

2007



ANNUAL REPORT OF THE

**RESERVE FORCES  
POLICY BOARD**



## About the Reserve Forces Policy Board (RFPB)

The RFPB is a statutory board created by the Armed Forces Reserve Act of 1952 and codified in Title 10, United States Code (USC), Section 175. Under Section 10301, the principal duty of the RFPB is to act as the “principal policy advisor to the Secretary of Defense on matters related to the reserve components.” Section 113 places an additional requirement on the RFPB to submit an annual report to Congress and the President to be delivered concurrently with the Secretary of Defense annual report. The predecessor of the RFPB was the Committee on the Civilian Components created in 1947 by Executive Order of President Truman.

The RFPB advises on all matters relating to the reserve components. It evaluates proposals by its members or other agencies for changes to existing laws and policies and recommends appropriate actions.

The RFPB reviews reserve component programs in an annual report transmitted by the Secretary of Defense to the President and the Congress as required under title 10 USC 113(c)(3). It also provides information on its field studies.

Section 10301 defines the Board’s membership to ensure the presence of the highest levels of expertise. Statutory members include a civilian appointed by the Secretary of Defense to serve as Chairman, a reserve flag or general officer to act as Military Executive, the Service Assistant Secretaries for Manpower and Reserve Affairs (M&RA), and flag or general officers from the staff of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and each of the active and reserve components. Additionally, a senior policy advisor from each of the reserve components makes up the RFPB support staff.

Department of Defense  
Reserve Forces Policy Board  
Navy Annex  
Federal Office Building 2, Room 3038  
Washington, D.C. 20310  
Commercial: (703) 697-4486  
Fax: (703) 614-0504  
Website: <http://www.dod.mil/ra/rfpb/>



OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE  
RESERVE FORCES POLICY BOARD  
7300 DEFENSE PENTAGON  
WASHINGTON, DC 20301-7300

June 2008

This past year has seen a great deal of potential change for the reserve components and the RFPB. The delivery of the interim *Report to Congress and the Secretary of Defense of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves* (CNGR) in March 2007 made some far reaching recommendations, many of which were later formalized in the National Defense Authorization Act for 2008. One such recommendation dealt with the restructuring of the Board, and the NDAA 08 levied a requirement for the Secretary of Defense to “develop a plan” to revise the legislative framework of the RFPB and submit it to the House Armed Services Committee and Senate Armed Services Committee not later than July 1, 2008. The resulting plan “shall be consistent with” the March 1, 2007, CNGR report recommendation and “to the extent possible,” take into account the views and recommendations of various civilian and military leaders and private organizations.

While the Board was involved in the deliberations as the Department and Congress wrestled with the future of the Reserve Component and RFPB, the Board turned its main focus to the year 2020 and beyond, and developed a broad strategic vision statement for the reserve components. The vision draws upon the full capabilities of American people to optimize the reserve components and other potential national capabilities, and we believe this vision will assist the Board in providing sound advice on all matters presented to it by serving as a compass directed toward a defined end state.

This annual report summarizes the activities of the Board in as complete a form as possible, so that it might be a timely tool to assist policy makers in their deliberations over the future role of the Reserve Component as a key element of our nation’s defense and civil support capability.

Sincerely,

G. Kim Wincup  
Chairman

# Table of Contents

Introduction .....

1

A Vision for the Reserve Components .....

2

A New Direction .....

4

The Future of the RFPB .....

8

Board and Staff Members .....

10

# Introduction

*The Board’s first task for 2007 was to gain a clear understanding of the current state of affairs in the RC so that we might establish a baseline or benchmark from which to evaluate change. At our meeting in March, the seven Reserve Component Chiefs and Senior Enlisted Advisors (or their representatives) outlined the situation in their components. Two current operational trends emerged that revolved around end strength and mission readiness. The Board found that Reserve end strength is overall strong and clearly helped by accession and re-enlistment bonuses as well as recruiting assistance programs that reward unit members who recruit others to join their units. Mission Readiness overall continues to be impacted by equipment shortages and unsatisfactory medical/dental readiness. All of the parent services are taking action to address these trends; however, particularly in addressing equipment shortages, the “get well” dates extend into 2013 and beyond.*

Two current operational trends emerged that revolved around end strength and mission readiness.

# A Vision for the Reserve Components

With this baseline for the state of the RC, the Board turned its attention to the future and a request from the Under Secretary of Defense for Personnel and Readiness, at our June meeting, to consider “how the military can react to future requirements for personnel with non-traditional skills and capabilities that can’t be anticipated.” The Board spent the better part of the year in consultation with the Reserve Chiefs and experts inside and outside the Department to develop a vision statement that draws upon the full capabilities of American society to address threats and opportunities in the year 2020 and beyond.

On a parallel path, the Board met to consider what the future might look like by hearing from various experts from inside and outside the Department of Defense. Mr. Ryan Henry, Principal Deputy Undersecretary of Defense for Policy, explained the Department’s “Trends and Shocks” construct. DoD uses this construct to assess the defense implications of long-term “trends” and potential “strategic shocks” (i.e. 9/11 and Hurricane Katrina) to generate defense strategies to shape the strategic environment and to predispose the national security establishment toward defense policies that can help us better hedge against a range of plausible alternative futures. DoD’s strategic analysts study six major trends in conflict, demographics, economy, environment, governance, and science and technology to evaluate how those trends interact in order to develop policies that shape the future strategic environment in our interest. Strategic shock scenarios are then developed for senior leaders to review and consider possible responses.

COL Gary Cheek, JCS/J5 Strategic Planning Directorate, briefed us on the J5’s “Long War Against Terror” briefing that makes two key predictions. First, transnational extremist groups will continue to use unresolved grievances with the U.S. and the West to radicalize youth to perpetuate violence. Second, the United States must make patient and persistent long-term efforts to establish robust global partnerships and greater partner-nation capacity to defeat the violent extremism and successfully address grievances in the Muslim world.

Dr. Stephen Flynn, from the Council on Foreign Relations, gave us a look at the “Long-Term Strategic Environment for Homeland Defense.” He exposed many examples of aging U.S. infrastructure that is already vulnerable, or that will become so over the next 20 years; the consequences of its failure would be truly catastrophic in both human and economic terms. Dr. Flynn stressed the deterrent value of national resilience to natural and man-made catastrophes, advocated an infrastructure inventory in order to determine what is truly valuable and vulnerable, and actions to prevent or mitigate consequences of failure. Homeland security response plans should integrate the capabilities of the Reserve and Regular Components, civilian agencies and non-governmental organizations (NGOs).

Mr. Erik Peterson, of the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS), presented the “Seven Revolutions Affecting Leaders thru 2025.” He postulated a global future shaped by revolutionary changes in population, strategic resources, technology, information technology, economic integration, conflict, and governance that will present future generations with both promise and potential peril.

The RFPB’s discussions with these experts were extremely helpful in shaping our understanding of what the future environment might look like as we endeavored to create a future vision for the Reserve Component. Take-aways from the discussions included:

1. Homeland defense/security missions are going to increase, not decrease;
2. Brittle domestic infrastructure is going to break;
3. The scourge of terrorism will continue for some time;
4. Revolutionary global change will tend to increase rather than decrease occurrences of conflict;
5. The Reserve Forces of the future will have to be much more flexible and adaptable to perform the types of missions they will be asked to perform.
6. Reservists will need to operate within joint and interagency teams, and with non-governmental organizations in difficult missions and in remote areas of the globe challenged by poor governance and lack of basic human needs.

The Reserve Forces of the future will have to be much more flexible and adaptable to perform the types of missions they will be asked to perform.

The RFPB then conducted an analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats (SWOT) of the Total Force to establish a foundation for the vision, and after many meetings and dialogues, the subcommittee’s first draft of the vision was discussed at length with the rest of the Board members, other authorities from inside DoD, as well as experts from RAND, the Center for Strategic and International Studies (CSIS) and Center for International Security and Cooperation (CISAC) to get an outside perspective. The culmination of these efforts is a vision for the reserve forces in the year 2020 and beyond. The vision seeks to leverage RC strengths such as flexibility of assignment, varying levels of availability to perform additional service, multiple military and civilian skills, strong community ties, cost-effectiveness, higher experience levels than the active force, and, in 2020, large numbers of combat veterans still serving. The vision statement will serve as a compass to guide the Board’s policy recommendations toward that future end state: *“The Reserve Force provides flexible, accessible and cost effective capabilities whenever and wherever needed in the defense of our vital National interests.”*



# A New Direction

*As the future vision of the environment portends a rise in homeland defense and civil support missions and the expectation that the RC will play an increasingly expanding role, the Board chose to focus on the significant challenges these mission areas present to the Department, to determine if there are steps or policies that can be undertaken to improve or guide the Department's planning and response.*

## The Federal View of Homeland Security (HLS)

The Annual meeting in October was focused on HLS through a federal lens. The guiding theme for speakers as well as Board members and Board alumni was "Reserve and National Guard Homeland Security Roles and Missions." The Board considered the views of a variety of federal agency leaders inside and outside DoD and will use these insights and discussions as we continue to assess long range planning and RC HLS mission sets.

The Honorable Joe Bagnal, Deputy Assistant to the President for Homeland Security, presented a brief history of homeland security reforms since September 11, 2001. He then offered his perspective on the complexities and inefficiencies in the inter-agency process central to homeland security. They included:

1. Civilian agencies lack a disciplined planning process;
2. They need a policy, planning, training, and lessons-learned process;
3. The Nation needs to stop thinking of terrorism as a federal problem only, and national (meaning federal + state + local) policies must be made adequate to enable robust information sharing and a responsive coordination of resources in homeland security crises;
4. The federal government needs a personnel system that values and enables interagency experience and training and a Goldwater-Nichols-like effort to create an interagency culture.

Dr. James Locher III, Executive Director, Project on National Security Reform, presented an overview of the Project on National Security Reform. As a centerpiece of this effort, Congress will be the center of gravity for major changes that are required to fix the national security process so it can respond effectively to international and domestic security threats and actions. It will take new legislation and also a reorganization of Congressional appropriations and oversight committees to manage a revamped national security process. His assessment is that there is too little detailed integrated interagency planning among government agencies, and no government-wide strategic planning. In a parallel effort, The Center for the Study of the Presidency is drawing lessons from 26 case studies of interagency operations and will report to the incoming administration in 2009 with recommendations for a multi-year Goldwater-Nichols-like effort to jointly reorganize the interagency national security policy-making process.

Dr. Paul Stockton, Center for International Security and Cooperation, Stanford University, presented his views shaped by a report of the National Security Consortium, that "[n]o federal, state, and local partnerships exist today for national security." His view is that states and localities must be in the front lines of our homeland security strategy, and not only in response mode, but in anticipation and prevention of crises. The federal government itself owns few critical HLS capabilities. Dr. Stockton opined that the overseas fight continues to be the priority of the administration at the expense of the homeland defense role of the National Guard. He recommended that the Board examine mission capabilities in homeland defense that are not derived from overseas missions. He believes that the CNGR efforts to better resource the National Guard are to be applauded, but the end result is still too federally-centric. He feels strongly that the National Guard is uniquely positioned to solve challenges where the national HLS Strategy falls short.

Dr. Lynn Davis, Director, Washington Office and Senior Fellow, RAND Corporation, presented a view of the Hurricane Katrina response with planning and operations lessons for the Army based on the report of a study titled Hurricane Katrina: Lessons for Army Planning and Operations, commissioned by the Army and conducted by Dr. Davis. This disaster of enormous scale received an unprecedented and heroic, yet flawed, military response. The study concluded that delays in assigning National Guard and Army responders to missions were largely due to lack of command and control capabilities. Barring changes in structure and policies, Katrina response numbers and timelines are about what the nation can expect in future large-scale domestic catastrophes. There are several specific recommendations to enhance military response to domestic events in the report. However, these recommendations can be summarized as a call for better planning, but most importantly they call for changes in the perceived role of the military in domestic emergencies. A new emphasis of the military's role in catastrophic domestic emergencies is equally important as its role in overseas contingencies.

## A State, Regional and Local View of HLS

The Board met in Baltimore in January 2008. At this meeting, it focused on state, regional, and local perspectives for HLS and Emergency Management (EM). Maryland has a unique role because of its proximity to the nation's capital and routinely works in concert with Virginia and the District of Columbia in regard to the National Capitol Region. The Board was hosted by RFPB member Major General Bruce Tuxill, the Adjutant General for Maryland. The Board visited Maryland's Emergency Management Agency (MEMA), Camp Fretterd, Maryland. General Tuxill invited directors and key staff of Maryland's HLS and EM communities to share their perspectives regarding the roles and responsibilities in the protection of the public and critical infrastructure.

The Board heard from Mr. Andy Lauland, Policy Advisor to the Governor for Homeland Security; Col Terry Sheridan, Superintendent of the Maryland State Police;

# A New Direction (continued)

John Droneburg, Director of the Maryland Emergency Management Agency; and Captain Chuck Rapp, Director of the Maryland Coordination and Analysis Center. Within the Maryland Military Department, the Board met with commanders from the Maryland Air National Guard Brig Gen Charles Morgan; Maryland Army National Guard, BG Ed Leacock; and the Maryland Defense Force BG (MD) Courtney Wilson.

Representing agencies at the regional and local levels, the Board also heard from Special Agent Phillip Celestini, Baltimore FBI Field Office; Coast Guard Captain Brian Kelley, Captain of the Port of Baltimore and Commander of Baltimore Coast Guard Sector; COL Jeff Connelly, Chief of Staff, 29th Infantry Division; Richard Muth, Director, Baltimore County Office of Homeland Security; and Mr. Robert Gould, Baltimore Gas & Electric utility company.

Emergency Management in Maryland is the responsibility of the Adjutant General except when the Governor declares a state of emergency and has Emergency Managers report directly to the Governor. Every state has its own unique HLS/EM considerations and organization. Maryland, representative of a smaller state, has some 26 local jurisdictions including three cities and 23 counties, and each of these local jurisdictions has its own emergency manager. A total of 40 State, local, regional and private agencies and non-governmental organizations (churches, etc.) are connected into the Emergency Management “hub” at MEMA, Camp Fretterd.

Maryland’s proximity to the National Capital Region (NCR) is a special consideration shared by two other entities. NCR is made up of portions of two sovereign states (two counties of Maryland and seven towns in Virginia) and the District of Colombia, not including the federal government. Maryland provides National Guard capabilities to the NCR via Joint Task Force-29 which is made-up of National Guard assets from Virginia and Maryland. The “Four Pillars” of Maryland’s Military Department are the Army National Guard, the Air National Guard, the Maryland Emergency Management Agency, and the Defense Force (Militia). Maryland’s National Guard Joint Operations Center (JOC) provides integration for several dozen agencies plus the Maryland Coordination and Analysis (MCAC) information fusion center and connects to the FBI and other law enforcement agencies.

Key to command and control in emergencies is the concept that “the local incident commander is in charge.” The emergency management community falls in on the supported incident commander, per the Incident Command System (ICS) framework. It was made clear to the Board by all presenters that the respective state and/or locally designated leaders expect to be in charge of any response should a disaster or emergency occur in their areas of responsibility. That local commander stays in charge, even if the emergency extends across jurisdictions, as it did during the (NCR) Beltway Sniper crisis in 2002. In this example, the emergency grew into a three-state response with local police Chief Charles Moose, Montgomery County, Maryland, in overall charge of the incident throughout the emergency.

Within Maryland, and across state lines, Emergency Management Assistance Compacts (EMAC) facilitate the sharing of people and resources across jurisdictions, facilitate later reimbursement, and they assign tort liability. An extreme example of Maryland’s use of EMAC was during the Hurricane Katrina response when Maryland sent 1,100 soldiers, airmen and civilian volunteers with ambulances, trucks, etc., to Louisiana and Mississippi for approximately 35 days. Assistance ranged from 60-person fire department search and rescue teams to 40-person police SWAT teams, three fuel tankers, and a medical reserve corps of 241 “tarmac-appointees.” Tarmac appointees are volunteers who are sworn into the Maryland Defense Force (State Militia) under Operation Lifeline [define in a footnote?].

## Key to command and control in emergencies is the concept that “the local incident commander is in charge.”

Maryland’s Defense Force militia contains dozens of chaplains, lawyers, engineers, doctors and other medical personnel. Maryland is one of 28 states with militias. It serves as a good model for a reserve force that can be surged in times of need with specialists, who will serve voluntarily, without a statutory commitment, and their civilian jobs are protected under state law.

# The Future of the RFPB

In its March 2007, report to Congress, the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves (CNGR) concluded that the Reserve Forces Policy Board (RFPB) “is not structured to obtain and provide to the [SecDef] a wide range of independent advice ... because of the nature of its membership, and because it is subordinated to other offices within the Office of the [SecDef].” Accordingly, the Commission recommended that the RFPB statute “be amended to create ... a Reserve Policy Board, composed of 20 members appointed by the Secretary of Defense from outside the Department of Defense” and that the Board’s chairman “have extensive knowledge of and experience with the National Guard and Reserves.”

In response to the CNGR’s recommendation, the RFPB submitted to the SecDef its recommendation that neither the name nor the composition of the RFPB be changed, but did agree that the Board’s Annual Report should be submitted through the DepSecDef to the SecDef. The RFPB also recommended that the Board be exempt from the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA), and that administrative support be provided by the DoD’s Washington Headquarters Services office rather than the Assistant SecDef, Reserve Affairs office. The RFPB also concurred that the manner and timeliness of providing advice to the SecDef needed to be improved.

## The RFPB also concurred that the manner and timeliness of providing advice to the SecDef needed to be improved.

Subsequent to the RFPB’s recommendation, the SecDef submitted to Congress his position on the CNGR’s recommendation and recommended that if the RFPB statute were to be amended, that the RFPB’s name be changed to the “Reserve Forces Advisory Board,” that the Board’s composition be changed to include 10 members to be appointed by SecDef (with unspecified terms) who may be military and civilian members, without restriction, and to have the RFPB report directly to SECDEF.

The House of Representatives and the Senate subsequently undertook to re-view the proposal to amend 10 U.S.C. § 10301 for inclusion in the NDAA-08. The House bill (H.R. 1585) passed May 17, 2007, and made the following major changes: (1) change the Board’s name to “Reserve Components Policy Board,” (2) change the Board’s composition to include 15 members “appointed from civilian life” by the SecDef, (3) that the Chairman and a Vice Chairman be appointed by the SecDef, (4) that an “Executive Director” and the staff be selected by the USD/P&R, (5) that the RFPB report to the SecDef through the DepSecDef with the staff reporting to the USD/P&R, and (6) that administrative support continue from USD/P&R. H.R. 1585 was silent on the issue of whether the RFPB should remain subject to FACA.

The Senate bill (S. 1547) passed 1 October 2007, and proposed, (1) the name be changed to “Reserve Policy Advisory Board,” (2) that board composition include 15 members appointed by the SecDef for 2-year terms with renewal, who must be from outside the DoD, with no more than four government civilians and no more than two military members, (3) that the military executive be chosen by the Chairman and approved by the SecDef, and (4) that the Board report to the SecDef through the DepSecDef. Unlike the House, however, the Senate bill proposed that the RFPB be exempt from FACA.

The Conference Report noted that the intent of the House amendments were designed to allow the RFPB “to provide independent advice and recommendations on strategies, policies, and practices designed to improve and enhance the capabilities, efficiency, and effectiveness of the reserve components of the United States.”

In Section 1823 of the NDAA-08, the Conference Report stated that the SecDef was required to “develop a plan to implement revisions [he] determines necessary in the designation, organization, membership, functions, procedures, and legislative framework of the” RFPB. Further, Congress directed that the plan “shall be consistent with the findings, conclusions, and recommendations” of the March 2007, CNGR Report, and, “to the extent possible, shall take into account the views and recommendations of civilian and military leaders, past chairmen of the [RFPB], private organizations with expertise and interest in [DoD] organization, and other individuals or groups in the discretion of the Secretary.”

The SecDef was directed to submit “a report on the plan” to the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, no later than July 1, 2008, “including such recommendations for legislation as the Secretary considers necessary.”

1. Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, Second Report to Congress, March 1, 2007, pg 85.  
2. Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, Second Report to Congress, March 1, 2007, Recommendation: 20, pg 85.  
3. 10 U.S. Code, Section 10301.  
4. National Defense Authorization Act For Fiscal Year 2008, Conference Report to Accompany H.R. 1585, pg 1181, December 6, 2007.

# RFPB Board Members

| Departed during 2007                        |                                 | Current                    |
|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| Chairman                                    |                                 | Honorable G. Kim Wincup    |
| Military Executive                          |                                 | Maj Gen Terry L. Scherling |
| Assistant Secretary of the Army (M&RA)      | Mr. Daniel Denning (Acting)     | Honorable Ronald James     |
| Assistant Secretary of the Navy (M&RA)      | Honorable William A. Navas, Jr. | Ms. Anita Blair (Acting)   |
| Assistant Secretary of the Air Force (M&RA) |                                 | Honorable Craig Duehring   |
| Joint Chiefs of Staff                       |                                 | LTG Walter L. Sharp        |
| Army  | LTG James J. Lovelace           | Vacant                     |
| Army Reserve                                |                                 | MG Paul E. Mock            |
| Army Reserve                                | MG Robert L. Heine              | MG William C. Kirkland     |
| Army National Guard                         |                                 | MG Gus L. Hargett, Jr.     |
| Army National Guard                         | MG Fred Rees                    | MG Robert G. F. Lee        |
| Navy  |                                 | RADM Peter H. Daly         |
| Navy Reserve                                | RADM John Hines                 | RADM Jeffrey A. Lemmons    |
| Navy Reserve                                | RADM Roger Nolan                | RADM Dirk J. Debbink       |
| Marine Corps                                | LtGen Ronald S. Coleman         | BrigGen Thomas Murray      |
| Marine Corps Reserve                        | Maj Gen Cornell A. Wilson, Jr.  | Vacant                     |
| Marine Corps Reserve                        |                                 | MajGen James Williams      |
| Air Force                                   | Maj Gen K.C. McClain            | Brig Gen Darell Jones      |
| Air Force Reserve                           | Maj Gen Robert Duignan          | Brig Gen Thomas R. Coon    |
| Air Force Reserve                           |                                 | Maj Gen Linda S. Hemminger |
| Air National Guard                          |                                 | Maj Gen Douglas Burnett    |
| Air National Guard                          | Maj Gen Bruce F. Tuxill         | Vacant                     |
|   | Maj Gen Mason Whitney           |                            |
| Coast Guard                                 | RDML Cynthia Coogan             | RDML Daniel May            |
| Coast Guard Reserve                         |                                 | RADM John C. Acton         |
|   |                                 |                            |

# RFPB Staff Members

| Departed during 2007                           |                         | Current              |
|--|-------------------------|----------------------|
| Chief of Staff                                 |                         | Col Marjorie Davis   |
| Senior Policy Advisor for Air Force Reserve    |                         | Col Marjorie Davis   |
| Senior Policy Advisor for Air National Guard   |                         | Col Don Ahern        |
| Senior Policy Advisor for Coast Guard Reserve  | CAPT Ron White          | Vacant               |
| Senior Policy Advisor for Army Reserve         | COL Walter “Cary” Herin | COL Mike Coughlin    |
| Senior Policy Advisor for Army National Guard  |                         | COL Mark Borreson    |
| Senior Policy Advisor for Marine Corps Reserve |                         | LtCol Carolyn Dysart |
| Senior Policy Advisor for Navy Reserve         |                         | CDR Jeff Scarritt    |
| Senior Policy Advisor for Enlisted Matters     |                         | CMSgt John Vallario  |
| Administration Assistant                       |                         | Ms. Audrey Britton   |



