the theater of operations. There are now sufficient stocks of Interceptor body armor to equip every soldier and Department of Defense (DOD) civilian in Iraq and Afghanistan, and we will fill our requirement for the remainder of the soldiers and DOD civilians in theater by the end of this month.

In summary, we are producing enough body armor so all soldiers now rotating into theater will be issued a set of body armor either before they deploy into Iraq or immediately after arrival in Afghanistan.

The Army provides relevant and ready campaign-quality land power to combatant commanders as a part of a joint force. To better do this, we are transforming the Army itself in response to lessons learned and experiences gained by the Army's recent 2½ years of combat in the global war on terrorism, as well as the operational environments envisioned in the foreseeable future.

Last Monday General Schoomaker and I announced the termination of the Comanche helicopter program as part of a major restructuring and revitalization of Army aviation. In lieu of completing development and procuring 121 Comanche helicopters in the fiscal year 2005 through fiscal year 2011 future years defense plan (FYDP), we will propose to reallocate these resources to procure almost 800 new aircraft for the Active and Reserve components.

As a part of our total program over the FYDP, we will also enhance, upgrade, and modernize over 1,400 aircraft in our existing aviation fleet. This program to revitalize Army aviation reflects the changed operational environment and will provide the modularity and flexibility we must have to achieve the joint and expeditionary capabilities that are so essential to the Army's role now and in the future.

The fiscal year 2005 President's budget we have submitted, when amended to reflect the termination of Comanche, represents a balanced consideration of both our current and long-term requirements and provides our Army with the resources we need, excluding war-related costs. The tempo of our current operations is high and has human and material costs. We appreciate the assistance of the Congress in addressing these issues as we work to restore

our units and equipment to the high levels of readiness necessary to continue to meet our obligations to the Nation.

In all that the Army has accomplished and all that it will be called upon to do, the American soldier remains the single most important factor in our success. Today our soldiers are present in over 120 countries around the world, representing the American people and American values with courage and compassion. I want to express my appreciation for the service and the enormous sacrifices made by our soldiers, especially those who have given the last full measure, and their families as we meet the challenges and risks posed by the war on terror.

Our deepest thanks go to the members of our Active and Reserve component units, as well as to the thousands of Department of the Army civilians who are deployed overseas in harm's way. Regardless of where our soldiers serve, they perform as the professionals they are with skill, courage, compassion, and dedication. They embody the values of our Army and our Nation, serving selflessly and seeking only to do what must be done before returning home.

Despite remarkable successes, our fight is far from over. It will take time to win the war on terror. Our enemies are resolute, but hard-line al-Qaeda operatives in Iraq recognize they cannot dislodge our forces by fear or intimidation. Our commitment to prevail in Iraq and elsewhere is unshakable. I have seen the resolution in our soldiers' eyes and heard the determination in their voices.

We must do our part to ensure they have all they need to do the job we have set before them. When the American people and our leaders stand behind them, they can do any task on Earth.

We are transforming the Army while retaining the values critical to the Army's achievements of the past 228 years. The fiscal year 2004 defense legislation and supplemental appropriations have enabled the Army to do that which it has been asked to do and I look forward to discussing with you how the fiscal year 2005 budget request will permit us to continue meeting our obligations now and in the years to come.

Mr. Chairman, in closing I would like to thank you and the members of this distinguished committee for your continuing support of the men and women in our Army, an Army at war, and a full member of the joint team, deployed and fighting terror around the world.

PREPARED STATEMENT

I appreciate this opportunity to appear before you today and I look forward to answering your questions.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF HONORABLE R.L. BROWNLEE AND GENERAL PETER J. SCHOOMAKER

February 5, 2004.

Our Nation is at war. The security of our homeland, the Global War on Terror, and sustained engagement around the world define today's complex and uncertain strategic environment. The future will be no less ambiguous.

We must prepare now to meet the challenges of tomorrow. Rather than focusing on a single, well-defined threat or a geographic region, we must develop a range of complementary and interdependent capabilities that will enable future joint force

commanders to dominate any adversary or situation. A capabilities-based approach to concept and force development, as articulated in the 2001 Quadrennial Defense Review, is the major focus of defense transformation.

Over the past year our Army has met the demands of the Global War on Terror, with more than 325,000 troops deployed around the world in over 120 countries. The Army was instrumental in the defeat of Saddam Hussein and the Taliban and the subsequent liberation of more than 46 million people from oppression and despair. The Army remains a central and critical participant in Operation Iraqi Freedom and Operation Enduring Freedom. Although these and other operations have stressed the force, our Soldiers have responded magnificently.

Our Army's commitment to the Nation remains absolute. While we execute the Global War on Terror, our Army simultaneously continues its organizational and intellectual transformation to meet the challenges of the 21st Century. In support of the National Security Strategy and the National Military Strategy we are improving our warfighting readiness and ability to win decisively. We also remain dedicated to the well-being of our Soldiers, their families and our civilian workforce.

The United States Army is the most powerful land force on earth. With this power comes a great responsibility. American Soldiers show by their daily actions that they understand this, and are fully worthy of the trust the American people have placed in them.

For 228 years the Army has never failed the Nation, and it never will.

PETER J. SCHOOMAKER,
General, U.S. Army, Chief of Staff.
R.L. BROWNLEE,
Acting Secretary of the Army.

PURPOSE OF THE POSTURE STATEMENT

The Army Posture Statement provides an overview of today's Army. Focusing on the Soldier, the centerpiece of the force, it explains the current and future strategic environments that provide our mandate for transformation. Our core competencies and how we intend to meet our current demands and future challenges are outlined. It describes what we must become in order to provide more ready and relevant forces and capabilities to the Joint Team.

2004 ARMY POSTURE STATEMENT EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Our Nation At War

Our Nation, and our Army, are at war. It is a different kind of war, fought against a global terrorist network and not likely to end in the foreseeable future. In the days following the attacks on September 11, 2001, President Bush spoke candidly to the Nation. "These terrorists kill not merely to end lives, but to disrupt and end a way of life." He added: "The only way to defeat terrorism as a threat to our way of life is to stop it, eliminate it and destroy it where it grows."

Our Army exists to fight and win our Nation's wars. We are an integral member of the Joint Team committed to winning in fulfillment of our responsibilities to national security. We are fighting to preserve the American way of life and to safeguard the many freedoms our citizens enjoy. Our Soldiers and their families have not forgotten the events of September 11, which launched us to action in Afghanistan and Iraq. They are reminded daily of the ongoing conflict through separation, concern for forward-deployed loved ones and, most regrettably, news of casualties. Our Army continues the mission and remains committed to defeating our enemy.

Our Army's Core Competencies

As our Army fights the current war and remains dedicated to transforming, we are focused on our two core competencies: (1) Training and equipping Soldiers and growing leaders; (2) Providing relevant and ready land power to Combatant Commanders as part of the Joint Force.

Our Army must be an agile and capable force with a Joint and Expeditionary Mindset. This mindset is the lens through which we view our service. We must be mobile, strategically deployable and prepared for decisive operations whenever and wherever required. We must be lethal and fully interoperable with other components and our allies, as well as flexible, informed, proactive, responsive and totally integrated into the joint, interagency and multinational context. Our management and support processes must reflect and support these same characteristics.

Strategic Environment—Our Mandate for Transformation

At the end of the Cold War, the United States had no peer competitor. Our Army was much larger and was built around heavy, mechanized and armored formations. Because America stood as the lone superpower during this time of global realignment, we were able to downsize our force structure. Today, the future is uncertain and presents many challenges. The emerging challenges manifest themselves as new adaptive threats, employing a mix of new and old technologies that necessitate changes to the ways in which the elements of our national power are applied.

The 21st century security environment is marked by new actors and a noteworthy proliferation of dangerous weapons, technologies and military capabilities. While threats from potentially hostile regional powers remain, increasingly non-state actors, operating autonomously or with state-sponsorship, also are able to endanger regional and global security. These forces—insurgents, paramilitaries, terrorists, narco-traffickers and organized crime—are a growing concern. They often are networked and enabled by the same tools and information systems used by state actors. Our adversaries will rely more frequently on indirect and asymmetric methods, such as anti-access and area-denial strategies, unrestricted warfare and terrorism, to mitigate their relative disadvantage. The most dangerous of these threats are the development and proliferation of weapons of mass destruction (WMD)—including biological or chemical agents, or radiological “dirty bombs”—to attack the United States. This security environment requires that the Army have the capability to dominate throughout the spectrum of conflict and to plan for multiple future contingencies.

As a result of this adaptive enemy and our worldwide commitments, current organizations, systems and facilities are and will continue to be stressed. We now rely on our Reserve Component to support our operations to a degree not seen since World War II. As of January 14, 2004, there were more than 164,000 Reserve Component Soldiers mobilized with over 139,000 of them serving overseas. The institutional Army is being asked to do more, applying lessons learned from current operations. These lessons are critical to our organizations and individual Soldiers as they prepare for worldwide missions. Therefore, the current and future strategic environments require the Army to have the capability to dominate throughout the spectrum of conflict and to plan for multiple contingencies. These new security challenges, coupled with the current war on terrorism, require a different approach.

Army Focus Areas

Last summer, Army leaders identified immediate focus areas instrumental to adapting Army organizations and processes that will help us to better meet the Nation's security requirements. All of our focus areas should be viewed in the context of our ongoing efforts to retain the campaign qualities of our Army while simultaneously developing a Joint and Expeditionary Mindset. Of these focus areas, a critical enabler is the redesign of our resource processes to be more flexible, responsive, and timely. Our goal is to be a better Army every day—better able to execute our core competencies as members of the Joint Team.

Adapting Resource and Acquisition Processes

The resource process is at the core of our Army's mission success. Our Nation faces a cunning and adaptive enemy, predictable only in his zeal and intent. We are just as cunning and our Soldiers are constantly changing tactics and techniques in order to disrupt the enemy's plans. In the same way, our resource and acquisition processes must become more flexible, responsive and timely in order to take immediate advantage of technological improvements and to sustain the quality of the force over time.

Resetting Our Force

Quickly resetting our forces upon their redeployment from current operations is a strategic imperative. The reset program incorporates lessons learned from Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) and Operation Enduring Freedom (OEF), retrains essential tasks, adjusts pre-positioned stocks of equipment and ammunition, and brings unit equipment readiness back to standard. Units must recover quickly in order to provide the Combatant Commanders with land-power capabilities for future requirements. We will face challenges as we rotate troops from deployment to home station, while simultaneously maintaining vigilance and readiness.

Continued congressional support and adequate resources are needed to accomplish our reset tasks and to mitigate the risk we have incurred to our Current and Future Forces. The fiscal year 2004 defense legislation and supplemental appropriation delivered substantial assistance toward covering the cost of current operations and initiating the reset process. We fully appreciate the exceptional support Members and

their staffs have provided this year. But, the job is not complete. In fact, it has only just begun.

Mitigating Strategic Risk Through Increased Land Power Capability

Today our Army is executing operations in defense of the homeland (Operation Noble Eagle); stability and support operations in the Balkans (Stabilization Force/Kosovo Force); peacekeeping in the Sinai as part of the Multinational Force and Observers (MFO) and combat operations in Iraq and Afghanistan (Operation Enduring Freedom/Operation Iraqi Freedom). We are also forward stationed in Korea and elsewhere. Approximately two-thirds of our active and reserve combat formations were deployed in fiscal year 2003 and will be deployed in fiscal year 2004.

These deployments, coupled with planned future rotation of units into OIF and OEF, the largest movement of Army troops since World War II, have highlighted already existing stress to our force. To mitigate risk, the Army is embarking on a series of initiatives. The first initiative is resetting forces returning from OIF and OEF to a standard higher than before their deployment. A second establishes force stabilization measures to reduce turbulence amongst Soldiers, units and their families. Thirdly, the Army is internally rebalancing Active and Reserve Component forces to better posture our existing force structure to meet global commitments. And lastly, we are beginning to increase the number of available combat brigades through improved force management and modular reorganization. This increase allows the Army to improve strategic flexibility, sustain a predictable rotation cycle, and permits the Reserve Component to reset.

To facilitate this end state, the Army will seek to maintain, or even to increase temporarily, its current level of manning. These measures, when resourced, will mitigate risk and ultimately provide increased capability to Combatant Commanders.

Conclusion

Our Nation is at war and our Army is at war; we remain ever relevant and ready to meet today's challenges. Yet there is much more to do. We are prioritizing wartime requirements, incorporating next-generation capabilities into current systems where appropriate, and preserving essential investments in the Future Force. We also are becoming more joint and expeditionary. We do not move forward alone, but as part of the Joint Team. We need the support of the American people and the U.S. Congress. With this backing, we will continue to carry the fight to our enemies to provide security here at home.

CORE COMPETENCIES

Our Army has two core competencies, supported by a set of essential and enduring capabilities. These core competencies are: (1) training and equipping Soldiers and growing leaders; and (2) providing relevant and ready land-power capability to the Combatant Commanders as part of the Joint Force. Additionally, our Army's senior leadership has established immediate focus areas and issued specific guidance for planning, preparation and execution of actions aimed at rapidly effecting necessary transformation in support of these core competencies. See Addendum I (available at www.Army.mil) for more information on the Army's focus areas.

Train and Equip Soldiers and Grow Leaders

Our Army prepares every Soldier to be a warrior. Our training replicates the stark realities of the battlefield in order to condition Soldiers to react instinctively in combat. Such training is essential to building Soldiers' confidence in themselves, their equipment, their leaders, and their fellow Soldiers. Constant training in weaponry and field craft, and a continuous immersion in the warrior culture, give Soldiers the skills they need to succeed on the battlefield. Mental and physical toughness are paramount to the development of the warrior ethos and apply to all Soldiers from private to general. Every Soldier is called upon to be a leader.

The Soldier

The American Soldier remains the centerpiece of our combat systems and formations and is indispensable to the Joint Team. Adaptive, confident and competent Soldiers, infused with the Army's values and warrior culture, fight wars and win the peace. As a warrior, every Soldier must be prepared to engage the enemy in close combat; the modern battlefield has no safe areas. Our Army trains our Soldiers to that standard, without regard to their specialty or unit. The Soldier—fierce, disciplined, well-trained, well-led and well-equipped—ultimately represents and enables the capabilities our Army provides to the Joint Force and the Nation.

Our Soldiers are bright, honest, dedicated and totally committed to the mission. All share common values, a creed and a warrior ethos. Our Army defines selfless service as putting the welfare of our Nation, Army and subordinates before your own. Soldiers join the Army to serve. Most Americans do not fully realize the personal sacrifices these Soldiers and their families endure. However, our Soldiers know that they have done their part to secure our Nation's freedoms and to maintain the American way of life.

Our Soldiers' Creed captures the warrior ethos and outlines the professional attitudes and beliefs that characterize our American Soldier. The warrior ethos is about the refusal to accept failure and the conviction that military service is much more than just another job. It defines who Soldiers are and what Soldiers do. It is linked to our long-standing Army Values, and determination to do what is right and do it with pride.

Recruiting and Retaining a High-Quality Volunteer Force

All of our Soldiers are warriors whose actions have strategic impact. Because we are at war and will be for the foreseeable future, we must recruit Soldiers who have the warrior ethos already ingrained in their character, who seek to serve our Nation, and who will have the endurance and commitment to stay the course of the conflict. We must recruit and retain Soldiers who are confident, adaptive and competent to handle the full complexity of 21st century warfare.

We will continue to bring the highest quality Soldier into the force. All newly enlisted Soldiers are high school graduates (diploma or equivalent) and 24 percent have some college. These young Americans, who believe service to our Nation is paramount, make our success possible. They display a willingness to stand up and make a difference.

Our recruiting and retention efforts continue to be successful. The active Army met its recruiting and retention goals in fiscal year 2003. The Army National Guard exceeded its retention goals for fiscal year 2003 and simultaneously met its end strength objectives. The Army Reserve met its recruiting goals and all but one retention target in fiscal year 2003. Most importantly, all components sustained their end-strength requirements.

We do not know yet the effect the high operational pace of recent months will have on our recruiting and retention in fiscal year 2004 and future years. We must carefully monitor recruiting and retention trends and adequately resource our successful recruiting and retention initiatives. Incentives such as the Enlistment Bonus Program, The Army College Fund and the Loan Repayment Program, have successfully enabled the Army to execute precision recruiting in fiscal year 2003. Our Special Forces Candidate "Off the Street" initiative continues to attract highly motivated and qualified warriors. Significantly, Selective Reenlistment Bonuses, such as the Present Duty Assignment Bonus and the Theater Selective Reenlistment Bonus, which are intended to enhance unit stability, have helped us realize our retention successes. For more information on recruiting, see Addendum C.

Civilian Component Enhances Our Capabilities

Army civilians are an integral and vital part of our Army team. They are essential to the readiness of our Army at war and our ability to sustain operations. Our civilian employees share our Army values. They are smart, resourceful and totally committed to supporting our Soldiers and our Army to do whatever it takes to meet the challenges that come our way. These dedicated civilians perform critical, mission-essential duties in support of every functional facet of combat support and combat service support, both at home and abroad. Army civilians serve alongside Soldiers to provide the critical skills necessary to sustain combat systems and weaponry. They work in 54 countries in more than 550 different occupations. In fiscal year 2003, nearly 2,000 Army civilians deployed to Southwest Asia in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom, Operation Enduring Freedom, and the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT). They have the education, skills and experience to accomplish the mission while ensuring continuity of operations for all commanders.

Realistic Training—Essential to Mission Success

Tough, realistic training ensures that our Soldiers and units maintain readiness and relevance as critical members of the Joint Force. Our Army's combined-arms training strategy, including an appropriate mix of live, virtual, and constructive training, determines the resource requirements to maintain the combat readiness of our troops. We revised our training ammunition standards to allow Combat Support and Combat Service Support units to conduct live fire exercises under conditions similar to those they might encounter in combat.

The Army's OPTEMPO budget is among its top priorities. Our leadership is committed to fully executing the Active and Reserve Component ground and air

OPTEMPO training strategies, which include actual miles driven and hours flown, as well as virtual miles associated with using simulators. The flying hour program is funded to achieve a historic execution level of live flying hours per aircrew per month. If units exceed the historic execution level, our Army will increase their funding. Thus far this year, OPTEMPO execution reports show units exceeding their programmed miles driven and hours flown. These are the units that are aggressively preparing for deployments to OIF and OEF, as well as the units who recently have returned and are preparing for future operations. Our combined arms training strategy is working and sustaining our warfighting readiness. We see the results every day in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Joint and Expeditionary

Our Army is the dominant ground component of the Joint Team and provides the Joint Force Commander a campaign quality force with unique and complementary capabilities. We are vital and indispensable members of the Joint Team first and are a Service second. We must remain aware that our Army always conducts operations—offensive, defensive, stability and support—in a joint and expeditionary context. Acting in concert with air and naval power, decisive land power creates a synergy that produces a Joint Force with abilities far exceeding the sum of the individual service components. Our Army can: support civil authorities at home and abroad; provide expeditionary forces at the right time and the right place; reassure our allies and multinational partners; deter adversaries and, should deterrence fail, decisively defeat the enemy; and win the peace through post-conflict operations, in concert with interagency and multinational efforts. Our Army must continually examine the capabilities resident in and required by the Joint Force. We will concentrate our energies and resources on those attributes which our Army is best suited to provide to the Joint Force. Our Army will arrive on the battlefield as a campaign-quality force fulfilling the requirements of the Joint Force Commander—lethal, agile, mobile, strategically responsive, and fully interoperable with other components within the interagency and multinational context.

Train and Educate Army Members of the Joint Force

Our Army is taking action across a broad front to make jointness an integral part of our culture by including this concept in our education and training programs. We have always produced leaders with the right mix of unit experience, training, and education. As we look to the future, we know that, to meet our current and future leadership requirements and those of the Joint Force, we must redesign aspects of our Army's training and leader development programs to include lessons learned from current operations. Our objectives are to increase our ability to think and act jointly and to provide our Soldiers with the latest and most relevant techniques, procedures and equipment that will make them successful on the battlefield. Additionally, the changes acknowledge the current and projected pace of operations and deployments. As a result, we will be better prepared for the current and future strategic environments.

Maintaining a ready Current Force today and achieving a transformed Future Force tomorrow requires a shift in the way units train for joint operations. Our Army's Training Transformation Initiative (TTI), which supports the June 2003 Defense Department Training Transformation Implementation Plan, provides dynamic, capabilities-based training and mission rehearsal in a joint context.

Leader Development—Train For Certainty, Educate For Uncertainty

Leader development is an essential part of our Army's core competencies and the lifeblood of our profession. It is the deliberate, progressive and continuous process that develops our Soldiers and civilians into competent, confident, self-aware, adaptive and decisive leaders. They emerge prepared for the challenges of 21st century combined arms, joint, multinational and interagency operations.

Army leaders at all levels bear responsibility for America's Soldiers and accomplishing the mission, whatever it may be. The range of missions and their complexity continue to grow, presenting our leaders with even greater challenges than previously experienced. The evolving strategic environment, the gravity of our strategic responsibilities, and the broad range of tasks that the Army performs require us to review, and periodically to refocus, the way we educate, train and grow professional warfighters.

We have a training and leader development system that is unrivaled in the world. Our professional military education prepared our officers and noncommissioned officers to fight and win in Iraq and Afghanistan. We will continue to develop our leaders with the right mix of operational assignments and training and education opportunities that meet the current and future requirements of the Army and Joint Force. Our leader training focuses on how to think, not what to think. We will main-

tain our investment in the future by sustaining the highest quality leader training and education for our Army.

Combat Training Centers (CTC)/Battle Command Training Program (BCTP)

The CTC program is a primary culture driver for our Army. Additionally, our CTCs are a primary enabler of, and full participant in, the Joint National Training Capability. The CTCs develop self-aware and adaptive leaders and Soldiers and ready units for full spectrum, joint, interagency and multinational operations. CTCs continuously integrate operational lessons learned into the training. Our Army enhances the training experience offered by our CTCs (National Training Center in California, Joint Readiness Training Center in Louisiana, Combat Maneuver Training Center in Germany and Battle Command Training Program based in Kansas) by increasing the focus on development of capabilities essential to joint operations. Leader training and development during CTC exercises hone the Joint and Expeditionary Mindset and promote our Army's warrior culture.

Provide Relevant and Ready Land Power Capabilities to the Combatant Commander and the Joint Team

To meet global commitments across the full spectrum of military operations, our Army has mobilized more than 164,000 Reserve Component Soldiers. More than 325,000 American Soldiers are serving overseas and more than 23,000 Soldiers are supporting operations within the United States. This high operating tempo is no longer an exception. Sustained operations and deployments will be the norm for our Army forces supporting multiple and simultaneous shaping and stability operations around the globe. At the same time, we will continue to contribute to Joint Force execution of major combat operations, homeland security missions and strategic deterrence.

Army Global Commitments

Our Army is engaged in more than 120 countries throughout the world. To highlight our Army's commitment, a review of the major warfighting formations of the Active and Reserve Component serves as a measurable benchmark. Over 24 of the Army's 33 Active Component Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs), and five of our 15 Reserve Component Enhanced Separate Brigades (ESB) were deployed in fiscal year 2003. This trend will continue in fiscal year 2004, with 26 of 33 Active Component BCTs and six of our 15 Reserve Component ESB brigades projected for deployment.

The majority of these combat formations are deployed in the U.S. Central Command area of responsibility (AOR), effectively executing stability and support operations. More than 153,000 Soldiers are supporting CENTCOM operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, Kuwait and the Horn of Africa. We are currently in the middle of the largest movement of troops since WWII, as we rotate more than eight-and-a-half divisions and two ESBs to or from the theater. The approximate ratio of Active to Reserve Component forces today is currently 63 to 37 percent, respectively. Once our current rotation is complete, the ratio will change to approximately 54 to 46 percent, Active to Reserve Component. Since September 11, we have mobilized almost half of the Reserve Component. They are trained, professional, and ready to execute any task.

Army support to other Combatant Commanders remains high. U.S. Northern Command's Army component, U.S. Army Forces Command, provides more than 23,000 Active and Reserve Component Soldiers for duty in the defense of our homeland. These troops are available for missions including Military Assistance to Civil Authorities (MACA), emergency preparedness, and anti-terrorist operations. The Army Reserve provides to NORTHCOM significant voice and data connectivity necessary to execute real-time operations. U.S. European Command provides forces, such as V U.S. Corps, to CENTCOM; and to Stability Force (SFOR) and Kosovo Force (KFOR) in the Balkans. U.S. Pacific Command supports ongoing operations in the Philippines, as part of the Global War on Terrorism, in addition to maintaining more than 31,000 Soldiers on the Korean Peninsula. U.S. Southern Command is fully engaged as the headquarters for 1,500 Soldiers executing detainee operations at Guantanamo Bay, Cuba; has deployed 740 Soldiers to Joint Task Force—Bravo at Soto Cano Airbase, Honduras; and is assisting the government of Colombia in its war on narco-terrorism. U.S. Special Operations Command's Army component provides professional, dedicated, and specially trained Soldiers to each Combatant Commander. These Soldiers, working closely with conventional forces, have been instrumental to our success in the Global War on Terrorism.

In addition to federal missions, our Army National Guard (ARNG) plays an important domestic role, routinely responding to state emergencies. In fiscal year 2003, there were 280 requests for emergency support, ranging from basic human needs to engineering support during natural disasters. Our ARNG has fielded 32 Weapons

of Mass Destruction (WMD) Civil Support Teams (CST), which assist first responders in the event of an incident. Another 12 CSTs are due to be activated within 18 months. To date, these teams have responded to 74 different requests for support. Also, more than 8,000 ARNG Soldiers have executed critical force protection duties at 148 Air Force installations in CONUS.

Resetting the Force

The extraordinary demands major combat and stability operations in Afghanistan and Iraq are placing on our equipment and personnel require that our Army quickly reset returning units for future national security needs. The reset program will incorporate lessons learned from OIF and OEF, retrain essential tasks, adjust pre-positioned stocks of equipment and ammunition, and bring unit equipment readiness back to standard. The objective is to ensure our Army forces are ready to respond to near-term emerging threats and contingencies. However, reset cannot be viewed as a one-time event. Reset will continue to be key to our future readiness as our military executes our National Security missions.

Through reset, all returning active duty and Army Reserve units will achieve a sufficient level of combat readiness within six to eight months of their arrival at home station. The Army National Guard will take longer to achieve the desired level of readiness. The goal for these units is to reestablish pre-deployment readiness within one year. Our Army also will take advantage of reset as an opportunity to reorganize units into modular designs that are more responsive to regional Combatant Commanders' needs; that better employ joint capabilities; that reduce deployment time; and that fight as self-contained units in non-linear, non-contiguous battlespaces. This effort began with the 3rd Infantry Division and will soon be expanded to include the 101st Airborne Division (Air Assault).

In addition to investing in new equipment to replace items that were destroyed or worn out during combat and stability operations, the reset program will repair major items used in OIF and OEF. Repair requirements have been determined for all OIF1 units and the workload for this comprehensive effort is immense: about 1,000 aviation systems; 124,400 communications and electronics systems; 5,700 combat/tracked vehicles; 45,700 wheeled vehicles; 1,400 missile systems; nine Patriot battalions; and approximately 232,200 items from various other systems. This effort represents a significant expansion of normal maintenance activities, requiring the increased use of CONUS and OCONUS based depot, installation and commercial repair facilities.

Reconfiguring existing Army pre-positioned stocks for global coverage of potential missions is a major component of the reset process. The intent is for each stock to have sufficient combat power to meet the immediate threat, as well as enough materials to render relief in other contingencies.

Congressional support, in the form of supplemental appropriations, has been invaluable in beginning the reset effort. Our readiness depends directly on the successful execution of the reset program, and it will remain an ongoing priority for the foreseeable future. Continued resourcing will be needed to ensure that our Army can fight the current war and posture itself for future missions.

Transformation: Moving From the Current to the Future Force

The goals of Army Transformation are to provide relevant and ready forces that are organized, trained and equipped for full-spectrum joint, interagency and multinational operations and to support Future Force development. Army Transformation occurs within the larger context of changes to the entire U.S. military. To support our Army staff in the execution of transformation, the Army leadership directed the establishment of an Army Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC) Futures Center, operational as of October 2003.

Our Current Force is organized, trained and equipped to conduct operations as part of the Joint Force. It provides the requisite decisive land power capabilities that the Joint Force commander needs across the range of military operations: support to civil authorities at home and abroad; expeditionary forces; the ability to reassure friends, allies and multinational partners; dissuading and deterring adversaries; decisively defeating adversaries should deterrence fail; and winning the peace as part of an integrated, inter-agency, post-conflict effort.

Our Future Force is the operational force the Army continuously seeks to become. Informed by National Security and Department of Defense guidance, it is a strategically responsive, networked, precision capabilities-based maneuver force that is dominant across the range of military operations envisioned for the future global security environment.

As our Army develops the Future Force, it simultaneously is accelerating select future doctrine, organization, training, materiel, leadership, personnel, and facilities

(DOTMLPF) capabilities into our Current Force. This process will be fundamental to our success in enhancing the relevance and readiness of our Army and prosecuting the Global War on Terrorism. Similarly, the operational experience of our Current Force directly informs the pursuit of Future Force capabilities.

Balancing Current and Future Readiness

Balancing risk between current and future readiness remains a critical part of our Army's transformation process and one that requires continual assessment to ensure that plans and programs are aligned with overall requirements. Without question, the issue of current operational readiness is our Army's highest priority. During the past several years, our Army made a conscious decision to accept a reasonable degree of risk to the readiness of our Current Force in order to permit investment in capabilities for our Future Force. This risk came in the form of reductions in and limitations to modernization and recapitalization programs. As part of the past four budget submissions, our Army made difficult choices to cancel and restructure programs, shifting resources to the development of transformational capabilities. Some of these investments have already produced results: for example, the new Stryker Brigade Combat Team formations now being fielded, the first of which is currently deployed on the battlefield in Iraq. Others are helping to develop emerging technologies and capabilities that will be applied to our force throughout the coming decade.

Besides the ongoing efforts related to equipping the Current Force, our Army also has begun other major initiatives that will improve our readiness and relevance in the future. These include an effort to realign Active and Reserve Component units and capabilities, in order to make our Army more readily deployable and available to Joint Force Commanders; home-basing and Unit Focused Stability, which will improve readiness and reduce personnel turbulence; and the reorganization of Army units into more modular and capability-based organizations.

While the previous decisions to accept reasonable risk in our Current Force were considered prudent at the time, the strategic and operational environment has significantly changed in light of the large-scale engagement of Army forces in Operation Iraqi Freedom and other expeditionary operations. Ever-changing demands on our force, coupled with our commitment to mitigating risk to our Soldiers, have necessitated re-examination and transformation of our Army's resource process and business practices (see Addendum H at www.Army.mil).

Making the Resource Process More Responsive

The resource process is our Army's center of gravity. Without the right people, the proper equipment, top-notch installations and adequate dollars to support all appropriately, our Army would not be able to fulfill its duty to our Nation.

In order to maintain our premier warfighting capability, Army resource processes must be flexible, dynamic, transparent and responsive to both our requirements and those of the Joint Force. This is especially true in today's environment. We are at war against conventional and unconventional enemies, and simultaneously pursuing transformation. Our resource process must be transformed to allow us to keep pace with changes brought on by the enemy. Though we anticipate the battle against terrorism will last for years, possibly decades, we cannot program and budget in advance for that war. Our Army obviously cannot ignore our country's current security needs, yet it would be equally imprudent to deviate from the development and fielding of our Future Force. Balancing these requirements will be one of our toughest tasks.

The GWOT requires a host of radical paradigm shifts in the way we view the face and nature of our global operating environment, as well as in the way that we conduct operations. Responsible yet creative stewardship of our resources will remain absolutely necessary. Internal controls must be tightened and waste eliminated; outsourcing non-core functions is still an important option. Risk will continue to be a factor and our resourcing decisions must take this into account.

We must transform our resource processes and adjust our priorities to meet the challenge of the current strategic environment. Because we cannot mass-produce a volunteer Army, the retention of the right volunteer force is an imperative. This force is essential to the combat effectiveness of an increasingly complex and technologically sophisticated Army. We must refine and streamline the resource, acquisition, and fielding processes for equipment and supplies as we cannot make up for lost time in a crisis.

Accelerated Acquisition and Fielding

We have adapted and continue to improve our acquisition and fielding processes. In 2002, as Soldiers reported equipment shortages in Afghanistan and elsewhere, we implemented the Rapid Fielding Initiative (RFI) to ensure that all of our troops

deploy with the latest available equipment. Equipment fielding schedules were revised to support unit rotation plans, and procurement and fielding cycles were radically compressed.

In coordination with field commanders and our Soldiers, a list of more than 40 mission-essential items, including the Advanced Combat Helmet, close-combat optics, Global Positioning System receivers, Soldier intercoms and hydration systems, was identified for rapid fielding. Laying the foundation for acquisition transformation, RFI already has equipped nine brigade combat teams (BCTs). In fiscal year 2004, RFI will upgrade a minimum of 18 BCTs and eight enhanced Separate Brigades, serving in OIF and OEF. Additionally, we are accelerating fielding of select future capabilities to our Current Force. These items include thermal weapon sights, enhanced night vision goggles, improved body armor, the Future Combat Rifle, and a new sniper rifle. Congressional support for regular budget and supplemental spending requests enables our Army to put this improved equipment in the hands of our Soldiers.

With this support, our Army also has instituted a Rapid Equipping Force (REF) that works directly with operational commanders to find solutions to operational requirements. These solutions may be off-the-shelf or near-term developmental items that can be made quickly available. For example, the REF established a coordinated effort to supply U.S. Forces with immediate solutions to counter improvised explosive device (IED) threats. Currently, IED teams are on location providing expertise and material solutions, to safeguard our Soldiers. We are acting aggressively to improve the armor protection of our armored and light-skinned vehicles. Other recent examples of REF products are the Well-Cam and PackBots. The Well-Cam is a camera, attached to an Ethernet cable and a laptop, that enabled Soldiers in Afghanistan to search wells for weapons caches. PackBots are operational robots used to clear caves, buildings, and compounds so Soldiers are not unnecessarily put in harm's way.

RFI and REF provide timely support to our relevant and ready forces and to the Combatant Commanders, and facilitate Army Transformation.

Balancing Our Active and Reserve Component Force Structure

Currently, neither our Active nor Reserve Component is optimized for today's rapid deployability requirements. We will continue ongoing efforts to restructure our forces in order to mitigate stress; to align better with the current and projected security environments; and to offer campaign-quality land power capabilities to the Combatant Commanders. By doing so, we will ensure that our Army provides the responsiveness and depth required to achieve strategic and operational objectives, while simultaneously defending our homeland.

Our Army is restructuring and rebalancing more than 100,000 positions in our Active and Reserve Component force structure. These conversions increase the Active Component capabilities available to support the first 30 days of a rapid response operation. In response to Secretary of Defense guidance, we have already completed approximately 10,000 positions. For example, the Army National Guard provisionally organized 18 additional military police (MP) companies. Between fiscal year 2004 and fiscal year 2009, our Army will divest approximately 19,500 positions of less frequently used Active and Reserve Component force structure to further resource critical high demand units such as military police, civil affairs, and special operations forces. We project that future rebalancing efforts will convert an additional 80,000 positions of lower-priority force structure. Despite these changes, our Army will remain stressed to meet anticipated requirements. To ensure that our Army can fulfill its commitment to our Nation, we should have the force capability level required to facilitate rebalancing, resetting, restructuring, and transforming of the Army.

Military-to-civilian conversions are another way to improve manpower efficiency. More military personnel will fill the operational force if they are moved out of positions that can be prudently performed by civilians. To improve the Army's ability to better support worldwide commitments, it is essential to start this process now.

Our Reserve Component relies heavily on Full-Time-Support (FTS) personnel to sustain support of current contingencies while restructuring the force. FTS personnel perform the vital, day-to-day organizational, administrative, training and maintenance activities that ensure the highest level of Soldier and unit readiness. To guarantee that our Army's Reserve Component will continue to fulfill ever-increasing demands with trained and ready units, our Army plans to raise FTS authorizations by 15 percent, from the current level of 71,928 to 85,840, by fiscal year 2012. In 2003, the Army Reserve began implementation of the Federal Reserve Restructuring Initiative. The goal is to better meet contingency requirements and to improve unit readiness.

Achieving Greater Combat Capability With Modular, Capabilities-based Unit Designs

Modular units are interchangeable, scalable, and tailorable formations, which provide the Joint Force Commander with a strategically responsive force that greatly increases his ability to defeat any adversary. Modularity enables us to tailor our capabilities to the requirements of the situation and delivered at the right time and the right place. Modularity permits the Combatant Commander to optimize his warfighting tool set.

Moving toward independent, echelon-above-brigade headquarters will enhance modularity. In accordance with our Unit of Employment (UE) construct, a UE will provide the command-and-control structure into which modular, capabilities-based Units of Action (UA) are organized to meet Combatant Commander requirements. These UAs will incorporate essential maintenance, intelligence, and communications functions previously provided by higher level organizations. Our UE headquarters, while able to accept joint capabilities such as a Standing Joint Force Headquarters element, will have an organic capability, depending on the contingency, to function as a Joint Task Force or Joint Force Land Component Command headquarters like we have already done in Afghanistan and Iraq.

Force Stabilization

The great demands placed on our Army have forced us to re-examine many of our long-standing personnel and basing practices. As a result, our Army is transitioning to an improved manning system, designed to augment unit readiness by increasing stability and predictability for commanders, Soldiers and families. Force Stabilization will allow Reserve Component Soldiers to plan for their deployments while supporting their civilian jobs and their community commitments. It places greater emphasis on building and sustaining cohesive, deployable, combat-ready forces for Combatant Commanders.

The home-basing initiative keeps our Soldiers in their assignments at specific installations longer, thus reducing unit turbulence and increasing unit cohesion. Unit Focused Stability synchronizes our Soldiers' assignments to their units' operational cycle, providing a more capable, deployable and prepared unit.

Installations as Our Flagships

Our installations are an essential component in maintaining the premier Army in the world. For the warfighter, installations are the platforms from which we project military power. Our installations perform the following key missions: (1) provide effective training facilities; (2) rapidly mobilize and deploy the force; (3) provide reachback capabilities; (4) sustain and reconstitute the force; and (5) care for our families. As power projection platforms, our installations must be equipped with a robust information infrastructure that gives the deployed commander quick and efficient reach-back capabilities. All of these missions help to maintain our Army's deployability and fighting edge.

Historically, we have accepted risk in our infrastructure and installation services in order to maintain our current readiness. The cumulative effect on our installations is that commanders rate more than 50 percent of our facilities as "adversely affecting mission and training requirements." We have adjusted our management processes to be more effective stewards of our resources. In 2002, we established the Installation Management Agency (IMA) to create a corporate-focused structure that provides efficient installation management worldwide. The IMA uses creative management programs to sustain quality installations and maintain the well-being of the entire Army family.

The Installation Information Infrastructure Modernization Program (I³MP) enhances the installation's role in power projection and provides the architecture to address the essential reach-back requirement. Additionally, our Installation Sustainability Plan addresses ways to fulfill environmental requirements without impacting current or future training. Other important progress include modernization of barracks and housing; a Residential Communities Initiative; and divestiture of redundant facilities infrastructure and non-core utility systems through privatization.

In the past few years, the administration and Congress have helped us to begin addressing our infrastructure challenges. We requested 94 percent of funding required for sustainment of installations in fiscal year 2004. We have made progress in improving our installations by adjusting existing programs and developing new management strategies. However, there is much still left to do in order to upgrade our installations to better support the mission, Soldiers, and our families.

Army Families and Well Being

People are the heart and soul of the Army—Soldiers, civilians, family members, and retirees. Our readiness is inextricably linked to the well being of our people. The Army Family, for both the Active and Reserve Component, is a force multiplier and provides the foundation to sustain our warrior culture. We have placed significant emphasis on our Reserve Component this year in recognition of their contributions to the Global War on Terrorism. With the help of the administration and Congress, many improvements have been made including the retention and increase of Imminent Danger Pay, Family Separation Allowance, and a sizable pay raise. Other key well-being initiatives include the Spousal Employment Partnership, new TRICARE policies for the reserve components, and improvements in barracks and family housing. For more information on other Army well-being initiatives, see Addendum D (available at www.Army.mil)

Introducing New Capabilities Into Current Force

While at war, the urgency to accelerate the development and fielding of new and enhanced capabilities to our fighting forces in the field has never been greater. Our Army is making significant strides in this regard with the employment of a new brigade combat team organization, equipped with the latest available technology, to provide the Combatant Commander with enhanced warfighting capabilities. The rapid fielding of the Stryker vehicle demonstrates our Army's ability to use the acquisition and resource processes to meet a Combatant Commander's urgent needs.

Stryker Brigade Combat Team (SBCT)

In 2003, our Army deployed our first SBCT, the 3rd Brigade, 2nd Infantry Division, to Operation Iraqi Freedom, delivering its enhanced capability to the Joint Force in record time: four years from broad concept to deployment. Exceptional support from Congress and the Office of the Secretary of Defense, along with close collaboration between the Army and industry, made this achievement possible.

Stryker brigades are our Army's first truly network-centric force, filling the capability gap between light- and heavy-force units with an infantry-rich, mobile force that is strategically responsive, tactically agile, and more lethal. Improved battlespace awareness and battle-command technologies embedded in our SBCTs enhance combat effectiveness and survivability by integrating data from manned and unmanned air and ground-based sensors and providing real-time, continuous situational understanding. Planned enhancements will incorporate still-developing technologies. Significantly, our SBCTs will improve our Army's understanding of Future Force processes, helping us to formulate an advanced warfighting doctrine that will serve as an important bridge to the development of our Unit of Action, the structural foundation of our Future Force.

This spring, our second SBCT at Fort Lewis, Washington, will become operational. Our third SBCT, in Alaska, will be available in 2005. Continued OSD and congressional support will ensure that subsequent brigades in Hawaii, Louisiana, and Pennsylvania, are fielded between 2004 and 2008.

Future Capabilities

Our Army plans to field a number of systems this decade that will provide a foundation for informing the transformation of our Current Force capabilities into those needed by our Future Force. Once fielded, these systems will perform as interdependent systems of systems and will greatly enhance joint warfighting capabilities. Our future capabilities programs are designed to enhance the campaign-quality land-power capabilities that we provide to the Combatant Commanders. Our programs undergo continuous reviews to ensure they meet the capability requirements of the Joint Force. When required, we restructure programs, revise requirements and reprogram resources. The following are just a few of the key transformational systems our Army will begin to field during the next six years:

The Network.—Our Future Force situational dominance will depend upon a comprehensive, ubiquitous, and joint-interoperable Command, Control, Communications, Computers, Intelligence, Surveillance, and Reconnaissance (C⁴ISR) architecture (the Network) that enables the Joint Force Commander to conduct fully interdependent and network-centric warfare. The Network will provide the backbone of our Future Force and the future Joint Force, enabling the maneuver commander to effectively coordinate battlefield effects. Some of the more important systems within our Network include:

—*Warfighter Information Network—Tactical (WIN-T).*—WIN-T will be the communications network of our Future Force, optimized for offensive and joint operations, while providing the Combatant Commander the capability to perform multiple missions simultaneously.

—*Joint Tactical Radio System (JTRS)*.—JTRS is a family of common, software-defined, programmable radios that will become our Army's primary tactical radio for mobile communications.

—*Distributed Common Ground System—Army (DCGS-A)*.—DCGS-A is a single, integrated, ground-based, ISR processing system composed of joint, common hardware and software components and is part of the DOD DCGS family of systems.

—*Aerial Common Sensor (ACS)*.—This ISR system and platform will use robust sensor-to-shooter and reach links, (such as DCGS-A ground stations), to provide commanders at every echelon the tailored, multi-sensor intelligence required for joint operations.

Future Combat Systems (FCS).—By extending the network capabilities into the Unit of Action, the FCS provide a system of systems capability that was not previously available to Soldiers and commanders in joint operations. The core of our Future Force's maneuver Unit of Action is the Future Combat Systems, comprised of 18 manned and unmanned platforms that are centered around the Soldier and integrated within a C⁴ISR network. FCS will provide our Soldiers greatly enhanced situational awareness, enabling them to see first, understand first, act first and finish decisively. Our FCS platforms will offer the Joint Force networked, lethal direct fire; indirect fire; air defense; complementary non-lethal fires and effects; and troop transport capability. In May 2003, FCS moved, on schedule, into the System Development and Demonstration phase. Our Army is aggressively managing our FCS development effort and intends to achieve initial operational capability by the end of the decade.

Army Science and Technology

The Army Science and Technology (S&T) Program provides our Army superiority in both human and materiel systems arenas—preventing technological surprise. The Army S&T program retains a dynamic portfolio of investments that are responsive to warfighter needs today and into the future. The priority for Army S&T is to pursue paradigm-shifting technologies that can alter the nature of the military competition to our advantage in the future and, where feasible, to exploit opportunities to accelerate the transition of proven technologies to our Current Force.

The Army S&T program exploits technology developments from the other services, defense agencies and commercial industry as well as international communities. The S&T program focuses on technology relevant to our Army and joint capabilities. It synchronizes operational concepts development and acquisition programs through transformational business practices that speed technology fielding to the Soldier. The Army's S&T program is balanced to satisfy the high payoff needs of the future force while seeking rapid transitions for critical capabilities to our Current Force.

Joint Operational Concepts (JOPSC)

The Joint Force has transitioned from independent, de-conflicted operations to sustained interoperability. It must now shift rapidly to joint interdependence. To that end, we are reviewing training requirements, traditional relationships and developmental and institutional programs. This process includes ensuring that our operational concepts are nested inside those employed by the Joint Force. The concepts and initiatives listed below discuss particular Army emphasis areas; these areas are not all-inclusive. Functional concepts and other Army initiatives that support the JOpsC are discussed in detail in Addendum J (available at www.Army.mil).

Actionable Intelligence

Our Army also is focused on attaining actionable intelligence—intelligence that provides situational understanding to commanders and Soldiers with the speed, accuracy and confidence necessary to influence favorably current and future operations. Actionable intelligence achieves its intended purpose of empowering greater individual initiative and self-synchronization among tactical units by fusing information across organizations and echelons—accelerating the speed of decision-making and the agility of operations.

Focused Logistics

Our Army's current actions around the world in support of the Global War on Terrorism present a view of future military operations and provide valuable insights as we transform our logistics systems from the Current to the Future Force. The successes enjoyed during OIF were the result of the integrated logistics team of Soldiers, civilians and contractors, all of whom developed innovative solutions to a range of challenges caused by four major capability gaps in the current logistics system. To sustain combat power, our Army must have the ability to “see the requirements” on-demand through a logistics data network. We require a responsive dis-

tribution system, enabled by in-transit and total-asset visibility and managed by a single owner who has positive end-to-end control in the theater. Our Army needs a robust, modular, force-reception capability—a dedicated and trained organization able to quickly open a theater and support continuous sustainment throughout the joint operations area. Lastly, we need an integrated supply chain that has a single proponent, who can reach across the breadth and depth of resources in a joint, inter-agency and multinational theater. As we move from the Current Force to the Future Force, we will build confidence in the minds of the Combatant Commanders by delivering sustainment on time, every time.

A COMMITMENT TO OUR NATION

Our Nation and our Army are engaged in a Global War on Terrorism—a war of survival against an insidious and cruel enemy that threatens our civilization and our way of life. This enemy is actively targeting the interests of America and our allies, both within our own country and abroad.

Defeating this enemy requires the continued, strong support of our Nation. The steadfastness of our Nation in this effort is readily apparent. Ordinary Americans are doing their part and will continue to do so. Congressional support for our troops has been critical to our success. The industrial base also has responded, accelerating production of items essential to our Soldiers' protection and warfighting ability.

Our Army, too, remains committed to its heritage of preserving freedom. American Soldiers display unrelenting tenacity, steadfast purpose, quiet confidence and selfless heroism. For America to survive and flourish throughout the 21st Century, our Army must defeat decisively the threats that challenge us today. To accomplish this essential task, we must recognize some important truths.

- The fight against terror will be a long one.
- Our Army must simultaneously deter aggression, defeat the forces of international terrorism, and maintain our campaign qualities.
- We must continue to modernize to meet the challenges of our future.
- Our operational tempo is high and will remain so.
- Sustained operations and deployments will be the norm for our Soldiers—NOT the exception.
- Old rules and operational methods may no longer apply; we will not achieve victory with a business-as-usual approach.

Congressional backing for reset, our continued transformation to the Future Force, our rebalancing and restructuring of the Active and Reserve Component, and improvements to our installation infrastructure is essential to continued mission readiness. We fully appreciate the exceptional support Members and their staffs provided this past year. The support of the American people and their elected representatives in the United States Congress is essential.

Our Army's commitment to the future is certain. We will continue to provide our Nation, the President, the Secretary of Defense and the Combatant Commanders a unique set of core competencies and capabilities. We remain dedicated to training and equipping our Soldiers and growing leaders. We will continue to deliver relevant and ready land power to the Combatant Commanders and the Joint Force. We will protect our country and our way of life as we have for 228 years. It is our privilege, our duty, and our honor to do so.

Senator STEVENS. Our co-chairman has arrived. Senator Inouye, do you have an opening statement?

STATEMENT OF SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

Senator INOUE. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I do, and I ask that my full statement be made part of the record. But before I do, I would like to join you in welcoming General Schoomaker and the Secretary of the Army, because this is their first time before us. I can assure you that it will be—I will not say a happy time, but we are good people.

I would like to join my chairman in expressing our admiration and our gratitude to the men and women who have stood in harm's way in our behalf since 9/11. I commend everyone who has played an important role in these operations. Time and time again, the extraordinary ability of our men and women in uniform and all the people who work to support them has been demonstrated. I can

speak for everyone here: We are extremely proud of our fellow Americans.

Thank you very much, sir.
[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR DANIEL K. INOUE

Secretary Brownlee and General Peter J. Schoomaker, I would like to welcome you both for your first appearance before this subcommittee. It is an honor to have you here and I look forward to your testimony.

It has been over two years since the United States responded to the 9/11 attack with the Global War on Terrorism. I commend everyone that has played a role in these operations. Time and time again, the extraordinary ability of our men and women in uniform and all the people that work to support them has been demonstrated.

However, these ongoing operations have strained our troops. Numerous concerns such as recruiting and retention, and force structure requirements have been raised in Congress and by our military forces in the field.

I suspect that these concerns will again be the subject of debate in Congress, as they are continually brought up by service members, their families, and the public. With ongoing operations for the Global War on Terrorism and our struggling effort to fund domestic priorities as well, this Committee has a very difficult road ahead.

I am pleased that the Army is responding to the stress of overseas deployments by temporarily increasing end strength by 30,000. Last year during the fiscal year 2004 Army budget hearing, this subcommittee raised the subject of Army end strength. General Shinseki testified that the requirements of the Army demanded a change in right-sizing and right-mixing the Army between Active and Reserve components. General Schoomaker, I commend you for responding to this issue.

I look forward to discussing the details of this plan, its funding and what you see as the long term future of Army force structure.

I would also be interested to learn how you plan to ramp up and then decrease the force within a few short years.

Part of the strain on our forces has led to our concern over recruiting and retention, especially for the Guard and Reserve. Ongoing deployments and the use of stop loss have placed enormous demands on our military personnel and their families.

I understand the Army is currently meeting goals for the active component but is slightly short on the reserve component. I would like to know your plan to address these concerns this year and in fiscal year 2005.

The Army faces an unknown future, largely depending on how things progress in Afghanistan and Iraq. Your task is to plan for a schedule that is as yet undetermined, while working to reset the force for another contingency.

To complicate this further, this will take place within the constraints of a difficult fiscal year and with supplemental funds coming later than you might hope.

Gentlemen, I must say the challenges facing you are great, but I have every confidence in your ability to succeed. Secretary Brownlee, General Peter J. Schoomaker, I look forward to exploring these issues today and hearing your responses.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you, Senator.

General Schoomaker, do you have a comment to make?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, I would like to make just a few brief comments if I might. Chairman Stevens, Senator Inouye: thank you very much for the opportunity to join Secretary Brownlee before you today and talk about our great Army.

I would like to reciprocate and recognize the great service of Secretary Brownlee as Acting Secretary of the Army. He had a very distinguished military career of his own—two tours in Vietnam, wounded, recognized and awarded for valor on the battlefield, and of course you are all aware that he also served with distinction here as a staffer in this body, in the Senate. He certainly is a great partner as we go forward with the great challenges that we have before us, as we transform the Army while we are engaged in the global war on terrorism and engaged all over the world.

I would also like to recognize Lieutenant General Ron Helmly with us today from the—he heads the U.S. Army Reserve; and Lieutenant General Roger Schultz, to my left rear, who heads the Army National Guard. We are one, we are a total Army, we are together. There is no daylight between us in what we are trying to achieve here, and I think you will see as we talk about what we are doing that we are approaching this as a unified body moving forward to the 21st century.

I would also like to recognize the great pride I have in being able to serve once again in uniform with the men and women of the United States Army, and this includes their families, it includes the great civilians that we have, that do so much to support our Army at war.

Finally, I would like to reinforce something that Secretary Brownlee has said, and that is that we are moving out with a great deal of vigor and momentum and we are trying to take advantage of the silver lining in this cloud of worldwide operations and being at war. We are trying to transform the Army using the momentum of the Army as we reset for continuous operations, that we do not reset it to the Army it was before, but we reset it to the Army of the future.

We see this as an extraordinary window of opportunity, to take advantage not only of the great resources that this Congress and this committee has provided to our Army, but also take advantage of the motion that the Army is in. It is a narrow window of opportunity and perhaps one of my greatest fears is that we do not take full opportunity here of this window and allow ourselves to come to rest and not complete the transformation that we feel is so necessary.

We have taken some extraordinary steps and one of them, of course, is as we looked at Army aviation we found a solution in the fact of terminating Comanche. I can assure you we did not start out with an attitude to terminate Comanche, but it made such sense from a business position as being a fiscally responsible thing to do, and also that the operational traits made so much sense.

I would ask your support for these kinds of initiatives to ensure that the commitment that we were able to obtain from the Secretary of Defense, from the White House, and from the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) that these resources would be committed to fixing Army aviation as we do it. I would tell you that in this particular case it is not just the extraordinary number of helicopters we are going to buy and the amount of upgrades and modernization that we are going to do with our existing fleet, but it also includes the military construction (MILCON), it includes fixing the ammunition like rockets and the Hellfire issue, which is a great concern to me, the simulators, the training base, the unmanned aerial vehicles (UAV's), and the future tech base for a future joint rotorcraft solution for 2020–2025.

So it is a far-reaching approach that we are taking, and I would very much appreciate your support with this, because I know that there is a great deal of interest in how we are going to accomplish all of this.

Having said that, sir, I stand with the Secretary of the Army here in his statement and we have submitted our posture state-

ment for the record, and I look forward to your questions. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Well, thank you very much.

We anticipate approximately 10 members coming to join in this hearing, so unless there is objection we will limit the original round to 5 minutes apiece.

I want to start off by congratulating the two of you for the Comanche decision. This committee had to make a decision once before, a similar decision on the Sergeant York. You have made the decision I think clearly and with a succinct statement, so from my point of view I intend to support your efforts and will honor the commitments that have been made that the funds that will be redirected from the Comanche will stay within Army aviation, where the need is very great.

But can you tell us, is there going to be a gap now in Army helicopter procurement because of this?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, the answer is no. In fact, as you know, we were not going to achieve delivery of Comanche until later within this future years defense program. There were 121 Comanches in the program at the time. The counterbalance is that we are going to be significantly upgrading the current fleet, bringing for instance Apache up to Block 3, which gives us the same capability, with the exception of low observability, as Comanche Block 1 was going to provide us.

What in effect we are doing, I believe we will achieve a greater industrial base capacity that in effect is going to give us very positive results on our readiness in the aviation fleet. So we see this as a win-win situation all the way across and I think it will give us immediate assistance here in maintaining the readiness of our aviation.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I am going to ask your cooperation by having a classified session on the total subject of the helicopter transition at a later date, because I think some of the questions might not be appropriate in an open session.

ARMY END STRENGTH

We discussed informally the question of what is going to happen to the increased strength you have now and your plans for forming separate brigades from those and transitioning them into the regular Army as you downsize other units. Could you explain that for us here this morning?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I might let Pete start out with what we need to do and then I could pick up and explain some of the how for that.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, please.

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, thank you very much. This is a total Army switch to modularity, and what we are talking about doing is maintaining 10 divisions on the Active Force and 8 divisions in the National Guard, for a total of 18 division battle command headquarters. We then want to expand the number of brigades. On the Active Army side we want to go from 33 active brigades that we currently have to a minimum of 43. That is an increase of 30 percent, with the possibility of going to 48. We have an off-ramp at

2006 to make that decision, to see how we are doing and what the affordability is.

But we believe that by going from 33 to 43 brigades, which is the equivalent of almost 3 divisions of fighting strength within the 10-division formation, that it will help us greatly.

At the same time, we are going to be transforming the Army National Guard under its 8 division headquarters to 34 brigade-sized units. This in effect gives us an Army of somewhere between 77 and 82 brigade combat teams, which is in fact the answer to relieving the stress to the force. This gives us a broader base, that we get greater dwell time between deployments and rotations. We believe that we can do this within the current authorized statutory end strength numbers.

We have asked for a temporary growth, not in statutory end strength, but a temporary growth in the Army under the authorities that the President has in Title 10, that the law gives him, for us not to use stop-loss, stop-move to grow the Army, but to actually be able to recruit, train, and organize through the pipeline on a temporary basis this additional 30,000 soldiers to create these brigades.

Simultaneously, we believe that we can find efficiencies through some of the global force reposturing, military to civilian conversions, and other efficiencies that we have had that will offset that temporary growth so that we can let the air out of the tires and come back down to our end strength, retaining the brigades that we form.

I will let Secretary Brownlee discuss the specifics of that.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I know there has been some discussion over here about how we had proposed this. When we look carefully at what we need to do and the authority to do it, there clearly is an authority that the Congress intended for peacetime, which was authorized end strength. There is another authority in Title 10 that allows the President to waive the requirements of the end strength and grow the force to whatever is necessary to deal with the emergency.

Since the President had declared an emergency, we looked and we were already some 20,000 people over our authorized end strength under this Title 10 authority. We then asked ourselves: Well, how are we paying for that additional end strength? We were in fact paying for it with the supplemental appropriations provided by the Congress for those purposes.

So what we have proposed is to allow us, as Pete described, to grow by up to 30,000 over the next several years and to use this to create these new brigades. It gives us additional head space to do some of the efficiencies that will be very difficult or impossible to do if we did not have this extra growth and flexibility.

During this period of time our strategy is to find within the Army these 30,000 spaces. So at the end of the conflict, whenever that is, and as Pete says when the conflict comes down and we let the air out of the tires, we can keep those brigades, but at the authorized end strength we currently have. That is our plan, that is our strategy.

As we looked at this, it was clearly better for us because if we had to put this in our budget request and ask you to increase our

authorized end strength by 30,000 people, it is about \$1.2 billion per 10,000, so that is about \$3.6 billion we would have to put in our budget and knock out other programs to pay for it. We then have to go through our future years defense plan and knock it out every year in there also. So we would be taking that out of programs that we are very interested in and you have helped us greatly with to modernize the Army.

In fact, I know because I worked here and deal with some of the same problems you do, if it were done over here, if you had to go into the budget and find \$3.5 billion of military personnel money, that money pays out at a one for one rate over 90 percent and most of the other accounts that you would actually be using as a source for funds pay out at a much lower rate. So you would have to take a much larger proportion out of those accounts to pay for these military personnel costs. You might have to find as much as \$7 to \$10 billion or even more out of these other accounts to pay for it.

So as we looked at this, we thought it was clearly better for us and hopefully you would see it as better for the Congress in dealing with this situation.

Senator BURNS. Secretary Brownlee, can you turn your microphone on?

Mr. BROWNLEE. I am sorry. I apologize, sir. I hope that came across.

Senator STEVENS. I just thought my ears were acting up again.

Senator BURNS. I thought I had gone deaf.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, as one with very bad ones I should know better. I apologize.

Senator STEVENS. Well, I appreciate that. I do hope we can keep the responses a little more succinct so that we can have more than one question per Senator.

But one thing I failed to do—would you identify for the record the general officers that have come with you, General Schoomaker? I think sometimes we fail to recognize they are here for your support. So I would like to have in the record who is here.

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, I recognized Lieutenant General Ron Helmly from the Army Reserve and Lieutenant General Roger Schultz on the far left from the Army National Guard. General Helmly is sitting right here in the middle. Lieutenant General Jerry Sinn, who is out of our budget office. He is our counsel on money, a very good one. And I think you know General Guy Swan behind us, who is our legislative liaison.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you very much.

Senator Inouye.

Senator INOUE. If I may follow up on the chairman's question, are the new brigades going to be a permanent part of the force?

General SCHOOMAKER. Yes, sir.

Senator INOUE. I recall Dr. Zakheim indicated that these new brigades will be phased out after the war in Iraq. Is that correct?

General SCHOOMAKER. No, sir. The 30,000 temporary end strength will be phased out after the emergency and they will be offset by the efficiencies we find within our current statutory end strength during the period that we are doing this transformation.

Senator INOUE. But not the new brigades?

General SCHOOMAKER. No, sir. They stay, they remain.

RECRUITING AND RETENTION

Senator INOUE. Secretary and General, with the strain of our deployed forces there is some concern among many about recruiting and retaining, and I suppose that should be a concern of all of us. Are you confident that you can meet your goals without changing any standards in recruiting or retention?

General SCHOOMAKER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Right now, sir, I would describe as cautiously optimistic where we are on all of this. We certainly are concerned within the Army because we do have a very high OPTEMPO. The Army is very busy. This impacts on soldiers and their families. Right now with respect to recruiting, we are confident that we are going to make our goals. We are running a little below the line in some of them, but for most of them it looks like we are going to make all our fiscal year 2004 requirements.

We have some concerns in retention in some spots, but in other areas we are doing very well. So we are going to concentrate on those. We have a lot of authority that has been provided by the Congress to take certain measures to allow us to provide incentives, which we will do when it appears time to do that. We have already used some of them on reenlistment bonuses and other authorities that have been provided for those things.

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, I would like to add very briefly. We were extraordinarily successful last year in meeting over 100 percent of our retention and recruiting goals across all components. This year it looks like we are on track right now to exceed 100 percent in recruiting across the components. We do have a few retention challenges, but everybody is very confident that we will make it.

BRIGADE UNITS OF ACTION

But I would like to make a very strong comment here that we must relieve the stress on this force, and we believe our plan is designed to do that, because we cannot rely on this extraordinary level of commitment, sacrifice, and patriotism to carry us at the level that we are currently operating. That is why I feel it is so important that we use this extraordinary window of opportunity to transform this Army to a broader brigade base, to be able to achieve the kind of dwell time.

We anticipate we will be able to create a force that will be able to sustain this level of effort we have today with an Active Force rotation scheme of 1 year in three and with the Reserve Components 1 year in five or six, which we think is sustainable.

Senator INOUE. I realize that the matter of policy is not within your jurisdiction, but, like all of us, you read the papers, you receive briefings and such. And there are potential hot spots throughout the world—the Korean Peninsula, Indonesia, Malacca Straits, the Middle East, just to name a few, Pakistan, India. Are you considering expanding the military if we find ourselves having to involve ourselves in all these activities?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, as I indicated, the plans that we have within the Army are to increase the number of combat brigades. That will give us an additional capability in case we have to respond to

something else. Our primary intent right now is, as General Schoomaker said, to relieve the stress, current stress on the force. If there is another emergency elsewhere, this clearly would give us more capability and flexibility in responding to that.

General SCHOOMAKER. I think again, just as a baseline, today we have 33 brigades in the Active Force and we have 15 enhanced separate brigades in the National Guard that we consider available and ready to go in a rapid way. If we complete our transformation, we could have as many as 82 brigades available to us in real combat power within our current statutory end strength.

This is what this transformation has taken us to. It will be between 77 and 82 brigade combat teams across the Army active component and National Guard.

Senator INOUE. You can have 82 brigades without changing the end strength?

General SCHOOMAKER. That is correct, sir.

Senator INOUE. Thank you, sir.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Shelby.

Senator SHELBY. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

ARMY AVIATION

Secretary Brownlee, regarding the Comanche program, I believe that is the right way to go. What about the OSD and White House commitment here? Are they committed to Army aviation in the future, which I think is very important, that this savings be spent there. I think General Schoomaker referenced that clearly. Do you want to comment on that? Go ahead, General.

General SCHOOMAKER. I personally received the commitment of Deputy Secretary of Defense Wolfowitz. I met in the Oval Office with the President and achieved his commitment, and we met with Josh Bolton in OMB and received their concurrence and commitment that we would apply the Comanche program \$14.6 billion to Army aviation.

Senator SHELBY. It is very important to the future of the Army, is it not?

General SCHOOMAKER. Yes, sir.

RESET

Senator SHELBY. The Army reset program, General Schoomaker. A lot of us are concerned about the health of the Army's combat equipment. We have talked about this before, especially combat vehicles, with what has been going on in Iraq. \$1.5 billion was included in the supplemental last year for the Army depot maintenance. Yet we understand that the Army Tank and Automotive Command currently has a backlog of roughly the same amount.

How much funding has the Army received from the 2004 supplemental for reset? What is the readiness level of the units that have returned and units still deployed in Iraq?

Mr. BROWNLEE. I want to do that for the record, provide for the record the exact amount of funding we received out of the supplemental for resetting the force. But we do have funds to recapitalize, reset, all of the major systems that we have brought back right now, I believe, and we are proceeding to do that.

[The information follows:]

RESET

The fiscal year 2004 emergency supplemental funded \$1.2 billion in depot maintenance requirements and \$2.0 billion in 10/20 level maintenance and delayed desert damage. Additionally, we received another \$208 million for transportation to move equipment to the depots and to commercialize some in-theater communications capability. This was particularly important in that it permitted us to redeploy several of the Army's unique communications units who were approaching their one-year mark for deployment. We also received \$712 million in investment funds to purchase communications equipment, replacement stocks for our prepositioned equipment sets, and lethality and survivability equipment for both Active and Reserve Component Soldiers.

Senator SHELBY. But you have got to have sufficient resources to reset. General?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, you are exactly right. I am again, with the same people, both the Secretary and I are on the record. We are going to require supplemental funding to reset the Army 2 years beyond the end of this emergency, which is consistent with what it took us to reset the Army following Desert Shield/Desert Storm. We have over 9,000 pieces of rolling stock, 9,000 pieces of rolling stock that were used and consumed and require repair, just from the Operation Iraqi Freedom 1 (OIF-1), from the war.

Senator SHELBY. We have got to get that to the depots, have we not?

General SCHOOMAKER. Yes, sir. That is who is going to have to do this work. Some of it is going to have to be done forward, some of it is going to have to be done here.

CALIBRATION SETS

Senator SHELBY. General Schoomaker, regarding test, measurement and diagnostic equipment, not very much attention gets paid to test, measurement, and diagnostic equipment, but I would like to express concern about the Army's action in this bill to decrease the research, development, test and evaluation (RDT&E) funding for calibration sets equipment by 275 percent and to zero all procurement funding.

The loss of this funding for calibration sets (CALSETS) 2000 a lot of people believe negatively impacts two transformation imperatives that are important to you, modularity and commonality. Do you have enough calibration sets in the force to meet immediate requirements? In other words, what are we going to do here?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, I believe we do, but we would need to provide that for the record, unless the Secretary knows.

[The information follows:]

CALIBRATION SETS (CALSET) REQUIREMENTS

Army is meeting immediate critical calibration requirements; however, it is assuming some near and long term modernization risk. We are satisfying immediate critical requirements for CALSETS 2000. CALSETS 2000 is a modernized, tactical, deployable mobility platform with mounted calibration and repair capability. The current Army requirement for CALSETS 2000 is 40: 29 tactical sets, six echelon above corps sets, three training base sets, and two sustaining base sets. To date, 20 CALSET 2000 systems have been procured. Without funding to procure additional sets, the military will continue to rely on a combination of CALSET 2000, and AN/GSM-286 and AN/GSM-287 tactical sets. The AN/GSM 286/287 sets have the same calibration capability, but do not meet mobility and survivability requirements.

The Army is taking risk by not providing funds to modernize existing calibration equipment or to fill emerging calibration requirements gaps. The Deputy Chief of

Staff, G4 is conducting a world wide mission assessment to determine how the Army will perform test, measurement, and diagnostic equipment (TMDE) calibration and repair support without an equipment acquisition program. The assessment focuses on risk mitigating solutions, including: deployable modular military support teams, contracts for calibration and repair support services, realignment of existing CALSETs sets into discrete missions and functions, a review of critical calibration standards and the systems they support, and the potential for creating a Joint Calibration and Repair support program. It will also address the legal liability associated with calibration, impacts of repair support to TMDE and review lessons learned and business cases used by commercial industry today.

FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEM (FCS)

Senator SHELBY. Okay. Future Combat Systems. Secretary Brownlee, how is the FCS-lead systems integrator (LSI) team performing? Is technology development where you want it to be?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I get different reports from the people who are over watching that. They tell me that they are doing well. I have to tell you that I have had some concerns about that and so recently I wrote a letter to the Institute for Defense Analysis and asked them to please examine the LSI relationship between the Army and the LSI contractor and to provide that report to the Army, just to be sure that that relationship is working as we intended from an independent point of view. So we will get that and that should be done in several months.

STRYKER

Senator SHELBY. Could you talk about the Stryker vehicle performance in this setting in Iraq?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir, I can, and I am sure Pete would like to add to whatever I might say. But we have been very pleased with the way it is performing in Iraq. We have had several vehicles that have been hit by rocket propelled grenades (RPG's) that have survived in the way we intended, and this is with an interim protective system, the slat armor that we put on it which was an interim protective system. So far that has worked as intended. The reports we get from the field are very good with respect to that vehicle and we are very pleased with it so far.

Senator SHELBY. General?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, I am very pleased with the way Stryker has performed, not only as a vehicle but as a system. The amount of infantry that is in Stryker is amazing and its lethality, its ability to network and move. As you know, we have just gotten our commitment and approval out of OSD to proceed with Stryker 5 and 6, so that completes Stryker. As we move forward—

Senator SHELBY. That is a good endorsement, too, is it not?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, it is. The improvements that are being made to Stryker along the lines of protection are significant. Currently it is the second best protected system that we have, second to the M-1 tank, and it will continue to improve. So we are very happy with what we see there.

Senator SHELBY. Mr. Chairman, we will get another round?

Senator STEVENS. Yes, we will.

Following the early bird rule, next we recognize Senator Hutchison.

Senator HUTCHISON. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

STOP LOSS

You said—I think your concept is outstanding, and you said you were going to use stop-loss orders to keep the people as you are in your retraining process. How long do you anticipate those stop-loss orders will be?

Mr. BROWNLEE. We only stop-loss units that are alerted to be deployed, units that are deployed, and units that have immediately returned from deployment. This is to, as General Schoomaker said, stabilize that force so that it stays together, trains as a team, deploys as a team and a unit, and fights that way.

Senator HUTCHISON. And how long do you anticipate the stop-losses to last?

General SCHOOMAKER. We stop-loss from alert to up to 90 to 120 days upon return. But you might have misunderstood me here. Our temporary end strength—our temporary growth that we have asked for above end strength is not stop-loss. We do not want to use stop-loss for that. We want to recruit and specifically target where those go.

So we will continue to use stop-loss for those units that are specifically going to war, to hold them together, and we do that very carefully. I mean, we recognize what stop-loss is, but if you take a look at our other initiatives, which is force stabilization, as we move to modularity and stabilize the force it will reduce our requirement to have to use stop-loss.

RESERVE COMPONENT DEPLOYMENTS

Senator HUTCHISON. I understand. Let me ask you this. Are you going to be able to show fairly quickly a relief to Guard and Reserve deployments?

General SCHOOMAKER. I think you know we have just alerted three more brigades and a division headquarters for OIF-3, and we have done it early to provide the predictability and the time so that people are not being rushed as has been necessary in the past. But again, the more of these brigades we can create on the active side—and that is why we have asked to do the 10 brigades in 3 years. We have already got one in the 3rd Infantry Division. They have already reset into a four-brigade division. We are going to do two more this year. We will do three or four next year and the residual three or four the third year.

The faster we can achieve that, the less we are going to have to—the more relief we can give to calling the Guard, as long as we are at this level of effort. If this level of effort reduces, of course, the requirement for the National Guard will reduce commensurately.

Senator HUTCHISON. Do you have a long-term goal on how long you would ask a member of the Guard and Reserve to activate during their time that they have signed up to serve?

General SCHOOMAKER. We are working very hard to reduce the amount of post-mobilization training requirements in the Guard. If we get into force stabilization and modularity, it will allow us to predict when we have to call—when a unit would be in the window of alert.

Senator HUTCHISON. I understand that you are saying predictability is very important, and it is. But I am also visiting our Guard and Reserves in Kuwait, Afghanistan, Iraq, and at home, and part of their frustration, as you know, is overdeployment. It is not just being able to tell when they are going; it is going so much.

General SCHOOMAKER. The path to relieve their frustration is the faster that we can get to this level, it will increase the dwell time between deployments. As I said, we could get on the Active side one deployment in a 3-year cycle, on the Guard side we can get one deployment in a 5- or 6-year cycle in a predictable fashion. Our desire is to limit these deployments to 6-month deployments if we have to do it.

Senator HUTCHISON. That is what I was after. Thank you very much.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Dorgan is recognized.

Senator DORGAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

RESERVE COMPONENT RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION

Secretary Brownlee and General Schoomaker, the National Guard and Reserve are being used in a manner that we had not previously anticipated. I think everyone agrees with that, and we have Guard and Reserve troops in Iraq that have now been mobilized for 13 months, away from homes, families, and jobs and who may not be back home until May. That was certainly not anticipated, and we have had long discussions about that.

Let me ask, what is this doing to recruitment and retention? There has been some concern about recruitment and retention rates in the Guard and Reserve. Can you give me information about that? I see General Schultz is here and perhaps he has information about that as well.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, in the National Guard in fact our retention rates, I believe, are running over 100 percent right now. Reserves are a little bit below the glide path that we would desire. We believe we can get that up in order to meet our fiscal year 2004 goals.

Senator DORGAN. At this point, then, you are not concerned about, based on your experience and also looking forward, you are not concerned that the increased deployments are going to affect recruitment and retention?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I am always concerned, I very much am. I think this OPTEMPO certainly has human costs that we have to measure and what we have told the Army staff is we want to know when the light on the dashboard flickers amber so we can take measures and steps to try to get things under control. What we want to avoid is having people come in and tell us when every light on the dashboard is red and then we are in trouble.

So that is the way we are trying to operate it. But I would not want to tell you we are not concerned. We are very concerned and that is one reason that we have come forth with the initiative to grow the size of the Army to reduce the stress.

General SCHOOMAKER. If I could, I may be the only person in the room that thinks it is extraordinary that we are calling the Guard and the Reserve. I think that is what we are for and I think that the Active, Guard, and Reserve are all volunteers. Now, what is disappointing is that we are working, of the million people we have

in uniform, we are working too few of them too much. Part of what we have to do in our restructuring is distribute the load across the force, and that is what we are trying to do here.

But the Guard right now is leading in both recruiting and retention in the Army, which is counterintuitive. But in fact—and I will let Roger verify, validate that.

Senator DORGAN. The reason I ask the question is it is counterintuitive, you would think. And I think it is extraordinary, by the way. I would not necessarily agree with you.

General SCHOOMAKER. It is.

Senator DORGAN. It is extraordinary that we would call up a unit and they are gone 17 months or in some cases close to 18 months from family, home, and job, and in a couple of cases only 2 years following a deployment to Kosovo.

I understand that is what the Guard and Reserve are for, but I think you have indicated in your testimony we need to be judicious about how often we deploy them and how long we deploy them, because they are citizen-soldiers.

SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST

Let me ask a question. You have mentioned General Sinn and we are very proud of General Sinn in North Dakota. You indicated that he is keeping track of costs. I suspect that you are taking a look at what are the anticipated future costs here with respect to deployments and, for reasons that the chairman and others have discussed on the floor with me and others, that those costs are not included in the budget. But I would expect that we will then pass a supplemental. We passed a \$60 billion supplemental for the military at the end of 2003 and we will do that again.

But can you give us some sense of what kind of costs you are seeing and what kind of costs you are planning for that are not yet included in the budget, but that we will be confronted with with respect to a supplemental?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, the cost of the operations, if you count all the costs to include the personnel costs, which maybe should not be counted, but it runs for both Afghanistan and Iraq over \$4 billion a month. Most of that would be covered, is covered now, by the supplemental that was previously passed. The Army got roughly \$40 billion of I believe the \$65.1 billion that was provided by the Congress for military operations and that is what we are using for that. We believe that certainly is adequate to take us to the end of this fiscal year.

We may need some assistance from the administration, depending on whether the costs continue or increase. So that right now is where we see that.

ADD-ON ARMOR

Senator DORGAN. Let me ask—my time is about expired. I want to ask one additional question. The marines recently engaged in a contract to buy sets of what is called LAST ceramic armor for HMMWV's in Iraq. As I inquired about that, I understood the marines determined that the LAST armor is the quickest and most efficient way of protecting its vehicles, HMMWV's, after observing tests done by the Army.

Does the Army have plans to proceed in a similar fashion? These are—apparently it is ceramic armor for the doors of HMMWV's that the marines observed in testing that the Army did, and they decided to proceed to purchase.

Senator STEVENS. Your time has expired, I hope that you realize.

Senator DORGAN. I preceded my question by suggesting my time was about to expire. I finished my question and if they have time to answer I would appreciate that.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, if we could take that for the record. I would prefer not to address that in open session.

Senator DORGAN. That would be fine. Thank you very much.

[The information follows:]

ADD-ON ARMOR KITS FOR THE HMMWV

The Army did not purchase the LAST Armor produced by Foster-Miller Inc., in Waltham, Massachusetts because the ceramic did not address the holistic approach to HMMWV add-on armor protection that the Army desired. The LAST Armor, a ceramic armor plate, provides only partial door protection, has no back plate or perimeter protection. Also, the ceramic armor is very expensive: \$600 per square foot as opposed to the Rolled Homogenous Armor (RHA), which is used in our Army Research Laboratories (ARL) add-on armor kits, at \$15 per square foot. In October 2003, the LAST Armor was sent to the Army Test Center where the armor demonstrated reasonable protection against ballistic threats. But there were concerns about the robustness of the ceramic armor when it is attached to the vehicle. LAST Armor is mounted to the canvas door of a HMMWV with clips and Velcro®, and cannot be expected to stop an improvised explosive device blast since the canvas door would likely dislodge, thereby creating an additional piece of fragmentation (door and armor plate) that can injure or mortally wound the Soldier.

The Army has purchased 6,900 ARL add-on armor kits and 1,500 O'Gara Hess add-on armor kits for HMMWVs. The Army kit provides door, perimeter, and back plate protection with ballistic glass and air conditioning. ARL's durable kit is composed of $\frac{3}{8}$ inch RHA and it takes approximately three hours to install all kit components. To date, 2,675 kits have been produced and 2,079 kits have been installed in theater. The U.S. Marine Corps is scheduled to receive 650 of these ARL add-on armor kits as well.

The Army believes LAST Armor is a good commercial off-the-shelf force protection product for civilian and local law enforcement, but does not provide robust or extensive enough force protection for Soldiers deployed to Iraq and Afghanistan.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Cochran is recognized.

Senator COCHRAN. Mr. Chairman, thank you.

ROTATION OF TROOPS

General Schoomaker, I understand the Army is in the midst of one of the largest troop rotations in the history—well, since World War II anyway. You have pointed out that in this period of 4 months from December through April you will have 110,000 troops deploying to the Iraq theater of operations and 120,000 returning. That is quite a challenge. You have said we are entering the most challenging period for the Army since World War II.

I wonder what you have done to help ensure the protection of those forces during the troop rotation and the logistical challenges that you face? Have you had enough equipment, airlift, sealift, support from the other forces or from the total force concept?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, it is a great question. We in fact are moving over 250,000 people in those 4 months. We are moving on average 5,000 people in and out every day. We have done very close work with Central Command, General Abizaid and his folks, to ensure the proper protection and operational security. All of the

things that are required there are extraordinary, and the support we have had out of Transportation Command, General Handy and his folks, in managing this movement is extraordinary.

What I find to be particularly extraordinary is we are right now at the very peak of this and it has been virtually seamless. It has been very, very well done. We are very proud of what the joint team has done to be able to pull this off, and we do not anticipate we will have any problems in the future because it is running very smoothly.

NATIONAL GUARD AVIATION MODERNIZATION

Senator COCHRAN. We have a good number of reservists and guardsmen on duty around the world. I have been told that about 40 percent of the force in Iraq is made up of reservists and National Guardsmen. I know we have 22 Guard and Reserve units represented from my State that are deployed to the theater.

One of our groups represented over there is an Army National Guard aviation group from Tupelo, Mississippi. They fly helicopters, and when they were deployed they realized they had lost their helicopters to a Tennessee Guard unit that had gone on before them, and they were anticipating some replacement helicopters. But these are challenges that I know you are facing. They have been dispersed among some other units, so they can take advantage of their training and their capability of contributing to the mission there.

But I am sure the aircraft distribution challenge is something that you are looking into and trying to manage as well. Do you have the replacement aircraft that you need, helicopters, for National Guard aviation units? Is there anything we can do in this budget cycle to help you overcome the deficits that you may face?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I appreciate the question and I have looked into this. That unit of yours has performed remarkably, because we used them in a way that we would prefer not to. We had to use them almost as fillers for other units. That is part of our reorganization of the Reserve components that we are going to address.

We have too much force structure for the number of people we have, so when we call a unit up we have to take people from other units to fill those units up. We want to reduce the number of units, but not reduce the number of people, so we can keep units filled. One point.

The second point is, for the unit at Tupelo, they did lose their OH-58's, their Kiowas, to the Tennessee unit. Under the aviation plan that is being put together right now, it is yet undetermined whether they will receive Kiowa Warriors back in that unit or Apaches. But that decision should be made soon and we will make sure that you know as soon as we make that decision.

General SCHOOMAKER. I would like to just jump on that. You asked what can you do. Support the movement of the Comanche funding to the Army aviation modernization, because we are going to purchase 800 new aircraft and upgrade 1,400, and that is for the Active, Guard and Reserve. It makes the Guard and Reserve well in aviation, and that was a significant factor in making the decision to go this direction.

ARMORING BRADLEY FIGHTING VEHICLES

Senator COCHRAN. In connection with force protection, we heard about the upgrading of the armor for HMMWV's. Is there a similar program underway for the Bradley fighting vehicles?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, the Bradley fighting vehicles can be equipped with what we call reactive armor. We have some reactive armor sets. We do not have enough for every Bradley in theater, but the Bradley of course has the kinds of ballistic protection already inherent in its organic armor up and beyond that that the up-armored HMMWV would have. The reactive armor that we are talking about would provide additional protection from even more deadly weapons, and we do not normally put that on every Bradley, but only on selected units.

Senator COCHRAN. As part of the improvement of the helicopter and other aviation situation—

Senator STEVENS. Senator, I am sorry to say your time is up.

Senator COCHRAN. I would be glad to wait for another round. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Shelby—Senator Burns. Pardon me. Senator Burns.

Senator BURNS. Mr. Chairman, I have a statement I will put in the record.

Senator STEVENS. Without objection.

[The statement follows:]

PREPARED STATEMENT OF SENATOR CONRAD BURNS

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank the witnesses for coming before our subcommittee today, to testify on the Army's fiscal year 2005 budget.

Our military, and the U.S. Army in particular, has many folks engaged in Afghanistan and Iraq, fighting the war on terrorism. We are winning this war on terror. Our soldiers, sailors, airmen and marines are performing magnificently. We must honor those who have made the ultimate sacrifice for our country, to ensure that our forces have the resources to defeat the enemies of our country. With 325,000 soldiers deployed in 120 countries, including 165,000 reservists, there is no question that our forces are being challenged.

I see the increasing trend in the ratio of reservists overseas from 37 percent in the early stages of Operation Iraqi Freedom to 46 percent currently. In Montana, over 40 percent of our National Guard units have been called to active duty. I intend to do my part as their representative to ensure our armed forces have what they need to win this war, protect our homeland, and come home safely.

We have announced that the Army force structure will grow by 30,000 soldiers, on a temporary basis. We must plan appropriately to house, equip, and train these men and women who serve. While the force structure increase may be temporary and funded through the supplemental appropriation, I urge the Army to consider all the costs associated with this increase so that we are not forced to sacrifice the research and development of systems that maintain the superiority of our forces, just so that we may support our operating budget.

I read daily of our great American Soldiers and Marines developing unconventional solutions to solve the problems they face in the field. I think it makes a great deal of sense to have an organization chartered to bring good ideas from our nation's universities, laboratories, and small businesses to the soldiers as soon as possible, and where necessary, bypassing the bureaucracy. I encourage your continued support of Army initiatives to expedite the fielding of urgently needed equipment through efforts such as the Rapid Fielding Initiative and the Rapid Fielding Force. These efforts have resulted in the fielding of great innovations such as advanced weapon sights, optics, compact soldier communication systems, and compact GPS Receivers.

I see that the Army has been cooperating with other agencies such as DARPA on a range of technologies urgently needed for the war on terror. This cooperation has allowed us to field technologies to defeat improvised explosive devices, investigate

underground structures, and provide a low cost air reconnaissance capability to our forces.

I am aware of the program initiated to transform our Army ground forces; the Future Combat Systems. It is a good sign of its acceptance by the Army to see its transition from science and technology into full-scale development. It is encouraging to see the Army take ownership of this program, begun unconventionally in partnership with DARPA, on a very challenging schedule intended to field an evolutionary capability in the near term. More recently in Operation Desert Storm and Operation Iraqi Freedom, we witnessed the incredible advantages of joint operations, leveraging the advantages of air superiority and precision weapons. We have seen an increase in the number of Unmanned Air Vehicles (UAVs) in use by our forces at all echelons. The feedback I have received from the soldiers on the ground is that they wish they had more of these systems, not less.

I look forward to seeing how the Army will amend its budget and re-allocate the resources dedicated to the Comanche within the Army to other aviation programs, like the continued fielding of technology that will add a measure of protection to our Blackhawks and Chinook helicopters.

Again, I thank all of you for being here today. I look forward to the discussion before us this morning. Thank you.

Senator BURNS. I just have one question.

By the way, I just want to state publicly now: Congratulations. Our visits to Iraq and Afghanistan have been very fruitful and I want to congratulate your people, both leadership and the Government issue (GI's) that we have got on the ground. They are doing a remarkable job under very difficult conditions, knowing that they are the target and are in a reactive position rather than in an active position, which is a tough way to operate your business. The morale I found was high. I was really impressed with the leadership of those young men and women that you have over there, and I want to congratulate you on that. That comes from an old marine and it comes hard. No, not really.

RESERVE COMPONENT TRAINING AND EQUIPMENT

We have got 40 percent of our Guard in Montana deployed and now we have gotten notification that the 163rd Mechanized Infantry Regiment out of Bozeman, Montana has been put on alert. There is some question about equipment. I have worked very hard to build the infrastructure for training both in my Reserves and my Guard in Montana, because whenever the move was made that a lot of our force structure was going to go into our citizen-soldiers I made sure that they had, the Guard and the Reserves, communications that was interactive for training, the facility was part of the recruitment and the morale of the troops. I felt their training had to be as good as what we are providing our soldiers on active duty.

But I am just wondering about the equipment when they deploy. Now, some of the equipment is not up to what we find with our active duty personnel. Will their equipment, such as the body armor—and I have got written down here “HMMWV, body armor”—will that all be brought up to the same as active duty whenever they are deployed?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, we have equipped the Guard—the 30th, the 39th, and the 81st that right now are in motion for OIF—2 received the top, the most modern body armor, equipment, helmets, what we call RFI, the rapid fielding initiative. They received it ahead of the Active Force, and we are now of course catching up on the Active Force.

But our intention and our commitment is to equip the Army at the top level across the Active, Guard and Reserve and to train, to do what you are talking about uniformly across the force. That is our initiative here as we go to modularity, stability, and to do the kind of things that we are talking about doing.

Senator BURNS. That is good news. Also, when you integrate they have still got to be part of a team and they have got to understand what position they play on the team, so to speak. I have been always concerned about that.

IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICES (IED)

Under another, I would like some sort of a briefing whenever we get time, and I can communicate this with Secretary Brownlee, but deploying new technologies for detection and worrying about these roadside bombs and detection devices. Is the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA)—are you satisfied with the progress that DARPA is making in new technologies for detection?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, we have within the Army an IED task force. I do not want to get into a lot of detail of what they are doing, but let me say that not just DARPA but every agency that can help has been asked to help and has been very forthcoming. Let me just say that we are pleased with what this task force is doing and what they are accomplishing and what it looks like we can accomplish, and we would be happy to provide that to you in a different session.

Senator BURNS. Well, it looks like this is the wave of the future and I think that is pretty important.

That is all the questions I have and I want to congratulate the General on his boots.

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, those are Wyoming boots.

Senator BURNS. That is what I thought. Are you as good a roper as the boots are?

General SCHOOMAKER. I am a half-decent roper. Are you a heel-er?

Senator BURNS. I can do both ends, but I am not very good.

General SCHOOMAKER. Good. I do not play golf; I do that.

Senator BURNS. Good man.

Senator STEVENS. The most important question is, do you fish, General?

Senator BURNS. He does that, too.

Senator STEVENS. We will cover that later.

Tell us about the Future Combat System and what the status of that project, program, is now, will you please?

FUTURE COMBAT SYSTEM

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, let me say a little bit about the program. As you know, it is the Army's system of systems approach to equipping our future forces. We intend to convert most of our heavy units to that and maybe some others in the future. Right now we are looking at an initial operational capability by 2010 and a full operational capability by 2012. It is all in R&D development right now and, as I said, we have this approach with a lead system integrator where the contractor works very closely with the Army in the development of these systems.

Do you want to comment on what we intend to do with it?

General SCHOOMAKER. I think the best statement is that we think we are going to fulfill, we have got confidence we are going to fulfill, the Future Combat System. We are protecting the funding. We are moving forward on it. We are informing ourselves with our current operations and spiraling things into Future Combat System, and we are trying to pull technologies as they are developed back into the current force.

So I look at the Future Combat System not as a destination, but as an effort every day as we move out there. I am fairly confident that we are going to do well there. The biggest challenge we have in the Future Combat System in my view is the command, control, communications, computers, intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance (C⁴ISR), the battle command and the intelligence, surveillance and reconnaissance aspects of that, because it is a network, it is dependent upon the network, and we must achieve the networkcentricity that is required for us to really optimize what the Future Combat System holds. It will significantly improve our ability to operate as part of a joint team.

SUPPLEMENTAL BUDGET REQUEST

Senator STEVENS. Gentlemen, I think I must take responsibility for the fact that there will be no supplemental this year, in the balance of this fiscal year. We just spent too much time on those supplementals in the past. I had the Congressional Research Service (CRS) take a look at policies we have followed now since the Persian Gulf war and those policies have been that in the initial periods of a war, engagement overseas, we have followed the practice that the Commander in Chief takes money from the funds we have already made available for the Department of Defense and uses them in the conduct of that activity and then later comes in and asks for a supplemental which repays the amounts that have been taken from the regular accounts, and then provides for the balance of the fiscal year for those activities using the experience of the first quarter, quarter and a half of the new fiscal year to determine how much will really be needed for that fiscal year.

My question to you is, you have not lived through those periods, but in terms of your judgment has the Army—the Army bears the real brunt of this type of policy. Has it in anyway been harmed by that practice? Is it a practice we should abandon and ask for a supplemental now? The budget will have at least \$30 billion indicated as being available for the supplemental some time after the beginning of next calendar year.

I want to know, are you willing to go on the record and tell us whether this policy adversely affects the Army in its activities in the conduct of the war?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir. We have looked at this very carefully and we believe with the funds we have in fiscal year 2004 both in our budget and from the supplemental that we can clearly get to the end of fiscal year 2004. If we get in trouble, OSD has assured us they are able to help. Beyond fiscal year 2004 when we would have the funds available in the fiscal year 2005 budget, we would be able to cash flow funds out of third and fourth quarter funds to help us in the first and second quarters, and if there are additional

problems that might arise, we have checked with OSD and they believe the administration is capable of providing any other help we might need, which means we should be able to carry ourselves at least through the end of March next year, maybe a little beyond. I would not want to put a date on it, but at least until then. That is our best estimate.

Senator STEVENS. That is the policy we followed in Kosovo and Bosnia and as a matter of fact in the initiation of the Persian Gulf war.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir.

Senator STEVENS. But there has been a request that we change that policy. You are confident that you can live with this policy in terms of this war?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Notwithstanding any emergencies that we do not see now, sir, we can.

Senator STEVENS. General and all your general officers, you lived—I am going over the line a little bit here—you lived through these other engagements. Was the Army inconvenienced in Bosnia or in Kosovo in that manner of funding the operations overseas?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, not that I am aware of. The only thing that I would say—and it is a little bit below the radar screen probably—but as you know, there are anti-deficiency rules and there are times when we could make better decisions if there was certainty of funding in certain areas, so that we may be able to not only anticipate better but provide better fiscal management if we had the opportunity to do a little longer lead time on some things.

But in terms of the macro picture and the big news, I am not aware of there having been a problem in that.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Inouye.

Senator INOUE. Thank you.

TRAVELING ARMY EXHIBIT ON INTEGRATION

As you can imagine, as part of my work I try my very best to travel and meet and listen to men and women in uniform. I find that there are two elements involved in the development of a combat soldier. One is morale, naturally; and the other is the sense of belonging to a unit.

So some years ago I began questioning people and, to my surprise—I should not have been surprised—almost no one had ever heard of the Fifth Regimental Combat Team, made up of Puerto Ricans, which served in World War II. When I tell that to the Puerto Rican Americans, their eyes light up and they say: My God, we had our men in there?

Even with all the documentaries we have had about the members of the Army Air Corps, the Tuskegee Airmen, not too many Americans are aware of them. But when you tell them that this unit protected bombers and never lost a single bomber they are stunned. They were made up of men who were segregated, like the Puerto Ricans were segregated. Then when I tell them that there was a Filipino regiment, a combat team, sent to the Philippines just before December 7 and they ended up the war with less than 800 men because they were left there by General MacArthur to serve as the basis of a guerrilla force, they are stunned. When I

tell Hispanic Americans that 17 of them have medals of honor, they cannot believe it.

So, Secretary, you and I have worked out something of a traveling exhibit. We are going to send them all over the museums of the posts. I just want to know, how is it coming along.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir. Sir, I will provide the answer for the record, but to my knowledge we are proceeding with that. I certainly support what you are doing. I think it will show a real benefit to the Army in recruiting and we want to do that. So I thank you for the idea and I will get you a detailed account of where we are.

[The information follows:]

TRAVELING ARMY ART EXHIBIT

Sir, I have asked our Chief of Military History, Brigadier General John S. Brown, to take the lead for the Army on this very important project. A partnership between the National Center for the Preservation of Democracy and the Army has been established for the purpose of establishing a traveling historical exhibit. I believe this is an excellent idea, and that the evolution through time of an acceptance of cultural and racial differences is a worthwhile theme. Certainly the spirit of tolerance is one of the greatest strengths of our present armed forces and of our democratic heritage. The funds have been transferred to the Center of Military History. General Brown's staff is currently working out the contracting details and assisting in coordinating the traveling venues with the National Center for the Preservation of Democracy. General Brown is scheduled to have an office call with you on Monday, March 22, 2004, and can answer any specific questions you have.

Senator INOUE. Well, we have a lot of talk about human rights and civil rights. Integration began in the Army. That is the first place. It was not the Interior Department or any other Department; it was the Army.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir. Sir, thank you for that.

Senator INOUE. Thank you, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Shelby.

Senator SHELBY. Thank you.

RESET

I would like to go back to the reset programs, the projections for it. It is my understanding from some of the depots, that a plan to do reset has not—the plans have not yet materialized, General, while projections for the reset workload at the depots continue to go down. Is 10/20 the standard our soldiers deserve? An adequate overhaul, a lot of people contend, cannot be accomplished anywhere but in the depots.

What is the real reset plan for the depots? Mr. Secretary, do you want to touch that?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, we are using the depots now. You might be interested to know that in these depots, particularly the one in Aniston, we are using them to assist us in preparing armor kits for all the HMMWV's that are not up-armored as they cross the line.

Senator SHELBY. I know. I was down there. I just saw what they are doing.

Mr. BROWNLEE. They are cutting steel and putting together kits——

Senator SHELBY. It is very innovative.

Mr. BROWNLEE [continuing]. To help us do that, and we are very appreciative of that. In fact, we fly those over, that is how important that work is that they are doing there.

Senator SHELBY. What about the projected work on reset for the depots? It has not come forth yet. What do you—what is going on here?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, a lot of our equipment has not been brought back yet, and we have provided for I believe it is 17 systems—is that the number that we would propose—

General SCHOOMAKER. I think 15 systems in reset.

Mr. BROWNLEE [continuing]. That we have provided for, and it should get to the depots soon. I am not sure why it has not. Now, some of it we are going to have to do in theater because it is going to stay there.

Senator SHELBY. Would you get back to me on the details of this? Will you get the details to me?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Okay, sir, we will do it.

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, I have got—

Senator SHELBY. General?

General SCHOOMAKER [continuing]. A card here, if I could, comment on that. We requested and received \$1.2 billion in fiscal year 2004 supplemental funding for depot-level resetting the force, above our President's budget 2005 position. So this is going to be a massive effort. As I said, this effort will continue 2 years beyond the emergency as we reset the massive amount of equipment.

Senator SHELBY. We are bringing our equipment up to readiness status.

General SCHOOMAKER. Yes, sir. Yes, sir.

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY FUNDING

Senator SHELBY. The science and technology (S&T) funding, General. In comparison to 2004 funding, every R&D account but one goes down in the 2005 request. Basic research is cut \$64 million, applied research is cut \$389 million, advanced technology development is cut \$391 million, advanced component development and prototypes is cut \$186 million, RDT&E management support is cut \$34 million, and operational systems development is cut \$167 million.

I am not sure how the R&D program is balanced. I support FCS, but it seems that the budget is harmful to the Army's organic labs and this could be a problem, Mr. Secretary.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, we actually—our R&D actually went up from fiscal year 2004 to fiscal year 2005.

Senator SHELBY. But not in these specific programs.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Not in those specific accounts. Sir, we will have to take a look at them. I suspect also because we had about \$1.2 billion in development funds for Comanche, much of which will now be directed into procurement, that that number is going to be adjusted when the budget amendment comes over.

Senator SHELBY. Would you look at these accounts, take a second look?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir, we will.

Senator SHELBY. These are organic lab accounts. I think they are important for the future.

MINIATURE KILL VEHICLE

I want to get, while I have got a little time hopefully, to Space and Missile Defense Command (SMDC). You are very familiar with that. The SMDC Technical Center is managing the miniature kill vehicle (MKV) program. What do you think of the MKV program and the technical center's role?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I would have to take it for the record.

Senator SHELBY. Do you want to get back with us on this?

Mr. BROWNLEE. I will.

[The information follows:]

MINIATURE KILL VEHICLE

Recent changes in policy, brought about by the demise of the Anti-Ballistic Missile Treaty, allow a broader set of midcourse defense alternatives to be developed, tested and fielded. The Multiple Kill Vehicles program, formerly titled Miniature Kill Vehicle, is addressing the need for a lower cost solution to emerging ballistic missile threats that may carry multiple reentry vehicles or sophisticated countermeasure suites. The Army's Space and Missile Defense Technical Center's long history of demonstrated success in developing advanced ballistic missile interceptors and in advancing basic science leading to component miniaturization under the Small Business Innovative Research program makes it the natural choice to serve as the Missile Defense Agency's Executing Agent for the Multiple Kill Vehicles program.

The Multiple Kill Vehicles (MKV) program will address midcourse discrimination issues created by countermeasures postulated for the 2010+ timeframe by intercepting all credible threat objects with one or more kill vehicles. This solution offers a low system cost and an effective approach against ballistic missile threats just beginning to emerge by using multiple kill vehicles deployed from a single booster and carrier vehicle to intercept all credible objects that have not been positively identified as non-lethal. At very high closing velocities, even a low mass kill vehicle will have enough kinetic energy and penetration capability to kill a threat warhead in most engagements. This work is indeed critical for the defense of the United States and our allies against long range ballistic missiles; however, the capability under development through the MKV program is not currently designed to engage battlefield rockets and other short-range threats currently encountered in Iraq.

Senator SHELBY. We have been told that the work is critical and the technology is badly needed. I do not know if this is the right forum to discuss all this.

Patriot Advanced Capability—Phase 3 (PAC-3) Medium Extended Air Defense System (MEADS) Reprogramming

Mr. BROWNLEE. I am not sure either, sir. I will be happy to take it for the record.

Senator SHELBY. Will you get back with me on this?

Of course, the PAC-3 MEADS transfer to the Army, there was apprehension in the Congress that the Army might use these funds to pay other bills. We were met a couple weeks ago with a reprogramming action. Could you get this to me, too?

Mr. BROWNLEE. What funds were these, sir?

Senator SHELBY. Reprogramming action, MEADS.

General SCHOOMAKER. PAC-3.

Senator SHELBY. PAC-3 MEADS.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I will look.

Senator SHELBY. Will you get back with us on the record on that?

[The information follows:]

MEADS REPROGRAMMING

The Army submitted a reprogramming request in order to fund critical Patriot software and hardware upgrades. These software and hardware upgrades will address deficiencies within the current Patriot system that contributed to the two incidents of fratricide during Operation Iraqi Freedom. These upgrades will improve situational awareness, command and control, classification, correlation, and operations in areas of increased electro-magnetic interference. Since final decisions on the combined aggregate Patriot/MEADS program, to include negotiations with international partners, have yet to be finalized, the MEADS portion of the combined program was deemed an appropriate bill-payer for these important Patriot upgrades.

Mr. BROWNLEE. You know, we greatly accelerated that program just before the war and we were going to bring it back down to a more reasonable level, because we did really accelerate it just before the war, PAC-3.

Senator SHELBY. If you will discuss those.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir.

Senator SHELBY. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

Senator STEVENS. Senator Cochran.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

UNMANNED AERIAL VEHICLES

General Schoomaker, as part of the announcement of the cancellation of the Comanche program, I understand the Army has decided to use unmanned aerial vehicles to fulfill some of the capabilities that Comanche was to provide, and that you have identified over \$300 million from that program to procure additional legacy and future UAV's.

Given that the Fire Scout UAV has been selected to be part of your Future Combat System force, would the Army be served better by accelerating procurement of Fire Scout UAV's instead of buying more legacy systems?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, I would have to—again, I would have to take that for the record. I know that UAV's are a significant part of our future and a growing part because the potential there is great. I know as we move to FCS, the Future Combat System, that they are going to be a large part of that.

As you know, we have had some significant success with UAV's in the current conflict. We are starting to see greater potential in some of that. But as to the specifics of that, I would have to go for the record.

[The information follows:]

UAV PROCUREMENT

In order to meet the current requirements for Operation Iraqi Freedom and the Global War on Terrorism, we are accelerating the procurement of Unmanned Aerial Vehicles (UAVs) already in production, such as the Shadow Tactical UAV, and the Raven Small UAV. We are also working to accelerate future systems such as Fire Scout and the Extended Range/Multi-Purpose (ER/MP) UAVs. However, both of these future systems are still in development and thus not available today to meet the warfighter's need. Army commanders engaged in current operations hail the capabilities of the Shadow UAV, which supports Current Force mechanized, light, and Stryker Brigade Combat Teams, and the Hunter UAV systems, which are fielded to III Corps, Fort Hood, Texas, XVIII Airborne Corps, Fort Bragg, North Carolina, and V Corps, U.S. Army Europe, and serve as the interim ER/MP UAV. Both current and future UAV systems are part of the Army's UAV strategy. However, in order to meet the immediate needs of combatant commanders, we must equip our units with these current systems until Future Force UAV systems are developed, integrated and ready for fielding.

Senator COCHRAN. I hope you would also include in your response for the record whether or not you think that the \$300 million is an adequate investment in advanced UAV's.

AMMUNITION SHORTAGES

There is also a critical shortage of both training and war reserve ammunition, such as the Hydra-70 rocket. The decision to cancel the Comanche program and procure new helicopters will increase the need for training ammunition and of course war reserve ammunition. The question is how does the Army plan to address these shortfalls, which we understand could be as high as \$16 billion?

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, we moved \$30 million this year to increase the capacity of Lake City, which is your small caliber, 50 caliber and below small arms ammunition, which is going to mitigate. I think by the end of this year, we will have capacity that will turn the corner and mitigate the shortfalls we have had in small arms, which I have been very concerned about.

As part of the Comanche program, we moved \$155 million of that program as part of the aviation reset, part of the aviation fix, to the Hydra rocket program. I think it buys something like 163,000 Hydra rockets in this program; and \$93 million into the Hellfire line. This was the point I tried to make earlier. This movement of money from Comanche into fixing Army aviation is not just about the helicopters. It is about UAV, it is about ammunition, it is about MILCON, it is about simulations, it is about training. It is a holistic approach to fixing Army aviation, and the point that you have made right there is one of the most significant.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you very much.

THEATER SUPPORT VEHICLES

I understand too that the Army has been impressed by the performance of leased high-speed vessels and is considering leasing these types of craft as theater support vessels. There are several American shipyards capable of producing these vessels both quickly and economically based on what I understand to be successful experimentation. What are the Army's plans for procurement of theater support vessels?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, we have been impressed by the capability of those vehicles. We are right now considering how they can help us in our deployments and so we are studying how we can do that. We do not have right now any plans to lease, but we are considering how that vehicle can be used. It is much faster than a normal ship and for some of our deployments we believe it would be very useful. So we are looking at that.

Senator COCHRAN. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

Senator STEVENS. Thank you.

Senator Leahy.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Gentlemen, good to see you, all of you. You have a pretty impressive bench behind you.

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, we need a lot of help.

Senator LEAHY. I do not think so, but you have good help there and that is good.

ADD-ON ARMOR

I understand Secretary Brownlee mentioned before I came in about the Bradley reactive armor and that you do not have enough. When I first heard about this reactive armor years ago, I said, you have got to be kidding, the way it was described. Then I started seeing some of the tests and all and I must admit I am very, very much of a fan. I think it is critical. I have heard great things about its performance. I hope we can get the funds to expand it. If my son or daughter were among those in this armor, I would want it there yesterday. I know some of our Guard forces that are going over into Iraq and scrounging armor wherever they can, I think it is important we get it out.

COMANCHE TERMINATION

General, on the Comanche program, General Cody had given me a call at home before that to let me know about the decision. Of course, I must admit we did end up chitchatting a little bit about Montpelier, Vermont, and you are welcome to come up there any time. As the Secretary has mentioned, General Richard Cody and I both come from Montpelier, Vermont, and knew each other when we were growing up. We only say good things about each other because it is sort of a mutual deterrent pact. But I cannot really think of anything bad to say about him.

But he told me about the Comanche program. I thought it was a good decision. I thought it was taking resources away from too many other very critical aviation programs, all the infrared missile countermeasures for example.

HEALTH USAGE MONITORING SYSTEM (HUMS)

Let me just mention one, and I admit this is probably the first time any parochial type questions have ever come out of this committee, but it is the HUMS program, the Integrated Mechanical Diagnostic Health and Usage Monitoring System. I am glad my staff wrote it all out because I have just called it "HUMS" and I never was quite sure what it stood for.

But we are using it on the Blackhawks of the 101st Airborne Division. It is a great diagnostic system. I have seen it demonstrated. If I was commander and I had 10 helicopters out there, I would want to know exactly which of the 10 can go out or how many can go out, and so on.

Are we going to reach a point where we might be equipping all our helicopters with HUMS? Are we going to be able to find money for that? I see it as sort of like cheaper to fix the roof before the rainstorm kind of thing. Mr. Secretary, what do you think about this?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I know that we have an intense interest in those kinds of diagnostics maintenance equipment. It has great use. I am not familiar with right now the extent to which we intend to buy those and equip all our helicopters with them, but we can certainly provide that for the record.

[The information follows:]

HEALTH USAGE MONITORING SYSTEM (HUMS)

The Army is currently performing a two-year demonstration on the Health Usage Monitoring System (HUMS). The 101st Air Assault Division tested HUMS on a number of UH-60 Blackhawks while deployed to Iraq. The initial reports from this demonstration are positive. The Army will use the data from this demonstration to help guide its future policies on installation and utilization of these types of diagnostic systems. For future systems, the AH-64D Block III, UH-60M, and CH-47F programs are planning to install some type of organic maintenance diagnostic system.

Senator LEAHY. Yes, would you have your staff talk to mine. Let us know where we are on that, because it is something I have followed very closely. I have helped get some of the money through here for the pilot programs. I have been impressed. I have had some things I have helped get money for pilot programs, they have not worked. I have freely admitted that. Others do, and this one does seem to work.

General SCHOOMAKER. Sir, if I could add to that, I think General Cody explained to you, again as part of our Army aviation modernization program, that as we transfer money from Comanche it is our intent to go to a two-level maintenance system in that, as well as going to the automated logbook on these aircraft. So I am not sure that this system you are talking about is integral to that, but we are certainly committed to a far advanced system of maintenance management to increase our operational readiness and impact the force maintaining-wise.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you, General.

POST-TRAUMATIC STRESS TREATMENT

My last subject. I was up here 3 or 4 weeks ago in Vermont on a beautiful Sunday morning, having my coffee. My wife is a nurse. She worked on medical-surgical floors and all, and has also spent time with the Veterans Administration (VA) hospital system when I was in law school. She said: Patrick, you have got to read this. It was this New York Times, this New York Times magazine, "Coming Home." It is basically talking about soldiers with post-traumatic disorder. In my generation we called it shell shock.

It was a very moving article. Since then I cannot tell you the number of e-mails I have gotten from veterans, from parents of people who were over abroad, those who are parents of people in the military or spouses or what-not, who sent me this article. Of course, we have all the reports of depression and suicide among our troops. I went out with some other Senators and my wife to have dinner one evening out at Walter Reed, and just some of the stories I was hearing there.

The condition requires specialized treatment. You have to have a system in there that will encourage troops to come forward. You are out there, you are facing terrible danger. You may get shot, you may be seriously wounded. You have proven your bravery, and our men and women are brave. But then there seems to be among some that it is not brave to come forward and ask for this treatment.

It has got to be there. You have got to make sure it is there. I am going to looking at it both on this committee and on the sub-committee I serve on that oversees the VA.

But can you give me just a broad overview? What kind of programs do we have? Because I find the suicide rate alarming among our forces. I find the people who come back terribly injured, and I do not want them to be rejects of society. They have earned an awful lot more than that.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Sir, I could not agree more. I appreciate all of the members who have gone out and visited our troops at Walter Reed and other hospitals. Clearly, the sacrifices that these young soldiers have made for our country are deserving of the very best attention we can get them. I have addressed your specific questions to those at Walter Reed. This is an integral part of their care. They receive this kind of care and counseling right along with the physical medical part, and it is just clearly integrated in their care.

Senator LEAHY. Is this budget going to reflect that?

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir. Yes, sir, it is.

I should also tell you that, while the number of suicides in the theater has been more than is acceptable to us, it is not significantly above the norm, and there are still some cases that are not properly determined and that could put us substantially or more above the norm. But we conducted, for the first time in a combat theater, a mental health assessment. We sent a team out, visited units, talked to soldiers, gathered data, and came back with some conclusions and recommendations for how we can do better, not during the war or after the war, but before we send troops in, what we can do to prepare them better, as well as—so that they can cope better with the situations that they face.

I thought it was significant that that was done while the troops were committed there. But it is the first time we had ever done that.

Senator LEAHY. I commend you for doing that, Mr. Secretary. I think it is extremely important. I know our men and women are motivated, but sometimes the things they face are something they really did not understand. I remember the conversations I had with my son after he finished out in Parris Island with the Marine Corps. Of course, like all former marines, the further he is removed from that the more enjoyable I guess it was. But at least there they always knew when the explosions were going off or anything else that that night or the next night or the next night they are going to be back in their barracks and the only thing they had to worry about was their drill instructor.

Now we have people out and they are seeing their friends having their limbs blown off and all and they are facing real danger, which is unavoidable in these situations. I just want to make sure that we fulfill our commitment—we tell them to go out—we fulfill our commitment when they come back. Some of them—on the one hand, I am very impressed when I see some of these high-tech prosthetics we have for those who have lost limbs, which are really amazing. But you also have to have—it is not just their bodies with some of them.

So I commend you for sending the team out, and please have your staff keep in touch with me if you have areas in there that you think would be worthwhile to know.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Yes, sir, we will.

If I could just add, Mr. Chairman, because I would like for the committee to know. When we first started getting wounded soldiers back to Walter Reed in significant numbers and with the very kind of grievous wounds they had, where they had clearly lost limbs and this sort of thing, where many of them were going to be medically retired as disabled—it is amazing the numbers that want to stay in even though they have lost limbs, and some have stayed. But I contacted Tony Principi, a dear friend of mine who runs the Veterans Affairs Department. We have put together a team. We have people in his organization. He has people from his organization working at Walter Reed and other places, and the whole intent of this is to ensure we have a seamless system for these soldiers, so that if they are medically retired from the military and then become part of the Veterans Affairs Department responsibilities nobody gets dropped off. We take care of them through that, manage them through that process.

His intent and mine is to make sure that for every single wounded soldier that is medically retired and becomes a part of the Veterans Affairs responsibility that that is a seamless operation.

Senator LEAHY. I have gone over my time. Let me just say that I talked to one young soldier who was there. His wife was with him and they have a little child, and he was showing me this leg, mechanical leg, with the computer sensors in it. I said: Well, what are you going to do now? He looks at me like: What kind of a question is that, sir? I want to be right back in the Army. He said: I am going to work hard with this because I want to go back. I thought: Good for you.

Mr. BROWNLEE. And many of them have, sir.

Senator LEAHY. Thank you.

Mr. Chairman, thank you very much. It is good to see both General Schoomaker and Secretary Brownlee. Thank you.

Senator STEVENS. Yes, we all thank you very much, Mr. Secretary and General. I do think there is a lot of comment being made around here now about how the Army is being harmed by these decisions that have been made with regard to the budget. I want to tell you before we finish our bill we will confer with you to make sure that you have the flexibility you need to use any funds that are available, not just in the Department of Defense, but to the President, period, to assure there be no shortfall in funds while we have soldiers in the field, keeping in mind that from this Senator's point of view the worst thing that can possibly happen to the Army as well as the Senate is to have a post-election session. We get nothing done and I assure you you would not get any more money after the election than you would get after January 1, but it would be a very arduous period in which to try to get it.

ADDITIONAL COMMITTEE QUESTIONS

I would like to avoid a post-election session in the interests of the people who are at war. We do not need that after the election. I hope to work with you to make sure you have the money you need and have all the flexibility you need.

[The following questions were not asked at the hearing, but were submitted to the Department for response subsequent to the hearing:]

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO HON. LES BROWNLEE

QUESTION SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI

SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY (S&T)

Question. I note that basic and applied research comprises only about one-tenth of the Army's \$10.4 billion request for RDT&E funding in fiscal year 2005. While funding for development of mature technologies is important, it has long been my belief that investments in basic science and technology are where cutting-edge breakthroughs occur. For DOD, this means that our warfighters are able to employ transformational technologies sooner. Would you please comment on the importance of basic S&T investments for Army transformation?

Answer. The Army's basic research program produces new knowledge to fuel revolutionary advances and leap-ahead technology that enable Army Transformation. The program invests in world-class expertise (government, academic, and industry) and state-of-the-art equipment. It balances its investment between in-house Army unique research and leveraging external scientific research that has great potential for military applications. The fiscal year 2005 budget submission reflects the Army's sustained commitment to make leap-ahead science and technology (S&T) investments that will provide high payoff transformational capabilities for our Soldiers.

Army S&T investments, laboratories, and research, development, and engineering centers are essential to provide America's Army with sustained overmatch in land combat. The Army continues to maintain a robust S&T portfolio and workforce to provide solutions to fill the capability gaps being identified in current operations in Afghanistan and Iraq and will continue to do so in the future. Through its S&T investments, the Army fosters innovation and accelerates and matures technologies to enable Future Force capabilities and exploit opportunities to transition technologies to the Current Force.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR JUDD GREGG

ATIRCM

Question. In addition to updating deployed Aircraft Survivability Equipment (ASE) systems, it is my understanding that the Army has successfully developed and begun to produce a next generation system, the Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasure (ATIRCM) that will protect helicopter crews from threats they currently face. What are the Army's plans to deploy the ATIRCM to rotary wing assets?

Answer. The ATIRCM consists of an active LASER jammer and functions as part of a suite containing a Common Missile Warning System, an Improved Countermeasure Munitions Dispenser (ICMD), and the Advanced Infrared Countermeasure Munitions (AIRCMM—flares). This system protects aircraft against all known and currently projected infrared threat missile systems. The Army will start fielding the ATIRCM to Army Special Operations Aviation in the near future. Conventional Army Aviation units will receive the ATIRCM shortly thereafter. Recent decisions resulted in accelerating the fielding of the ATIRCM system by three full years.

Question. Secretary Brownlee, the Congress provided approximately \$7 million in fiscal year 2004 for the development and integration of the Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasure Multi-Band Laser. This Multi-Band Laser is a pre-planned product improvement to the Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasure system. What is the status of this effort?

Answer. The Army is in the process of negotiating a task order with the Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasure (ATIRCM) Lead Systems Integrator (BAE) to complete the design of the Multi-Band Laser for ATIRCM. The estimated award date is scheduled to be not later than April 15, 2004.

Question. Secretary Brownlee, it is my understanding that the Army plans to upgrade the Advanced Threat Infrared Countermeasure (ATIRCM) system with a multi-band laser that is being developed specifically for the ATIRCM program. Furthermore, the Army has considered inserting an alternative Multi-Band Laser, developed for the Air Force, into ATIRCM. What analysis has the Army or Air Force done on the effectiveness of this alternative Multi-Band Laser?

Answer. The U.S. Air Force has done extensive testing of their multi-band laser (MBL) for use with large aircraft. This testing includes live missile firings, lab testing, and simulations. The results of this testing demonstrates that their MBL is effective for large aircraft. The Air Force has made a great deal of this information available to the Army. The Army has analyzed this data and determined that the Air Force MBL could be effective for rotary aircraft. However, the Army has also determined that integration of this MBL would be schedule prohibitive and would not meet our acceleration requirements.

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED TO GENERAL PETER T. SCHOOMAKER

QUESTIONS SUBMITTED BY SENATOR PETE V. DOMENICI

IMPROVISED EXPLOSIVE DEVICES

Question. Does the Army have the authorities it needs to get existing technologies in the hands of Task Force Improvised Explosive Device (IED) to better detect these bombs? If not, what authorities do you need?

Answer. The Army has sufficient legislative authorities to accelerate and transition proven technologies to the IED Task Force. Sustained Science and Technology (S&T) investments over time have enabled Army S&T organizations, including the U.S. Army Materiel Command's Research Development and Engineering Command and the Army Corps of Engineers' laboratories, to quickly develop and provide expedient solutions to the warfighter in support of the Global War on Terrorism. Examples of successful S&T solutions already being provided to the warfighter to counter the IED threat include: omni-directional under vehicle inspection systems to detect IED and contraband and an electronic countermeasure system that provides force protection by jamming the prevalent electronic detonators being used to set off IEDs.

RECRUITING AND RETENTION

Question. What is the active-duty Army doing (besides temporarily increasing end-strength) to alleviate its reliance on Guard and Reserves? Can the Army better manage its use of personnel to ensure more of its active-duty component is available to participate in future operations?

Answer. In conjunction with temporarily increasing end-strength, the Army is rebalancing its Active Component/Reserve Component (AC/RC) capabilities to meet combatant commander needs with an expeditionary, campaign quality force. The Army is working to provide the proper Active and Reserve Component balance of units to enhance high demand and early deploying capabilities. Changes contained in the Program Objective Memorandum for fiscal years 2004–09 reduce stress on existing high demand units in both the AC and RC by converting approximately 30,000 of "Cold War" force structure. Additionally, we are reducing structure and creating a Trainees, Transients, Holdees, and Students account in the Army National Guard and Army Reserve. This enhances RC readiness by allowing the assignment to units of only those Soldiers who are available for deployment. To reduce RC demand for current operations in Iraq, the Office of the Secretary of Defense has called upon the U.S. Marine Corps to provide a division sized force for Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) 2. The Active Component is aggressively reconstituting forces while converting to a modular based unit design to increase capabilities for the Global War on Terrorism and prepare for potential OIF3 and 4 deployments.

SUBCOMMITTEE RECESS

Senator STEVENS. Thank you both very much.

General SCHOOMAKER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. BROWNLEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

[Whereupon, at 11:46 a.m., Wednesday, March 3, the subcommittee was recessed, to reconvene at 10 a.m., Wednesday, March 10.]