

Main Attack

1 I assume with 4 hours of pre-game time any USA infantry or FOs could be entrenched. The engineering rules say it takes 2 hours to entrench any infantry unit.

Your assumption is correct here. That is how I read the rules and that was the intent. In practice, we rarely used attached engineering assets to dig ourselves in. That's why Infantry carried pioneering tools ;).

2. I assume any USA unit that chooses could be under cover before the game starts.

Yes, again, they may start the game that way; as I read the rules it is not necessary to place a cover marker on entrenched units, they are assumed to be under cover. The "Hull Down" positions are actually turret down Ys. The straight of the Y is turret down with each branch being a hull down firing position. Therefore, Hull Down units are considered under cover also.

3. Would the onboard TOCs have 4 hours of planning accumulated up to their maximum?

Here I would say no. The TOC realistically is not just the S-3 Operations but also the S-1 (personnel), S-2 (Intel), S-4 (Supply) and attached liaisons. A lot of this time is spent planning and integrating the flow of information coming into the TOC in preparation of the Defense (or even Offense) prior to the start of an engagement. Plus the TOC also has to get itself dug in or prepared for the operation. ON the other hand, it would not be unreasonable to start the game with a minor accumulation of points, not necessarily 4 hours-worth though.

4. As the game progresses, I assume the engineering units could continue to construct additional engineered items, hull down positions, bunkers, point minefields and other engineered facilities. The Soviets do not get their full forces until turn 6 and it could take another 6 turns to get on the board, move to attack position and then move across the middle board. As 12 turns is one hour it would seem the engineers, the busy beavers they are, could build another hour of stuff.

Absolutely correct here. That is definitely the intent of the rules and the game. I never understood why it sometimes assumed, oh the engagement starts and everyone stops working so that the combat units can fight. There are alternate fighting positions and routes to prepare; etc. You can never have enough obstacles if you are on the defense.

Supply Rules

1. I assume that the supply HQ for the various division, regiment, brigade and battalions shown on the map represent the administrative organization that dispenses the supply counters to the supply trucks. The supply comes from a higher HQ supply vehicles not shown on the game map. In the case of the Soviets the Division supply Log Packs are trucked to the Regiments to be converted to Tac Log Packs to the Battalions. The Log Packs come from the Division Supply Escalon. In the US the Division (DISCOM) provides the Log Packs to the Brigades. From Brigade to Battalion and from Battalion to Company. For a true campaign the USA would continue to get more supply while the Soviet Division would be limited to the two resupply operations based on my understanding that they burn up the division and replace it with a new uncommitted division. The USA expects to fight, replace, resupply and rebuild as the fight goes on. Battalions would be pulled out of line and rebuilt.

You are correct here. That is the exact intent of the supply rules. NATO has more supply options and resupply operations to draw from than Warsaw Pact forces. I also attempted to simulate oversized units receiving more supplies by taking into account the number of subordinate units assigned. It would not make much sense to attach an additional Tank Battalion to a Motorized Rifle Regiment without providing supply assets to it.

2. I would also think that the resupply for artillery would be more. It is the big killer. For the Soviets the resupply for the artillery is three reloads and maybe four for the USA. Just a thought.

I will take a look at that. Also, pre-game artillery fire does not count against the ammunition supply. It is assumed that the preparatory fire ammunition supply is pushed forward to those artillery units assigned to prep-fire missions.

3. Can the company (USA) or battalion (Soviet) supply truck move to a location and drop the supply package as a preposition stock? The company HQ (USA) or battalion HQ (Soviet) along with the company units would move to the supply pack and when the HQ occupies the hex with the counter, the resupply operation begins. Alternately, the supply truck must stay with the supply pack until the HQ move to where the truck is and then the pack is deposited.

To answer part one of this, I would say no. At least I do not recall ever conducting this type of supply operation. As a logpac we would move to the company location and the elements of the company would pull back to the trucks for resupply (POL, Ammunition, Food). Rarely, we drove down the line and resupplied in place. That being said, in love and war anything is possible, so I would not consider it to be out of the realm of possibilities for this to occur. IF you choose this option, I would think that the Trucks would have to stay with the Logpac, mainly for security. Soldiers tend to scrounge and I would hate for my company supply of APDU ammunition to go missing..

Overs all 1/3 BDE versa GMRD

1. What happens if there is no USA units assigned to a 1st tier board. The Soviets might take 4 to 5 turns or more to cross the board with no resistance. If the adjacent 1st tier board is fought and the overall delay is 20 turns before a Soviet unit exits. How is the time to the 2nd tier board determined.

Check the Scenario Instructions, Section II. B. Combat Column 2 Rule #4.

Divide the turn number recorded in Section A. Step 4 by 12. U. S. player rolls one die, divide value by 2, round down. Add these two values to determine the the number of hours of engineer prep time available to U. S. player if Engineering assets are assigned to the current Engagement Area.

- a. U. S. player conducts engineering construction and obstacle emplacement and places units on the map.
- b. U. S. units available from a contested Engagement Area in Combat Column 3 may conduct pre-game movement by entering anywhere along the east edge of the Eastern Engagement Area Map until all Combat Column 3 units have entered the Eastern Engagement Area Map.
- c. U. S. units available from an un-contested Engagement Area in Combat Column 3 may be placed on the Western Engagement Area map but may not be placed in entrenchments, bunkers or hull down fighting positions.

To answer your question using this formula; the U. S. player rolls a die, divides by two rounding down. Since there is no value from Section A or a 0, the prep time is the value of the die roll divided by 2. Therefore, the most prep time a U.S. player may have is 5 hours. There is assumed to be additional distances between the Engagement Areas that are not represented.

2. Could dummy counters only be deployed on a board? If so how many? A smart Soviet player would just rush across based on their doctrine. Where a cautious player might delay to avoid casualties.

3. How many dummy counters would be used on an occupied board? 1 for each real unit, 1 per 2 real units or another ratio

Good questions. The intent of the game is simulate doctrine. Of course, the Soviets were famous for stating that Americans do not study their own doctrine nor do they feel obligated to follow it. Instead of making specific dummy counters for use in Advance Assault, I felt it a better use of resources to give all counters (i.e. supply, wrecks etc) the same national/organizational counter backs so that you have an endless supply of dummy counters. Realistically, no more than 10% of total units available should be dummies. 90 unit counters get you 9 dummies and you can re-use the dummies once identified. They just go right back into the counter mix. I really did not get to

specific about dummies mainly because I play solitaire for the most part and don't use them. I will start addressing that in future scenarios.

Shtora Defense System

1. I understand that the system is a combination of flashing IR lights and a smoke screen. The flashing lights confuse the missile director. The smoke screen blocks line of sight for one combat phase or an over watch fire during movement. Can a laser equipped unit lase the Shtora vehicle and cause it to discharge its smoke but not fire? Could it do this up to its main weapon rate of fire?

My understanding of the Shtora system is that the commander has the option of disengaging the smoke from firing. SO, yes you can do that with a laser but as an option leave it up to the Soviet commander whether or not to fire the smoke. You are never required to fire a weapon. Remember, that the Shtora also orients the lased target vehicle turret in the direction of the lasing unit and increases the ability of the lased target unit to spot the lasing unit.

2. How about FOs with lasers could they lase the Shtora vehicle to get it to discharge its smoke. I could see an FO laseing a vehicle as it moves, at the end of movement in the indirect fire phase a laser guided artillery round is then targeted on the vehicle which has already in the movement phase discharged its smoke.

Again, absolutely; and I would reference the answer for #1 above. However, the Soviet Commander may decide to stop when the smoke discharges or change directions such that the smoke blocks the laser, in which case laser targeted precision guided munitions would be useless.

GENERAL QUESTIONS

I have one question and please don't think of it as criticism in any way. Based on my research it does not appear that the soviet T90 was made in many numbers until after the Soviet Union fell apart. Are you proposing that the Soviet Union did not fall apart and this is a final gasp of their system that they saw failing. Or is it just a hypothetical contest between the best of US and Soviet equipment? Either way is ok with me, I am just curious about your thoughts.

You are correct in that in the 1990 Assault pages this alternate history is based on the assumption that the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact did not collapse. The arms race continued and the weapon systems presented are ones that were either being developed (Eurocopter Tiger) or were in the early stages of deployment; M1A2, Leopard 2A5 etc. I also pushed forward weapon systems that indeed were developed in the mid-to-late 1990s. Due to the "peace dividend" some systems were significantly delayed or cancelled. So I just postulated what a 1995+ NATO vs Warsaw Pact world would look like. I did leave some units in their 1980-90 configuration; the U. S. 9th ID for instance. It was a dead end project that wasn't going to go anywhere since it was too light to fight in Europe and nobody really knew what to do with it.. Testbed for technology really. Plus it will make for some interesting scenarios in Norway and NORTHAG area.

