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DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HISTORICAL SUMMARY

FISCAL YEAR 2007
Changes and challenges characterized fiscal year (FY) 2007 for the United States Army as it fought two major conflicts, in Iraq and Afghanistan, and prepared for the future through modernization and transformation. While Army leaders continued to prosecute the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT), they also emphasized recruiting, maintaining, and supporting soldiers and their families who were stretched and stressed by the demands of repeated deployments and limited recovery time. By the summer of 2007, the U.S. Army was “out of balance,” according to its new chief of staff, and “consumed” with meeting its current demands at an unsustainable tempo of deployments. To regain balance, Army leaders sought to better prepare soldiers for combat, reset the forces after deployments, transform to meet future demands, and sustain the Army’s soldiers, families, and civilians.

The Army experienced a number of staff and organizational changes during FY 2007. The former commander of the Multi-National Force–Iraq, General George W. Casey Jr., became the Army chief of staff in April, and a few months later, Preston M. “Pete” Geren III became secretary of the Army, having been the acting secretary since March 2007. The new U.S. Army Africa began its mission as part of the United States Africa Command on 1 October 2007. It was the newest of six unified commands in the Department of Defense command structure. The Army also changed its logistical structure with several organizational changes and established a new theater signal command in the United States as well.

The Army’s FY 2007 budget proposal emphasized manning the force, supporting soldiers and families, and sustaining the quality of
Army personnel. Key features of the Army’s planning and financial emphasis included the Future Combat Systems (FCS) program and the continued development of the new modular force, which was designed to create brigade-based units for expeditions and campaigns.

Preparing Army units for overseas duty was the catalyst for the new Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) model, which provided for recurring availability of units for operational deployment. Simultaneously, the Army worked to identify, recruit, and retain high quality soldiers. To sustain the force, the Army spent significant resources to upgrade installations, facilities, and family housing and developed plans to continue these efforts into the future.

Secretary Geren
Several major organizational changes within the Army’s structure occurred in FY 2007. In October 2006, Fifth United States Army became U.S. Army North and assumed America’s homeland defense mission, which included support for federal, state, and local civil authorities during times of crisis, and security cooperation activities with Canada and Mexico. The creation of U.S. Army North was part of the Army’s ongoing transformation process, an effort to adapt the headquarters command structure to execute Military Department Title 10 functions more efficaciously. The command, based at Fort Sam Houston, Texas, served as the Army service component of U.S. Northern Command. In addition, U.S. Army North assumed responsibility for the training and readiness of Civil Support Response Teams, National Guard units dedicated to weapons of mass destruction and disaster response missions.

The newly organized United States Army Installation Management Command (IMCOM) began operations on 24 October 2006, under the leadership of Lt. Gen. Robert Wilson. Its purpose was to reduce bureaucracy, apply a uniform business structure to manage U.S. Army installations, sustain the environment, and enhance the well-being of the military community. IMCOM consolidated the Installation Management Agency, the Community and Family Support Center, and the Army Environmental Center under a single command as a direct reporting unit. Before the genesis of IMCOM, one of the Army’s fifteen major commands managed 184 installations. In November 2006, in a consolidation of two subordinate offices, IMCOM activated IMCOM-West at Fort Sam Houston. The following month, the Installation Management Command announced the Installation Management Study, a blueprint for IMCOM to fit seamlessly into the Army’s structure and to strengthen installation support services to soldiers and their families. In 2007, IMCOM created thirty-five Warrior Transition Units, to deliver support to families and soldiers at Army garrisons.

Furthering the Army’s restructuring efforts, in November 2006, Secretary of the Army Francis J. Harvey approved redefining the service’s
major command headquarters and aligning each based on new definitions and their relationships with Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA). Harvey approved several new definitions:

- Army Command: an Army force, designated by the Army secretary, which performs multiple Army Service Title 10 functions across multiple disciplines. The command responsibilities are set by the Army secretary.

- Army Service Component Command: an Army force comprised primarily of operational organizations serving as the Army component of a combatant command or sub-unified command.

- Direct reporting unit (DRU): an Army organization comprised of one or more units with institutional or operational support functions, normally to provide broad general support to the Army in a single, unique discipline, not otherwise available in the Army. DRUs report directly to an Army headquarters principal and/or Army Command, and operate under authorities established by the Army secretary.

Under the secretary’s restructuring scheme, U.S. Army Forces Command, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, and U.S. Army Materiel Command (AMC) became known as Army Commands. The nine Army components of the worldwide combatant commands were to be described as Army Service Component Commands. Direct reporting units, such as U.S. Army Network Enterprise Technology Command, U.S. Army Medical Command, and U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command comprised a further headquarters.

In a significant change to the Army’s logistics structure, in January 2007 the Military Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC) became a major subordinate command of Army Materiel Command, headquartered at Scott Air Force Base, Illinois. Previously, the Surface Deployment and Distribution Command had been a major Army command reporting to the Department of the Army. SDDC remained the Army service component command of the U.S. Transportation Command, with the responsibility for coordinating all
surface movement of Department of Defense assets and the operation of twenty-four seaports. As a result, the SDDC became the single Army integrator of logistics, managing the Army’s logistical distribution and troop transportation efforts from the United States to deployed theater support commands.

On 7 February 2007, President George W. Bush announced that he had directed the Defense Department to develop and stand up a unified command for Africa. The new command was one of six unified geographic commands within the Department of Defense organization. General William E. “Kip” Ward became the first commander of U.S. Africa Command (AFRICOM) in Stuttgart, Germany, on 1 October 2007. The new organization covered the entire African continent except Egypt, which continued to fall under U.S. Central Command. AFRICOM’s purpose was to oversee security cooperation with African allies, nonmilitary operations, and, if needed, military operations as well. For its first year, the command existed as a subcommand of U.S. European Command, with a separate headquarters. On 1 October 2008, the command separated from U.S. European Command and began operating as a full-fledged combatant command.

Reorganization during FY 2007 also included the Army’s efforts to use its past experiences to enhance its training, education, esprit de corps, and decision making in the present and future. Accordingly, the U.S. Army Center of Military History (CMH), located at Fort Lesley J. McNair, Washington, D.C., moved from under the auspices of the Director of the Army Staff to the Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army, effective 14 March 2007. The Center of Military History remained responsible for the appropriate use of history throughout the United States Army. Formed in 1945, CMH provides historical support to the Army Secretariat and Staff, and contributes essential background information for decision making, staff actions, command information programs, and public statements by Army officials.
At the end of the fiscal year, the Army announced plans to establish a new theater signal command within the continental United States, headquartered at Fort Gordon, Georgia. Headed by a three-star general and designated as 7th Signal Command, the organization was responsible for command and control of the Continental United States LandWarNet, the infrastructure and services that allow the Army to collect, process, store, disseminate, and manage information on demand for users; defending homeland-based, information-enabled operations; and synchronizing network operations in the Continental United States. The 7th Signal Command became one of five theater Signal Commands worldwide, and a subordinate element of the Army’s NETCOM/9th Signal Command.

Management

The Army continued to emphasize Lean Six Sigma methodology in its “Business Transformation” efforts to seek process refinement, waste reduction, and quality improvement, in order to free manpower and money for more pressing operational needs. From these initiatives, the Army also sought reduced costs. Based on the Toyota Production System, Lean Six Sigma techniques as implemented throughout the Army proved successful and produced an estimated cost savings of $2 billion by 2007. A number of Army organizations continued to use this methodology in FY 2007. One noteworthy example is the Army Materiel Command, which earned twelve Shingo Prizes presented for continuous improvement through employee empowerment and effective leadership. The Central Issue Facility of Fort Bragg, North Carolina, a one-stop equipment and clothing outlet for soldiers, reduced issue and turn-in times by 50 percent and its inventory by more than 65 percent. Fort Bragg officials projected a 20 percent cost savings by October 2007. Employees at the Red River Army Depot, Texas, focused Lean Six Sigma techniques on projects involving the production of the M2 Bradley fighting vehicle to realize almost $600,000 in savings. Fuel-recycling initiatives at Red River Depot also saved more than thirty-seven thousand gallons of fuel, with a value of approximately $85,000 in FY 2007. The depot also saved more than $19 million after a program aligning two process-improvement activities helped eliminate waste and reduced variation in business and industrial processes.

With regard to Army personnel issues, plans continued for the rollout of the congressionally mandated Defense Integrated Military Human Resources System. This was the largest finance reorganization since the creation of the paymaster general of the Army at the beginning of the American Revolution. The system attempted to transfer all payroll and personnel functions to Human Resources Command, with a planned rollout date of August 2008. The system utilized PeopleSoft commercial software
to integrate ninety automated systems across the Department of Defense and was intended to provide soldiers with secure, Web-based self-service options such as leave and earnings statement access, initiating requests for assignments, and requesting various forms, all without having to see a personnel specialist.

**Budget**

The Army’s FY 2007 budget mirrored General Casey’s priorities by emphasizing manning the force, taking care of soldiers and families, and sustaining the quality of Army personnel. For operations and maintenance, the Army sought funding for combined arms training, the Baseline Depot Maintenance Program, commitments to improve base support and sustainment, as well as ongoing peacekeeping operations in Kosovo. Additionally, the Army relied on supplemental budget requests for Operations IRAQI FREEDOM (OIF) and ENDURING FREEDOM (OEF).

The budget reflected a 2.2 percent across-the-board pay raise for active and reserve military personnel, with selective additional increases for certain warrant officers and mid-grade senior enlisted personnel. There was also a 2.2 percent pay raise for Department of the Army civilians.

The operations and maintenance section of the Army budget supported readiness objectives by funding institutional training, mobilization operations, installation management, and recruiting missions. The FY 2007 budget also supported the Army’s war fighting readiness through training, mobility, and sustainment programs, and sought to provide adequate levels of funding for the maintenance of weapon systems, equipment, and infrastructure. The research and development funds in the FY 2007 budget emphasized the Future Combat Systems program, the Joint Tactical Radio System, and continued development and demonstration activities for the Patriot/Medium Extended Air Defense System Combined Aggregate Program.

The Army’s FY 2007 procurement budget contained funding for the development of the Army modular force, including more than $5 billion for equipment required to allow soldiers to operate in the new modular brigade combat teams. The budget projected additional funds for new aircraft, including Black Hawk, armed reconnaissance, and light utility helicopters, as well as new and remanufactured Chinook cargo helicopters. The delivery of Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles to deployed troops received significant financial emphasis. Secretary of Defense Robert M. Gates asked Congress in July for approval to shift an additional $1.2 billion from other defense programs to the MRAP effort, which meant an MRAP budget of $5.4 billion for FY 2007.
Military construction funds in the budget were intended to improve facilities across the Army by making barracks renewal a top priority. This allocation also supported transformation and readiness by creating facilities for training and deployment, revitalizing infrastructure, and providing Reserve Component readiness facilities. The active component military construction budget furnished projects to upgrade the quality of life of soldiers and families, improve readiness, and support transformation. New facilities included modern barracks, training ranges, and physical fitness centers.

In the Army’s budget, research, development, and acquisition (RDA) included both $75 billion in procurement appropriations and $69 billion in research, development, test, and evaluation appropriations. The RDA budget balanced the needs of the forces fighting the war with modernizing and recapitalizing the force for future challenges, and supported investigating, acquiring, and fielding technical and materiel solutions as quickly as possible to meet soldiers’ needs in the field. In addition to Future Combat Systems, the FY 2007 budget sought to allow the Army to progress with the delivery of the first iterations of the new Battle Command Control Network, with Unattended Ground Sensors and Intelligent Munition Systems and the Non-Line-of-Sight Launch System. For the entire Defense Department, from FY 2000 to FY 2007, research development, test, and evaluation funds increased by nearly 72 percent
and procurement increased by 110 percent in constant dollars, figures that include supplemental funds. RDA funding for the Army in FY 2007 was $11.3 billion, down from $11.7 billion in FY 2006 (Table 1). Army procurement funds totaled $48.6 billion, an increase from $28.2 billion in the previous fiscal year.

Financially, FY 2007 was challenging. The bulk of the Army’s funds was spent to sustain its people, maintain vital infrastructure, and prepare equipment for combat deployment. (See Table 2.) As a result of these costs, the Army’s ability to fund its investment accounts was limited. Budget shortfalls led the Army to announce on 16 April that spending restrictions were necessary while it waited for Congress to pass an emergency supplemental budget request to fund GWOT requirements. Funds for operations and maintenance ran low during this time, requiring reductions in other areas to ensure funds were available to execute the Army’s mission of defending the nation and prosecuting the Global War on Terrorism while continuing to support military families.

**Table 1—Presidential Budget Requests, FYs 2005–2007**

(Billions of Dollars)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>41.4</td>
<td>42.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Family Housing</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Demilitarization</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Realignment and Closure</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>98.8</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.4</strong></td>
<td><strong>111.8</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Army FY 07 Budget Overview, Assistant Secretary of the Army for Financial Management and Comptroller.*

By the end of the fiscal year, the Army’s top civilian and military leaders informed Congress they needed continued and uninterrupted support to maintain current operational levels while preparing for the future. General Casey outlined four imperatives for the House Armed
Services Committee, which he said were critical to the Army’s ability to restore balance and maintain the all-volunteer force: improving the way the Army sustained soldiers, families, and civilians; preparing troops for success in the current conflict; resetting troops and equipment for future deployments; and transforming the force for the twenty-first century. General Casey further stressed the need for fielding the best new equipment to the fighting forces, incorporating new techniques, and deploying the Army’s Future Combat Systems to brigade combat teams to ensure that the Army has a decisive advantage on the battlefield. Casey also urged House Armed Services Committee members to support these initiatives into FY 2008 and to avoid a funding gap after 1 October 2007, which had the potential to slow military efforts then under way. Secretary Geren noted in his testimony to the same congressional committee that the Army’s focus had shifted away from the pay issues that dominated the 1970s and housing issues of the 1990s. Rather, the current emphasis focused on taking care of Army families, particularly with regard to long deployments of service members. Casey echoed these remarks, and stressed “resetting the force,” by which he meant giving soldiers and their families time to regroup between deployments.

In February 2007, President Bush delivered his FY 2008 defense budget request and FY 2007 emergency supplemental funding request to Congress. The 2008 proposal called for a 3 percent pay raise for service members, an increase in ground forces, and continued funding of the Global War on Terrorism. The request aimed to improve readiness through additional training and maintenance and by resetting forces following overseas deployments. Bush’s budget called for the Army to receive $130.1 billion in FY 2008, an increase of more than 20 percent. The Army’s Future Combat Systems would receive $3.7 billion in research and development funds. The Army asked for slightly more than $24 billion in procurement dollars for aircraft purchases, combat and support vehicles, and weapons, including 70,000 M4 carbine rifles and more than 8,300 M249 squad automatic weapons.

The president’s emergency supplemental request for FY 2007 was set at $93.4 billion, with $39.3 billion going to war fighting, supplies, support, and maintenance. It also sought $10.4 billion to defeat improvised explosive devices. Under the proposal, the active Army would grow to 547,400 soldiers by the end of FY 2012, and give soldiers two years at their home stations for every year deployed. By July, Secretary Gates planned revisions to the FY 2008 budget requests to account for new requirements, including the purchase of new MRAP vehicles, which was expected to cost at least $10 billion. Gates approved a plan to increase production of MRAPs to a monthly rate of 1,300 vehicles by December 2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appropriation</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Military Personnel</td>
<td>40,880</td>
<td>41,636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare-Retiree Contribution</td>
<td>2,727</td>
<td>2,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations and Maintenance</td>
<td>63,487</td>
<td>72,934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>26,808</td>
<td>43,087</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aircraft</td>
<td>(3,400)</td>
<td>(5,672)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missiles</td>
<td>(1,365)</td>
<td>(1,617)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weapons and Tracked Combat Vehicles</td>
<td>(4,047)</td>
<td>(8,337)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammunition</td>
<td>(2,793)</td>
<td>(2,617)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Procurement</td>
<td>(15,203)</td>
<td>(24,853)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research, Development, Test, and Evaluation</td>
<td>11,683</td>
<td>11,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Construction</td>
<td>1,959</td>
<td>3,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Family Housing</td>
<td>1,245</td>
<td>1,316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation</td>
<td>(805)</td>
<td>(719)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>(440)</td>
<td>(597)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reserve Components</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Guard</td>
<td>13,492</td>
<td>14,718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>(5,979)</td>
<td>(7,144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>(5,191)</td>
<td>(5,869)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>(1,102)</td>
<td>(473)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare-Retiree Contribution</td>
<td>(1,219)</td>
<td>(1,232)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Army Reserve</td>
<td>6,427</td>
<td>6,873</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personnel</td>
<td>(3,427)</td>
<td>(3,514)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operations</td>
<td>(2,133)</td>
<td>(2,451)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>(151)</td>
<td>(166)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicare-Retiree Contribution</td>
<td>(717)</td>
<td>(742)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Realignment and Closure 2</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base Realignment and Closure 5</td>
<td>873</td>
<td>3,605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Demilitarization</td>
<td>1,387</td>
<td>1,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afghan Security Forces Fund</td>
<td>1,908</td>
<td>7,406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iraq Security Forces Fund</td>
<td>3,007</td>
<td>5,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defense Working Capital Fund</td>
<td>460</td>
<td>628</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint IED Defeat Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>4393</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>176,454.8</td>
<td>221,264.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Title IX, supplemental appropriations, and construction funding.
^ Totals may not add due to rounding.
* FY 2007 column includes all base, bridge, and supplemental funding.

The Army’s active component end strength on 30 September 2007 totaled 522,147 personnel: 70,839 commissioned officers, 13,843 warrant officers, 433,101 enlisted soldiers, and 4,364 academy cadets. This was a total increase of 14,989 since October 2006. Minorities constituted 37.5 percent of the active Army. At the end of September 2007, women constituted 13.7 percent of the active Army, with 71,100 females serving on active duty. Of these, 11,824 were officers, 1,159 were warrant officers, and 58,117 were enlisted. Women who were married at the time of their active duty service constituted 46.1 percent of those in the Army, and 14 percent were single with children.

The Army National Guard’s (ARNG) end strength in September 2007 totaled 352,707: 30,757 commissioned officers, 6,738 warrant officers, and 315,212 enlisted soldiers. Minorities constituted 25.4 percent of the Army National Guard. At the end of FY 2006 the National Guard had 346,288 soldiers, out of authorized strength of 350,000. Women constituted 13.8 percent of the Army National Guard.

The end strength of the U.S. Army Reserve (USAR) in September 2007 was 189,882: 33,265 commissioned officers, 2,725 warrant officers, and 153,892 enlisted soldiers. Minorities constituted 40.2 percent of the Army Reserve, while women made up 23.4 percent of the total. In FY 2007 the Army Reserve’s authorized strength dropped from 205,000 to 200,000.

At Army Headquarters, General Casey received the nomination from President Bush to become the 36th Chief of Staff, U.S. Army, to succeed General Peter J. Schoomaker, who had served in that position since August 2003. Casey received Senate confirmation on 8 February 2007, by a vote of 83–14. He assumed his new duties on 10 April 2007, in a ceremony at Fort Myer, Virginia. Three months later, on 13 July, Preston Geren received unanimous confirmation by the Senate to become the secretary of the Army. Geren had been acting secretary of the Army since 9 March, after he replaced Secretary Harvey, who resigned on 2 March.
Manning Initiatives

The demands of the conflicts in Afghanistan and Iraq led to pressures on the Army’s uniformed and civilian leaders with regard to the use of its forces. President Bush announced in early 2007 his intention to “grow” the Army by approximately 65,000 soldiers between FY 2008 and FY 2013, and in January Secretary Gates authorized the Army to increase the active force by 65,000 to a permanent end strength of 547,000 by 2012. To maintain its strength in active theaters, however, the Army announced in April, at the request of General Casey and Secretary Geren, that soldiers in all active duty Army units in Central Command would begin serving longer combat deployments—fifteen months rather than twelve months. They would spend no less than twelve months at home before another deployment. Even with these changes, Army Vice Chief of Staff General Richard A. Cody declared in July 2007 that the 65,000 personnel increase was inadequate to meet the service’s demands and that more troops were needed.

In March 2007, the G–1 issued manning guidance for the fiscal year for Headquarters, Department of the Army, active component forces. The guidelines signified a move toward a phased readiness strategy necessary to support Army Force Generation, the structured progression of increased unit readiness over time. The ARFORGEN process resulted in recurring periods of availability of trained, ready, and cohesive active, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve units prepared for operational deployment. All manning initiatives were designed to support the prosecution of the Global War on Terrorism and Army transformation.

Enlisted Personnel

For FY 2007, the Army’s accession goal was 80,000 new soldiers, in addition to 35,505 for the Army Reserve and 70,000 for the Army National Guard. After a struggle with recruiting in May and June, the results for the Army’s active component improved late in the fiscal year and ended with 100.5 percent of its accession mission with the recruitment of 80,407 new service members (Table 3). The Army added about 1,200 recruiters over the prior 18 months to achieve this goal, which raised the total personnel performing that duty to 8,400.

The Army’s recruiting success, however, came with a price. Although the percentage of recruits who scored above average on the Armed Forces Qualification Test remained stable at 61 percent during FY 2007, only 79 percent of the new recruits entering the Army possessed a high school diploma. This level was below the Department of Defense benchmark standard of 90 percent, which the other services met. Additionally, the
Army accessed 3,200 Category IV recruits, those who scored in the lowest third on the aptitude test. The Army also approved more criminal history waivers—15 percent of new recruits—than it had in years past. Of those approved waivers, 87 percent were because of misdemeanor convictions. The remainder of them were for more serious offenses including felonies. FY 2007 saw an increase in the number of medical and misconduct waivers granted as well. Nearly one in five recruits required a waiver.

A number of causes contributed to the recruiting difficulties experienced during the year. Relatively low unemployment in the United States, the rate of which declined from 6 percent in 2003 to 4.6 percent for 2006 and 2007, likely decreased economic incentives to join the services, as did the major role the Army played in the Iraq conflict. Survey research conducted prior to FY 2007 indicated that certain segments of the adult population—especially women and African Americans—had become less likely to recommend military service to young people since the invasion of Iraq commenced. Other evidence indicated that Army recruiters had difficulty signing up high school seniors, especially those below the age of eighteen, who required parental consent to enlist. Moreover, the ongoing effort to increase the size of the active Army increased the goal for new recruits from 73,800 in 2003 to 80,000 by 2008, which presented Army recruiters with a more challenging goal.

The Army met the challenges to enlist more men and women with creative solutions. A new nationwide Army recruiting campaign started on 9 November, with advertisements delivered through television, internet search engines, text messaging, and Web sites, including an updated www.goarmy.com Web site. The new theme, “Army Strong,” was intended to be distinctive and powerful and replaced the “Army of One” slogan in use since early 2001. McCann Worldgroup, a marketing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Component</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Active Army</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td>80,407</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>100.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNG</td>
<td>70,000</td>
<td>66,652 (3,348)</td>
<td>95.2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAR</td>
<td>35,505</td>
<td>35,734</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>100.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: ARNG = Army National Guard; USAR = U.S. Army Reserve

communications agency retained by the Army in December 2005, developed the campaign by conducting research among prospective recruits and their influencers, and interacted with hundreds of active duty soldiers. Print advertisements began running in January 2007, primarily with media that appealed to young adults. The campaign had a budget estimated at $1.35 billion over five years. The advertisement efforts also funded national sponsorships to help promote awareness and interaction with the Army, such as NASCAR and the National Hot Rod Association drivers, and athletes who competed as professional bull riders, cowboys, and arena football players. Bowing to the social realities of the time, the television ads for the most part omitted images related to the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan.

To help meet the challenge of maintaining a large volunteer force during wartime, the Army also used several enlistment incentives for its recruiters, as well as soldiers already in the ranks and for those who referred potential enlistees. In November 2006, the Army doubled the existing bonus amount for active duty and reserve-component soldiers and military retirees who referred qualified recruits to the Referral Bonus Pilot Program to $2,000. By February 2007, the Army had received more than ten thousand referrals. The Army expanded its Referral Bonus Program to include civilian employees in March 2007, making it possible for them to earn $2,000 as well. By early August, sponsors had referred
31,000 recruits resulting in 6,800 contracts.

In late May, the U.S. Army Recruiting Command introduced two new enlistment incentives. A bonus of up to $51,864 was available to recruits who signed up for a two-year enlistment in more than forty-five active-Army military occupational specialties, including fire support specialist, signal support systems specialist, petroleum supply specialist, pharmacy specialist, and health care specialist. The Army also raised the maximum combined bonus for a three-year enlistment from $10,000 to $25,000 for certain military occupation specialties. Qualified recruits who enlisted for two years in addition to training were eligible for an enlistment bonus of up to $15,000, as well as Montgomery GI Bill and Army College Fund benefits.

To bolster the growth of the Army by more than thirty-four thousand soldiers, Army officials in August began implementing bonuses for recruits who signed up by the end of September 2007. The Army Recruiting Command announced $20,000 “quick-ship” bonuses for aspiring recruits with no prior military service who enlisted for at least two years of active duty and reported to basic training within thirty days of their enlistment. Other initiatives included adding financial incentives and advertising a two-year enlistment option; establishing a program to help refine nearly one million leads to identify prospective recruits with the highest potential to enlist, to save recruiters time and allow them to focus on prospecting; requesting additional soldiers graduating from initial training to serve as hometown recruiter assistants and returning combat veterans to serve as special recruiter assistants; re-emphasizing the $2,000 referral bonus program; requesting the temporary return of up to one

In 2007 “America’s Army” was released in several new platforms including arcade and mobile devices.
thousand former successful recruiters to augment the current recruiting force; and requesting general officer assistance to help the recruiting effort through speaking engagements in local communities and colleges and at events. Increasing the maximum enlistment age to forty-two years brought in hundreds more recruits that year as well.

Taking advantage of modern technology for recruiting purposes, the Army launched the game “America’s Army: Special Operations” for mobile phones in February 2007. An arcade version of “America’s Army” was released five months later. “America’s Army” consisted of a series of video games and other media developed by the Army and released for personal computers in 2002 as a global public relations initiative to help with recruitment. By 2007, it ranked in the top ten most popular computer games of its kind. In February 2007 the Army also launched “The Virtual Army Experience,” a mobile simulator that allows participants to experience various aspects of the soldier’s life. “The Virtual Army Experience” became available in a full-scale rendition or broken down into two smaller versions enabling it to appear at two separate events simultaneously at hundreds of venues across America. This effort did meet with some public opposition, however, among critics who argued that war was an inappropriate theme for a game.

In addition to attracting new recruits to its ranks, the Army also sought to retain its veterans. Retention rates among units supporting Operations Enduring Freedom and Iraqi Freedom exceeded the Army’s
goals, in part due to the use of deployed reenlistment bonuses to active duty soldiers in Iraq, Afghanistan, and Kuwait (Table 4). These incentives included tax free lump sums of up to $15,000, with an average payment of $10,400, provided soldiers reenlisted for three- to six-year extensions while still in the war zone. The Army increased bonuses by as much as $7,500 for soldiers whose terms of service expired in FY 2007, if they reenlisted by 30 April.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personnel</th>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Obtained</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial-term</td>
<td>25,502</td>
<td>29,828</td>
<td>117.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mid-career</td>
<td>21,770</td>
<td>23,314</td>
<td>107.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career</td>
<td>14,928</td>
<td>16,636</td>
<td>111.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62,200</td>
<td>69,778</td>
<td>112.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Officer Personnel

The Army’s need for junior officers in FY 2007 was acute. In February 2007 the Government Accountability Office reported that the Army had a shortfall of mid-level officers because it commissioned insufficient officers ten years beforehand during the post–Cold War force reductions. The report observed that the Army’s projected annual shortage of officers through FY 2013 was more than three thousand. To address this shortage of experienced leaders in its officer corps, the Army implemented a set of options in September 2007 to provide most captains a choice of incentives in exchange for an additional three years of active duty service. These included choice of post or branch, attending a military school, language training, attending a fully funded graduate school degree program, or a critical skills financial retention bonus. These incentives targeted 17,000 active duty Army captains.

Civilian Personnel

The Army employed 221,666 direct-hire employees in October 2006, a number that increased to 223,643 by September 2007. Over 4,600 Army civilians served in the field. In 2007, the Army converted 7,843 positions from military to civilian status to “further integrate the civilian corps into the Army team.” In a memorandum issued in September 2007, Secretary Geren designated himself as the “Army Civilian Corps Champion,” committing himself and the Army chief of staff to “maximizing the development of the Civilian workforce and transforming the systems and structures that provide its support.” The secretary appointed the Deputy Under Secretary of the Army as the proponent of the Army’s vision of the civilian corps as an important component of its workforce, as well as the integrator between staff elements.

On 19 April 2007, the Partnership for Public Service and American University’s Institute for the Study of Public Policy Implementation recognized the Department of the Army as one of the “Best Places to Work” in the federal government for 2007. The Army received the award for ranking tenth among large federal agencies, defined as those independent agencies or cabinet departments with two thousand or more full-time, permanent employees. The “Best Places to Work” survey aimed to present a comprehensive and authoritative rating of employee satisfaction across agencies and subcomponents in the federal government. The rankings provided job seekers insight on opportunities for public service by highlighting the federal government’s high-performing agencies and promoting federal organizations.
Army civilians continued to transition to the new National Security Personnel System, an evaluation structure based on rewards for performance, innovation, and results. Implementation occurred in mid-2006 to replace the General Schedule system with a pay band scheme intended to provide more flexibility in establishing compensation levels. In 2007, members of the Army Staff, Army Materiel Command, U.S. Army Medical Command, and the Military District of Washington converted to the National Security Personnel System.
Modularity

The Army continued to transform the operational force to multipurpose modular brigade-type units in the active and reserve components. Building on recommendations made by the 2005 Quadrennial Defense Review, which called for forty-two brigade combat teams in the Regular Army and twenty-eight in the Army National Guard, the Army began to plan for the creation of a rotational pool of brigade combat teams. Modularity, initially conceived in 2004, was designed to meet demands of the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan, to accelerate Army modernization, and to support the new armed forces global basing plans. The modular conversion of active and reserve forces was designed to create brigade-based modules that Army planners and strategists could “plug into” joint and coalition task forces in expeditionary and campaign settings.

Each brigade combat team, the basic building block of the Army’s fighting capability, fit into one of three standard designs: infantry, heavy infantry, and Stryker. The Army planned approximately 225 support brigades to back up brigade combat teams, other services, and civil authorities in homeland defense missions, including disaster relief. The modular support brigades (including seventy-eight in the Army National Guard and fifty-eight in the Army Reserve) fell into two categories, multifunctional support brigades and functional support brigades. Multifunctional brigades were created to perform operational roles including combat aviation, combat support (maneuver enhancement), sustainment, fires, and battlefield surveillance. Functional brigades assumed broad support roles on a theaterwide basis including air defense, engineer, chemical, military police, signal, medical, logistics, and intelligence. Support brigades were trained, manned, and equipped to work directly for headquarters without augmentation of either personnel or equipment. Finally, the Army focused on creating “whole” units that were fully manned, trained, equipped, and supported. Conscious of limited resources, Army planners chose to build fewer, but fully resourced, units.

The Army announced on 20 December 2006 that it would accelerate the modular conversion of two active-component brigade combat teams
to increase the number of combat and combat-support units available for overseas combat and homeland-defense missions, and to give units and soldiers more dwell time. The 3d Brigade, 1st Armored Division, at Fort Riley, Kansas, passed its transition team mission and resources to the 1st Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, and converted to a heavy brigade combat team in April, eleven months earlier than planned. The brigade combat team re-flagged as the 2d Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, aligning all Fort Riley units under the 1st Infantry Division. The 3d Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, at Fort Hood, Texas, converted to an infantry brigade combat team in April, seventeen months earlier than planned. The unit relocated to Fort Knox, Kentucky.

The Army Science Board reported in January 2007 that the conversion to a modular force had suffered from a lack of focus on readiness and other measurements, as well as inadequate attention paid to software, network issues, and the potential for unmanned systems to increase security and reduce manpower requirements. The report concluded that the Army needed to examine the impact of these shortfalls on the quality of a modular force.

Rebalancing and Stabilization

Preparing units for deployment during wartime was a top priority for Army leaders. By late 2006, the secretary of the Army approved the new Army Force Generation program, which allowed for the recurring availability of well-trained, ready, and cohesive active component, Army National Guard, and Army Reserve units for operational deployment. Units increased their readiness as they progressed through three force pools, dubbed “Reset,” “Train-Ready,” and “Available.” During reset units re-integrated soldiers and their families, and completed individual education, development, and training, while the institutional Army focused on manning and equipping the unit for future collective training. The focus of the train-ready pool was unit training, with the unit leaving this stage upon completion of a culminating collective training event, after which the unit entered the available force pool. From this stage units were subject to deployment. With this model, Headquarters, Department of the Army, exercised oversight of the ARFORGEN process managed by U.S. Army Forces Command.

Army Aviation

In early July 2007, the Defense Department announced its approval of full-rate production of UH–60M and HH–60M Black Hawk helicopters by Sikorsky Aircraft under a $23.8 billion U.S. Army program. Kenneth J. Krieg, Undersecretary of Defense for Acquisition, Technology, and
Logistics, also approved procurement of advanced materials in FY 2008 for the program to upgrade the U.S. military’s popular Black Hawk helicopter. The Bush administration requested $1.2 billion for forty-two Black Hawk helicopters in FY 2007.

The Boeing Company announced on 16 July 2007 that the U.S. Army had authorized full-rate production and fielding of the new CH–47F Chinook helicopter. The CH–47F had completed U.S. Army operational testing at Fort Campbell, Kentucky, in April 2007. The cost of a new CH–47F was $32 million, but the costs were reduced to $8.5 million per aircraft by remanufacturing CH–47Ds to CH–47Fs with the CH–47F improved cargo helicopter Service Life Extension Program. Following extensive testing, the Army authorized First Unit Equipped, assigning the aircraft to a company of the 101st Aviation Regiment, 159th Combat Aviation Brigade, 101st Airborne Division, based at Fort Campbell.

In October 2006, American Eurocopter received a production contract for 345 UH–72 Lakota aircraft to replace aging UH–1H/V and OH–58A/C helicopters in Army and Army National Guard inventories. The Army took delivery of the first aircraft on 11 December 2006, while the first production helicopters went to the National Training Center (NTC) at Fort Irwin, California, for medical evacuation missions in January 2007. On 20 June 2007, the NTC’s United States Army Air Ambulance Detachment became the first operational unit to field the Lakota.
CH–47F Chinook helicopter

UH–72 Lakota helicopter
Training

In the beginning of FY 2007, the Army published two new field manuals (FM) with direct bearing on operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. *Urban Operations*, FM 3−06, published in October 2006, discussed major Army operations in urban environments and how complex terrain, a concentrated population, and an infrastructure of systems affect how Army forces operate. The new manual served to demonstrate how soldiers were to apply the doctrinal principles in FM 3−0 to this unique environment.

In December 2006, the Army published FM 3−24, *Counterinsurgency*. Based on two years of study, and prepared in cooperation with the U.S. Marine Corps, this publication was a significant revision of the Army’s existing counterinsurgency doctrine. Written to provide principals and guidelines for counterinsurgency operations in Iraq and Afghanistan, it was grounded in historical studies and informed by modern experience. This joint effort between the Army and the Marine Corps established doctrine to help American military leaders face the challenges of asymmetric warfare. The manual’s authors used input from over one thousand soldiers and marines to prepare the guide, as well as feedback from U.S. State Department employees, Central Intelligence Agency officials, academic experts, and representatives of the international human rights community. Instructors at the Command and General Staff College and the Army War College began teaching from the new manual upon its publication. In addition to providing guidance for current operations, the new manual discussed historical approaches to counterinsurgency taken by U.S. forces, and highlighted the importance of continually evaluating the circumstances of a counterinsurgency campaign so forces can adapt their actions.

A new information technology system was introduced to Army civilians in 2007, the Army Civilian Education System (CES). The Army Management Staff College offered this comprehensive, sequential leader development and education program to prepare career Army civilians for leadership roles. Developed by the U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, CES provided civilians with essential skills to support the war fighter as leaders in the Army community. Available to all Army employees, the courses were competency-based, sequential, and progressive, using a combination of distributed learning followed by residential training available at Fort Belvoir, Virginia, and Fort Leavenworth, Kansas.

Deployed Operational Forces

In the fall of 2006, America’s military leadership changed while U.S.-led efforts to defeat the insurgency in Iraq continued. On 8 November,
Secretary of Defense Donald H. Rumsfeld resigned, one day after Congressional midterm elections turned control of Congress over to the Democrats. President Bush announced that Rumsfeld would be replaced by Robert Gates, former director of the Central Intelligence Agency. By the end of 2006, the war in Iraq had failed to quell the insurgents, despite over three years of Army military operations since the fall of Baghdad. Sectarian violence between Iraqi Shi’ites and Sunnis escalated as public support among Americans for the war declined. Five combat brigades drawn from the 1st, 2d, 3d, and 82d Divisions deployed to Iraq between February and June 2007.

Early in January 2007, President Bush named General David H. Petraeus to be the top U.S. military commander in Iraq. Shortly thereafter, on 10 January 2007, the president announced his decision to deploy an additional thirty thousand troops to Iraq in what became known as “the Surge,” an increased effort to quell sectarian violence in that country by sending more soldiers. In April, the Defense Department announced that twelve thousand National Guard troops would go to Iraq and Afghanistan in addition to those previously designated as part of the Surge. General Petraeus officially took charge of U.S. forces in Iraq on 10 February 2007, replacing General Casey, who became Army chief of staff.

In late December 2006, the Diyala campaign began, consisting of a series of operations conducted by coalition forces against Iraqi insurgents and a number of bombing and guerrilla attacks against the security forces in the Diyala Governorate. Most of the heavy fighting had ended and the U.S. and Iraqi forces managed to clear all remaining insurgent fighters out of the Diyala River Valley by the beginning of October 2007. U.S. forces in Iraq continued to battle insurgents and suffered significant casualties as well. In March 2007, U.S. and Iraqi forces began fighting at Ba’qubah, in the capital of the Iraqi province of Diyala, in order to establish security and stability in the region, a process which lasted several months. In June of that year U.S. forces began arming Sunni militias (primarily in Anbar Province) in order to enable them to fight militants linked with al-Qaeda, with whom they had previously been allied. (See Table 5.) That same
month, Operation PHANTOM THUNDER began when Multi-National Force–Iraq launched large-scale offensive operations against al-Qaeda and other Iraqi terrorists. Operation PHANTOM THUNDER was a corps-level operation in Diyala Province, Anbar Province, Babil Province, Baghdad, and in areas of southern Iraq. It was one of the largest military operations in Iraq since the U.S. invasion in 2003, and aimed to eliminate al-Qaeda in Iraq and Iranian-supported terror groups. The operation concluded in January 2008.

By mid-August 2007, the number of U.S. troops in Iraq reached the highest of the war (approximately 162,000 soldiers). The following month, reports indicated that U.S. forces had made some progress in the efforts to protect the Iraqi people from insurgent violence. Data on car bombs, suicide attacks, civilian casualties, and other security measures in Iraq showed that violence was declining, though the levels generally remained higher than in 2004 and 2005. Nevertheless, the Pentagon delayed security handover to Iraqi authorities for the second time that year due to difficulties in developing Iraqi police forces and the slow pace of economic and political progress there.

The fighting for North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led forces in Afghanistan remained intense throughout the second half of 2006.
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NATO assumed responsibility for security across the whole of Afghanistan in October 2006, taking command in the east from a U.S.-led coalition force. NATO troops were successful in achieving tactical victories over the Taliban and denied areas to them, but the Taliban were not completely defeated, and NATO had to continue operations into 2007.

Operation MOUNTAIN FURY was a NATO-led operation started on 16 September 2006 to clear Taliban rebels from the eastern provinces of Afghanistan and to enable reconstruction projects such as schools, health care facilities, and courthouses to continue. The Taliban suffered heavy losses during the operation. U.S. troops initiated their combat operations against the Taliban forces that were entrenched in the mountains on the border with Pakistan in the provinces of Paktika, Khost, Ghazni, Paktia, Logar, and Nuristan. The U.S. Army’s 10th Mountain Division led efforts to establish remote outposts in regions previously dominated by Taliban elements. These outposts came under sustained attack, as did U.S. Army...
combat patrols, which resulted in almost one hundred fifty casualties by the beginning of December. (See Table 6.) On 15 January 2007, NATO leaders formally declared an end to the operation.

In March 2007, one thousand U.S. troops took part in Operation Achilles, an offensive designed to clear the Helmand Province in Afghanistan of Taliban fighters. The offensive was the largest NATO-led operation held in Afghanistan to date, and involved more than forty-five hundred NATO troops and close to one thousand Afghan personnel. The operation ended in late May.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Killed in Action</th>
<th>Accidents/ Other Deaths</th>
<th>Total Deaths</th>
<th>Wounded in Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>598</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Includes Army National Guard and Army Reserve

Reserve Components

Organizational Change

Organizationally, the Army continued to shift the chief role of the reserve components from a strategic reserve to an operational force with units specifically organized to engage in combat, provide combat support, or provide service support. By the end of FY 2007, Guard units prepared for transformation to modular units like the active army, in order to become fully manned, trained, and equipped operational brigades. This restructuring created twenty-eight brigade combat teams (seven heavy, twenty infantry, and one Stryker), seven fires brigades, nine sustainment brigades, six battlefield surveillance brigades, eight combat aviation brigades, four theater aviation brigades, one theater aviation group, thirty-eight functional brigades, two special forces groups, and sixteen maneuver enhancement brigades, which included headquarters, tactical combat forces, and engineer and military police battalions. At the end of FY 2007, the Army National Guard had transformed more than fifteen hundred operating force units to their new designs, and planned to convert more than thirteen hundred additional units to the new modular designs by the end of FY 2008.

Measures to strengthen the Army National Guard in 2008 and beyond came under the consideration of the U.S. Senate at the end of the fiscal year. In September 2007, Senate National Guard caucus cochairmen Patrick J. Leahy (D-Vt.) and Christopher S. “Kit” Bond (R-Mo.) introduced legislation to give the National Guard input into Pentagon programming, budgeting, and strategy formulation; make the deputy of Northern Command a National Guard officer; and elevate the National Guard Bureau chief to the rank of four-star general.

Personnel Management

At the end of FY 2007, there were a total of 352,707 National Guard troops, of which 33,193 were serving in Operation IRAQI FREEDOM, 4,808 in Operation ENDURING FREEDOM, and 164 in Operation NOBLE EAGLE (homeland security and support to federal, state, and local agencies). Additionally, as of 30 September, 2,597 personnel were serving in support
of the U.S. southwest border mission to prevent illegal immigration and interdict drug smuggling. The Army National Guard formed the nucleus of Task Force Phoenix, the Operation ENDURING FREEDOM mission to train the Afghan National Army to be a self-sustaining Army.

**Recruiting and Retention**

Army National Guard recruiting in FY 2007 proved to be a success because of several innovative programs, incentives, and command emphasis. The incentives included increasing bonus maximums to $20,000 for enlistments, $15,000 for reenlistments, and $15,000 for prior-service enlistments. The Army National Guard also increased retention bonuses from $5,000 to $15,000 and implemented several initiatives to help achieve and maintain congressionally authorized end-strength levels: the Guard Recruiting Assistance Program, the Recruit Sustainment Program, Every Soldier a Recruiter, and the “American Soldier” advertising campaign. The Guard Recruiting Assistance Program was a contract program designed for individuals who voluntarily applied to become recruiting assistants and provided services by contacting people in their communities to discuss joining the Guard. At the end of FY 2007, there were approximately 113,000 active recruiting assistants. The Recruit Sustainment Program reduced training pipeline losses by introducing newly enlisted ARNG soldiers to the military and easing their adjustment to Basic Combat Training and Advanced Individual Training (AIT), while the Every Soldier a Recruiter campaign paid bonuses to individual national guardsmen for signing up new recruits with no prior military service who completed AIT. The bonus was paid in two lump sum installments: $1,000 after the soldier attended initial entry training and $1,000 after the soldier graduated from AIT. The “American Soldier” advertising campaign refocused the image of the ARNG from a strategic reserve to an operational force by creating new messages, imagery, mediums, and response devices. This recruiting effort focused spending on innovative advertising programs such as NASCAR, iTunes, event teams, pizza boxes, gaming, and theater and also relied on Web-based advertising and the 1-800-GO-GUARD Web site. The Army National Guard had the nation’s largest recruiting force with more than 6,500 recruiters.

The Army Reserve, despite having missed its quantity goal for the three preceding fiscal years, rebounded in FY 2007 and achieved 100.6 percent of its annual requirement. The comparatively high rates of mobilization in the Army Reserve components during the wars in Iraq and Afghanistan may have been a factor in making recruiting difficult. Moreover, among soldiers leaving active duty, concerns about being promptly called back to active service by mobilization orders and deployed to Iraq, Afghanistan,
or some other location may have discouraged reserve affiliation as well. In order to boost Army Reserve officer numbers, the Army offered bonuses of $10,000 to those active component officers, typically captains and majors, who accepted commissions in the USAR's Individual Ready Reserve or a Selected Reserve unit, one considered to be in an active status and most readily available for call-up to active duty.

Training and Readiness

The most significant challenge facing the Army National Guard in FY 2007 was the chronic shortage of equipment in units not deployed. By April 2007, the National Guard had only 40 percent of required equipment within units not serving overseas and only 12 percent of the units at home were fully equipped. The average nondeployed unit had less than 54 percent of its authorized equipment needed to conduct training, to respond to domestic missions, and for future deployments. Some units had as little as 33 percent of required equipment. These units were, therefore, “not operationally ready” due to major equipment shortfalls. Much of the deficiency resulted from the Army’s practice of pooling equipment from across the force to supply deploying units, which left stateside forces bereft of their assets. States across the country eventually entered into an agreement to share their National Guard resources to attempt to fill in gaps as needed, called the Emergency Management Assistance Compact. Nevertheless, unresource shortfalls still existed in 2007 that approached the $40 billion needed to provide equipment and training for the Army National Guard.

In May, Lt. Gen. H. Steven Blum, Chief of the National Guard Bureau, testified before the House of Representatives Committee on Homeland Security’s Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management. The Defense Department had proposed spending $22 billion for National Guard equipment purchases over the next five years, but, as General Blum observed, that would equip the Guard to only 75 percent, its level before the terrorist attacks of 11 September 2001. The ARNG chief was also critical of the equipment most Guard units had at home and declared that some of it was decades old and not fit for active service, to sell, or even to give away. In 2007, the Army’s senior leadership recognized the Guard’s equipment shortfalls and programmed over $12 billion for new equipment in FY 2008 through FY 2013. This unprecedented increase aimed to improve the average nondeployed unit equipment-on-hand levels from the current 54 percent to 77 percent. The top three supply challenges facing the ARNG included the availability of equipment for deployment and premobilization training, the availability of equipment for the Guard’s mission for homeland defense and support to civil authorities, and Army transformation and modular force.
Several other changes occurred during FY 2007 to resolve reset issues within the National Guard. The reset process restored the readiness of Army National Guard and prepared units for rapid reaction capabilities for unexpected worldwide contingencies. Reset did not, however, remedy all shortfalls of equipment still committed in support of Operations IRAQI FREEDOM and ENDURING FREEDOM. The Army National Guard received funding directly to reduce bureaucratic delays and conduct reset operations at home stations. The National Guard initially received $127 million for FY 2007, followed by an additional $38 million from Headquarters, Department of the Army. A streamlining of the reset process resulted in states receiving their equipment much faster.

Mobilization

The Army National Guard provided more than 5,700 soldiers from 45 states, totaling 115,000 man-days to support U.S. European Command in FY 2007. The National Guard played a pivotal role in the successful execution of the U.S. Southern Command’s mission to provide regional stability to Latin America and the Caribbean. During FY 2007, 5,016 Army
National Guardsmen from 27 states deployed to the region. The ARNG also provided forces to U.S. Central Command’s two major exercises in FY 2007, Regional Cooperation and Steppe Eagle, both in Kazakhstan, and to U.S. Pacific Command as well. Overseas mission support included multiple linguist and translator missions to Korea and Japan. Within the United States, ARNG units responded to extensive tornado damage in Kansas, the Interstate 35 bridge collapse in Minneapolis, Minnesota, and Tropical Storm Erin in Texas.

Structurally, the Army continued to change the reserves from a traditional strategic reserve mobilized only in national emergencies, to an operational reserve involved in Army requirements. In support of this change, the U.S. Army Reserve underwent restructuring to the Army Force Generation model. Army leaders planned to deploy reservists once every five years, and by 2007, there were 25,000–35,000 Army Reserve soldiers routinely mobilized at any given time for duty in Iraq, Afghanistan, and in homeland support. During 2007, U.S. Army Forces Command had approximately 72,000 guardsmen and reservists mobilized for active duty per month.

On 19 January 2007, Secretary Gates redefined the mobilization policy. In his “Utilization of the Total Force” memorandum, Gates identified six key areas of mobilization policy to adjust in order to better manage the Army Reserve components during the Global War on Terrorism. These six key policy modifications included setting the length of involuntary mobilization at a maximum of twelve months; mobilizing ground forces on a unit basis instead of by individual soldiers; establishing a planning objective with a ratio of one year of mobilization followed by five years of dwell time; establishing a new program to compensate members required to mobilize or deploy early or often, or be extended beyond established rotation policy goals; reviewing hardship waiver programs to ensure they were properly taking into account exceptional circumstances; and, minimizing the use of stop loss as a force management tool.

Materiel and Aviation

By the close of FY 2007, three Army National Guard aviation brigade level units had been deployed—the 42d Aviation Brigade from Fort Dix, New Jersey; the 185th Aviation Group from Jackson, Mississippi; and the 36th Aviation Brigade from Fort Hood. Continuing shortages in filling the modernized aircraft authorized for ARNG aviation units remained a problem for the Guard throughout FY 2007.
Logistics

Management and Planning

As part of the Army Materiel Command's reorganization of its logistical infrastructure to support the modular field Army more effectively, the new U.S. Army Sustainment Command at Rock Island Arsenal, Illinois, began operations in FY 2007. This newest AMC major subordinate command resulted from the transformation of the U.S. Army Field Support Command. In addition to continuing the missions of the former Field Support Command, including Army Pre-positioned Stocks management, administration of the Logistics Civil Augmentation Program, and operating the Logistics Assistance Program, the Army Sustainment Command gained critical missions in support of the Army Force Generation process. The new assignment included assisting Army depots with reset tasks, distribution and materiel management services, contingency contracting, and management of training equipment. Seven deployable Army field support brigades comprised the Army Sustainment Command to provide a single command structure in strategic locations, including Kuwait, Europe, and Forts Bragg, Lewis, and Hood. The Army Sustainment Command thus became the linchpin linking the national sustainment base with the expeditionary Army.

Continuing efforts to improve efficiency, the Army announced in August that almost 10 percent of its programs had implemented a performance-based logistical supporting strategy, while another 30 percent had pending performance-based logistics strategies. The performance-based logistics approach was intended to achieve improved performance at a reduced life cycle cost. As of 30 June, 32 programs had implemented performance-based logistics and the move was pending for 102 additional programs. The Pentagon instituted performance-based logistics to improve operational readiness and logistical response times while decreasing costs and the program's environmental footprint.

Research, Development, and Acquisition

While supporting the conflicts in Iraq and Afghanistan, research, development, and acquisition programs aimed to prepare the Army for
future threats by modernizing and transforming technologies and materiel. In May, the Army released an overarching plan for developing technologies to meet the force transformation goals set by the 2005 Quadrennial Defense Review. The Army Science and Technology Master Plan was developed in coordination with other military services, defense agencies, and industry partners, as well as with consideration of international technology capabilities. The largest near-term science and technology investment for the Army focused on maturing technologies to enable fielding of the initial Future Combat System brigade combat team and follow-on technology “spin outs.”

The Army remained committed to its key modernization program, the Future Combat Systems, in FY 2007. This initiative represented the first full modernization of the ground forces in more than four decades. The Future Combat Systems consisted of eighteen components, including a networked battle command system, non-line-of-sight precision missiles and gun launched munitions, engine technology, and unmanned air and ground systems. Despite looming budgetary constraints, the Army opened the Future Combat Systems Test Operations Complex at White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, on 23 October 2006, and stood up an evaluation task force there, and at Fort Bliss, Texas, in an effort to move FCS from the development stage to testing, refining, and evaluation. The first deployment, or spin out, of FCS technology was scheduled for delivery to the Army Evaluation Task Force in 2008, which consisted of unattended ground sensors, non-line-of-sight launch system, and a joint tactical radio system.

In 2007, the Army budgeted $300 million for planned Future Combat Systems program technologies. Budget reductions over the prior three years and anticipated fiscal limitations for future years reduced the scope and delayed the FCS fielding schedule by FY 2007, and also postponed the Army’s plans to field the first of fifteen projected FCS-equipped brigade combat teams. In February 2007, the Army announced restructuring of the modernization effort, in order to adapt to previous congressional cuts and tightened budgets. Under the revised plan, the service aimed to cut four Future Combat Systems platforms, reduce the number of times brigades received FCS technologies, and slow the pace at which FCS-equipped brigades were fielded.

The high projected costs of Future Combat Systems led to continued scrutiny from congressional representatives, so-called “watchdog” groups, and Defense Department budget analysts. Moreover, several studies conducted by researchers outside the U.S. Army projected higher costs for FCS than did Army officials. In July, House appropriators voted to cut $406 million from the Future Combat Systems program in research, development, test, and evaluation funding. The proposed cuts
would reduce FCS research and development allocations by $47 million, while also cutting funds for FCS manned, common, and unmanned ground vehicles.

Apart from Future Combat Systems, the Army also worked to develop new information technologies, including the Joint Network Node (JNN), a communication system designed to be the new tactical command and control backbone using a remote, satellite-based communications system to provide beyond-line-of-sight capabilities. The Joint Network Node provided a package of voice, video, and data communication tools designed to meet the needs of commanders at the division, brigade, and battalion command post level. The JNN, after field testing by soldiers at the National Training Center, Fort Irwin, California, began to see use in Iraq in 2007. Due to competing Army priorities, however, it was subject to significant budget scrutiny and cost cutting by May 2007, at which time House and Senate authorizers recommended the Army combine its two current and future high-speed information network programs and cut funding for procurement of the Joint Network Node.

Major systems the Army focused on in the FY 2007 budget for research, development, and acquisition and procurement included AH–64D Longbow Apache attack helicopters, RCH–47 Chinook cargo helicopters, UH–60 Black Hawk utility helicopters, armed reconnaissance helicopters, and light utility helicopters. Additionally, the Army expected FY 2007 funding for the High-Mobility Artillery Rocket System, the
Javelin antitank weapon, a tank upgrade program, Future Combat Systems, the interim armored vehicle, and several tactical vehicles.

With an eye toward technology and innovation, the commanding general of the U.S. Army Materiel Command, the U.S. Army vice chief of staff, and other senior Army science and technology leaders recognized the U.S. Army’s “Top Ten Greatest Inventions of 2007” in an awards ceremony on 12 June in Arlington, Virgina. The Army-wide awards program recognized outstanding technology solutions, and nine of the ten award recipients were elements of the U.S. Army Research Development and Engineering Command. The Army chose the ten winning programs based on their impact on Army capabilities, inventiveness, and potential benefit outside the Army. The inventions included the Unmanned Aircraft System Shadow 200 Communications Relay System; Objective Gunner Protection Kit; the Excalibur Precision Guided Extended Range Artillery Projectile, the M110 7.62-mm. Semi-Automatic Sniper System; the Picatinny Blast Shield for light armored vehicle; and the Improvised Explosive Device Interrogation Arm.
Support Services

Morale, Welfare, and Recreation

The Army Family Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (FMWR) program was a $1.9 billion annual business with more than thirty-six thousand employees serving more than five million authorized patrons. Garrison commanders managed these activities, funded by authorized and available appropriated funds and by nonappropriated funds generated locally by FMWR activities.

In FY 2007, Army Family and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation Command received $972 million in appropriated funds from Congress and $1.3 billion in nonappropriated funds, primarily from cash register sales of goods and services. FMWR’s major business partner, the Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES), provided a $137 million dividend to Army FMWR based on two distinct agreements. The Army shares 50 percent of AAFES net income after depreciation with the Air Force based on the number of active duty soldiers and airmen in each service—the Army receives 30 percent and the Air Force 20 percent of the allocation. Through the Army Simplified Dividend, garrisons also receive 100 percent of Class VI profits, 80 percent of pay telephone revenue, and .4 percent of all local AAFES sales. The latter component is deducted from the Army share of total AAFES profit with the remainder going to the Army FMWR fund.

Housing and Infrastructure

A strong commitment to improve the quality of life for soldiers and their families led the Army to commit much of its resources to building projects, including an investment of $37 billion over five years for military construction to support base realignment and closure. In FY 2007, money went to providing new or renovated Army barracks and family housing. The Army began allowing the Corps of Engineers to implement contracts on an accelerated schedule to speed the execution of numerous building projects. The Army utilized the Residential Communities Initiative (RCI) to build modern residential communities for military families. The program provided long-term, quality, sustainable housing where soldiers
trained, mobilized, and deployed. Using RCI, by summer 2007, the Army was closer to fulfilling its vision of eliminating inadequate family housing, having constructed more than ten thousand new homes and completing renovations on an additional ten thousand. As of 1 September 2007, the Army had privatized family housing at 36 of its installations with a goal of 78,789 homes. Key RCI accomplishments in FY 2007 included completion of additional housing at Forts Bragg, Drum, and Bliss and a plan to privatize an additional three new projects and expand three existing projects with approximately 2,939 homes.

Safety

The Army lost 250 soldiers to accidents in FY 2007, 10 more than in the previous fiscal year. The greatest killer continued to be accidents involving personally-owned vehicles, which accounted for 116, or 46.4 percent, of the deaths. Other accidental deaths included 47 from personal injury, 33 Army motorized vehicles, 11 from Army combat vehicle accidents, and 37 from aviation mishaps. Sixty-eight ground fatalities occurred on duty and 145 off duty. The Army had 2,271 ground mishaps during the fiscal year; it also suffered 203 aviation accidents.

Army and Air Force Exchange Service

The Army and Air Force Exchange Service supported Army troops at home and abroad by providing on-post retail locations and morale, welfare, and recreation funds to the service. In 2007, AAFES increased its earnings, subject to dividends, to $426 million, a 27 percent improvement, including appropriated funding. During the same period, AAFES decreased its inventory by $107.5 million. Retail sales in FY 2007 for AAFES facilities in all war zones were $737 million, up 13.8 percent from FY 2006. AAFES contributed $272.7 million in dividends, which support service members and their families. This represents the highest dividend returned to the services since FY 2000. These results were due to efforts to improve supply chain efficiencies across the enterprise and, in part, attributable to Congressional supplemental funding for reimbursement of AAFES expenses in support of the Global War on Terrorism.

In FY 2007, AAFES invested $355 million in capital programs at 57 installations, including 496 new or renovated retail, dining, and services facilities, and 8 new shopping centers. In addition, AAFES formed a real estate energy management team and joined the U.S. Green Building Council in 2007 to reduce energy consumption through employee training and construction of four shopping centers that were Leadership in Energy and Environment Design certified.
AAFES executives also developed a new Planning, Allocation and Replenishment Division in 2007 to study and implement industry best practices and to develop new business opportunities in merchandising, forecasting, and inventory control.

Special Functions

Civil Works

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) employed 33,000 civilians and 580 soldiers in over 90 countries, and had 137 environmental protection projects under construction at the beginning of FY 2007. Additionally, USACE engaged in construction of hospitals, roads, communication facilities, water treatment plants, and schools. The corps was also involved in Gulf Coast restoration efforts, including Federal Emergency Management Agency–assigned debris clearing missions, and work on the area’s levees. A large demand for military construction existed, driven mainly by base realignment and closure concerns and aging buildings, as well as for housing and training facilities. Overseas, in the Gulf Region Division, the Army Corps of Engineers worked on building Iraq’s capacity to take over the reconstruction effort. Approximately 75 percent of Gulf Region Division contractors and laborers were Iraqis. The USACE had 14,000–20,000 Afghans at work on projects in 2007.

Environmental Protection

In January 2007, the Army announced the winners of its highest honor for environmental stewardship. Six installations, one team, and one individual received Secretary of the Army Environmental Awards, which honor the Army’s top programs in endangered species protection, historic preservation, waste reduction, environmental cleanup, and pollution prevention. The Radford Army Ammunition Plant, in Virginia, one of the Army’s main TNT production facilities, won the award for Pollution Prevention. The U.S. Army Garrison Grafenwoehr, Germany, won the award for Environmental Quality, Overseas Installation, in part for its efforts to give soldiers more room to train. Karstin Carmany-George, a cultural resources manager at the Indiana Army National Guard, took the Cultural Resources Management, Team/Individual category for using technology to manage and preserve cultural resources and support the building of a state-of-the-art urban training complex. Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, won the Environmental Quality, Industrial Installation award by applying lean manufacturing methods as it delivered almost nine
hundred reinforced armor High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle
door kits to soldiers in Iraq. The cultural resource staff at Fort Drum, New
York, constructed mock Muslim cemeteries and archeological sites for use
as aerial gunnery avoidance target training and won the Cultural Resources
Management, Installation award. The environmental staff from Fort Riley
helped make land available for a Tactical Unmanned Aerial System
operational area, earning the Environmental Restoration, Installation
award. At Camp Edwards Training Site, a Massachusetts Army National
Guard installation, a training program that benefited eleven natural plant
and animal communities contributed to winning the Natural Resources
Conservation, Large Installation award. Fort Lewis, Washington, won the
Pollution Prevention, Nonindustrial Installation award by reusing lumber
and other resources from building deconstruction to make improvements
to training facilities.

On 16 September 2007, the Army received the Environmental
Protection Agency’s “Best of the Best Award” for its acquisition and
procurement policies that support environmental initiatives as well as
soldiers. The award recognized the Halon-Free Military Ground Vehicle
Fire Suppression System, a crew compartment explosion suppression
system. The systems were being retrofit in Abrams tanks, Bradley fighting
vehicles, Multiple Launch Rocket Systems, Field Artillery Ammunition
Supply Vehicles and watercraft.

Legal Affairs

The Office of the Judge Advocate General advised the Army leadership
and developed policies to improve the provision of legal services to Army
commanders, soldiers, and support activities worldwide.

In FY 2007, the Criminal Law Division served as the focal point within
the Army for implementing an expansion of court-martial jurisdiction
over civilians. The 2007 National Defense Authorization Act amended the
Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ) to provide for court-martial
jurisdiction over civilians serving with or accompanying the force during
times of declared war, as has historically been the case, as well as during
contingency operations. The Criminal Law Division worked with the
Defense Department’s Office of General Counsel in drafting policies
concerning appropriate authority to exercise this jurisdiction (Table 7).

Nineteen active duty military judges, one mobilized U.S. Army
Reserves military judge, and eighteen reserve military judges not on active
duty presided over 1,468 general and special courts-martial worldwide in
FY 2007, a slight increase from FY 2006. Trials in Iraq, Afghanistan, and
Kuwait numbered 108 for FY 2007, bringing the total number of cases
tried in combat pay zones to over 600 since May 2003. Army judges
continued to preside over high-profile cases, including the only officer tried for misconduct related to the Abu Ghraib prisoner abuse scandal and a desertion case stemming from an Army officer’s moral opposition to the war in Iraq. A military judge provided instruction to Iraqi judges in Baghdad as part of a program to stand up the Iraqi judiciary, and a military judge briefed contingents of African and Korean judges as part of outreach efforts by the Department of State.

The U.S. Army Trial Defense Service (USATDS) has approximately 130 active duty and 180 reserve attorneys who provided professional defense services to soldiers throughout the Army from 63 active duty installations worldwide and 54 reserve locations. USATDS counsel defended soldiers facing the entire range of allegations under the UCMJ. The USATDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>FY 2005</th>
<th>FY 2006</th>
<th>FY 2007</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White House Inquiries</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional and Other Inquiries</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clemency Petitions</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Officer Dismissals</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article 69 Review</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freedom of Information/Privacy Act</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Report Submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Homeland Security, and Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Courts-Martial</td>
<td>1,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Boards</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-judicial Punishment</td>
<td>42,882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consultations</td>
<td>42,245</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Annual Report Submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Homeland Security, and Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.
detailed one or more counsel to every Army special and general courts-martial referred in FY 2007 (Tables 8 and 9). The Trial Defense Service counsel carry large workloads, assisting soldiers in myriad military justice related actions. USATDS provided defense services to deployed forces around the world, including in Iraq, Kuwait, Kosovo, and Afghanistan.

The attorney strength of the active component Judge Advocate General’s Corps at the end of FY 2007 was 1,643 (including general officers). This total did not include sixty-two officers who attended law school while participating in the Funded Legal Education Program. The attorney strength of the reserve component Judge Advocate General’s Corps at the end of FY 2007 was 1,921, and the strength of the Army National Guard at the end of FY 2007 was 575. The Army’s diverse attorney population included 121 African Americans, 45 Hispanics, 75 Asians and Native Americans, and 414 women.

A November 2006 Associated Press investigation into the Army’s handling of the death of Cpl. Patrick Tillman revealed new information about his controversial death while on active duty in 2004. Tillman, a former National Football League player with the Arizona Cardinals, forsook his professional career and enlisted in the U.S. Army in the immediate aftermath of the 11 September 2001 terrorist attacks. Assigned to the 2d Battalion, 75th Ranger Regiment, he was killed on 22 April 2004, in a friendly fire incident in Afghanistan, although preliminary statements by Army authorities indicated that Tillman was killed by the enemy. The investigative documents made public by Associated Press reporters showed that four of the soldiers failed to identify their targets before shooting during the firefight in

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Court Type</th>
<th>Tried</th>
<th>Convicted</th>
<th>Acquittal</th>
<th>Change from FY 2006</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>809</td>
<td>772</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad Conduct Discharge</td>
<td>625</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bad Conduct Discharge</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>66.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summary</td>
<td>1,223</td>
<td>1,128</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Annual Report Submitted to the Committees on Armed Services of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives and to the Secretary of Defense, Secretary of Homeland Security, and Secretaries of the Army, Navy, and Air Force.*
which Tillman was killed, and one had recently undergone laser eye surgery. Moreover, key evidence in the incident was burned, including Tillman’s body armor and uniform. In March 2006, the Army launched a criminal probe of the incident, and acting Army Secretary Geren publicly apologized to Corporal Tillman’s family for mistakes made in reporting his death. A Department of Defense Inspector General report and findings of an Army investigation into the circumstances following Tillman’s death were released in late March 2007 and concluded that the cause of death was accidental fratricide. An initial report from Tillman’s unit determined his death was due to hostile fire. When follow-on reports indicated Tillman’s death was an accident, Army officials failed to notify the primary next of kin until a memorial service held weeks after his death. Tillman’s chain of command made critical errors in the reporting and assigning investigative jurisdiction in the days following his death.

In July 2007, Secretary Geren censured retired Lt. Gen. Philip R. Kensinger, commanding general of the United States Army Special Operations Command at the time of Tillman’s death, for his “failure of leadership in matters relating to the investigation and reporting of the death of Cpl. Pat Tillman.” Senior Army officers determined that General Kensinger lied to investigators about when he knew Tillman’s death was a suspected friendly fire case. Two brigadier generals also received written punishments for their roles in the case.

Walter Reed Army Medical Center

On 2 March 2007 Secretary Harvey resigned as Secretary of the Army in the wake of revelations of poor care and squalid conditions at the Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington, D.C. In February 2007, stories in Washington newspapers reported that wounded soldiers were burdened by administrative bureaucracy, placed in unclean quarters, and often neglected. Poorly maintained facilities, overworked case managers, cumbersome regulations, and daunting paperwork requirements for the soldiers were all issues raised by news reports. Many blamed cost-cutting measures, reduction of personnel, and the shift from federal management of the facilities to a private contract with IAP Worldwide. Maj. Gen. Eric B. Schoomaker replaced Maj. Gen. George W. Weightman as commanding general of the hospital and as commanding general of the North Atlantic Regional Medical Command, after the latter was relieved of duty by Secretary Harvey on 1 March. The Walter Reed Health Care system included 10 major treatment facilities in 3 states, with a staff of 6,000, of which more than 600 were Army physicians. It provided care for more than one hundred
fifty thousand soldiers, other service members, family members, and retirees in the National Capital Area.
Conclusion

Fiscal year 2007 saw the Army continuing to fight the Global War on Terrorism at home and abroad, while sustaining the force and planning for its future. The ongoing process of transformation, primarily in the shift to a modular force of brigade combat teams, remained a priority for Army leaders. The development of the Future Combat Systems initiative was also part of the Army’s efforts at modernization and preparation for future conflicts, reflected by the amount of financial resources the service sought to devote to it. Recruiting and retention of soldiers challenged the Army throughout FY 2007, although the accession goals were for the most part met or exceeded. A key part of retention efforts included a renewed and aggressive program to support Army families, particularly with regard to housing. Repeated deployments, the stress of operations in The Long War, financial constraints, and other challenges stressed and unbalanced the Army. Nevertheless, Army leaders remained dedicated to fighting global terrorism with a force General Casey often referred to as “The Strength of the Nation.”
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronyms</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAFES</td>
<td>Army and Air Force Exchange Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AFRICOM</td>
<td>U.S. Africa Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AIT</td>
<td>Advanced Individual Training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMC</td>
<td>Army Materiel Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARFORGEN</td>
<td>Army Force Generation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARNG</td>
<td>Army National Guard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CES</td>
<td>Civilian Education System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMH</td>
<td>Center of Military History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRU</td>
<td>Direct Reporting Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FCS</td>
<td>Future Combat Systems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>Field Manual</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FMWR</td>
<td>Family Morale, Welfare, and Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY</td>
<td>Fiscal Year</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GWOT</td>
<td>Global War on Terrorism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HQDA</td>
<td>Headquarters, Department of the Army</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMCOM</td>
<td>U.S. Army Installation Management Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNN</td>
<td>Joint Network Node</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MRAP</td>
<td>Mine Resistant Ambush Protected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATO</td>
<td>North Atlantic Treaty Organization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTC</td>
<td>National Training Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OEF</td>
<td>Operation ENDURING FREEDOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OIF</td>
<td>Operation IRAQI FREEDOM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RCI</td>
<td>Residential Communities Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RDA</td>
<td>Research, Development, and Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDDC</td>
<td>Surface Deployment and Distribution Command</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UCMJ</td>
<td>Uniform Code of Military Justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACE</td>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USAR</td>
<td>U.S. Army Reserve</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USATDS</td>
<td>U.S. Army Trial Defense Service</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Abrams tank, 48
Abu Ghraib prisoner abuse scandal, 49
Accidents and safety, 44
Advanced Individual Training (AIT), 34
Advertising campaigns, 15–19, 34
Afghanistan War. See Operation ENDURING FREEDOM.
Africa Command (AFRICOM), 1, 5
Age of enlistment, increase in, 18
Airborne units
82d Division, 28, 31
101st Division, 101st Aviation Regiment, 159th Combat Aviation Brigade, 25
Al-Qaeda, 28–29
American Eurocopter, 25
American Revolution, 6
“American Soldier” advertising campaign, 34
American University, Institute for the Study of Public Policy Implementation, 20
“America’s Army” games, 17, 18
Aptitude test, 15
Armored Division, 1st, 3d Brigade, 24
Army Air Ambulance Detachment, 25
Army and Air Force Exchange Service (AAFES), 43, 44–45
Army Civilian Education System (CES), 27
Army College Fund, 17
Army Environmental Center, incorporated into IMCOM, 3
Army Evaluation Task Force, 40
Army Field Support Command, 39
Army Force Generation (ARFORGEN) program, 2, 14, 24, 37, 39
Army Materiel Command (AMC), 4, 6, 21, 39, 42
Army Medical Command, 4, 21
Army National Guard (ARNG) 185th Aviation Group, 37
ARFORGEN program, 24
aviation units and equipment, 37
budget, 35, 36
deployment, 33, 34, 36–37
domestic mobilization, 34, 37
environmental awards, 47, 48
Judge Advocate General’s Corps, 50
modularity, 23, 33, 35
organizational changes and realignments, 33
personnel strength and distribution, 13, 33–34
readiness issues, addressing, 35–36
recruitment and retention initiatives, 14, 15, 34
U.S. Army North and, 3
Army Pre-positioned Stocks management, 39
Army Reserve. See U.S. Army Reserve.
Army Science and Technology Master Plan, 40
Army Science Board, 24
Army Simplified Dividend, 43
Army Staff Management College, 27
“Army Strong” and “Army of One” slogans, 15–16
Army transformation, 1, 3, 6, 8, 14, 33, 35, 39, 40
Army Trial Defense Service (USATDS), 49–50
Army War College, 27
Attorneys, active duty and reserve, 49–50
Aviation accidents, 44
equipment and units, 7, 24–26, 37
U.S. Army Air Ambulance Detachment, 25
Aviation units
36th Brigade, Army National Guard, 37
42d Brigade, Army National Guard, 37
185th Aviation Group, Army National Guard, 37
Awards and prizes, 6, 42, 47–48
Barracks renewal, 8
Baseline Depot Maintenance Program, 7
Basic Combat Training, 34
Battle Command Control Network, 8
“Best of the Best Award,” EPA, 48
Blum, Lt. Gen. H. Steven, 35, 36
Boeing Company, 25
Bond, Christopher S. “Kit,” 33
Bonuses for enlistment, referral, and
reenlistment, 16–20, 34–35
Bradley fighting vehicle, 6, 48
Budget, 1–2, 7–11
    FMWR program, 43
    housing and infrastructure, 8, 43
    logistics, 40–41
    reserve components, 35, 36
Bush, George W., 5, 10, 14, 25, 28
Camp Edwards Training Site, 48
Canada, 3
Carmany-George, Karstin, 47
Casey, General George W., Jr., 1, 7, 9–10,
13, 14, 28
Casualties
    accidents, 44
    Afghanistan, 31, 32
    Iraq, 28, 30
    Tillman, Cpl. Patrick, 50–51
Cavalry Division, 1st, 3d Brigade, 29
Center of Military History (CMH). See U.S.
    Army Center of Military History.
Central Intelligence Agency (CIA), 27
Chief of Staff of the Army. See
    Casey, General George W., Jr.;
    Schoomaker, General Peter J.
Civil Support Response Teams, 3
Civil works, 47
Civilian court-martial jurisdiction, 48
Civilian Education System (CES), 27
Civilian personnel, 20–21
Cody, General Richard A., 14
Command and General Staff College, 27
Community and Family Support Center,
    incorporated into IMCOM, 3
Congress. See also Budget.
    House Appropriations Committee, 40
    House Armed Services Committee, 9–10
    House Committee on Homeland
        Security, Subcommittee on
        Oversight, Investigations, and
        Management, 35
    Senate National Guard caucus, 33
Courts-martial, 48–50
Criminal history waivers, 15
Criminal Law Division, 48, 49
Cultural resources management, 47, 48
Defense Integrated Military Human
    Resources System, 6–7
Department of the Army, 1–2, 53
    budget, 1–2, 7–11
    civil works, 47
    deployed operational forces, 27–31,
        33, 34, 36–37. See also specific
        operations.
    environmental protection, 44, 47–48
    force development, 23–27. See also
        Force development; Training.
    GWOT. See Global War on Terrorism.
    legal affairs and services, 48–51
    logistics, 4–5, 39–42
    management methodologies, 6–7, 39
    medical services. See Medical care.
    organizational changes and
        realignments, 1, 3–6, 33
    personnel, 2, 13–21. See also
        Personnel.
    readiness, rebalancing, and stabilization
        of forces, 1, 24, 35–36
    reserve components, 33–37. See also
        Army National Guard; U.S. Army
        Reserve.
    support services, 43–45
Department of Defense, 1, 5, 7, 8, 14, 24,
    28, 35, 40, 48, 51
Department of State. See State
    Department.
    Deployed operational forces, 27–31,
        33, 34, 36–37. See also specific
        operations.
    Deployment length increases, 14
    Deputy Under Secretary of the Army, 20
    Direct Reporting Units (DRUs), 4
    Director of the Army Staff, 5
    Diyala campaign, Operation IRAQI
        FREEDOM, 28–29
Egypt, 5
Emergency Management Assistance
    Compact, 35
Engineers, Corps of, 43, 47
INDEX

Enlisted personnel, 14–19
Enlistment initiatives, 14–21, 34–35
Environmental protection, 44, 47–48
Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
“Best of the Best Award,” 48
Essex, Maj. Gen. Bill, 45
European Command, 5, 36
Every Soldier a Recruiter program, 34
Excalibur Precision Guided Extended Range Artillery Projectile, 42

Family Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (FMWR) program, 43
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), 47
Field Artillery Ammunition Supply Vehicles, 48
Field manuals
Counterinsurgency, FM 3–24, 27
Urban Operations, FM 3–06, 27
Force development, 23–27. See also Training.
Army transformation, 1, 3, 6, 8, 14, 33, 35, 39, 40
aviation equipment and units, 7, 24–26, 37
modularity, 7, 23–24, 33, 35
rebalancing, stabilization, and readiness, 1, 24, 35–36
Fort Belvoir, 27
Fort Bliss, 40, 44
Fort Bragg, 6, 39, 44
Fort Campbell, 25
Fort Dix, 37
Fort Drum, 44, 48
Fort Gordon, 6
Fort Hood, 24, 37, 39
Fort Irwin, National Training Center (NTC), 24, 41
Fort Jackson, 37
Fort Leavenworth, 27
Fort Lesley J. McNair, 5
Fort Lewis, 39, 48
Fort Myer, 13
Fort Riley, 24, 48
Fort Sam Houston, 3
Friendly fire, 50–51
Funded Legal Education Program, 50
Future Combat Systems (FCS) program, 2, 7, 8, 10, 40–41, 42
Gates, Robert M., 7, 10, 28, 37
General Schedule System, replacement of, 21
Geren, Preston M. “Pete,” III, 1, 2, 10, 13, 14, 20, 51
Germany, 5, 47
GI Bill, 17
Global War on Terrorism (GWOT), 1
AAFES expense reimbursements, 44
budget requirements, 9, 10
mobilization policy and, 37
personnel requirements, 14
Government Accountability Office (GAO), 20
Grafenwoehr, Germany, U.S. Army Garrison in, 47
Guard Recruiting Assistance Program, 34
Gulf Coast oil spill restoration efforts, 47
Halon-Free Military Ground Vehicle Fire Suppression System, 48
Harvey, Francis J., 3–4, 13, 51
Headquarters, Department of the Army (HQDA), 4, 13, 14, 24, 36
Heavy infantry brigade combat teams, 23
Helicopters
AH–64D Longbow Apache, 41
CH–47D Chinook, 25
CH–47F Chinook, 25, 26
HH–60M Black Hawk, 24
OH–58A/C, 25
RCH–47 Chinook, 41
UH–1H/V, 25
UH–60 Black Hawk, 41
UH–60M Black Hawk, 24, 25
UH–72 Lakota, 25, 26
High-Mobility Artillery Rocket System, 41
High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle door kits, 48
Homeland security support, 3, 37
House Appropriations Committee, 40
House Armed Services Committee, 9–10
House Committee on Homeland Security, Subcommittee on Oversight, Investigations, and Management, 35
Housing and infrastructure, 8, 43–44
Human resources. See Personnel.
Human Resources Command, 6
HISTORICAL SUMMARY: FISCAL YEAR 2007

Improvised Explosive Device Interrogation Arm, 42
Improvised explosive devices (IEDs), 10, 11
Incentives for enlistment, referral, and reenlistment, 16–20, 34–35
Indiana Army National Guard, environmental award for, 47
Individual Ready Reserve, 35
Infantry brigade combat teams, 23
Infantry units
  2d Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, 24
  3d Brigade, 1st Infantry Division, 24
  2d Infantry Division, 28
  3d Infantry Division, 28
Infrastructure and housing, 8, 43–44
Inspector General, Department of Defense, 51
Installation Management Agency, 3
Installation Management Command (IMCOM), 3
Institute for the Study of Public Policy Implementation, American University, 20
Intelligent Munition Systems, 8
Interim armored vehicle, 42
Iraq War. See Operation IRAQI FREEDOM.

Japan, 37
Javelin antitank missile system, 42
Joint Network Node (JNN), 41
Joint tactical radio system, 2, 7, 40
Judge Advocate General’s Corps, 50
Judges, military, 48–49

Kazakhstan, 37
Kensinger, Lt. Gen. Philip R., 51
Korea, 37, 49
Kosovo, 7, 50
Krieg, Kenneth J., 24–25
Kuwait, 39, 50

LandWarNet, 6
Leadership in Energy and Environment Design (LEED) certification, 44
Leahy, Patrick J., 33
Lean Six Sigma methodology, 6
Legal affairs and services, 48–51
Letterkenny Army Depot, Pennsylvania, 47–48
Logistics, 4–5, 39–42
Logistics Assistance Program, 39
Logistics Civil Augmentation Program, 39
M2 Bradley fighting vehicle, 6
M110 7.62-mm. Semi-Automatic Sniper System, 42
Management methodologies, 6–7, 39
Manning, recruitment, and retention initiatives, 14–21, 34–35
Marine Corps, 27
McCann Worldgroup, 15–16
Medical care
  helicopters for medical evacuation missions, 25
  modularity, 23
  North Atlantic Regional Medical Command, 51
  U.S. Army Air Ambulance Detachment, 25
  U.S. Army Medical Command, 4, 21
  Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC), 51–52
Medical waivers for enlistees, 15
Mexico, 3, 35
Military construction budget, 8, 9, 11
Military Department Title 10 functions, 3
Military District of Washington, 21
Mine Resistant Ambush Protected (MRAP) vehicles, 7, 8, 10
Minorities in the Army, 13, 15, 50
Misconduct waivers for enlistees, 15
Mobilization. See Deployed operational forces; specific operations.
  Modularity, 7, 23–24, 33, 35, 39
Montgomery GI Bill, 17
Morale, welfare, and recreation. See Family Morale, Welfare, and Recreation program.
  Mountain Division, 10th, 30
  Multi-National Forces–Iraq, 1, 29
  Multiple Launch Rocket Systems, 48
NASCAR, 16, 34
National Hot Rod Association, 16
National Security Personnel System, 21
National Training Center (NTC), Fort Irwin, California, 25, 41
INDEX

NETCOM, 6
Non-line-of-sight launch system, 8, 40
North Atlantic Regional Medical Command, 51
North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO)-led forces in Afghanistan, 29–31

Objective Gunner Protection Kit, 42
Office of General Counsel, Department of Defense, 48
Office of the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army, 5
Officer personnel, 20
Operation ENDURING FREEDOM (OEF), 29–30
Army National Guard and Reserves in, 33, 34, 36, 37
budget, 7, 11
casualty rates, 31, 32
civil works of USACE, 47
field manuals, 27
legal affairs, 48, 50
organizational changes and realignments, 1
personnel requirements, 14
RDA in support of, 39–40
recruitment issues and, 16, 34
retention rates in supporting units, 18–19
Task Force PHOENIX, 34
Tillman, Cpl. Patrick, death of, 50–51

Operation IRAQI FREEDOM (OIF)
Abu Ghraib prisoner abuse scandal, 49
Army National Guard and Reserves in, 33, 36, 37
budget, 7, 11
casualty rates, 28, 30
civil works in Iraq, 47
Diyala campaign, 28–29
field manuals, 27
High Mobility Multipurpose Wheeled Vehicle door kits, 48
insurgency in Iraq, 27–29
legal affairs, 48–49, 50
Multi-National Forces–Iraq, 1, 29
organizational changes and realignments, 1
personnel requirements, 14
RDA in support of, 39–40
recruitment issues and, 15, 16, 34
retention rates in supporting units, 18–19
Surge, 28

Operations
ACHILLES, 31
JUMPSTART, 36
MOUNTAIN FURY, 30–31
NOBEL EAGLE, 33
PHANTOM THUNDER, 29
REGIONAL COOPERATION, 37
STEPPE EAGLE, 37
Operations and maintenance budget, 7, 9, 10
Organizational changes, 1, 3–6, 33, 37

Parental consent to enlist, 15
Partnership for Public Service, 20
Patriot/Medium Extended Air Defense System Combined Aggregate Program, 7
Pay raises, 7, 10
Paymaster general, creation of office of, 6
PeopleSoft, 6–7
Performance-based logistics approach, 39
Personnel
budget, 9
civilians, 20–21
deployment length increases, 14
enlisted soldiers, 14–19
legal affairs and services, 48–51
management methodologies, 6–7
manning, recruitment, and retention initiatives, 14–21, 34–35
National Security Personnel System, 21
officers, 20
pay raises, 7, 10
reenlistment rates, 18–19
Referral Bonus Pilot Program, 16–17
safety and accidents, 44
strength and distribution, 13, 33–34
support services, 43–45
Petraeus, General David H., 28, 29
Picatinny Blast Shield, 42
Planning, Allocation and Replenishment Division, AAFES, 45
President, U.S. See Bush, George W.
Presidential budget requests (2005–2007), 9, 10
Prizes and awards, 6, 42, 47–48
Procurement budget, 7, 9, 10, 11
Quadrennial Defense Review (2005), 23, 40
Qualification test, 14

Radford Army Ammunition Plant, Virginia, 47
Ranger Regiment, 75th, 2d Battalion, 50
Readiness, rebalancing, and stabilization of forces, 1, 24, 35–36
Recruit Sustainment Program, 34
Recruitment initiatives, 14–21, 34–35
Red River Army Depot, Texas, 6
Reenlistment rates, 18–19
Referral Bonus Pilot Program, 16–17
Reorganizations and realignments, 1, 3–6, 33, 37
Research, development, and acquisition (RDA)
    budget, 7, 8–9, 11
    logistics, 39–42
Reserve Component readiness facilities, 8
Reserve components. See Army National Guard; U.S. Army Reserve.
Residential Communities Initiative (RCI), 43–44
Retention rates and initiatives, 18–19, 34–35
Road accidents, 44
Rumsfeld, Donald H., 28

Safety and accidents, 44
Schoomaker, Maj. Gen. Eric B., 51, 52
Schoomaker, General Peter J., 13
Secretary of the Army. See Geren, Preston M. “Pete,” III; Harvey, Francis J.
Secretary of the Army Environmental Awards, 47–48
Secretary of Defense. See Gates, Robert M.; Rumsfeld, Donald H.
Selected Reserve units, 35
Senate National Guard caucus, 33
Service Life Extension Program, 25
Shingo Prizes, 6
Signal Commands
    7th, 6
    9th, 6
Sikorsky Aircraft, 24
Slogans, 15–16
Stabilization, rebalancing, and readiness of forces, 1, 24, 35–36, 53
State Department, 27, 49

Stryker brigade combat teams, 23, 33
Stuttgart, Germany, AFRICOM
    headquartered in, 5
Support services, 43–45
Surface Deployment and Distribution Command (SDDC), 4–5
Surge, 28
Tactical Unmanned Aerial System operational area, Fort Riley, Kansas, 48
Tactical vehicles, 42
Taliban, 30–31
Tanks
    Abrams tank, 48
    Javelin antitank missile system, 42
    upgrade program, 42
Task Force PHOENIX, 34
Thurgood, Brig. Gen. Keith L., 45
Tillman, Cpl. Patrick, death of, 50–51
“Top Ten Greatest Inventions of 2007” awards, 42
Total Obligation Authority (2006–2007), 11
Toyota Production System, 6
Traffic accidents, 44
Training
    AIT, 34
    Basic Combat Training, 34
    budget support for, 7, 8
    CES, 27
    field manuals, 27
    Funded Legal Education Program, 50
    NTC, Fort Irwin, California, 25, 41
    as officer retention bonus, 20
Transformation process, 1, 3, 6, 8, 14, 33, 35, 39, 40
Unattended ground sensors, 8, 40
Uniform Code of Military Justice (UCMJ), 48, 49
Unmanned Aircraft System Shadow 200 Communications Relay System, 42
U.S. Army. See Department of the Army.
U.S. Army Center of Military History (CMH), 5
U.S. Army Commands, 4
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). See Engineers, Corps of.
U.S. Army Environmental Center, incorporated into IMCOM, 3
U.S. Army, Fifth, 3
U.S. Army Forces Command, 4, 24
U.S. Army Installation Management Command (IMCOM), 3
U.S. Army Intelligence and Security Command, 4
U.S. Army National Guard (ARNG). See Army National Guard.
U.S. Army Network Enterprise Technology Command, 4
U.S. Army North, 3
U.S. Army Recruiting Command, 17
U.S. Army Research Development and Engineering Command, 42
U.S. Army Reserve (USAR)
  95th Division, 45
  ARFORGEN program, 24, 37
deployed forces, 37
legal affairs and personnel, 48, 50
modularity, 23
recruitment and retention initiatives, 14, 15, 34–35
strength and distribution, 13
U.S. Army Service Component Commands, 4
U.S. Army Staff, 21
U.S. Army Sustainment Command, 39
U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command, 4, 27
U.S. Army Trial Defense Service (USATDS), 49–50
U.S. Central Command, 5, 37
U.S. European Command, 5, 36
U.S. Green Building Council, 44
U.S. Marine Corps, 27
U.S. Southern Command, 36–37
U.S. Transportation Command, 4
“Utilization of the Total Force” memorandum, 37

Vehicular accidents, 44
Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army. See Cody, General Richard A.
Video games, 17, 18
“The Virtual Army Experience,” 18, 19

Walter Reed Army Medical Center (WRAMC), 51–52
Ward, General William E. “Kip,” 5
Warrior Transition Units, 3
Weightman, Maj. Gen. George W., 51
White Sands Missile Range, New Mexico, 40
Wilson, Lt. Gen. Robert, 3
Women in the Army, 13, 15, 50