

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION  
OF APPROPRIATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR  
2015 AND THE FUTURE YEARS DEFENSE  
PROGRAM**

---

**TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2014**

U.S. SENATE,  
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,  
*Washington, DC.*

**ARMY ACTIVE AND RESERVE FORCE MIX**

The committee met, pursuant to notice, at 9:34 a.m. in room SDG-50, Dirksen Senate Office Building, Senator Carl Levin (chairman) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Levin,, Reed, Nelson, Udall, Manchin, Gillibrand, Blumenthal, Donnelly, Hirono, Kaine, King, Inhofe, McCain, Sessions, Chambliss, Wicker, Ayotte, Fischer, Graham, Vitter, Blunt, Lee, and Cruz.

Committee staff members present: Peter K. Levine, staff director; and Leah C. Brewer, nominations and hearings clerk.

Majority staff members present: Jonathan D. Clark, counsel; Mariah K. McNamara, special assistant to the staff director; John H. Quirk V, professional staff member; and William K. Sutey, professional staff member.

Minority staff members present: John A. Bonsell, minority staff director; Daniel C. Adams, minority associate counsel; Steven M. Barney, minority counsel; John D. Cewe, professional staff member; Samantha L. Clark, minority associate counsel; Ambrose R. Hock, professional staff member; and Sean J. Wolfe, research analyst.

Staff assistants present: Daniel J. Harder and Brendan J. Sawyer.

Committee members' assistants present: Carolyn A. Chuhta and Jennifer T. Wilson, assistants to Senator Reed; Susan Perez Quinn, assistant to Senator Nelson; Christopher R. Howard, assistant to Senator Udall; C. Patrick Hayes and Paul C. Hutton IV, assistants to Senator Manchin; Moran Banai, assistant to Senator Gillibrand; Rachel H. Lipsey, assistant to Senator Donnelly; Nick Ikeda, assistant to Senator Hirono; Karen E. Courington, assistant to Senator Kaine; Chad M. Metzler and Stephen M. Smith, assistants to Senator King; Alexander H. Herrgott and Joel E. Starr, assistants to Senator Inhofe; Elizabeth C. Lopez, assistant to Senator McCain; George Elliott, assistant to Senator Sessions; Brandon H. Bell, assistant to Senator Chambliss; Joseph G. Lai, assistant to Senator

Wicker; Bradley L. Bowman, assistant to Senator Ayotte; Peter W. Schirtzinger, assistant to Senator Fischer; Craig R. Abele, assistant to Senator Graham; Joshua S. Hodges, assistant to Senator Vitter; Charles W. Prosch, assistant to Senator Blunt; Peter H. Blair, assistant to Senator Lee; and Victoria Coates and Jeremy H. Hayes, assistants to Senator Cruz.

**OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR CARL LEVIN, CHAIRMAN**

Chairman LEVIN. Good morning, everybody. The committee welcomes General Ray Odierno, Chief of Staff of the Army; General Frank Grass, Chief of the National Guard Bureau; and Lieutenant General Jeffrey Talley, Chief of the Army Reserve and Commander of the U.S. Army Reserve Command. Gentlemen, thank you for your service, thank you for joining us today for this very important hearing on the Army's size and structure.

For more than a decade, the men and women of the active Army, the Army National Guard, and the U.S. Army Reserve have shared the burden of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan. They have all done what we have asked and more, and demonstrated great professionalism and dedication even after repeated deployments.

All three components grew during the decade-plus of war in Iraq and Afghanistan. Now, with the end of the war in Iraq and the reduction of our presence and our role in Afghanistan, it is understandable that our services will shrink somewhat. Because of the difficult choices imposed by budget caps and sequestration, reduction in end strength and force structure will be faster and deeper than many expected. In developing a plan to address the budget caps, the Army faces the unenviable task of generating the needed savings while minimizing military risk.

The Department's fiscal year 2015 budget request proposes end strength reductions through fiscal year 2017 that would leave the Nation with an Active Army of 450,000, or 20 percent less from its wartime high of 569,000. It would leave the Nation with an Army National Guard of 335,000, or 6 percent less than its wartime high of 354,000; and the Army Reserve at 195,000, or 10 percent less than its high of 205,000. But these end strength numbers assume that the defense budget caps will be increased by \$115 billion for the fiscal years 2016 through 2019.

If the budget caps for those years remain unchanged, the Army will be required to cut even deeper, reducing the Active Army to 420,000, the National Guard to 315,000, and the U.S. Army Reserve to 185,000 by fiscal year 2019. The Active Army would then be required to divest 680 aircraft, or 23 percent of its aviation structure, and inactivate up to 13 of its remaining 37 brigade combat teams, while the National Guard would lose 111 aircraft, or 8 percent of its aviation force structure, and inactivate up to 6 of its remaining 28 brigade combat teams.

General Odierno testified last week that at those levels the Army would not be able to meet the requirements of our defense strategy and that, "this will call into question our ability to execute even one prolonged, multi-phased major contingency operation."

Earlier this year, most of our Governors signed a letter to the President in which they opposed any cuts to the Army National Guard in fiscal year 2015 and through the balance of the FYDP.

They also asked that all of the National Guard's current operational capabilities, as well as its current end strength of 350,000, be preserved without change. Many of us would also like to be able to avoid cuts to the defense budget, not only to the National Guard, but also to Active-Duty Force structure, to military compensation and benefits, to training and readiness, and equipment modernization. Unfortunately, the budget situation does not offer us that option. We have many, many difficult choices ahead of us.

For instance, the Army proposes to save \$12 billion by restructuring its aviation assets. This proposal would consolidate the Army's Apache attack aircraft in the Active component by taking Apache attack aircraft out of the National Guard and transferring Black Hawk helicopters to the National Guard instead.

I look forward to the testimony of our witnesses on that subject and also, of course, on how the components of the Army will resize, restructure, and reorganize to make the reductions required by the budget caps now in law, as well as the impact that these changes would have on our ability to meet our National defense strategy.

Again, our committee is grateful to your services and to each of your component contributions to our Nation.

Senator Inhofe.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Would you put the charts up on both sides?

I'd like to remind everyone why we're here today. We're talking about the yellow wedge. The yellow wedge in there, that's end strength, and I think we're all familiar with this. Each member has a copy of this chart up here. That's significant because it shows the year and the amount of cuts.

Now, if you look down below you'll see efficiencies and all that. A lot of times people think, well, through efficiencies we can accomplish these goals. You can see by this chart that you can't do that.

I was going to cover the force mix. I think the chairman—I agree with your comments on this and I think you covered it very well.

This comes at a time, these cuts, where we're confronting a more dangerous and volatile world. In fact, the threats we face are outpacing our ability to deter and confront them as a result of the massive cuts associated with sequestration. General Odierno, you testified last week that 450,000 active soldiers, the number of active soldiers we will have by the end of fiscal 2017, define the risk as significant in executing the Defense Strategic Guidance; and if the Army goes to sequestration levels of 420,000 active soldiers, the Army will not be able to implement the Defense Strategic Guidance.

At the heart of the total Army force mix issue is the Army's proposal to restructure its aviation assets. While everyone is focused on the mix of Apaches in the Army and Reserves, the budget request also divests the entire fleet of Kiowa Warrior armed scout helicopters and the TH-67 training helicopters and transfers 111 modern UH-60L helicopters from the active to the Reserve component. Black Hawks became available because the Army cuts three active combat aviation brigades in the budget request, so you don't need, theoretically, that many.

I want to hear all these arguments played out today. We need to understand the impact of taking our Army down to the levels

below the September 11. I am very concerned that we are sacrificing too much capability at a time when we should be increasing our current structure and capabilities in these uncertain times.

As I noted in the Army posture hearing last week, we have been wrong in the past when it comes to assuming—to assumptions regarding the size of our ground forces and the capabilities required to protect this country. We're poised to repeat this same mistake. I recall when we had the Secretary here that the Secretary and I used to sit next to each other on the House Armed Services Committee and can remember testimony back in 1994 that in 10 more years we would no longer need ground troops. Well, we were sure wrong then. I think we're wrong today.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe.

General Odierno, welcome.

**STATEMENT OF GEN RAYMOND T. ODIERNO, USA, CHIEF OF STAFF OF THE ARMY**

General ODIERNO. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member Inhofe. Before I start, I just want to let the committee know that as soon as we're done with the hearing I'll be traveling to Fort Hood to visit with the soldiers, families, commanders, those wounded, and will attend the memorial service tomorrow. Things continue to progress there. I'm satisfied that, as we continue to investigate and look at this, I'm satisfied that if we had not implemented some of the lessons learned in 2009 the tragedy could have been much worse than it was. However, we still have much to learn about what happened and why and what we have to do in terms of our mental health screening, assessments, as well as taking care of our soldiers. And the Army is committed to thoroughly understanding what we must do and the actions we must take, and we look forward in the future to reporting out to you on what we have found as we continue and conclude our investigations at Fort Hood.

Chairman, I'm truly humbled to lead the extraordinary men and women of our Army, who volunteer to raise their right hand and serve our country. As a division, corps, and theater commander for over 5 years in Iraq, I've personally led and seen the tremendous sacrifice the soldiers from the active Army, Army National Guard, and U.S. Army Reserve have made for our Nation.

As the Chief of Staff, my focus is on ensuring all soldiers from all components are properly trained, equipped, and ready. Over the last 13 years, the Army has met the call to defend the Nation during two wars. From 2001 to 2011, the Army's budget nearly doubled as we restructured, modularized, and modernized the entire force, especially our National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve. We needed our National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve to serve as an operational Reserve. We optimized the Army for the known demands of Afghanistan and Iraq and our emphasis was on gaining predictability for our deploying units.

With the war in Iraq over and as we continue to reduce our commitment in Afghanistan, we must confront our difficult fiscal environment. We must make tough but necessary choices. We must ensure we have the best Army possible, even under full sequestration.

In developing a total Army solution for the future, the Secretary of Defense directed the Army to not size for large, prolonged stability operations. Furthermore, we were not to retain force structure at the expense of readiness, and to develop balanced budgets that permitted the restoration of desired levels of readiness and modernization by the end of the sequestration period.

The Secretary of the Army and I provided additional guidance to fulfil the needs of our component commanders first and then to disproportionately reduce our Active Forces while implementing modest reductions in our Guard and Reserve Forces. The Army and the Office of Secretary of Defense conducted a transparent, open, and highly collaborative budget formulation, force structure, and aviation restructure decision process that included representatives from all components at every level. Additionally, experts and analysts within the Department of Defense assessed all proposals for their viability and ensuring the Army could meet its defense strategy requirements.

Finally, numerous meetings of the Joint Chiefs and combatant commanders examined these proposals before a final decision was made by the Secretary of Defense. The result is a balanced approach that gives us the best Army possible, even if sequestration continues in fiscal year 2016. The plan calls for end strength reductions of 213,000 soldiers, with a disproportionate cut of 150,000 coming from the Active Army, 43,000 from the Army National Guard, and 20,000 from the Army Reserve. These reductions to the active Army represent 70 percent of the total end strength reductions, compared with 20 percent from the National Guard and 10 percent from the U.S. Army Reserve.

We could reduce up to 46 percent of the brigade combat teams from the active Army and up to 22 percent of the brigade combat team from the National Guard. This will result in an Army going from a 51 percent Active and 49 percent Reserve component to a 54 percent Reserve and a 46 percent Active component mix. The Army will be the only Service in which the Reserve component outnumber the Active component, and we believe under these fiscal constraints it's appropriate.

The Aviation Restructure Initiative allows us to eliminate obsolete air frames, sustain a modernized fleet, reduce sustainment costs, and efficiently organize ourselves to meet our operational commitments and imperatives. Disproportionate reductions come from the Active component aviation. We will inactivate and eliminate three complete combat aviation brigades from the Active component. We will move all LUH-72s from the Active component to Fort Rucker in order to train pilots across all three components. In the National Guard we'll maintain 10 aviation brigades. We will move Apaches to the Active component while increasing the fleet of UH-60s by sending 111 of the most modern Black Hawk helicopters to the National Guard. The National Guard will also retain all of its LUH-72s and CH-47s.

In the end, the Active component will be reduced by 686 aircraft, which is 86 percent of the total reduction. The National Guard will be reduced by 111 aircraft, which is 14 percent of the total reduction. ARI will result in better and more capable formations which are able to respond to contingencies at home and abroad.

My goal remains to sustain the National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve as an operational Reserve. To accomplish this, we must take moderate reductions to overall end strength in order to invest in appropriate training and sustainment levels. Combat training center rotations and maintaining more modern equipment is expensive. We need to have the resources to fund collective training and to sustain equipment modernization. By taking the modest end strength reductions to the National Guard and Reserves, we can continue to retain them at the current record high levels of readiness and modernization.

Finally, let me address the calls for a national commission to examine Army force structure and why we believe that such a commission is unnecessary. First, the Army worked our plans to downsize the force and reduce spending levels in an open, transparent, and collaborative manner that has been approved by the combatant commanders, the Joint Chiefs of Staff, as well as the Office of the Secretary of the Army and Secretary of Defense following months of deliberation and analysis.

Second, the Army continues to provide Congress with our intent, rationale, and proposed plan for the total Army.

Third, our plan disproportionately reduces Active Forces over National Guard and Reserve Forces. With our current and future budget levels, cuts will happen. Our proposal adequately balances the importance of readiness, responsiveness, operational requirements, future requirements, cost, and provides the most effective and efficient force for the budget allocated.

No one is fully satisfied with the final outcome, including myself. However, the reality is that the funding in the future will not allow us to have everything we may want. These cuts will still occur even if we delay our decisions or fail to address the issue as a total Army. The results will be hollowing out of our Army. Our soldiers will be less prepared and this will cost more lives in the next conflict.

Our Army is made up of professionals who have superbly executed their assigned missions under extraordinary circumstances. This total force plan reflects the continued commitment and sacrifice of soldiers from every component of our Army. This is not about active versus National Guard or U.S. Army Reserve. This is about providing the best total Army for our Nation.

Our Army is getting smaller. We must be more ready in all three components to respond to future threats. This plan allows us to balance end strength, readiness, and modernization across the Army and sustain our critical National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve Forces as viable operational Reserve.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to the entire committee for allowing me to testify, and I look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Odierno follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, General Odierno.  
General Grass.

**STATEMENT OF GEN FRANK J. GRASS, ARNG, CHIEF OF THE  
NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU**

General GRASS. Chairman Levin, Ranking Member Inhofe, and members of the committee: It's an honor to testify here today. I'm pleased to participate with General Odierno and General Talley to discuss the important issues before us.

Before I continue, Chairman Levin, on behalf of the guardsmen, both Army and Air, please accept our thanks for your distinguished career of service to the Nation. Everyone who wears a uniform today has been positively impacted by your leadership.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much.

General GRASS. Let me begin by saying, to meet the challenges of today and tomorrow will take nothing less than a concerted effort by the total Army, Active, Reserve, and Guard. The Guard is committed to being a part of that team.

As I look to the future and envision the National Guard, I do so mindful of the last 12-plus years, fighting as part of a combined joint force. Today's Army National Guard is the best manned, best trained, and best equipped in its history. It is accessible, ready, capable, and provides a significant value to the taxpayer. Your Guard has proven time and again that we fight our Nation's wars, we defend the Homeland, and we have the structure to build enduring partnerships, both overseas and at home.

During the last 12-plus years, we have deployed guardsmen overseas more than 760,000 times. Domestically, National Guard soldiers and airmen responded to emergencies in 53 States, territories, and the District of Columbia in fiscal year 2013. Our highly successful State partnership program has yielded strong military-to-military relations where 15 of our partner nations, from Estonia to Jordan, El Salvador to Mongolia, have paired with our States and deployed 79 times.

None of this is possible without the support we've received from this committee and our parent services. The assistance Congress has provided in the form of the National Guard and Reserve equipment account has been invaluable. We must be careful to preserve the operational force we've built in the National Guard, but sequestration already threatens the total force.

The National Guard provides our country, our Army, our Air Force with flexible military capability and capacity that cannot be easily replaced once it's gone.

I recently returned from an overseas trip to visit the outstanding guardsmen and women mobilized. In my travels I am frequently told by commanders that when you see our soldiers in the combat zone they are indistinguishable as to whether they are guardsmen, active duty soldiers, or Army reservists. This is exactly the way we want it and we should be resolved to ensure it remains that way.

I am proud to say that the Guard units and soldiers have accomplished every mission assigned to them. This includes brigade combat teams conducting counterinsurgency operations and combat aviation brigade deployments, and nonstandard units such as agricultural business development teams. We have done all of these missions side by side with our joint, interagency, and international partners.

This integration did not occur overnight, nor did the evolution from strategic reserve to operational force. It happened far from home, apart from families, with great sacrifice.

Our National Guard soldiers tell me they want to remain operational at some predictable level, with deployment opportunities. They look forward to integrated, realistic, and challenging annual training periods and weekend training assemblies, such as those that our combat training centers and our state-of-the-art equipment provides.

What I just outlined for you is how I see the Army National Guard, truly a solid partner both overseas and at home. However, given the current fiscal uncertainty and turbulence, I am concerned that this vision is at high risk. Congress provided much-appreciated relief with the Bipartisan Budget Act. However, even with the Bipartisan Budget Act, the Army National Guard fiscal year 2015 budget might be reduced as much as a billion dollars from the fiscal year 2014 level.

Chairman LEVIN. Could I interrupt you, General Grass, for one minute.

We are about to lose a quorum, and while we have a quorum I want to ask the committee to consider one civilian nomination and a list of 131 pending military nominations. First I would ask the committee to consider the nomination of Brian McKeon to be Principal Deputy Under Secretary of Defense for Policy. Is there a motion to report that nomination?

Senator INHOFE. I so move.

Chairman LEVIN. Is there a second?

Senator REED. Second.

Chairman LEVIN. All in favor say aye. [Chorus of ayes.]

All opposed, nay.

[No response.] The motion carries.

Now I ask the committee to consider a list of 131 pending military noms. All these nominations have been before the committee the required length of time. Is there a motion to favorably report them?

Senator INHOFE. I so move.

Chairman LEVIN. Is there a second.

Senator REED. Second.

Chairman LEVIN. All in favor say aye. [Chorus of ayes.]

Opposed, nay? [No response.]

The ayes have it. The motion is carried.

Thank you very much. Sorry to interrupt, but I think all of you can understand this and welcome the interruption.

General ODIERNO. I appreciate that very much, Senator.

Chairman LEVIN. It's not often you appreciate being interrupted, but I think in this case you probably do.

General GRASS. Yes, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

General GRASS. This will require the Army National Guard to accept risks in fiscal year 2015 in certain areas. Our brigade combat teams will be limited to achieving individual, crew, and squad-level proficiency. Personnel will have fewer opportunities to attend schools and special training. And our armories, which average 44



years in age, will lack funding to repair those facilities except for those that have health and safety issues.

Looking forward, when reduced funding levels return in 2016 we will have to make further difficult decisions. We also face the prospect of a reduction in Army National Guard end strength to 315,000 by 2019. This is unacceptable risk and it jeopardizes the Defense Strategic Guidance.

These fiscal challenges come at a time when we are faced with asymmetric threats and conventional threats from state and non-state actors, to include our physical environment.

As I close, I would like to leave you with a very simple but critical thought. The very core of the National Guard is our most important resource, our people who have volunteered to serve. The wellbeing of our soldiers, their families, and their employers remains a top priority of every leader throughout the Guard. We will continue to aggressively work to eliminate sexual assaults and suicides cross the force and maintain faith with our people, the very same people who put their faith in us.

Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, your National Guard is a combat-tested and proven hedge against uncertainty in this turbulent security and fiscal environment. Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today.

[The prepared statement of General Grass follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, General Grass.  
General Talley.

**STATEMENT OF LTG JEFFREY W. TALLEY, USAR, CHIEF OF  
THE ARMY RESERVE AND COMMANDING GENERAL OF THE  
U.S. ARMY RESERVE COMMAND**

General TALLEY. Chairman Levin, Ranking Member Inhofe, distinguished members of the committee: Thank you very much for the opportunity to appear before you today. It's an honor to represent America's Army Reserve, a lifesaving and life-sustaining Federal force for the Nation.

I would like to begin by thanking the committee for the steadfast support you have provided to all members of our armed forces and their families.

The Army Reserve is a community-based force of 205,000 soldiers, 12,900 civilians, living and operating in all 54 States and territories and 30 countries. We provide almost 20 percent of the total Army force structure for only 5.8 percent of the budget. That's a great return on investment, especially given the positive economic impact we make everywhere we are.

As the only component of the Army that is also a single command, we are embedded in every Army service component command and combatant command, and we currently have almost 20,000 soldiers serving around the globe, with 6,000 still in Afghanistan. We also provide a unique linkage to industry and America's private sector, as most of our troops are traditional reservists who work in technical careers in the civilian sector that directly correlate to what they do in the Army Reserve. In fact, most of the total Army's support and sustainment capabilities, such as our attorneys or legal support, chaplains, civil affairs, military history, logistics, information operations, postal and personnel, medical, our

doctors and our nurses, chemical, transportation, public affairs, full spectrum engineering, all of that are in the Army Reserve.

Because the majority of these soldiers are traditional Reserve soldiers, they keep their technical skills sharp at little or no cost to the Department of Defense. Currently, 74 percent of all the doctoral degrees and almost half of all the master's degrees in the total Army are held by Army Reserve soldiers.

I'd like to take a few minutes to share some stories that illustrate our unique capabilities and the dedication of our Army Reserve soldiers and families. On 8 November 2013, a typhoon struck the Republic of the Philippines. The Army Reserve has almost 4,000 soldiers permanently assigned throughout the Pacific and most of them are organized under the Ninth Mission Support Command, which is commanded by Brigadier General John Cardwell. I received a call the same day from John and also from General Vincent Brooks, who's the Commanding General for U.S. Army Pacific, about the crisis and the need for immediate assistance for the Philippines. I authorized and supported the immediate use of a Logistics Support Vessel stationed in Hawaii and within 48 hours we had 13 crew members, all traditional reservists, preparing to set sail.

I also called to active duty Major General Gary Beard, an Army Reserve individual mobilization augmentee serving in U.S. Army Pacific Command, who left immediately for the Philippines to assist in leading ground coordination support of PACCOM.

We conducted many more missions, but this illustrates the ability of the Army Reserve to respond and act quickly. We exercised that capability every day in service to requirements at home and abroad.

On 29 October 2012, Super Storm Sandy hit New York and New Jersey, resulting in immediate need for assistance. That day I authorized to active duty our emergency preparedness liaison officers—we call them EPLOs—for full-time support to the Federal Emergency Management Agency, or FEMA. EPLOs provide direct linkage to the DOD in time of crisis. Our EPLOs, supporting FEMA and linked to Army North and NORTHCOM, quickly identified military assistance requirements. Within 48 hours we had multiple units on active duty and en route to the East Coast to assist their fellow citizens.

Specifically, I had three dewatering and pump units providing relief—located at Breezy Point, where they executed dewatering missions and support to our citizens. In addition, we had two Chinook helicopter teams activated to provide support to the National Guard Joint Task Force headquarters.

These are just some of the examples of how the Army Reserve can immediately respond to assist Americans in need during a complex catastrophe. As the Commanding General for the United States Army Reserve Command, I have the authority to order immediate help when and where needed to assist our first responders, our police, and our firefighters, and our great State force, the Army and Air National Guards.

In the case of Super Storm Sandy, I ordered the troops to active duty via annual training for 29 days, which then gave us time to convert the orders over to 21304[a] mobilization orders, as re-

quested by General Jacoby, the NORTHCOM commander. The Army Reserve, as a dual mission force, can routinely provide this type of support to States in need, as authorized under the National Defense Act of 2012.

My last story is about an Army Reserve family, the Henshields. Don and Janet Henshield are like so many military families. They love their country and they're proud to have their most precious resource, our sons and daughters, serve in the military. What makes Don and Janet extra special in my opinion is the fact that they had three boys serve in combat in Iraq and Afghanistan, all as Army Reserve soldiers. They're names are Landon, Cody, and a son-in-law named Jacob. All three became wounded warriors. The wounds and experience of war were severe, in fact so severe that they would no longer be able to do what they wanted most, to serve as a soldier in the Army.

The many months of multiple surgeries and treatments, both physical and mental, took a tough toll on that family, especially when they found out that Landon, who was finally recovering from his war wounds, had developed cancer. Eventually Landon died. As Cody and Jacob continue to struggle with their own wounds and the grieving associated with losing Landon, my wife and I got to know this family well. In fact, my wife visited with them regularly during this entire tragic ordeal.

But this story has a happy ending. Normally what I've seen in similar circumstances is a family that hates the military. But not here. Don and Janet and the whole family appreciated the tremendous support the Army Reserve and our whole Army family gave them under the most difficult situation you could ever find yourself as a family. Their courage, their commitment to our Army and to the Nation, makes my contributions and those of so many others pale in comparison. Don and Janet represent to me the best of what it means to be American. I will miss Landon, especially our talks about my Jeep J-10 pickup, which is a classic, and Duck Dynasty—he liked that show—but he taught this soldier a lot about giving and a lot about dying.

In closing, since September 11, 2011, more than 275,000 Army Reserve soldiers have been mobilized. Like all Reserve components, we have become part of the operating force, and I'm sure we all agree that we must preserve that capability. Essential to this effort is the necessity to maintain our full-time support, which is currently authorized at 13 percent, the lowest of any service or component. The DOD average for the Reserve component is 19.4 percent full-time support.

In addition to increasing our full-time authorizations on parity with the DOD average, I urge your support on two very important legislative proposals that have been submitted to the committee on modifying the military technician program. These proposals allow for greater flexibility and upward mobility for our members in and out of uniform.

As you are aware, I have provided the committee a statement that outlines the challenges of the Army Reserve and some specific ways the committee and the Congress can assist us in keeping us viable and strong in service to others. I ask for your continued sup-

port for all of our services and components as we keep America secure and prosperous.

I look very much forward to your questions, twice a citizen and Army strong.

[The prepared statement of General Talley follows:]

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you so much, General Talley.

Let's have a 7-minute first round.

General Odierno, first, please pass along to the Fort Hood family, the Army family, the thoughts and the condolences of this committee if you would.

On the aviation restructure proposal, what I'd like to do is first call on you, General Grass, to outline the alternative that you've offered. Then I'm going to call on General Odierno to comment on that proposal. I think we have to get into this issue. It's one of the important issues that we are going to be struggling with. So, General Grass, could you outline the proposal which you offered to the Chiefs as an alternative to the one which they adopted?

General GRASS. Thank you, chairman. First let me say that over the past 12-plus years as we've deployed our aviation teams I've had an opportunity to visit some of those facilities, to visit the great men and women, and they are very thankful for the upgrades that we've received, almost \$900 million in upgrades over the years.

And they have fought hard, no doubt. A unit just returned from Missouri, my home State, many, many hours in combat. In fiscal year 2013 we actually attracted 45 active duty AH-64 pilots. I hope whatever the outcome is, we can continue to attract those active duty folks as they make that decision to go back into civilian life, but stay with us in the National Guard. You know, that 45 represented a savings of \$36 million to the Department of Defense by being able to bring them in. But something larger than that was the combat experience they brought to the Guard in addition to our warriors.

Sir, as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, we have fought and we have discussed many, many times these topics. I provided my best military advice. I have assessed the risk, I've given the cost, but the decision's been made, Mr. Chairman, and my job now is to begin to look at the effects across the States and figure how we're going to execute this plan.

Chairman LEVIN. Do you have any comment—I guess maybe specifically, let me ask you this about the \$12 billion in savings which will result from your proposal. About \$10 billion as I understand that comes from the Kiowa Warrior cancellation, in effect, of the upgrades. Is that true?

General ODIERNO. It is, in combination—yes and, in addition to that, the elimination of three complete combat aviation brigades out of the Active component. So it's a combination of eliminating all OH-58 Deltas and Alpha Charlies, as well as eliminating three complete aviation brigades out of the Active component.

That causes us to generate a savings that enables us to reinvest that savings back into training, back into modernizing the fleet that we have, and actually moving aircraft, some aircraft, from the active to the Reserve component in terms of UH-60s.

Chairman LEVIN. Could you give us for the record the portion of the \$12 billion that is in the budget before us, the authorization bill before us? In other words, how much of that \$12 billion in savings is actually part of, counted on, in the 2015?

General ODIERNO. All of it, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Pardon?

General ODIERNO. All of it.

Chairman LEVIN. All the 12?

General ODIERNO. Not in 2015, now.

Chairman LEVIN. No, no. I mean—

General ODIERNO. That's across the total FYDP.

Chairman LEVIN. Right. If you could break it down year by year for us?

General ODIERNO. Well, in 2015 it's approximately about \$2 billion in 2015.

Chairman LEVIN. If you could give us for the record how that's broken down, that would be helpful.

General ODIERNO. I will.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Chairman LEVIN. As I understand—well, your testimony, General Odierno, was clear in terms of whether or not we should have a committee appointed, basically, the proposal that there be a commission. I'm wondering if our other two witnesses would comment on that proposal. General Grass, then General Talley? General Odierno has already indicated his opposition to that proposal. What is the Guard's view of it?

General GRASS. Chairman, a year and a half ago when I stepped into this job we were faced with similar challenges, but different in some ways, but still similar, as the Air Force struggled with the 2013 budget. At that point, General Welsh and I, both coming on new into the jobs, we committed to working together and try to find a solution, what was best for the total Air Force and for the Nation.

General Welsh set on a path and we included in his committee, in his team effort, an Air National Guardsman, he included an active National Guard and a Reserve, Air Reserve Guardsman in that team, which helped set the path. What I would tell you that that team came up with was about half of the solutions that the committee had proposed when they made their announcement in February.

I would tell you since then the information we've received from that committee has been very helpful, and we're continuing to look at it, its recommendations. And as we look to 2023 and with the fiscal realities we're facing, who would not want an independent look? This committee is going to have to help us through this. I would think you would want an independent look as well.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

General TALLEY..

General TALLEY. Mr. Chairman, thank you for the question. To be frank, it's not clear to me today why we need a commission. I understand about the bill that's been introduced, but I think the Army, Active, Guard, and Reserve, working through the Congress, can lead through these challenging times. If a commission were to

be established, as directed by the Congress, I think obviously, to echo what General Grass has said, we've got to make sure that those members truly understand and represent the different components.

The final comment I would make is it's very important to me to caution anybody from applying Army Reserve conclusions from commissions of other services. I'm thinking specifically of the recent report from the Air Force commission. There were some interesting recommendations that came out of that that I'm concerned could affect the U.S. Army Reserve Command.

Thank you, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. My final question is to General Odierno. Is it correct that Acting Deputy Secretary of Defense Christine Fox tasked the Office of Cost Assessment and Program Evaluation to conduct its own independent assessment of the Army force mix options, including aviation and restructure issues? Did they—I understand that the CAPE analysis agreed with the Army's assessment as reflected in the budget request.

First of all, is that true, very quickly if you can give us a yes or no to it? If not, give us a more accurate or complex answer. But also, can you tell us whether or not that—the results of that analysis were shared with the Council of Governors?

General ODIERNO. Chairman, yes, they did an independent assessment; and yes, it was shared with the Council of Governors, the assessment that they did.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Senator INHOFE.

Senator INHOFE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I want to get back to the end strength question. This would be for General Grass and General Talley. By the end of fiscal year 2015, the Army end strength will be 450,000 active, 335,000 Guard, and 195 reservists. In General Odierno's statement in talking about force levels he said, quote: "The Army will be able to execute the 2012 Defense Strategic Guidance at this size and component mix, but at significant risk."

The two of you, do you agree with his statement? Does that represent your feelings of your services?

General GRASS. Senator, yes. At the 335 force structure level—and that is not consistent with what the governors and adjutants general have asked for. We've actually asked for a higher end strength. But at the 335, yes, we could.

Senator INHOFE. You could do it, but at significant risk?

General GRASS. Significant risk.

Senator INHOFE. Do you agree with that, General Talley?

General TALLEY. Yes, Senator.

Senator INHOFE. All right. For all three of you: Without a long-term solution to sequestration—let's assume the worst happens—the Army end strength would then be 420, the National Guard 315, and the Reserves 185. At the Army posture hearing last week, General Odierno said at 420,000 end strength sequestration levels the Army could not execute the Defense Strategic Guidance.

Does this hold true for the Reserves and the Guard?

General GRASS. Senator, yes, it does.

General TALLEY. Yes, Senator.

Senator INHOFE. General Odierno, at the January 7th at the National Press Club event you said—and this is a quote: “So first is the Army. For many years now, its structured to be complementary, and what I mean by that is you have an Active component that has a certain capability, you have a National Guard that has a certain capability, and you have a U.S. Army Reserve that has a certain capability. The capabilities are not interchangeable.”

Then, General Grass, two days later at the same forum you said: “So, however the Army looks or however the Air Force looks, we’ve got to be interchangeable. We’ll never be identical to them. They’re not going to be, and we’re not going to try. And they will never be identical to us because of that homeland mission, where we roll out the gate. But we’ve got to be complementary to each other.”

It appears that you agree that active and Reserve Forces must be complementary, but you don’t agree on the interchangeable. I’d like to ask why that would be. Let’s start with you, General Odierno.

General ODIERNO. Thank you, Senator. First, it has to do with a combination of things. You know, when I look at the force I look at readiness, I look at responsiveness, I look at all kinds of things. The bottom line is, because of the Active component being collocated, being—having ranges and air ranges and ground ranges readily available to them on a daily basis, they’re able to sustain a significant higher readiness rate. They’re more capable, they’re more responsive. So they provide us a capability that the National Guard will not.

But with time, with mobilization time, with post-mobilization training, then the National Guard can provide us that capability. But it is not the same capability. They are not interchangeable. They are complementary to each other. The Active component provides the initial force, no notice, capable of responding, especially for the more complex organizations.

For less complex organizations, actually they’re closer to being interchangeable, for example a maintenance unit or transportation unit. Where it becomes difficult is when you require a significant amount of collective training, which is brigade combat teams, aviation units, etcetera. That’s where the not completely complementary—I mean, not completely interchangeable; they’re complementary.

Senator INHOFE. General Grass, two days later you made your statement.

General GRASS. Senator, I’ve made three trips since I’ve been in this job overseas, and every time I hear the same thing, that the commanders on the ground, and it doesn’t make any difference which service or which country in some places they’re supporting, they tell me they can’t tell the difference.

Senator INHOFE. So this is a disagreement between the two of you, is that right?

General ODIERNO. It is.

Senator INHOFE. All right, that’s fine. That’s fine. When you see statements like that, we need clarification up here around this table.

For all three of you: What I’ve heard in testimony and in the press recently is the National Guard can provide combat troops at

a fraction of the cost of the regular Army. We constantly hear cost as the compelling argument for retaining National Guard end strength and there are models that can prove that assertion.

Now, these factors I'm sure played a major factor in the Army's, in the Department's, planning for component size and mix. However, cost is only one of many factors to consider in deciding Army force mix. Equally if not more important are other factors, such as readiness and demand, that should be used in determining the mix.

So I'd like to hear from each of you as to what should be the critical factors in determining the appropriate size and mix of the Army and of our Reserve component?

General ODIERNO. Senator, first a couple. We look at flexibility and agility. We look at readiness levels. We look at responsiveness. We look at current operational commitments. We look at future requirements and we look at cost. Those are the things that we take a look at. And I would say in the proposal that we have provided based on that, that's why we're taking 70 percent of the total reductions out of the Active component. That gets after the cost factor.

However, in order to sustain flexibility, agility, readiness, and responsiveness, we have to sustain a level of Active component structure. We've taken—with sequestration, we take 150,000 soldiers out of the Active component. That is a significant reduction, 46 percent reduction in brigade combat teams. We're removing three complete aviation brigades. So we're taking a significant amount out of the Active component, which is directly related to the cost factor.

I cannot go any lower. In order to meet our budget requirements, we had to take a smaller portion out of the National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve, understanding that they do cost less. So that's why we took a much smaller reduction out of the National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve.

Senator INHOFE. And I appreciate that, and that's the reason I asked the question. It appears to me that everything nowadays is budget-driven.

What do you think about the cost factor? Do you agree with General Odierno?

General GRASS. Senator, there's a tough issue that always comes up every year, and it's what is the right mix between Active component—and for the Guard that starts with understanding what is the requirement the Nation is asking us to do and how much time do we have to get ready to go? Then we can determine what readiness levels our Guard needs to be at. For those in the homeland, though, they have to be ready all the time at some level.

Senator INHOFE. Do you agree, General Talley?

General TALLEY. Sir, I do agree with General Odierno's assessment. For me it's about performance, cost, and risk. Performance is about effectiveness. You've got to be effective. Cost is you want to, obviously, be efficient, but you can't just look at it as a money drill. You've got to be effective and efficient, so you've got to balance that risk, low or high risk, which is why, as General Odierno described, in our Active component we've got to have those combat formations ready to go. It's a little easier for me to have combat support and service support in the Army Reserve provide that support to the Active component or to the National Guard.



Senator INHOFE. My time is expired, but I'm glad you brought up the risk factor. Risk means lives and I think we all need to understand it. We do understand it.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Inhofe.

Senator REED.

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

General Odierno, we understand Active Forces are in various levels of readiness, with I presume still the 82nd being the lead division in terms of hours in getting units out the door. But are you prepared to order any of your Active Forces into a combat situation virtually immediately, given transportation and all the other issues aside, because of their readiness?

General ODIERNO. Right now, as I have publicly said before, is that we are building readiness right now. Because of the sequestration and how it's been executed, our readiness is lower than normally it would be. By the end of this summer, we plan on having about 14 to 16 brigades ready, so we would be prepared to immediately send them as soon as they were noticed, and including the combat support-combat service support structure that would go with that.

Senator REED. General Grass, let's move forward to the end of the summer. Would you be prepared to send one of your National Guard brigades into combat without any training, immediately into combat?

General GRASS. Senator, no.

Senator REED. Thank you. So there is a difference between Active Forces and National Guard Forces in terms of national security and the ability to respond quickly. As I sense, and the point you're trying to make, General, as the Active Force gets smaller, the ability to project these forces immediately becomes more critical; is that correct?

General ODIERNO. It is. It's almost—the smaller we get, the more ready we have to be, both in the Active component and in the National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve.

Senator REED. One of the other issues here which is critical, too, is that—my observation has been that our National Guard when they're deployed, our Reserves when they're deployed, it's one Army. There is no difference. And the skill level, ironically, is sometimes higher in the Reserves and National Guard because pilots, for example, they've been flying the same platform for 20 years, and in the Army you move around.

But the issue also is the unit you deploy. The typical deployment unit is a brigade, and your brigades—you train at the brigade level, I assume, General Odierno, is that correct?

General ODIERNO. We do, Senator. We train at the battalion and brigade level. The advantage we have is at our installations, whether it be Bliss, Bragg, Carson, pick an installation, they have the air space, they have the ground capability, they have the—they're collocated with all the aviation, their ground forces, their support. So they can train at a battalion, brigade, and even division level if necessary, where in the Guard we can't until we deploy them to a CTC. That's the difference. We just have the resources and capability to do it. But if they had those they could do it as

well. But they don't have the time or the large installations to do that.

Senator REED. General Grass, essentially, again my recollection is that Guard units are extremely capable. In fact, as I would suggest, some of the individual Guardsmen have more skills than some Active Forces because of their experience. But typically the training level and the training test of the year is at the platoon and company level; is that fair?

General GRASS. Yes, Senator.

Senator REED. Yes, it is. Well, I don't want to cut you off.

General GRASS. With the projections that we have right now for fiscal year 2015, we'll have to drop that level. We won't have the funding. Then we will also lose two of our rotations to the Combat Training Center.

Senator REED. That is one of the—again, that's something that we all have to reflect upon in terms of the costs, as Senator Inhofe pointed out, of the sequestration impact. But typically how often does one of your brigades assemble and go to a training center?

General GRASS. Senator, before the war started we had 15 brigades that were held at a higher state of readiness. They were given more resources. Of our 32 brigades at that time, we eventually came down to 28. But of those 15 that received greater resources, they got a chance about one in every seven or one in every eight, depending on whether they were light or heavy.

The real value, though, of the Combat Training Center is not just the rotation. The rotation will ratchet it up to whatever level you want to go in there at. It's a premier—there's nothing like it in the world. The real value is when you step up and you sign up for that rotation, even at the squad and individual crew level, you begin to focus at that brigade operational level.

Senator REED. General Odierno, what's the impact on your rotations at the National Training Center, given the budget?

General ODIERNO. Last year we had to cancel eight rotations to the National Training Center. So we're in catch-up mode this year. We're going to be able to do a full complement in 2014 and 2015. So this year we have all Active components and one National Guard brigade. In 2015 we have two National Guard brigades and the rest Active component going through. That's because we're in catch-up mode and we're trying to catch up on readiness. Our worry is in 2016 it goes down again.

Senator REED. But this goes back to the point that the force, the smaller force you're building, Active Force, has to be able to go out the door almost immediately. That means that you have to catch up with your VCTs going through the National Training Center, and then you have to, as General Grassley just said, keep adding each year additional National Guard brigades.

General ODIERNO. That's exactly right, Senator.

Senator REED. But a National Guard brigade, even if we get back to the pre-this budget and this sequestration, it was about an average of once every seven years a brigade would go through; is that correct, General Grass?

General GRASS. Senator, I didn't hear.

Senator REED. If we went back to pre-sequestration, it was about once every seven years—

General GRASS. Yes.

Senator REED.—that a typical brigade would go through?

General GRASS. It was one in seven or one in eight, depending on whether you were a light or a heavy.

General ODIERNO. The only other point I'd make, Senator—excuse me—would be the other thing that happens, you're not done when you finish a CTC rotation. So when an active unit finishes, they go back to home station and they continue to train on the lessons they learned at the CTC. So there's just a good advantage in terms of the readiness levels.

With the Guard, we try to do the same thing. What it does, it helps them then to develop their training plans that follows. But it just takes them a longer period of time in executing because of the limitations that they have.

Senator REED. Just a final point. You might take it for questions for both you, General Odierno, and General Grass. This issue of the Apaches versus Black Hawks. One of the key things that an Apache crew has to do is fire their weapons frequently. There are door gunners on Black Hawks, but a different sort of platform. My sense—again, please correct me if I'm wrong—is that access to ranges for regular forces are much easier. They're right on post. Whereas access to National Guard units, it's challenging. You have to get the aircraft or use other aircraft. Is that fair?

General ODIERNO. It is. The other piece I would argue, it's the collective training aspect, integrating the aviation.

Senator REED. The one point I think, because it's one thing going down the range, which I couldn't do, and hit anything flying a helicopter, but you also have to work with ground troops on a constant basis, so that they're comfortable and you're comfortable. Is that another fair assessment?

General ODIERNO. That is.

Senator REED. Thank you very much, gentlemen.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Reed.

Senator FISCHER.

Senator FISCHER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Odierno, if we return to the sequestration level budgets, what effect will that have on the ARI? And do you think it's going to force major changes with these plans, that they're all going to have to be rethought?

General ODIERNO. No, ARI we can—ARI is built—it's something we have to do and we will do it. If it goes to sequestration, the current ARI proposal will remain the same.

Senator FISCHER. Can you elaborate on that for me?

General ODIERNO. Sure. What that means is on ARI we are going to eliminate all OH-58 Deltas, which are scout helicopters. We're going to eliminate the Alpha-Charlies, which are the older model of the scout helicopter. We are going to get rid of our TH-67 single-engine training aircraft that are at Fort Rucker. We are going to eliminate three combat aviation brigades out of the Active component completely. We have 13; we're going to go to 10.

In the National Guard, they will maintain 10 brigades, but we will reduce—we will take all the Apaches and move it into the Active component, to replace the OH-58 Deltas that are being removed, so we have 10 complete brigades. We will move 111 UH-

60s from the Active component, from the 3 inactivating brigades, to the U.S. National Guard and to the Army Reserve.

We will also—the other thing we did is initially we were going to take 100 LUHs out of the Congress. We are now going to keep every one of those into the National Guard. We will take all the LUH's out of the Active component and put that in the training base in order for them to train all of the pilots from the National Guard, Reserves, and the Active component.

Senator FISCHER. Will you be deactivating some of these brigades?

General ODIERNO. We will deactivate three combat aviation brigades in the Active component.

Senator FISCHER. General Grass, do you have anything to add to that?

General GRASS. Senator, first let me say that the Lakota aircraft, we're fielding 212 in the National Guard. We have used them extensively already in the homeland and actually have deployed some to Germany for rotation. So I thank the committee and others that fielded those and had the vision years ago to change out from our old UH-1's many years ago.

But on the overall, none of us like what we have to do. I'm sure General Odierno would tell you the same thing. None of us like what we're having to do. My big concern right now is trying to figure out how I'm going to move and how many States I'll have an impact on and what's the cost to facilities and to retrain pilots. I've got to tackle that because the decision's been made.

Senator FISCHER. General Talley, do you have anything to add to that as well?

General TALLEY. Yes, Senator. The Army Reserve has two Apache battalions. We're swapping out two Apache battalions for two assault battalions to give us lift capability, since we're predominantly combat support and service support. It's actually better suited for us. So we're very pleased with the restructuring initiative as it relates to the Army Reserve.

Senator FISCHER. General Grass, you mentioned you have to look at how many States are going to be affected by this. Do you have any idea right now how many?

General GRASS. Senator, if you take the Kiowa Warriors that Tennessee flies and then we have 9 States that fly the Apache today, that's 10 States. Then when you take the maintenance units, we're estimating right now—and this is just an estimate—probably about 22 States in the total shuffle to move aircraft around and people and to re-gear up facilities to handle a different type of aircraft.

Senator FISCHER. You mentioned facilities and installations, the requirements there. Specifically, do you know how many States would be affected by that, the changes that are going to require costs?

General GRASS. Senator, we don't have that analysis yet, but I can get that to you as soon as we've done the analysis.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator FISCHER. General Odierno, do you have any idea on the cost analysis on the facilities and installations that are going to be

affected? Any time you make changes, it's going to add to costs. Do you have any idea?

General ODIERNO. That has been part of—I can't give you the specific numbers. I will give those to you.

Senator FISCHER. Thank you.

General ODIERNO. But that has been incorporated into all our analysis.

[The information referred to follows:]

[COMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator FISCHER. And do you think you're going to be satisfied that everything's been considered up to this point?

General ODIERNO. I think we've done extensive work on this for over a year and I'm confident that we have captured most. I will never say that we've captured everything, but we will continue to look at it and make sure we do, to ensure that we understand all the costs.

Senator FISCHER. General Odierno, I understand the reasoning behind moving all the Apaches into active duty is so that they're ready now. You had talked before that the active duty has—it's the initial force. There's no notice, so we can handle anything that happens. Do we have the logistical capability to deploy that many helicopters immediately?

General ODIERNO. Actually, in terms of Apaches specifically, we're reducing from 37 battalions of OH-58s and Apaches to 20. So we have the capability. That's one of the reasons. We're reducing almost 50 percent of the attack aviation capability in the active Army, even with the movement of the aircraft from the National Guard. So we have the infrastructure, we have the maintenance to sustain all these. We have less aircraft in the end, significantly less aircraft. So we have the ability to do that.

Senator FISCHER. And you're looking then at making personnel cuts to those operations because of the decrease then in the aircraft?

General ODIERNO. We will have to—we will offer—some will have to, they will retrain. Others, we're reducing the numbers of people, so we will have to take people out of the Active component who are working in some of these areas.

Senator FISCHER. Thank you.

General Grass, how's the National Guard going to implement the changes that are required under the aviation plan? It's my understanding it's not going to be an even swap, is it, between the Apaches and the Black Hawks?

General GRASS. Senator, no, no, it will not. Part of it is taking Lima model modernized Black Hawks and replacing some of our older, more expensive to fly Alpha models. It'll also require some reductions in full-time manning as we adjust the numbers downward.

Senator FISCHER. How's the Guard going to do that? If we don't authorize a BRAC process, how are you going to do it just through the budget?

General GRASS. Senator, first of all, identifying those States—and this is much larger than just the Apache discussion, especially as we look down the road. It's brigades. It will affect just about

every jurisdiction in the United States when we look at this to get down to the 315 number some day that we face.

So we're trying to manage that now. Actually, by May we have to load in the 2017 force structure into the Army's total analysis program so that we can start building that structure now. It gets pretty serious. The States have been told what the cuts are. They don't agree with them. They're trying to offer countermeasures of what structure they might trade.

Senator FISCHER. Do you believe we even will have to have a BRAC process? Don't you think we'll be forced to do a lot of this just through budget?

General GRASS. Senator, I don't know how we're going to be able to maintain—I mentioned before our armories are 44 years old at the average. I don't know how we're going to be able to maintain these facilities and not have them start falling down if we don't close something, as structure goes away.

Senator FISCHER. And can that happen through a budget process?

General GRASS. Yes, ma'am.

Senator FISCHER. Thank you, sir.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Fischer.

Senator UDALL.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good morning, gentlemen. Thank you for your service. Thank you for being here to share your important perspectives on this issue. I would be remiss if I didn't both talk about more broadly the tremendous courage and commitment, dedication that the Army's demonstrated under your leadership.

I would also like to just comment specifically about Colorado. We're the proud home of tens of thousands of Active Duty Reserve and National Guard soldiers. We've watched with awe as they've answered our Nation's call time and again.

Last week, General Odierno, we talked a little about what's happening in Colorado the last couple years. We've had the worst wildfires and flooding in our State's history, and it was the Army that came to our rescue. Active Duty and National Guard soldiers fought the flames, rescued our citizens from rising flood waters, and saved countless homes. Then when it was over they've been helping us rebuild our State.

Then at the same time, you've got thousands of soldiers from Fort Carson, CO, reservists and national guardsmen, who are doing heroic work overseas, just as they have done since September 11.

My point of view is that we need our Army to be able to perform all of those roles with the same skill and honor and courage that they've demonstrated over the last decade. No one doubts the value of the Guard or questions the incredible service of our citizen soldiers. But we need to ensure that our total force remains well trained, well equipped, and ready. It's not about the active duty or the Guard; it's about our Army. That's why it's so important that we get this decision right.

In that spirit, I know it's been addressed I think early in the hearing, but I want to make sure I've got it and we do have it

right. So, General Odierno, let me direct a comment and a question to you. Some of my colleagues in Congress are considering legislation that would establish an independent commission to examine the total Army's force structure. As I understand it, the proposal would freeze National Guard troop and equipment levels pending the release of the commission's findings.

Would you describe the effect such a freeze would have on the total force, considering that similar studies have taken I think up to two years to complete?

General ODIERNO. I would, Senator. We estimate that if it was delayed it would cost us \$1 billion a year. The problem with that is, I've already submitted a \$10.7 billion UFR for 2015. So this would be another billion dollars. So what that means, it directly comes out of readiness. There's no other place for it to come out of if this is not done. So if it's delayed two years it would be \$2 billion, \$1 billion a year of savings that we have already forecast. So that would increase the UFR's.

Again, my other concern is then it would exacerbate our already problematic readiness levels in all three components.

Senator UDALL. So if you put it plainly—

Chairman LEVIN. A "UFR" is an Unfunded Requirement?

General ODIERNO. An Unfunded Requirement, yes, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Sorry.

Senator UDALL. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So to put it plainly, if the current plan is blocked or delayed, would additional active duty Army brigades be at risk of deactivation?

General ODIERNO. It wouldn't be immediately. It would not be immediately. But readiness and training would be. If it's not executed—if they don't execute our plan over the long term, then by 2019 it will result in additional active units coming out. And it would be up to somewhere between 20 and 30,000 additional soldiers that would have to come out if ARI is not implemented.

Senator UDALL. General Grass, let me turn to you. How have the AH-64s been used to support homeland defense and civil support missions? Let me give you an example. In Colorado we've benefited greatly from having National Guard Black Hawks available to perform SAR, search and rescue, missions, evacuate flood victims, drop water on wildfires, even deliver hay to cattle stranded by blizzards.

Have Apaches ever been used for those purposes, and wouldn't it make sense to have those utility aircraft available to governors for in-State missions?

General GRASS. Senator, if you would allow me first to congratulate your folks from the Colorado Army and Air National Guard. I had a chance to visit during the floods and that was the third disaster in 18 months. I also had a chance to go up afterwards and have an opportunity to see Colorado, Wyoming, Kansas, and Utah repair the road between Lyons and Estes Park in record time.

Senator UDALL. Yes.

General GRASS. Senator, to answer your question, there is one time when the Columbia disaster occurred, the Columbia Space Shuttle, that an Apache was used under the direction of NASA to locate hot spots out across the lands of Louisiana, Mississippi,

Texas, mainly Mississippi—I mean, Texas and Louisiana. But the main mission of those Apaches is to support, to be the combat Reserve of the Army.

Senator UDALL. General, thank you for the work you did. It was uplifting to have all those Guard units from all the surrounding States. As you know, that road was due to be completed a month or 2 after it actually was finished and put back into operation. It was quite a moment for everybody, and it showed when we work together, private sector, government sector, we can really do remarkable things. So thanks again for the involvement there.

General Odierno, if I could come back to this attack aircraft question. Will moving the attack aircraft to the Active component relegate the Reserve component to a support role rather than a combat role? Is there any intent by the Army or the DOD leadership to return the National Guard to a lower tier status? After your comment, General Grass, I'd like your comment.

General ODIERNO. No, and in fact the reason we are recommending aircraft moving is actually to increase readiness, increase their capability. UH-60s have flown more combat hours in Iraq and Afghanistan than any other aircraft by far. It's the centerpiece of everything that we do. So their need for combat operations will continue because it's the centerpiece.

The other piece I would say is that it will also allow us the ability to reinvest in the readiness of the National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve. It'll free up dollars so they can sustain the readiness to in my opinion to be closer to a full operational Reserve, which is what we all want.

Senator UDALL. General Grass, would you care to comment?

General GRASS. Senator, I've received letters from the governors as well as the adjutants general on the very issue you bring up. There's a concern. They want to stay as a member, as a combat Reserve of the Army and the Air Force. So it is a concern of theirs.

Senator UDALL. Thank you.

General Odierno, can you describe the process by which the force structure plan was designed, reviewed, and approved? For example, were all of the Joint Chiefs included in the process before the budget was finalized?

General ODIERNO. This has been a 14-month process, where we had meetings that were attended by all the Joint Chiefs, all the combatant commanders, all the service secretaries, all leaders in the Secretary of Defense. We had multiple meetings, multiple iterations of this, where we looked at all different types of courses of action. That has been going on. It went on for a very long period of time.

Senator UDALL. I believe you believe the plan is in the best interests of the military and the U.S.'s national security?

General ODIERNO. I do, Senator. These are tough choices, and I want to make it clear. The Army needs a ready National Guard, we need a ready Army Reserve, but these are necessary. That's why, again, we took the majority of the cuts from the Active component, because we recognize that. We think this is the best total Army package for the dollars that we have been allocated.

Senator UDALL. Thank you for that.



Thanks again, gentlemen. I look at the three of you and I see the Army. Thank you for being here.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Udall.

Senator McCain.

Senator McCAIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Odierno, last week when you were here you stated that the world was more—the security situation in the world was more unpredictable than at any time you'd ever seen it in your career. But you also stated, in answer to questions, that we are in danger of or possibly have reached a point or are reaching a point of a hollow Army. Would you elaborate on that, especially in light of our ability to respond to contingencies, since the world is more unpredictable in your view?

General ODIERNO. The problem we have, Senator, is because of the significance of the sequestration cuts that we've taken and will take again in 2016, it will directly impact readiness, because it would force us to take out significant force structure, which we can't do fast enough. So our readiness levels for the next three or four years will be lower, and it'll impact our ability to deploy ready forces. We will still deploy forces, but they will not be as ready as we would like them to be.

It will take us up until fiscal year 2019 to even begin to rebuild the Army as we're used to seeing it, which is an Army that is ready to go across all three of its components in the appropriate time frames that we've defined for each component.

So we are moving towards a hollow force for the next several years. We're doing everything we can to keep that from happening. In the end, in 2019 the other part we have, even if we fully execute our plan, we'll have a ready force, but it'll be much smaller. Then you start thinking about what's the deterrent capability of that force.

Senator McCAIN. How much difference does it make if we are able to give you relief from a renewed sequestration after this two-year hiatus? What difference would that make to you?

General ODIERNO. That will enable—depending on how, what the relief is, it will definitely impact—

Senator McCAIN. Say we gave it, just did away with it as far as the defense side is concerned.

General ODIERNO. That would allow us to keep more end strength. That would allow—in all components. That would allow us—and I think what we're thinking about would be the 450, 335, 195 level. It would allow us to sustain ourselves at a higher level. It would also allow us to start reinvesting in our modernization, which we've had to cut significantly as well.

Senator McCAIN. Would it give you some change in your opinion about the approaching hollow force situation?

General ODIERNO. Significant difference, because in order to keep out of the hollow force you need sustained funding over a long period of time. That would allow us that sustained funding that would enable us to sustain our readiness.

Senator McCAIN. I'm not trying to put words in your mouth because you've been very candid with this committee. But this really is the difference between your confidence in maintaining the security of this Nation, as you have opined and I agree, the most unpre-

dictable period in recent history, and not being able to maintain an ability to respond, since Secretary Gates said, and I quote—I think he said it before this committee. He said: “In the 40 years since Vietnam, we have a perfect record in predicting where we will use military force next. We’ve never once gotten it right. If you think about it, from Grenada to Haiti to Somalia to Panama to Iraq twice, to Afghanistan, to Libya twice, the Balkans and so on, not one of these cases did we have any hints six months ahead of the start of hostilities that we were going to have military forces in those places.”

You agree with that, obviously?

General ODIERNO. I do, Senator.

Senator MCCAIN. So again, I’m not trying to put words in your mouth, but do you share my opinion that we are literally putting our National security at some risk if we continue sequestration as it is presently programmed to be?

General ODIERNO. I believe across the joint force, not only the Army but the entire joint force, it puts it at risk. The last comment I would make is it also puts our young men and women at much higher risk when we use them if we don’t have the money necessary. That’s also a deep concern of mine.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, I just hope that every member of Congress can hear those words of yours, General Odierno, because I continue to be puzzled and deeply disappointed that colleagues on both sides of the aisle don’t realize the danger that we’re putting our National security in.

General, would you agree that the A-10 is probably the best close air support mission-capable aircraft ever?

General ODIERNO. The A-10 was built to be a close air support aircraft. It’s provided support, has the guns, has the maneuverability, it has the visibility that’s important to provide close air support for our soldiers.

Senator MCCAIN. Do you believe that there is right now an adequate replacement for it?

General ODIERNO. Well, that’s a difficult—there’s not the same replacement for it. I will say that. But they have provided close air support with other platforms in Afghanistan successfully. So they have proven that they can do it in other ways. Obviously, we prefer the A-10.

Senator MCCAIN. I think it depends on what kind of conflict you’re talking about, doesn’t it?

General ODIERNO. It does. Each conflict is very different and the capabilities that you might need will be very different.

Senator MCCAIN. But I’m not sure you could substitute a helicopter for an A-10.

General ODIERNO. You cannot. It is not the same. You cannot. It’s a different capability.

Senator MCCAIN. And an F-35 is cost prohibitive, wouldn’t you agree?

General ODIERNO. Well, the F-35—and it’ll be a while before we get that, so again there’s a vulnerability period that I worry about.

Senator MCCAIN. But also cost. I believe the A-10 is about \$15 million and the F-35, God only knows what it will cost by then. It just doesn’t make sense to replace the perfectly capable aircraft

with a much, far, far more, by a factor of 10, aircraft to replace it, which would probably have not any greater capability. Would you agree with that?

General ODIERNO. Senator, what I would say is the A-10 has performed very—I probably don't know enough about the F-35 to comment on that. But what I will say, the A-10 has performed well. Close air support is an important mission to our ground forces. We are working with the Air Force to come up with new solutions as we move away from the A-10 if that's what the decision is.

Senator MCCAIN. Well, the reason why I'm pressing you on this is because unnamed, quote, "administration officials" continue to say there'll be no more land wars, which then if you accept that means that you really don't need an A-10. But as Secretary Gates said, in the last 40 years we have never anticipated one of the conflicts that arose. And to then eliminate the A-10 with some future capability it seems to me is a roll of the dice.

I don't ask you to respond to that because I don't want to get you in any more trouble than I usually do.

I thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator McCain.

Senator MANCHIN.

Senator MANCHIN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all again for being before us. I want to thank General Odierno for coming back. He was just here last week. And General Grass and also General Talley, good meeting you in the office. I appreciate your coming.

Just a few questions. I know there's a big difference, a little bit of a big difference, or in my mind a difference, between the roles of the Guard and the roles of the Army and the Reserves. With that, and I think the Apache kind of shows there's a difference of approach of how we do this.

I was looking at the \$40 million plus of difference between a battalion of Guard and a battalion of the Army operating the same aircraft. With that being said, I think, General Odierno, you gave us a complete list of where you—the savings and what it was about, the \$12 billion.

We're talking about operational and strategic, what role the Guard's going to play. If that's the case, the Guard today is a different Guard than what we had before, General Grass. I've got to be honest with both of you. I observed—in my former role as Governor of West Virginia, I worked very closely with the Guard, as you know, the Army Guard and the Air Force Guard. I saw and I still see a better connect between the Air Force Guard and the Air Force than I do the Army Guard and the Army. I'm thinking hopefully you can work through that, or if you're moving closer to working in more of a succinct pattern.

Can you give me some examples of areas where you think you are working closer together?

General GRASS. Senator, first I want to applaud U.S. Army Forces Command, General Dan Allen, who has reached out to our States and our units and he's working very closely with the adjutants general. I've received some very, very positive comments back

where he's aligning active divisions with some of our brigades and our divisions.

I'll give you an example. The 86th Brigade out of Vermont is going to do a rotation this summer at the Joint Readiness Training Center at Fort Polk. The Tenth Mountain Division, who they're aligned with, is going to provide them some additional military intelligence support. What we had hoped is later on when the Tenth Mountain goes through their warfighter we'll be able to take some folks out of the 86th Brigade.

I saw this work so well before, really before 9-11, as our forces were deploying to Bosnia and we did rotations and we were aligned with the active corps, and our divisions aligned very well with them.

Senator MANCHIN. Do you have any?

General ODIERNO. Well, Senator, for 13 years we've worked very closely together, closer than any other service probably in the history of this country, active and Guard. So I kind of reject your thought there, because we've been very close. We've worked, we've trained together, we've fought together. So in my mind we're close.

This is like a family spat here. We're arguing over a little bit of resources. I'm here speaking for all three components. I'm the only one under Title 10 who's responsible for ensuring that a total Army is here. I want you to know, I am dedicated to that. I am absolutely dedicated to make sure that we have the right Guard, the right active, and the right Reserve. It is critical to our future.

This is about our future, and what I'm trying to do is with the dollars allocated come up with the best answer for the future of the Army. As was said, FORCECOM has an extensive total force policy. The Secretary of the Army has an extensive total force policy. So I'm comfortable with that. Again, this is a spat about resources. Let's not interpret that as not close relations between the Guard, because there's significant close relationships between the Guard, active, and U.S. Army Reserve throughout our Army, sir.

Senator MANCHIN. With all that being said, and we're talking about money, and it comes down to the bottom line.

General ODIERNO. Right.

Senator MANCHIN. Last year Congress learned that the Army accumulated \$900 million worth of Stryker vehicle repair parts, many of which were unneeded or obsolete. This year the Army effectively cancelled the Ground Combat Vehicle after investing almost \$1 billion in the program. This is in the reports that—I'm sure you see the same reports.

My point is that perhaps if we focus more closely on some of the waste and things of that sort, maybe we wouldn't be having our so-called "family spat."

General ODIERNO. Senator, I would argue if we got predictable budgets we wouldn't have to do that. That \$1 billion cut in GCV is because we have unpredictable budgets and we have sequestration. That was not originally part of the plan.

Senator MANCHIN. How about the Stryker parts and all that?

General ODIERNO. Well, Stryker parts, I'd have to look more into that. That was in Afghanistan. I'll take a look at that. I think you're right, I think there are some efficiencies that we should gain.

Senator MANCHIN. The thing I was concerned about is training to the lowest tier. If there's going to be cutbacks in the training that the Guard and the Reserves do, is that going to put you in a different tier as far as readiness? General Grass, do you have concerns of that?

General GRASS. Yes, sir, I do, and it will, especially as we look out beyond, 2016 and beyond. It's going to have an impact in 2015, but 2016 and beyond it gets worse. I think General Odierno would agree that the training seats are going to begin to disappear. We're already seeing some of that in some of our aviation seats, as well as schools that will be available starting in 2015.

Senator MANCHIN. That would almost immediately put you in the strategic reserve, right?

General GRASS. Senator, we've had such great support over the years with the deployment of 760,000. Probably 46 percent right now of our Guard is combat veterans. So our leadership is strong. But over a few years I think we would definitely see a loss.

Senator MANCHIN. General Talley, do you have a concern?

General TALLEY. Senator, I think the concern affects all three components of our Army, as our ability to have OPTEMPO money is going to draw down because of the effects of sequestration if that's not reversed. All three components are going to have less ability to be ready.

In the Army Reserve right now, if we execute all the individual training tasks that we're supposed to execute, it eats up about 34 days of our 39 training days that we're authorized. So we rely on that extra OPTEMPO money to make sure we're ready, particularly as we get closer to being in the window, if you will, for availability. So it absolutely will have an impact.

Senator MANCHIN. General Odierno, my final question here. I understand that there are different challenges, of course, for the personnel in the Active Forces than those in the Guard and Reserve. The Active Duty Army units typically rotate through a combat training center I believe every 2 years, and according to the briefings of the Army National Guard units will only have that opportunity on a rotation of 7 to 10 years, the way it's been—

General ODIERNO. Every 7 to 10 years, depending on the brigade availability.

Senator MANCHIN. So that again will put them in a different tier, just not having the training available.

General ODIERNO. Right. It also has to do with mobilization time and other things. So it's a combination of what we talked about in terms of how much time they're called up, how much they're not. So that was all factored in as we do this.

Senator MANCHIN. I'd like to work with you on the waste factor, sir.

General ODIERNO. Absolutely.

Senator MANCHIN. My time is running out, but this is really something very much concerning to me, which I think a lot of this can be avoided if we can get our cost effectiveness.

Thank you, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Manchin.

Senator WICKER.

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

General Grass, let's talk about the Regional Counterdrug Training Academy program, the RCTA program. These schools, including one located in Meridian, MS, have the unique mission of providing combatant commands, law enforcement agencies, community-based organizations, military personnel with training to support and enhance their capabilities to detect, interdict, disrupt, and curtail drug trafficking.

I have visited with our regional training academy in Meridian. I found it to be an outstanding facility with a world-class faculty. I've met with our law enforcement and uniformed service members who've benefited from the classroom lectures and hands-on practical training provided in Meridian. Members of this committee may be interested to know that many graduates of the program return to their home jurisdictions as instructors.

The feedback I've received from these individuals has been effusive, as well as feedback from our governors, adjutant generals, and law enforcement leaders. This is not only for the Meridian RCTA, but also the four sister schools located throughout the country. Based on their testimonials, our RCTAs are of utmost importance. Interesting to note, we have five of them nationally, General, and the entire cost to the government is less than \$5 million for all five of these.

So I was disappointed to learn that President Obama's budget request contains zero funding for these schools. Just for the benefit of the chairman and the ranking member, I intend to work with my colleagues on this committee to try to ensure that we can find that \$5 million.

General Grass, you are I believe a supporter of the RCTA program; is that correct?

General GRASS. Senator, yes, I am. I have visited Meridian.

Senator WICKER. And do you agree that these training academies are productive institutions that have contributed to our National security and public safety?

General GRASS. Senator, these facilities have trained over 600,000 law enforcement agents since they were established.

Senator WICKER. Let me ask you to elaborate, then, on your testimony last week before the House Appropriations Committee. Indeed, the Pentagon has directed you to close these five training centers; is that correct?

General GRASS. Yes, sir. We've been directed in 2015 to close them.

Senator WICKER. And am I correct that we're really talking just under \$5 million to keep all of these open?

General GRASS. Senator, I think that was the figure that we were given, what was available this year. Let me go back and get the actual figure, what they needed to run before we received a reduction.

Senator WICKER. It would be fair to say that a relatively modest investment will keep these invaluable programs open and available—

General GRASS. Yes, sir.

Senator WICKER.—for these hundreds of thousands of participants?

It's also my understanding that law enforcement officers and National Guard personnel staff have contacted the Bureau in support of the RCTA program. Are you aware of these communications, General?

General GRASS. I'm not aware of the law enforcement contact, but I am aware of a number of adjutants general that have reached out and had the conversation with me.

Senator WICKER. Okay. Well, would you be willing to sit down and listen to some of these law enforcement testimonials?

General GRASS. Senator, yes, I would.

Senator WICKER. I know you're busy.

Then finally, do you believe the value of the RCTA program warrants authorization by Congress?

Senator WICKER. Senator, yes, I do.

Senator WICKER. Thank you very much.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Wicker.

Senator King.

Senator KING. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Odierno, some pretty straightforward, quick questions. What would be the cost—this also may be for the record. What would be the cost of leaving the National Guard as is and leaving the rest of the—implementing the rest of the plan, in other words maintaining National Guard strength at 354 instead of 335?

General ODIERNO. In terms of end strength only, or the whole?

Senator KING. Just take the plan as is, but just not reduce the National Guard component. What I'm looking for is what are the savings anticipated from that piece of the reduction?

General ODIERNO. Roger. It's about—it's somewhere around 6 to \$7 billion when you take into account—I'll get you the exact number. It's between \$6 and \$7 billion, which accounts for AH-64s, annual training of AH-64s, the procurement of additional AH-64s, and then the payment of end strength. Then also it's about the training of the brigade combat teams that would be reduced, the two that would be reduced, and the sustainment of those capabilities. So it's about that number, somewhere in there.

Senator KING. Is that per year?

General ODIERNO. That would be—it's about—it's somewhere close to \$1 billion annually, and then there is some one-time costs that you would have to pay for.

Senator KING. How long does it take a—we've had some experience in this. How long does it take to bring a Guard unit up to combat readiness?

General ODIERNO. Well, it depends on the type of unit and the mission that they're going to do. Over the last 10 years—this is an average—based on our records that we've kept, first it's one year—they give them one year notice for mobilization. That's the requirement. Then once they become mobilized, we train them somewhere between 95 and 145 days to prepare them to go to either Iraq or Afghanistan, depending on the unit.

Now, over the last six years that was reduced because there was legislation passed that reduced the amount of time that they could be mobilized. So it reduced their time they could be mobilized and

it reduced the amount of training they would do. So we had to adjust missions based on that adjustment that we were given as well.

Senator KING. But it sounds like what you said is basically a year and a half from the time you say we need them to the time they're in the field.

General ODIERNO. Until the time they can deploy.

Senator KING. And with the regular Army what's the time?

General ODIERNO. It's as long as it takes us to—it depends on the different readiness levels. But for the top tier readiness, which is the first 8 to 10 brigades, they can go out the door immediately, and it's just a matter of how long it takes them. Beyond that, it's probably about 30 days later.

Senator KING. So there really is a significant difference between the two in terms of readiness, particularly in a more or less emergency situation.

General ODIERNO. There is.

Senator KING. General Grass, I'm a former governor, so I have lots of warm feelings about the National Guard. They were enormously helpful to us. We had an enormous natural disaster when I was in office that the Guard was absolutely critical.

On the other hand, I don't understand—make the argument to me why a National Guard unit needs Apache helicopters? I know you're supportive of the agreement, but put yourself—be an advocate for a minute and explain to me, what is the argument out there, because we don't have someone at this table to make it, why a National Guard unit needs Apaches?

General GRASS. Senator, I go back in the history of the Guard, of who we are from our founding fathers, our founding foundation in 1636. It was men and women who would leave their farms, grab their musket, and consider them infantrymen. So there's a long tradition of being a part of the combat forces of the United States military.

In every war we've been called forward, and that combat capability has come out. But that combat capability is really where we get the bulk of our leaders that execute missions, complex missions in responding to major catastrophes in the homeland. If I think of Hurricane Sandy, I often thought afterwards that those 12,000 troops—it probably took six brigades worth of colonel-level leadership on down and staff to execute those kinds of missions. We rely heavily on our combat force for that capability.

Senator KING. But there are combat functions for Guard units. It's not like the Apaches are the only combat function for a Guard unit, right?

General GRASS. Yes, sir. No, there are other combat capabilities.

Senator KING. But the basic idea is that the Guard would like to maintain, have its hand in this piece of the combat readiness.

There's an article in this morning's newspaper that quotes a member of the other body that says that this proposal, that is to get rid of the Apaches from the Guard, significantly—I should say, trade one capability for another, but significant—quote, “significantly reduces personnel, many of whom are aviation personnel with years of experience as either pilots or in aircraft maintenance. Over 6,000 of these personnel, in whom the Army has invested sig-



nificant time and money, will be forced out of a job and will be cut from the Army National Guard as a result of this proposal.”

General Odierno, is that a true statement?

General ODIERNO. Well, first off, I don't know about the number 6,000. I think that's a bit high. I would argue that that's happening across the entire force. I'm cutting 150,000 Active component soldiers who we've invested an incredible amount of money in, who have multiple tours in combat, that we're also cutting out of the Army. So this is happening across every single component and this is happening in significant numbers because of the reduced budget.

Now, what I would say is many of those individuals will be retrained to fly UH-60s or LUHs or other aircraft, because they're only losing 111 aircraft. So if you have two pilots per aircraft, that's 222 pilots. Now, there's some sustainment people that are behind that. But 6,000 is a pretty high number. They just have to retrain some of this great experience to go on UH-60s.

In the Active component, we're cutting 700 aircraft. So the reduction of experienced combat pilots is actually greater in the Active component, much greater, seven times greater than it is in the National Guard or U.S. Army Reserve.

Senator KING. And on the National Guard side they are going to be gaining Black Hawks, is that correct?

General ODIERNO. 111 Black Hawks, sir.

Senator KING. I think that's—Mr. Chairman, that's what I have at this time. I yield back the remainder of my time. Thank you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator King.

Senator Graham.

Senator GRAHAM. General Grass, how long—can you tell us how long it takes to mobilize and deploy a brigade combat team in the Guard?

General GRASS. Senator, using the training strategy that was published in December 2013, it's 71 days, the tasks that we have to accomplish if we're at company-level proficiency. It's 87 days at platoon. I might mention that on our attack aviation over time we got better and better at this. We got modernized aircraft, and our post-mobilization time for our attack is about 71 days now, unless you're a non-modernized unit and you're going through an upgrade. Then it's about 113 is what the facts show.

Senator GRAHAM. What's the difference the mission of a Black Hawk and an aircraft attack aircraft?

General GRASS. Senator, it's combat versus support for the most part.

Senator GRAHAM. So isn't that the big difference, that they'll be flying Black Hawks, but they will not be flying attack helicopters?

General GRASS. Yes, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. So the bottom line is that the National Guard really—will it have any attack capability?

General GRASS. No, Senator.

Senator GRAHAM. So that's the big deal, is whether or not you should divest the Army National Guard of the ability to have attack aviation assets.

General O, you said last week that, knowing we're \$17 trillion in debt, probably 500,000 would be a moderate risk Army, is that right?

General ODIERNO. That's correct, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. If we got to 500,000, that would take some of these problems off the table for the big Army, right?

General ODIERNO. Yes, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. Do you know the difference between 450 or say a 420-person Army on the active side and 500,000, how much cost?

General ODIERNO. It's a billion dollars per 10,000 people, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. So we need to add that up and see what you get for that money.

General ODIERNO. That would be \$8 billion, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. \$8 billion. For \$8 billion—

General ODIERNO. A year.

Senator GRAHAM.—what kind of difference would we be able to achieve in terms of the Army?

General ODIERNO. Well, first, it would—if all the readiness dollars came with it, obviously—that's a key part of this, and modernization dollars—that would allow us to have a significant—that would enable us to have up to 32, 33, 34 brigades. It would allow us to have more aviation, which we need. It would allow us to have more air defense, ballistic missile defense capability that we need, so we wouldn't be struggling with some of the demand and density of equipment that we have. And it would allow us to meet prolonged, longer term conflicts that we might have to face in the future. It would also allow us to probably do two at once.

Senator GRAHAM. Would it also create more deterrence in your mind?

General ODIERNO. I think it would obviously create more deterrence.

Senator GRAHAM. The world as you see it today, are the threats to the Nation rising, about the same, going down?

General ODIERNO. Well, I know the uncertainty has grown significantly, and the unrest that we see, whether it be in Europe, whether it be in the Middle East, whether it be on the Korean Peninsula, seems to be ratcheting up a bit, not going down.

Senator GRAHAM. General Grass, would you support a commission to look at the Army mix of force between the Guard, Reserve, and active duty, an independent commission?

General GRASS. Senator, I had mentioned earlier my experience with the Air Force commission, which is different, no doubt, because it was a different time. But looking forward to 2023 and where we're headed with sequestration, I don't see any problem with having an independent look, especially for this committee.

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you.

My view is it would be wise, but the wisest thing we could do is find a way to give some sequestration relief. So I will be introducing with Senator Leahy a commission, and I would like the commission to look at the effect of sequestration and have an independent view of that. I trust, General O, I think you've just been an outstanding commander, but I want somebody outside the Army looking at what we're doing to the Army, to tell the committee, if they could, the effects of sequestration.

From the Reserve component, General Talley, what are we losing in the Reserves as a result of sequestration?

General TALLEY. Senator, thank you for the question. I think the short answer is we're losing readiness. So as sequestration, if it stays in effect long term, I won't be able to have the additional OPTEMPO money that I need to make sure that those technical enablers that the Army relies on every day, which is predominantly from my component, as well as providing that direct support to the combatant commanders.

Senator GRAHAM. What does that mean to you, General O?

General ODIERNO. What that means is that we lose depth. They provide us the depth that we need. And frankly, in a lot of combat support, combat service support, that depth is pretty thin. So we rely a lot on the National Guard and U.S. Army Reserve for combat support, combat service support capability.

Senator GRAHAM. When you look at the African theater, do you think it would be wise for us to beef up our military training presence and our intelligence capability and special forces capability in Africa?

General ODIERNO. We have slowly been doing that, Senator, over the last couple years. It's much more this year than it was last year, and I think it's something that we have to continue to do.

Senator GRAHAM. When you do that, that comes at the expense of something else in this budget environment, correct?

General ODIERNO. It does, it does. We have to pay for that, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. From a Korea point of view, it seems fairly unstable. What's the likelihood in your mind that the current regime in Korea would do something very provocative that could lead to a larger shooting conflict than we've seen in the last couple of weeks?

General ODIERNO. I don't know the percentage. What I would say, though, is just recently we've seen, again, the launching of ballistic missiles. We've seen some artillery being fired. I worry that we continue to ratchet this up a bit more. I just worry where that could head. I think we have to be very cognizant and aware that they are conducting some provocation that could elicit a response from South Korea which then could begin to escalate. I think it's something that's very dangerous and it's important for us to understand that we have to be very careful here, because I think we are unsure what the leader over there is going to do.

Senator GRAHAM. Do you talk to our allies frequently throughout the world?

General ODIERNO. I do, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. Is there a general impression throughout the world that America is in retreat in terms of our actual strategy?

General ODIERNO. I wouldn't say that, but what I would say is they expect us to lead.

Senator GRAHAM. Do they see us leading?

General ODIERNO. When I talk to my counterparts, they want to know how we're doing, how we're going to implement in the future. And we talk about how we're going to lead. Whether they believe that or not I will leave up to them. They don't say that to me.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Graham.

Senator NELSON.

Senator NELSON. General Odierno, I agree with you in your response to Senator McCain, the future sequester cuts would clearly

diminish our capacity to be in a state of readiness as we want to to meet the world threats.

Now, I want to get into the cuts to the Guard. Basically, the Department of the Army has suggested approximately 32,000 cuts to the National Guard. General Grass, your recommendation, whether it was imposed on you or whether it came from you, is roughly about 12,000 cuts. So that's a difference of about 20,000, and I suppose that it's going to end up being the Congress that is going to decide this difference.

Now, what I want to get to, General Grass, is the difference in the States as to the threat that is facing each of the Guards in the State, be it Army or Air Guard. So if you take an acronym known as CAPE, otherwise Cost Analysis and Program Evaluation, on simultaneous events using historical data, it would reallocate the Guard among the States as to the ones that have the largest threats.

My State of Florida is now the third largest State. We have surpassed New York in population. But New York and Florida also have in common the threat of hurricanes. We have a peninsula that sticks down into the middle known as Hurricane Highway. But New York found out that it was suddenly threatened with Hurricane Sandy, very significant damage, along with those other northeastern States. So that was taken into consideration. Sandy, Katrina, you go back to the 2004 hurricanes. We had four hurricanes hit Florida in 2004.

What it shows is that about a third of the States ought to be increased in National Guard and about two-thirds of them ought to be decreased. Now, I understand you're not in the business of going around and telling existing Guards. But when a cut is going to be imposed on you, be it your 12,000 cut nationally or General Os 32,000 cut, then a 12,000-member Florida Guard gets cut one-twelfth, 1,000, 800 Army, 200 air.

Now, that just doesn't seem right. Why in the world?

General GRASS. Senator, first of all, none of us, none of us, want to make the cuts we're having to make. One of the issues that we deal with right now, especially in the Army, is trying to figure out where we can take risk—it's all about risk now when we have to make these cuts—and still fulfil the requirements for a governor to be able to call up his or her Guard and get them there on the ground within a timely time frame so that they can respond and they can save lives.

We're working very closely with FEMA and Northern Command right now to look at what we call the worst night in America. We've done some great analysis looking at those scenarios across the U.S. We've never been totally able to quantify the requirements. We've got 54 State plans now. We know how each State plans. Your State, sir, has been tremendously helpful in providing us their experiences. Unfortunately, because of the hurricanes, they've created tremendous capability. They've provided us their plan.

We're taking those plans. So if you imagine the Gulf Coast and the East Coast, right now I can pretty much tell you what each State needs for a CAT-5.

What we haven't been able to isolate in on in the past is to be able to tell you, of the 10 essential functions that we use in pretty

much every State disaster, where do they come from in that disaster? How many will come in from other States?

Senator NELSON. Let me just interrupt you here because we're running out of time. Is this the modeling that you're talking about?

General GRASS. Yes, Senator.

Senator NELSON. Okay. Now, but there's something also known as consequence management. Why do you pick modeling over consequence management?

General GRASS. Senator, it is a part of the calculus. In the end it will be.

Senator NELSON. Well, tell me, what did the Florida TAG say to you about what a 1,000 cut in Florida from a 12,000 strength would do with hurricane season approaching?

General GRASS. Senator, I have had calls, I've had letters from every adjutant general about the proposed cuts, that it's unacceptable to them, especially when I talk about the 315,000 number we have to get to. This is just an immediate step, but full sequestration takes us back to even worse cuts, and it will have an impact on our response times.

Senator NELSON. So now you're modeling it, and the State plans, which are synchronized between the National Guard and the local responders, and you're looking at the gaps, and is that what you're saying is how you're going to allocate the cuts nationally?

General GRASS. Senator, first we have to understand the requirement by region. But each State day to day for the smaller events has a capability they need. And there's a certain type of capability that they need, the 10 functions that I mentioned.

Senator NELSON. Did the Florida Guard accept this kind of allocation of cuts, assuming that General Odierno's 32,000 cut nationally is what is the final figure?

General GRASS. Senator, I haven't had a single State accept them yet.

Senator NELSON. So the answer is no?

General GRASS. No.

Senator NELSON. Did the Florida Guard argue that there are other States that have a much larger Guard that do not have the threats and therefore there ought to be a reallocation among the States as to the actual threats?

General GRASS. Senator, they have made that case.

Senator NELSON. Apparently not successfully.

General GRASS. Senator, we're still in the deliberations.

Senator NELSON. I thought these were your recommendations.

General GRASS. Senator, we have to get to the May time frame. Right now the States are coming back with their proposed trade spaces for force structure reductions. And by May we have to load that into the total Army analysis program.

Senator NELSON. So that means things are going to change in May?

General GRASS. Sir, it depends on what comes out of the debate and discussion that will occur with all the States present. They'll have a chance again to make their case.

Senator NELSON. Okay. Then while you're listening to the States, I would just add my voice. Hurricanes are a way of life. Back in the early part of the last decade, I can tell you the Florida Guard

knew how to take care of business, and had they been in New Orleans there wouldn't have been the problem that occurred there because they knew what to do. I don't want to lose that capability.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Nelson.

Senator Lee.

Senator LEE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you all today for your testimony and to your faithful service on behalf of our country.

You all have been forced to make some difficult decisions and you've been put in an unenviable position, having to deal with scarce and declining resources. I know that you've made those decisions with the security of our country and the safety of the men and women who serve under you as your highest priority.

The Army's restructuring plan for aviation, of course, calls for the divestment of several fleets of helicopters and also for the remissioning of all National Guard Apache battalions over to the Active component. Of course, under this plan this means that if this plan were implemented the National Guard would no longer have aviation attack flyer on-target capabilities.

As has been highlighted to some extent already today, the National Guard's Apache battalions have performed exceptionally well in past wars, providing readiness and providing strategic depth for the Army and really some of the best trained personnel in the world. As one example of this, I will point, as one prominent example of this, I'll point to the Utah National Guard's 1-211th Attack Reconnaissance Battalion, that has deployed three times in the last 14 years, including multiple tours in Afghanistan, where it received the German Presidential Unit Streamer from our German allies in that conflict.

While understanding the need to reduce costs and to prioritize modern equipment over older aircraft, I do have some concerns about getting there by divesting the valuable and very cost-effective national defense asset that we have in our National Guard Apache battalions. So, General Grass, if I could start with you, can you tell me, did the National Guard have a proposal for aviation restructuring that would have maintained some of the National Guard attack capabilities with the Apache while simultaneously ensuring that the Army had the equipment necessary to make up for the capabilities that would be lost from the divesting of the Kiowa Warrior?

General GRASS. Senator, first let me say that I want to applaud the men and women of the National Guard that have flown this mission and all of our Army forces that have flown the mission. The Guard did 12 rotations, battalion rotations, and five company detachment rotations. We have a detachment right now out of Tennessee that flies the Kiowa Warrior that is at mobilization. They will do their mission and they will come home and they will change missions.

I would tell you that I was included in every discussion. I provided my best military advice and I provided options. But now, sir, since the decision's been made I have to begin to plan for the future. And I come back to sequestration, that this will be just a se-

ries of cuts that are going to continue as we look out to the future by 2016 when we take even further reductions.

Senator LEE. You refer to the fact that you outlined other options. Can you tell me whether some of those options included what I've described?

General GRASS. Senator, yes, they did.

Senator LEE. Why did you think it was important to maintain some attack aviation capability within the National Guard?

General GRASS. Senator, I think every National Guardsman wants to maintain a close relationship with our Army, and we want to continue to look like our Army and to work closely. I think going forward, looking at multi-component forces, I think we definitely have some opportunities coming in the future.

Senator LEE. One of the justifications for the aviation restructuring initiative is that State Guard and governors will have more aviation equipment, that includes transport capability, which some have suggested might be more suitable to their homeland security missions than the Apache. General, to your knowledge has the governor of any State requested more transport capabilities as opposed to Apaches? In other words, have any of them asked for more Black Hawks rather than Apaches?

General GRASS. No, sir.

Senator LEE. Not one?

General GRASS. No, sir. They have asked for CH-47 Chinooks.

Senator LEE. So in addition to this, I would note that we had 50 State and territorial governors who wrote a letter to President Obama in February asking that the proposed changes to the Guard's combat aviation capabilities be reconsidered. So I do think that's significant.

As you know, General Grass, many National Guard aviators and crew have flown the Apache for many decades, and they've made the choice to stay in the National Guard with this mission in mind, to continue to serve in connection with the Apache. Can you tell me whether there have been any studies completed or any analysis conducted to estimate how many personnel from our National Guard Apache battalions might remain in the National Guard if they need to be retrained to fly the Black Hawk?

General GRASS. Senator, I'm not aware of any studies. I know, looking at just changes in structure that turbulence always creates, no matter what the discipline is, will always create some folks who will just not, probably don't have the time to get away and retrain.

Senator LEE. Is there any historical precedent you can think of that might give us some insight into what that might look like?

General GRASS. I think some of the recent changes that have occurred, especially over the last four years, with the Air Force.

Senator LEE. And those would indicate that we might see some departures?

General GRASS. Yes, sir. The restructuring where a pilot has to go requalify on a new platform and may have to travel much greater distances. In this case we wouldn't have the same, but what we find is employment becomes an issue, family becomes an issue, especially when they're getting close to retirement. You lose that experience

Senator LEE. Thank you.

I see my time has expired. Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Lee.

Senator Donnelly.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thank you both for your service.

General Grass, the Chief of the National Guard has a unique role among the members of the Joint Chiefs, in that you serve as chief military adviser to the Secretary of Defense for non-Federalized Guard matters, but not necessarily owning or controlling the Guard the same way that other Chiefs own their services. Given the Guard's dual State and Federal roles and command structures, does this cause a structural challenge for you on how to guard input factors into budget and planning decisions?

General GRASS. Senator, first let me say, and thanks to this committee, I'm proud to be able to serve in this capacity as a member of the Joint Chiefs. I think one of the huge values of being able to serve here is to be able to provide that advice that comes from the National Guard, not just in responding to disasters, but also across the 54 States.

I think from a budget perspective I've been received, I've been able to—I've been received very well by the Joint Chiefs. I've been able to provide my input on every discussion. I've been able to provide issue papers when I disagreed possibly or me and a service chief maybe disagreed. I was still able to bring my message forward to the Deputy Secretary. Then once the decision's made, sir, it's my job to execute.

Senator DONNELLY. Is there anything that can be done to improve this situation or do you think it's working appropriately right now?

General GRASS. Senator, I recently sat down and I read the charter, the history of the JCS. I think there are growing pains. I looked at the Marine Corps and it took almost 25 years before they went from being just an advisory role to a full member. We are a full member. I think it's historic what this committee has done and what the Department of Defense has done to welcome us into this. I think there's huge value for the future for being a member of the JCS.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you.

General Odierno, as we have discussed before—and we appreciate all your efforts on this—I view the mental and behavioral fitness of our soldiers also as a readiness issue. I appreciate the Army's leadership on implementing smart behavioral health screening policies. In particular, I want to highlight the leadership the Army has shown on implementing annual enhanced behavioral health assessments for all active duty soldiers, not just those in the deployment cycle, but for all active duty soldiers, as part of their periodic health assessments.

I understand the Army is working on implementing the same policy and tools in annual assessments for the Reserve component. I was wondering, General, what the status of that effort is at this time?

General ODIERNO. Well, first off, a couple things have happened which is good. First now, the Army National Guard utilizes the di-



rector of psychological health to assess all of their programs. That's a new initiative that we put into place. They support all 54 States and territories when they're doing this.

The other thing is we have incorporated telebehavior health, which is really good for the Guard and Reserves because it enables them now to not necessarily have to be right there, but we can do it over long distance, where we then can utilize some of the Army capabilities when we have behavioral health. But there's still a lot more work to be done.

The other piece we've done is TRICARE Reserve Select, which is a low-cost, premium-based health plan which you approved for the Reserve component. That's enabling them to go outside to get this help. So we now have some things in place that will help us. We're also putting behavioral health specialists at the brigade level at all the components.

So a combination of all of these things are beginning to help us. We still have a distinct challenge in the Reserve component, and that is reaching out to them on a regular daily basis like we can Active component soldiers, because of the fact that they are spread out over large distances and they have other jobs where they're not in daily contact. But the Guard and Reserve are putting in several different initiatives that help them to reach out.

So we're nowhere near where we need to be, but we have made some progress.

Senator DONNELLY. General, this is a little bit different from the original question, but one of the things I've heard is you've worked so hard to eliminate any stigma to seeking help. But I have still heard that some Army members or Reserve members, that they'd rather see somebody outside the uniform, I guess would be the way to put it. Has there been any thought in terms of making sure that there is, in towns where you have such a big place or in bases where you have such a huge presence, to having somebody just outside the gates who may not be connected per se to the Army, but is there to provide those kind of services?

General ODIERNO. Each one of our major installations on the Active component are working very closely and have a relationship, that they have a behavioral health network that is available, and they identify what that network is so people have options. As I said earlier, for the Reserve component it's now TRICARE Select, and that helps them then to, obviously, seek help outside of the uniformed military to do this.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you.

Do you know, General Grass, whether there is an effort to provide the same type of annual behavioral health assessments for the Guard as well?

General GRASS. Senator, yes, there is. Today we have 167 mental health clinicians across the Guard, both with the Army and Air. At the Air level, we are at each wing. In the Army level, we have one in every State, contracted clinicians. We also have 24 additional in our high-risk areas of the State.

Thanks to the Congress, we have another \$10 million this year that we're applying to bring on additional. What I've been working with the Air Force on is to convert some of those contract positions to permanent civilian positions. We want to do the same with the

Army, so that you put someone in the State headquarters or in a unit that's going to be there and when the contact runs out you don't lose them. And you bring them from, as you said, sir, from that community, that they understand the problems we're dealing with.

Senator DONNELLY. This would be for both of you. Are there any challenges to that drive to provide those services? Obviously, there are financial challenges because of resources. Are there any other challenges on this end we can be helping you with to try to make sure that you have the tools necessary to provide those services?

General ODIERNO. I'd say a couple things. We have the tools, so I don't think we need help from you. There are some things we have to do internally. That's hiring more behavioral health specialists.

The only other thing, I mentioned the other day in the wake of the Fort Hood is it has to do with our getting commander access to information, and there are some internal things we can do, but there might be some legislative things that we have to look at. That should come out of some of the studies we're doing based on what happened at Fort Hood.

Senator DONNELLY. Okay.

General GRASS. Senator, if I could add one thing. And we've had great support from the Army on this, but a lot of our capability and our resources have come through overseas contingency money. As that money dries up, we're concerned about what we'll have left behind there to execute the mission.

We're working very closely with Health and Human Services and Veterans Administration, because one of the concerns that I have as over 100,000 men and women are coming out of active duty with four, five, six years in combat, how's that going to have an impact? We hope to attract them in the Guard, but how is that going to have an impact on them and their mental health? I don't think we as a Nation have tackled that yet.

Senator DONNELLY. General Odierno and General Grass, thank you, and thank you to all the men and women who serve our country.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Donnelly.

Senator SESSIONS—no, wait a minute. That may not be right. Is that still right? Still right, Senator Sessions.

Senator SESSIONS. Well, thank you.

General Odierno, thank you for your service. You've been given a tough, tough job. All of us need to know that.

General Grass, I think your recent comment about the danger to the morale and spirit of soldiers who've served us, even in combat, maybe more than one or two or three deployments, when they're said that they're not needed any more, worries me. I think it's a danger to the service.

We've known all along we're going to have to draw down the numbers after the peak of Iraq and Afghanistan. So we've been preparing for that. But it's just not something we ought to take lightly.

General Odierno, I know you will wrestle with it and try to do the best you can, and you're being asked to do some very tough things.

My impression is that, General Odierno, as you said at the beginning, that the Guard is being listened to effectively, and you're doing your best to shape a force for the future that reflects their contributions and the active duty contributions. In fact, if your plan is carried out, the Guard will have a larger percentage of the total force than they had before, either before September 11 or after September 11. Is that correct?

General ODIERNO. That is correct, Senator.

Senator SESSIONS. I thank you for doing that. I think it does have—the Guard makes great contributions and the Army Reserve does, and at a reasonable price, and I appreciate that.

With regard to the total numbers, I hope we don't have to go to 420. That number to me is lower than I would have thought possible, or maybe it's not possible. And we're going to have to look at those numbers hard.

General Odierno, maybe someone else would be better able to answer this, but I'll just ask you first. What about civilian personnel? We've been told and I understand that as many as 100,000 new civilian personnel were added to the total work force after 9–11, after 2000, and that—so I'm wondering what kind of reduction in their numbers should occur with regard to our overall constant desire for military leadership and Congress to have more available at the point of the spear and less available in the establishment bureaucracy, for lack of a better word.

General ODIERNO. Senator, so far since we started in 2012 we've reduced the U.S. Army civilians by approximately 20,000. We will continue to reduce them over the next five fiscal years as well. So they are coming down as well. It's a bit harder to predict because it's based on number of budget dollars, but we are—we've directed a 25 percent reduction in all headquarters, both civilians and military. That's part of this. We have reduced civilians in every one of our installations and we're continuing to do this. AMC, Army Materiel Command, has done a study on how we will reduce civilians there.

So all of that we are continuing to work, and we will continue to see reductions in our civilian workforce as we move forward.

Senator SESSIONS. Well, it seems to me that the logical thing would be to ask—as we've drawn down the size of the active-Duty Force, you would need fewer civilians to support that force, number one. Number two, we were facing life and death events every day in Iraq and Afghanistan and troops being deployed, and we need to have the kind of civilian support staff that made sure that they got what they needed, when they needed it, because lives were at stake. It seems to me therefore that, could you go lower than that? How much lower do you think, and why shouldn't we have a greater percentage reduction in civilian than we do in active uniformed personnel?

General ODIERNO. I think what we're trying to do is we are looking to proportionally cut based on our assessment. So in other words, I think over the time you will see proportionate cuts in the civilian work force as it is in the military as well.

We're also, by the way, just to add something else, we're also reducing contractors significantly. We began that process this year. We are continuing to go after that, and we will reduce—we're try-

ing to reduce contractors first, civilians, and then military. That's the thought process we're going through as we move through this. But we still have lots of work to do here.

Senator SESSIONS. Well, I respect the difficulty of this. This is a huge institution and you're trying to make changes over time. But with regard to the budget numbers, 2015, next year's budget beginning in September—October, would be \$498 billion, basically the same as this year, and then go to 499 in 2016, which is another tight, flat year with no increases.

Then the next year it jumps 13 billion to 536, and grows at 2.5 percent a year for the next four years after that.

So I guess what it seems to me from the outside looking in, of all the challenges you face, it's trying to stay within those numbers now, because you're making decisions now to reduce structure and personnel and so forth that will create savings in the years to come, but it's hard to effectuate and capture those savings this year.

Would you share with us how you see the current stress you're under, as opposed to the longer term trajectory?

General ODIERNO. For the next three to four years, until we get to those numbers you just described, it's impacting our readiness and our modernization programs. So we've had to reduce readiness in the active, Guard, and Reserve. We've had to cut modernization programs. We've had to delay procurement of equipment. So all of that is happening now.

Around fiscal year 2020, if sequestration goes out to its final stages, that will be the first time that we are able to start to balance the right amount of readiness, force structure, and modernization. That will allow us then to build a complete, ready force as we move forward.

Senator SESSIONS. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Sessions.

Senator Vitter.

Senator VITTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Thanks to all of you for your service, as well as of course your testimony today.

When not mobilized, I assume it's clear National Guard and Reserve personnel train less than active duty. For instance, the Guard has far fewer rotations at combat training centers like JRTC at Fort Polk. What impact does that less frequent training have on skill proficiency and interchangeability, etcetera?

General ODIERNO. What the Guard is able to do is do individual proficiency and small unit proficiency. So they get good at their individual MOS. They can do some small unit, platoon level capability, maybe at home station. But without having CTC rotations, it's much more difficult to get to company, battalion, brigade. And the more complex the organization, the more difficult it is. The complex organizations are brigade combat teams, aviation brigades. Less complex organizations, such as transportation units and maintenance units, they can do a lot of it at home station. But the impact is really on the more complex, integrated, collective training that has to be done, that they're simply not able to do, where in an active unit you can do it at your home station because you have the ground and air space and facilities to do it and you're collocated

together, where the Guard is spread out and they don't have that. So they need the training center in order to build that readiness.

Senator VITTER. Generals, we've all heard a lot about possibly including an amendment that would restrict funds from being used to retire any aircraft associated with Air National Guard or Air Force Reserve units until a study could be done, basically for a couple of years. It strikes me that that would be reasonable if nothing were changing and no cuts were happening in that time period. But of course the threat is that major things are changing, major reductions have to be made in that time period.

So that would be a decision. Taking things off the table is an affirmative decision in the context of all of those other changes and cuts that would have to be made. Isn't that a fundamental problem with a two-year pause, protecting sort of some assets and not others?

General ODIERNO. What it does is it creates \$1 billion a year for two years. As I mentioned earlier, I already submitted a \$10.7 billion unfunded requirement problem that we have in the Army already. So this would add to that. So it would directly impact readiness of all the three components if in fact a commission is established.

Then if the commission does not go along with our recommendations and comes in with another, you go on a whole other significant amount of bills, up to \$11 billion, \$12 billion, which we'd have to find. Everything is zero sum. So it would just delay that, so it would further delay the readiness. It would further delay our ability to respond. It would further delay our capabilities in this very uncertain world that we have.

Senator VITTER. Generals, can you respond to my basic concern that a major two-year pause, protecting some things, holding some things harmless, in the context of major changes or reductions that are happening in those same two years, is an affirmative decision, isn't it?

General GRASS. Senator, if I could comment, again my only experience with this was with the Air Force and as we stepped in we had moves that needed to occur going back to 2010 when the report—when the commission was stood up in 2013. So we had to get agreement to go ahead and make those moves or it would have had a major impact. But we were able to do that.

General TALLEY. Senator, I think from a commission perspective as it relates to the Army, my concern is the Air Force commission came out and there's a lot of analogies that are being drawn, even though one of the members asked for those analogies not to be drawn, to apply that to the Army Reserve. Specifically, one of those recommendations is to eliminate the U.S. Air Force Reserve Command. That issue's been brought to me many times, almost weekly. If there's an Army commission, we're concerned that there could be similar sort of conclusions.

So I guess my concern is I'm not sure we need a commission. I think the Army needs to move forward and execute its right-sizing of the total force, working with the Congress. But if the Congress does decide to move forward with an Army commission, it's going to be critical to make sure that we have all the right representation

from all three components and folks that truly understand how the total Army is integrated and synchronized.

Senator VITTER. And General Odierno, if there were this 2-year pause and this billion dollar hit to the Active Army, I assume that could certainly affect Army end strength. So how low could that push it? Lower than 420?

General ODIERNO. If the decision by the commission is to not take any structure out of the Guard and not do the ARI, it would result in somewhere between 20 to 30,000 additional people out of the Active Army. So it would go somewhere between 390 and 400,000.

Senator VITTER. So we're talking about well below what you consider your absolute minimum level.

General ODIERNO. Which is 450,000.

Senator VITTER. Right.

Now, I know the Guard has proposed a plan that accounted for about \$1.7 billion in offsets. I wonder if each of you can address that wherever you're coming from, positive or negatively, including why the Army couldn't accept that particular plan?

General TALLEY. Senator, again, as I look out to full sequestration coming back in 2016, we looked at the Army Guard and said that we have to be willing to pay part of the bill. And if we are not, sequestration is still going to take the money at some point unless the Congress elects to put money back in there.

But at the same time, I rely heavily, we rely heavily, on our services for research and development, for acquisition, for schools. So we have to get the balance right. So when I proposed to the adjutants general that a reduction in our budget, the \$1.7 billion, which ends up at about roughly 12 percent of our total obligation authority, that I felt that that was a good number that is consistent with some of the discussions we've had with the Secretary of Defense, that that number would reduce our full-time manning, definitely would reduce our full-time manning. It would reduce some of our MILCON, our sustainment of our facilities; it would reduce there.

So it is painful, no doubt. But as I look out over the next 10 years at what we have to do, I could see no other alternative.

General ODIERNO. As the National Guard provided us the alternative, which was well thought out, there are several issues with it as far as I'm concerned. In their proposal, it significantly reduces the amount of force structure that leaves the National Guard. So actually it proposes that we take more—we're already taking three complete aviation brigades out of the Active component. It proposes we take more aviation out of the Active component.

We are already moving from 37 shooting battalions to 20 shooting battalions in the Active component. We cannot go any lower than that. We simply cannot. We will not be able to meet our operational commitments if we do that. So for me that made it a bit more difficult.

The other piece is, what it does is—what I'm concerned about in the National Guard is that if we don't take any force structure down, you're going to have this mismatch between force structure and readiness. That's what we've done in the active. We've taken 150,000 out of force structure so we can pay for readiness. We don't have to take as much out of the Guard to pay for readiness because

they're cheaper, so we have proposed taking a little bit out of the Guard so we can pay for the readiness, because we want them to be an operational Reserve.

But if we maintain more structure, they're headed towards a strategic reserve because we are not going to be able to pay for their training that I think is necessary for them to have in order to sustain the level of readiness that they've achieved over the last 10, 12 years, with huge investments in OCO money that we have used to obtain this level of readiness.

So in my mind, that was my concern about it. Again, we want to come with the right solution and we think the one we've come up with enables them to have the right—we cut less end strength, less percentage of end strength out of the Guard, and we're able to maintain at a higher readiness level, which is important to all of us. That's really what the difference is. But again, it was a well thought out proposal that they gave us.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you.

Senator VITTER. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Vitter.

Senator Blunt.

Senator BLUNT. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Odierno, last—I think it was last week. I know it was; you and Secretary McHugh were here. I'd like to follow up on just one thing that came up last week on the mental health issues. My understanding from last week was that when a soldier leaves an installation his or her medical records follow them to the next post, but their mental record does not follow them. Is that right?

General ODIERNO. Sir, we're working our way through this. This is something we're looking into. The medical record does—the mental health record can go to certain people, but is not distributed completely. So one of the problems we have is that commanders don't know that this has transitioned. The medical professionals might, but the commanders don't know.

That's what we're trying to work out now and figure out how we can look at that and what we can do to help with these problems, because that's something that we have faced for some time now and we have not been able to solve yet. So we're trying to work through legislation—not legislation, but legal issues, HIPPA, and other things that are out there that allow us to do this to protect our soldiers and provide them the right care as we identify it.

Senator BLUNT. Well, at some level we have to start dealing with these mental issues, both in how we treat them, how we pay for them, how we communicate them like they're health issues. I assume what you're trying to determine in your answer—I assume from your answer you're trying to determine at least what level in the command structure all records need to be available as decisions are made?

General ODIERNO. That's correct, so we can get them the right care, so we understand there might be a problem, so we understand and we can make sure that they are getting the right capabilities that they need in order to help themselves. That's really the key piece of this.

In reality, the other piece is, we're even looking at things that, if somebody has a significant medical issue, do we even allow them

to do a change of station. Let's fix it where he is, unless we think it's better for him to move. That would be a conscious decision that we would make as well.

Those are all the kind of things that we have to constantly review as we look at this very difficult problem.

Senator BLUNT. NIH, the National Institute of Health, says that one out of four adults has a diagnosable and treatable mental health issue. I don't know if it's higher or lower in the military, but I suspect the military is pretty reflective of overall society in that regard. Both as a society and as the institutions that defend us, we just can't continue to act like somehow this is something nobody else has to deal with but the one individual you're talking to, nobody else.

So I'll be supportive and hope to be helpful of whatever you're doing there.

I appreciated Senator McCain's remarks about the A-10. I think there is a real gap here and we need to be thinking about how to fill that gap. General Talley, F-16s are one of the supposed replacements, but I don't think the F-16s do all the A-10s do in terms of close combat support. Am I right on that or do you want to make a comment about that?

General TALLEY. Sir, I don't. That's outside my area of expertise. Anything you want to ask about the Army or technical enablers, I can talk for hours.

Senator BLUNT. So in terms of close support for the Army, you don't have a sense of which of those aircraft would be better?

General TALLEY. Sir, I'll leave those comments to General Odierno and to others, sir.

Senator BLUNT. Okay. General O, do you want to follow up at all? One of the potential replacements is we put the F-16 in and I don't think it does the same things.

General ODIERNO. I've said this a couple times, not in this hearing. But what I would say is the F-16 is designed for close air support. It is designed to provide support for our soldiers. Its both visual and capability enables us to provide close air support. In Afghanistan, more than 50 percent of the close air support missions have been flown by F-16s.

So what we have to figure out, though—now, remember this is a counterinsurgency environment. So what we have to work with the Air Force is what is the right platform or what is the tactics, techniques, and procedures we need to provide close air support across the wide variety of potential scenarios that we're going to have to operate in. We do know the A-10 works in those scenarios today. So we have to work with them to make sure that we have that capability.

General Welsh has been very specific about saying they will ensure that we have the right close air support. Soldiers like the A-10. They can see it, they can hear it. They have confidence in it. That's the one thing that we have to account for as we move forward.

Senator BLUNT. Well, I would hope before we replace the A-10 we know that we're replacing them with something that works and there's no gap between the thing that would work and the ability to have that particular replacement as something that would work.



General Grass, in the coming and going here as we do, I know you mentioned some mobilization figures for the Guard. Could you repeat those to me? It seems to me there's some real disagreement about readiness as it relates to the Guard.

General GRASS. Senator, what I mentioned in my opening statement was 760,000 mobilizations of Army and Air Guard. Of that, just over 500,000 have been Army Guard.

Senator BLUNT. And in terms of readiness?

General GRASS. Over time, again going back to pre-September 11, resources weren't always there to maintain—for all the right reasons. I mean, we were at peacetime, we were taking a peace dividend. As long as we could meet our State missions and a certain level of training in peacetime, we were able to have some reduced levels of funding.

But as the war started, we had to ramp up quickly. What has happened over the last 12½ years, thanks to the great work of the Congress and of the services, they've helped us get up to a level where we've reduced the amount of post-mobilization time significantly. Over time that will atrophy, especially as the resources go away, and as we get out into full sequestration we will slowly atrophy back to at a lower level of training.

Senator BLUNT. And I believe what you said, General Odierno, is a lot of the OCO money, the Iraq and Afghanistan money, has been used over this 12-year period of time to be sure that the Guard was ready?

General ODIERNO. Yes, it has. In fact, we have this organization called First Army whose total responsibility is to train the Guard and Reserves. We have to reduce that because a lot of that—we built that up over the last 10 or 12 years with OCO dollars as they were preparing the Guard and Reserve to go. So that organization is shrinking in the Active component and they were—with input from the U.S. Army Reserves and the National Guard, that organization was the main trainer of them and will continue to be.

We're still going to have that organization, but it's not going to be robust or as big as it once was because that was funded in OCO money.

General TALLEY. Senator, can I get in on that for just a minute?

Senator BLUNT. Yes.

General TALLEY. In the Army Reserve, since we're technical enablers, our requirements at a mobe site are generally two, three weeks. We've consistently gotten in and out of the mobe site ready to go in less than a month. Normally it's two to three weeks.

Every mission that's ever come down to the Army Reserve, we've been at C1 or C2, which is the highest level of readiness, 60 days prior to the late entry date. So that says a lot about the ability of the Army Reserve to generate readiness quickly.

Then, to tack onto what the Chief's talking about is, that OPTEMPO money, that extra money, is how we buy back and maintain that readiness. On First Army, most of First Army is actually Army Reserve. Almost the majority of First Army's structure is provided by me out of the U.S. Army Reserve Command. And it's a great organization, very helpful in helping us get all the Army Reserve components ready to go.

Senator BLUNT. Well, I would think if the force was truly interoperable and the readiness issue could be dealt with, that as you're reducing the full-time force that you'd want to actually be increasing the backup, part-time force. I'm going to let you talk about that, General. That'll be my last question.

General ODIERNO. Thank you. Forces Command, which is the commander of all continental forces in the continental United States, to include U.S. Army Reserve, National Guard, and active, he has put together a plan that will better integrate training at several different levels to increase the capabilities of the Guard and the Reserve. This was at the request of the Guard and Reserve. They wanted us to do this, and he has—and General Grass talked about it earlier, where we're integrating better active, Reserve, and National Guard when we can in training, which will help us to do this.

So we have to come up with new ways to do this, but there are ways we can come up with that will continue to ensure we have the right readiness levels.

Senator BLUNT. I thank all of you.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Blunt.

Senator Ayotte.

Senator AYOTTE. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Odierno, I wanted to follow up on some of the questions that Senator Blunt asked you about with regard to the A-10. There are different kinds of close air support, aren't there?

General ODIERNO. There are, ma'am.

Senator AYOTTE. Yes. Some close air support is done at the 10,000 foot level, right, with precision guided bombs, correct?

General ODIERNO. That's correct.

Senator AYOTTE. And then there's the close air support that saved 60 of our soldiers in Afghanistan last year from A-10s, where they dealt with a situation where the A-10's were flying at 75 feet off the ground, using their guns, and they were within 50 feet of friendlies. That's what the A-10 is best at, isn't it, right, that kind of air support?

General ODIERNO. Yes, ma'am.

Senator AYOTTE. When you talked about vulnerability, I think in response to Senator McCain's question about the A-10, isn't that what we're worried about the TTP's about that, that lower mission, where getting down—I think the F-16 is a great platform, so I don't want to diminish the strength of the F-16.

But as I understand it, the F-16 has to go a lot faster down there because it doesn't have the same type of survivability that the A-10 would. So can you help me understand this?

General ODIERNO. You have close air support that provides, again, systems that are further away. You have close air support that provides with troop contact, which is close contact, medium contact. So there's different depths of the battlefield. The A-10 has over the years provided us great close air support very close in when we need it, along with the Apache helicopter. But the A-10 has different capabilities than the Apache. They are not interchangeable, either. So it's given us a significant capability.

The F-16 provides some capability. It is operated at a higher level. That's one of the things you have to look at: Can they operate

at lower levels? I think that's one of the things that we're working with the Air Force: Can they, and what are their capabilities?

Senator AYOTTE. I think, General, just to be clear, when we've had—and I know that you and I talked about this last week as well. When we talk about developing TTPs for close air support for this, we're talking about that scenario, where we're talking about the support needed on the ground, also having the capacity to distinguish between the friendlies and the enemy, because the A-10 can get low and go at a slower pace, and also it's a titanium tank, so it's got more survivability, correct?

General ODIERNO. That's correct, ma'am.

Senator AYOTTE. So you would agree with me, you've said in the past that for that mission the A-10 is the best?

General ODIERNO. It is.

Senator AYOTTE. One of the things I'm concerned about, I know when you talked to Senator McCain he asked you about the F-35 and whether the F-35 could replace the A-10, and I think you said "I don't know."

General ODIERNO. If I could—

Senator AYOTTE. Sure.

General ODIERNO.—what I said is I know the F-35 is being built to replace, and I'm not familiar enough with the exact capabilities.

Senator AYOTTE. Right. That's fair. I think the F-35s an important platform as well.

However, it seems to me that one of the concerns I have is, even if we assume that the F-35, A, can replace the A-10, our plan right now has a gap, because under what General Welsh has introduced all of the A-10s would be retired by fiscal year 2019 and even the best case scenario, the F-35A is operational in 2021. So there's a gap there.

So if we don't know the answer to this question on the TTPs of whether the F-16s or other platforms can perform this low function that is so critical to our men and women on the ground—I know you agree with that because we have lots of stories to tell and you have way more stories to tell than me on this.

I think this is a very important issue that we should not overlook and I am hopeful that this committee will address, because I see a gap here until we know the answer to these questions. And this is a gap we can't afford, because these are our men and women on the ground who are taking the bullets and we want to make sure that we give them the very best when it comes to this mission. Would you agree with me on that?

General ODIERNO. I'm always concerned about making sure our soldiers who are in contact have the best capability possible for them across all of our capabilities.

Senator AYOTTE. Great. Thank you, General. I appreciate it.

I wanted to ask both you and General Grass on another issue. This is the issue that I know, General Odierno, you've already mentioned, that we want the Guard to be an operational, Guard and Reserve, we want it to be operational. It has been operational in Iraq and Afghanistan. This is so important. We couldn't have fought those wars without their support. And training and readiness is really the key to all of this.

So one issue that I see in all of this is that not only you train individually, but you train as a group, correct? So this readiness involves both.

How important, General Grass, are the combat training center rotations in your view in terms of the preparedness of the Army National Guard and the brigade combat teams to ensure that they have combat training center rotations?

General GRASS. Senator, they are critical. I know in the past we've done about once every seven or eight years with certain brigades. What I learned is that over time—and I'm sure it's the same for the Active Force—when they get the mission, they know their rotation's coming up, that focuses all their training. For our men and women, that's every weekend drill, that's every additional staff period, that's the annual trainings for years leading up to that rotation.

Senator AYOTTE. So, General, as I look at this proposal, under the fiscal year 2015 proposal, no National Guard brigade combat teams will be sent to combat training centers, is that right?

General ODIERNO. There's two, ma'am.

Senator AYOTTE. There's two. Okay, so you're going to send two under the fiscal year 2015 proposal. Okay, so I didn't understand that correctly.

General ODIERNO. And maybe—there's one undecided. So there may be up to three. But two for sure, maybe three. It depends, frankly, on availability of active brigades. In 2014 there's one and in 2015 there's two.

Senator AYOTTE. Okay.

General Grass, do you feel that we're prioritizing this amount of training with regard to the combat brigade teams, sending them to the combat training centers, with the proposal before us?

General GRASS. Senator, we're very pleased to have the rotation. The 86th Brigade will go to Fort Polk this summer and they're very excited about it, and the Tenth Mountain will go along and support them.

What we're concerned about is the money going away in 2015. We have two allocated rotations for 2015. We'd love to have another one. I think for the long term what we ought to examine, especially with the resources dwindling, what can we afford, and then build a plan consistent with what the men and women of the Guard can do as well, because there is a commitment.

So seven years may be too infrequent, but we have to find that right number for them.

Senator AYOTTE. Well, I think of all the issues that we hopefully can work on is this issue of making sure that there's enough training. I know that's been the focus of all of you in some of the difficult choices that you've had to make in terms of force structure and readiness. So I look forward to continuing to talk with you about this issue.

And I thank you all for your service and what you've done for the country and continue to do.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you, Senator Ayotte.

I just have a few additional questions. First, General Grass, you made a very important point about your concern about the availability of funds for mental health needs once OCO either goes away

or is dramatically reduced further. That I think means that you all need to be sensitive about trying to find a way to build this into the base. I would just simply make that point. It's something I frankly had not thought much about until you made that reference, General Grass. So I thank you for that, and I would just urge you, all of you, to think about how do we build into the base what we need for the additional mental health for our troops as they come home.

Is that something—I'll just ask a quick question. General Odierno, is that something which is on your radar?

General ODIERNO. It is, it's very much on our radar. We are actually increasing our behavioral capability even this year and next year. So we are trying to increase it so we get it out of OCO completely.

Chairman LEVIN. All right, thank you.

General Grass, separate and apart from the issue of trading Apaches for Black Hawks, is it accurate that there has been an unmet requirement for Black Hawks in the Guard?

General GRASS. Senator, I'm not aware of one.

Chairman LEVIN. So you're not aware that the governors or TAG's have sought additional Black Hawks in the past before this issue of the trade came up?

General GRASS. No, sir. They have sought more Chinook aircraft.

Chairman LEVIN. Oh, they have sought them, but there may or may not be a requirement; is that it?

General GRASS. Yes, sir.

Chairman LEVIN. Senator King asked me to ask you this, General Grass. As the reductions in size are made, do you know yet whether those reductions will be allocated proportionately to the States, or will there be other factors that will be considered? Do you know that yet?

General GRASS. Senator, we're in the middle of developing those metrics. But to be fair, we have to look across the States and consider their homeland mission, consider their structure within the State that can respond to the Army and Air Force's needs. But also the other thing that we take into consideration are the demographics of the area of support, looking out 10, 15 years from now.

Chairman LEVIN. Okay, I see Senator Cruz has arrived. Senator Cruz.

Senator CRUZ. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

General Odierno, General Grass, General Talley, thank you all three for your service. Thank you for being here.

General Odierno, I'd like to start by just making a comment about the brave men and women at Fort Hood. I was down there last week visiting with the heroes and, as tragic as that shooting was, I have to tell you it was at the same time inspirational. One young soldier I visited with in particular had been shot twice, was recuperating, was in the hospital with his fiance and his mother and his sister. As he was sitting there and the commanding general came in and he saw the Ranger patch on his uniform, this young soldier leaned forward and said: I want to be a Ranger; can I go to Ranger school? This was 48 hours after he's shot. He's recuperating and the only thought he had was that he wanted to be a Ranger and fight for our country. It's a powerful testament to

the extraordinary men and women who serve in our Army and serve in the military, and I know all of us are praying for those soldiers or remembering those soldiers and are standing with them.

One question that has obviously been discussed in the past week has been the question of concealed carry on military bases. I recognize that's a question on which there's a difference of opinion, a difference of opinion in the military, a difference of opinion in the civilian world. There are some soldiers who feel quite strongly that concealed carry would be a sensible change in policies. There are others who may disagree.

I guess my question would be, it has been a long time since this committee has held a hearing examining that question, examining the policy benefits and detriments of allowing concealed carry on military bases. In your view, would that be a productive topic for a hearing for this committee?

General ODIERNO. There's clearly a difference of opinion on this. I would just say, Senator, that our assessment is that we right now probably would not initially support something like that. But all of this is always worth a discussion if we think it's important.

Senator CRUZ. Well, thank you for that. I do agree it's a question worth further examination, because I think we are all agreed that we want to implement policies that will maximize the safety of the men and women who are serving on our base. Obviously, Fort Hood has now twice in a very short time period suffered through a traumatic experience. I'll tell you, the community has come together even more strongly in the aftermath of that.

I'd like to ask another question focused on the proposals of the Army to reduce its active duty end strength after more than a decade of war. I understand that the Army can handle much of the reduction through normal attrition, but that there will be some soldiers with several tours in Iraq or Afghanistan, in other words some of our most valued combat veterans, who under the current plan will not be allowed to reenlist or otherwise stay on on active duty.

The question I would ask you is, if we go down that path, wouldn't it make sense for the Nation if we could find places for those soldiers in the National Guard, so that we don't lose this experience?

General ODIERNO. Senator, it does. We're working programs now as we go through this to ensure that—we have some limitations that we're working our way through now in terms of recruiting and how we do that and get them exposed to the National Guard, because we clearly would love to keep this experience in the National Guard or the U.S. Army Reserve, either one, because, as you said, they have great experience, they have great contributions, and the fact that we have to draw down 150,000, there's going to be some incredibly capable people that will leave the Army that we would certainly like to continue to serve.

Senator CRUZ. General Grass, I would welcome your views as well on the ability of the Guard to absorb and provide a home for some of these combat veterans and ensure that we have their contribution to readiness going forward.

General GRASS. Senator, we actually, as General Odierno mentioned, we have programs already where we're having an oppor-

tunity to talk with the soldiers who are going to be getting out and talking about what part of the country they're going in. We also have the ability to retrain them. If the skill that they've been serving on active duty doesn't exist in their home town, we can get them additional skills. And we can actually do that before they leave active duty now, which is a huge success from the past.

Senator, one of the things that I'm really pushing hard on is—looking at the mix between our prior service and non-prior service, when the war started the Army National Guard was sitting at about 50 percent prior service and 50 percent non-prior, which meant that everyone we recruited in the non-prior had to go to basic training, they had to go to AIT. They had no skill—I mean, no experience when they came out. All of those prior service recruits already qualified, had great experiences.

As the war unfolded, a lot of people that came off of active duty and with two or three deployments felt that they had served their Nation and they wanted to get on with their civilian life. So our numbers went down to about 20 percent prior service, 80 percent non-prior. So that has cost us additional in recruiting and training.

We would really like to get back to about a 50–50 split and be able to capture all those great young men and women coming off active duty into the Guard.

General TALLEY. Senator, if I may, as we transition from AC to RC, as we lose that quality soldiers from our Active component, it's critical that we bring them into our Reserve component. But we really shouldn't look at them as no longer being a soldier. We want them to be a soldier for life, which means in the regular Army, the Army Reserve, one of our 54 Army National Guards.

In the Army Reserve, we created the Employers Partnership Program that was replicated across all services and components and now it's called Heroes to Hire at the OSD level, so we can help those soldiers; instead of pushing them out, we can pull them out, give them into a civilian career in the private sector, that we can train them for in the Army Reserve and that will allow them to be one of our enablers.

To your opening comments, all I have to say is: Rangers lead the way.

Senator DONNELLY. Well, thank you and thank you for that comment and your service.

Let me ask one final question, which is, at a time when budget resources are certainly scarce it seems to me there's a difficult policy question of the right balance between active duty and Reserve and Guard, and each has a different impact on cost structure and also our readiness. The question I would ask to all three of you is: Would you support the idea of an outside independent commission to study and analyze the proper mix for Active and Reserve component forces for the Army?

General ODIERNO. Thank you, Senator. I think I'm on the record of not supporting that commission, and let me give you reasons why. I think I owe you that, obviously. First, a lot of us compare it to the Army and Air Force commission, the Air Force commission, but in the Air Force proposal initially they didn't cut anything out of the Active component. All their cuts were out of the Reserve component, where in our case 70 percent of the reductions are com-

ing out of the Active component to begin with. So we believe it's been a real fair assessment.

Besides that, we've done—this has not been a surprise. For the last year, 12 to 18 months, we've done detailed analysis internal to the Army and we've done external to the Army. The Rand Corporation has studied this.

In addition to this, OSD CAPE has validated our total force levels as well as the Aviation Restructure Initiative. So we've had outside validate this.

So in my mind, I'm not sure what additional expertise would be brought to this by a commission. In addition to that, it would cost us \$1 billion additionally a year if we delay this two years, and I worry about that because we already have significant unfunded requirements.

Thank you, sir.

Senator DONNELLY. General Grass, General Talley?

General GRASS. Senator, I think your question to me is is there a value in an external look at the Reserve component versus the Active component balance. I will tell you, throughout my career every time we've had challenges, fiscal challenges, this comes up. My personal opinion is that it never hurts to have another look at that balance, because we all learn from it over time.

I do think, going forward, no matter what comes out of the budget—and General Odierno and I have talked about this—we've got to build more multi-component opportunities similar to what we had on pre-September 11, where we had what was called the Title 11 embedded officers and NCOs from active duty into our Guard units. I think that's the kind of thing we've got to look to in the future, and how do we get there with the challenges that we've all been handed, with the great difficulties in the fiscal horizon.

General TALLEY. Senator, it's not clear to me why we need an Army commission. I think the Army, working together and leading through some of the challenges we're having, which are really, to be frank, an impact of the serious budget issues that have been placed upon this service, I think we can resolve them.

If the Congress makes the decision to go forward with the commission, the only thing I would ask is it's critical to make sure that all three components are well represented and integrated. Then I just—as I mentioned earlier in the hearing, my concern is when I look at the Air Force commission that just concluded, there are already some comparisons being drawn out of one of the recommendations, to eliminate the U.S. Air Force Reserve Command, and how that might apply to the U.S. Army Reserve Command, which is a great Title 10 response force for the Nation. So I'm a little leery and question whether or not this is needed.

Thank you, sir.

Senator DONNELLY. Thank you, gentlemen.

Chairman LEVIN. Thank you very much, Senator Cruz.

Senator Blunt, do you have any additional questions?

Senator BLUNT. No.

Chairman LEVIN. One of the things I've been impressed by this morning is how you work together as one Army, even under these circumstances, where you're asked questions which require you to give your different perspectives, to the best of your ability you do



everything you can to support the concept of one Army and come to support each other. It's a very impressive performance here this morning, and I want to thank you all for what you do for our Nation and thank you for your testimony.

General TALLEY. Army strong.

[Whereupon, at 12:52 p.m., the committee adjourned.]