



National Commission on the Future of the Army

2530 Crystal Drive, Zachary Taylor Building, Suite 5000
Arlington, VA 22202

SUBJECT: Closed Meeting—National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Comprehensive Analytic Review Minutes

Date: 16-17 October 2015

Locations: Institute for Defense Analysis, Alexandria VA

Format: Commissioner and NCFA staff discussion

NCFA Attendees:

GEN Carter F. Ham (USA, Ret), Chairman
HON Thomas R. Lamont (ARNGUS, Ret), Vice Chairman
GEN James D. Thurman (USA, Ret), Commissioner
GEN Larry R. Ellis (USA, Ret), Commissioner
LTG Jack C. Stultz (USAR, Ret), Commissioner
HON Robert F. Hale, Commissioner
HON Kathleen H. Hicks, Commissioner
SMA Raymond Chandler (USA, Ret), Commissioner
Mr. Don Tison, Designated Federal Officer (DFO)
MG Ray Carpenter (ARNGUS, Ret), Executive Director
Mr. Rickey Smith, Staff Director

NCFA Staff-

Mr. Jim Boatner	COL Kristen Dixon
Mr. Tony Boyda	COL Rich Miller
Ms. Cherie Emerson	COL Kelly Peters
Mr. Joe Eule	COL Kurt Weinand
Mr. Greg Johnson	LTC Greg Hartvigsen
Mr. Eric Magnell	LTC Tim Palmer
Mr. James Eric Minton	LTC Steve Pierce
Mr. Peter Morgan	LTC Edwin Rice
Mr. Kerry Schindler	LTC Sean Spence
Mr. Scott Sharp	LTC Brian Stevenson
Mr. Jason Southerland	LTC Barry Vincent
Mr. Johnny Thomas	MAJ Benjamin Fernandes
	CPT Sarah Moore

Other Attendees:

Kathleen Conley, Institute for Defense Analysis (IDA)
BG (R) Edward Donnelly, IDA
Mr. Tom Wallace, IDA
Ms. Amrit Romana, IDA
Mr. David Ochmanek, RAND Corporation
Mr. Michael Johnson, RAND Corporation
Mr. Tucker Hughes, Center for Army Analysis (CAA)

SUBJECT: Closed Meeting—National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Comprehensive Analytic Review Minutes

Documents Presented to the Commission

- RAND Force Sufficiency Briefing (document is classified)
- NCFA Briefing (document is classified)
- NCFA Backup Slides (document is classified)
- End Strength Ramps under Different Funding Levels (document is classified)

Methodology for Minutes

Provided the nature of the Comprehensive Analytical Review (classified and seminar), a different approach was used to prepare these minutes. A detailed agenda is provided first, and then a summary of the topics follows in order of the agenda. This methodology was selected, and approved by the DFO, as it best balances the NCFA's transparency desires and responsibilities on the one hand with the NCFA's obligations to protect information in the interests of national security on the other.

Agenda

The meeting was called to order at 0800 hours on Oct. 16, 2015. The Chair made introductory remarks explaining the purpose of the closed meeting. The DFO discussed the meeting procedures and explained the rules regarding the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA).

The meeting recessed at 1715 hours on 16 OCT 15, reconvened 0800 hours on 17 OCT 15, and adjourned at 1605 hours on 17 OCT 15.

The two-day event followed the below agenda:

Day 1 (Thursday 15 October)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 0800-0805 | Admin/Welcome |
| 0805-1200 | NCFA Staff Presentations (Defense Planning Guidance, Scenarios, Steady State and War Plan Requirements, Current Army Force Structure, Modeling Results) |
| 1200-1300 | Commissioners' Time/Lunch |
| 1300-1645 | Discuss Budget, BCT Mix, and Aviation |
| 1645-1715 | Commissioners' Guidance for Day 2 |
| 1715-2040 | Hot Wash and Prepare for Day 2 (NCFA Staff only attending) |

Day 2 (Friday 16 October)

- | | |
|-----------|---|
| 0800-0850 | RAND Potential Regrets Presentation |
| 0850-1230 | Discuss BCT Mix, HQ and Enablers, Forward Stationing, Army Prepositioned Stocks, Strategic Lift, and Rotation Rates |
| 1230-1400 | Commissioners' Time/Lunch |
| 1400-1515 | Army Expansion; Training and Readiness; Recruiting; Modernization |
| 1545-1605 | Commissioner Guidance |
| 1605 | Meeting adjourned |

SUBJECT: Closed Meeting—National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Comprehensive Analytic Review Minutes

1605-1630 Hot Wash (NCFA Staff only attending)

The CAR provided an environment in which the Commissioners could expand their understanding of classified topics. All eight Commissioners, as well as most members of the NCFA staff, attended the event. In addition, representatives from several analytical organizations (Center for Army Analysis (CAA), TRADOC Analysis Center, RAND, and IDA) were invited to provide analytic support. The Commission gained assistance from BG (R) Donnelly serving as the moderator for discussions.

Discussions throughout both days flowed freely back and forth from classified to unclassified information. The NCFA Staff presentations were designed to prompt discussion using a question and evidence format covering the structure of the Army today, warfighting challenges relative to alternative force mixes, and insights drawn from scenario-based analyses. After the opening remarks, the NCFA staff reviewed the prepared questions with the Commissioners. They also presented additional data and analyses generated by the Staff to inform the Commissioners' deliberations. Participating analysts also presented applicable findings from their research and shared their expertise with the Commission. As Commissioners agreed on an approach to a specific topic, or agreed they had enough information to address the topic at a later point, the discussion moved to the next question.

Following NCFA Staff presentations, Mr. Johnson, RAND analyst, led a discussion of how the addition or substitution of new scenarios could influence demand and stress on the force. The findings of these analyses were illuminating to the Commissioners, generating additional discussion and, in some cases, revisiting earlier conclusions. The CAR concluded with a “gap analysis” presented by Mr. Smith, NCFA Staff Director, designed to expose areas that may require additional attention and discussion among the Commissioners to resolve any remaining gaps.

The general consensus regarding the CAR was the analysis and discussion helped to crystallize issues affecting the Commission's recommendations. A subsequent classified review was planned for the 18-19 NOV 2015 as a Closed Meeting.

Analytical Models

NCFA used several analytical models to ensure thorough and complete predictive analysis was applied throughout the process of simulation and comparison. These models took on many forms, including but not limited to, dynamical systems, statistical models, and differential equations. Considering all, central to the quantitative assessments were the modelling results provided by Marathon, Joint Integrated Campaign Model (JICM), Analysis of Mobility Platform (AMP), and Force Requirements Generation (FORGE) models.

MARATHON analyzed inventory, demand, and force generation of ready forces

SUBJECT: Closed Meeting—National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Comprehensive Analytic Review Minutes

over time. JICM validated the feasibility of the force lists and concepts of operation in the jointly-developed planning scenarios; as well JICM provided important data on the speed of advance, casualties, equipment losses, fuel consumption, and other factors critical for analysis of support force requirements. AMP modeled the movement of personnel, equipment, and supplies from home station to ports and airports in the U.S., transit from U.S. ports and airports to overseas ports and airports, and onward to their final destinations using all available methods of transport. FORGE applied Army doctrine, the concept for providing support and sustainment element from the jointly-developed planning scenarios, JICM output, and other analytic processes to determine the doctrinal requirements for a balanced force capable of conducting and sustaining major combat operations. When applied to new data or records, each model assisted to predict viable outcomes based on historical patterns.

Below are unclassified results by topic.

Budget

The Commissioners determined that the Budget Control Act (BCA) funding levels created unacceptable risk and considered how to appropriately balance modernization, structure, and readiness for the Army. They expressed great concern over the impact of budget uncertainty and the increased costs associated with uncertainty, which prevents consistent funding for important modernization and readiness programs. The Commissioners believe recommendations requiring funding above the President's Budget will be dismissed as not feasible. Commissioners directed the final report to clearly articulate the benefits of the All-Volunteer Force (AVF) and the costs required to maintain an AVF.

Force Mix

Commissioners discussed the appropriate mix of Brigade Combat Teams (BCTs) and enablers (operational support and sustainment units) for current and potential future missions based on the operational environment, including current and projected threats. Discussions included how to determine the overall size of the Army, including all Soldiers, civilians, and contract personnel. The discussions included how the Army could best meet expected or potential daily requirements around the globe and retain sufficient capacity for "surge" event(s).

Commissioners expressed concerns over the health of the civilian workforce who provide critical capabilities to the Defense Department but are frequently demonized by Congress and the press. Commissioners realized the Commission lacks the time to dig deeply into civilian workforce issues, but agreed civilian size depends on requirements dictated by a variety of factors including Congressional tasks, Army size, and infrastructure. There is no simple correlation or ratio between the appropriate civilian size and number of uniformed Soldiers. A large portion of Army civilians cannot be eliminated due to installation requirements and "pass through" responsibilities (positions paid for by non-Army funding but executed by the Army, for example the Defense Health Program). Additionally, as the uniformed Army

SUBJECT: Closed Meeting—National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Comprehensive Analytic Review Minutes

shrinks, civilian requirements may increase to fulfill tasks previously performed by uniformed service members. The Generating Force model, developed by CAA and US Army Force Management Agency, presented to the Institutional Subcommittee offers the most accurate predictive tool found to date.

Commissioners anticipate a smaller Army must employ RC forces more frequently and should do so in a predictable manner to minimize stress on RC forces, families, and civilian employers. Routine use of RC forces requires proper planning, authorities, and funding.

Commissioners received a force sufficiency briefing from RAND and discussed the risk of various changes when shifting forward-stationed and managing rotational forces. This led to the Commissioners discussing pros and cons for forming and employing multi-component units as a possible way to improve readiness and force integration.

Aviation

Mr. Pippin from TRAC shared their forces sufficiency analysis comparing aviation forces options developed by the Aviation Subcommittee. The analysis integrated BOG dwell, surge options, varying mobilization windows, and progressive readiness cycles.

The Commissioners discussed the Aviation Subcommittee's work including scenarios and the potential costs and benefits of multi-component aviation units. They determined the Aviation Subcommittee had more work to do before making proposals. The Commissioners asked the NCFA staff to conduct further modeling excursions using the different aviation options under consideration.

Headquarters (HQ) & Enablers

Commissioners discussed OSD directed reductions in manpower for all 2-star and above headquarters. Commissioners considered information gained from multiple site visits concerning operational requirements and the loss of capacity to meet those requirements within these HQ, especially the Army Service Component Commands (ASCC).

Commissioners articulated the need to more fully employ eight National Guard Divisions or recapitalize the force structure for other requirements. The NCFA staff was tasked to identify how many the number and types of commitments sourced by the Army using Regular Army and ARNG Divisions since the last ARNG Division deployment to Afghanistan in 2011.

Forward Stationing vs. Rotational Forces

Commissioners addressed the benefits, costs, and limitations of forward stationing and rotating forces in various regions around the globe.

SUBJECT: Closed Meeting—National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Comprehensive Analytic Review Minutes

Army Prepositioned Stocks (APS)

Commissioners discussed APS and if adjustments should be made to improve the Army's ability to support Combatant Commander's demands or foreign policy considerations.

Strategic Lift

Commissioners discussed current and future capacity of strategic lift assets available to DOD in relation to current operations, war plans, and contingency operations.

Rotation Rates

The Commissioners agreed demand for Army forces will remain high despite lower commitments in Iraq and Afghanistan. The smaller force size and continued demand will cause Army formations in all components to continue violating deployment to dwell and mobilization to dwell policy goals. Commissioners discussed whether "Boots-on-the-Ground" (BOG) time for a given deployment should be the same for all Army components. Commissioners expressed support for a RC 1:4 mobilization to dwell ratio goal, but were concerned about the costs of increasing mobilization frequency, which varies tremendously by unit type.

Commissioners agreed the Army could leverage 10 U.S.C. § 12304b authority to employ RC units more often to reduce stress on Regular Army units. Commissioners noted funding would have to adjust for increased use of this authority. They also expressed concern about the challenges for using 12304b authority for emerging requirements within the budget and programming cycle specified by law. Commissioners asked the NCFA Staff to examine the impact and feasibility of adjusting Congressional authorization language to allow usage of 12304b authority for emergent requirements.

Mobilization

Commissioners discussed changes to pre-mobilization and mobilization processes and how adjustments could improve integration between Army components while meeting Combatant Command requirements.

Expansion

Commissioners discussed the ability to regenerate and expand the Army to support extended operations and other unexpected contingencies.

Commissioners indicated improved Individual Ready Reserve (IRR) management was a necessary part of expanding the Army. The Force Generation Subcommittee was tasked to develop proposals for Commission recommendations.

Commissioners indicated post 9-11 mobilization efforts occurred under unique circumstances benefiting the Army, such as a weak economy, sufficient infrastructure base, and a generating force manned with field grade officers and NCOs to provide the cadre to expand the Army. Commissioners expressed concerns similar

SUBJECT: Closed Meeting—National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Comprehensive Analytic Review Minutes

circumstances may not exist in the future. One example was the decline of mid-grade leaders (officers and Non-commissioned Officers) in the institutional force that could rapidly fill positions in new units. Post 9-11 actions included accelerated promotions as means of crediting mid-grade leaders, which resulted in some of the problems the Army is experiencing today where leaders have insufficient preparation for their duties. Commissioners worried the Army may have outsourced or eliminated too much of its "seed corn" for the next expansion.

Training and Readiness

Commissioners discussed the Army's training infrastructure. Commissioners directed the Institutional Army Subcommittee to investigate further, and acquire more information to develop proposals for more efficient use available capacity (e.g. Regional Training Institutes) and clarify authorities across the Total Army School System for the full Commission's consideration.

Recruiting

Commissioners indicated they had concerns with the separate and distinct Regular Army, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve recruiting and marketing practices, which appear inefficient and competing with each other. Commissioners determined the Institutional Subcommittee had sufficient information to craft proposals for the Commission to consider.

Modernization

Commissioners discussed Army investments in modernization as part of an appropriate balance of resourcing for readiness, force structure, and modernization in a resource-constrained environment. Commissioners discussed the need for Army modernization to support the Joint Force. Commissioners supported the Army protecting its relatively small Science and Technology Research and Development funding. Commissioners directed NCFA Staff to invite the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Acquisition, Logistics, and Technology (ASAALT) and Department of the Army G-8, or their representatives, to appear at an Open Meeting to discuss the Army modernization plan.

Modernization was the last discussion topic during the CAR.