



Office of the Secretary of Defense
Reserve Forces Policy Board
Quarterly Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, March 7, 2012
Pentagon Conference Center, Room B6



Members Present

1. MajGen Arnold Punaro, USMCR, Retired - Chairman
2. VADM John Cotton, USNR, Retired
3. RADM Steven Day, USCGR, Deputy Commander for Mobilization and Reserve Affairs
4. Maj Gen H. Michael Edwards, ANG, The Adjutant General of Colorado
5. Maj Gen Anita Gallentine, USAFR, Deputy Chief of Staff for Installations and Logistics, HQ USAF
6. The Honorable Grier Martin - Member, North Carolina House of Representatives
7. SGM Gary Martz, USAR, Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Reserve Forces Policy Board (Non-voting)
8. Ms. Paulette Mason – Delaware Chair, Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve
9. MajGen Darrell Moore, USMCR, Director - Reserve Affairs
10. Dr. John Nagl, President, Center for New American Security & Minerva Fellow, US Naval Academy
11. Mr. Sergio Pecori – President & Chief Executive Officer of Hanson Professional Services Inc.
12. RADM Russell Penniman, USNR, Reserve Deputy Commander & Chief of Staff, U.S. Pacific Fleet
13. Maj Gen James Stewart, USAFR - Military Executive of the Board (Non-voting)
14. MG Jeffrey Talley, USAR, Commanding General 84th Army Reserve Training Command
15. The Honorable Gary (Gene) Taylor - Former Congressman from Mississippi
16. MG R. Martin Umbarger, ARNG, The Adjutant General of Indiana
17. Ms. Maria Vorel – Disaster Operations Coordinator, Federal Insurance and Mitigation Administration, Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
18. MajGen Leo Williams III, USMCR, Retired

Invited Guests

1. Mr. David McGinnis, Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs
2. Mrs. Jessica Wright, Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs
3. Ms. Janet St. Laurent, Government Accountability Office (GAO)
4. LTC (P) Timothy Lynch, USAR
5. Mr. Jerome Howard, Army Photographer

Briefers

1. Dr. Paul Stockton, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense
2. Mr. Robert Salesses, Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense
3. General Philip Breedlove, Vice Chief of Staff, United States Air Force
4. BG Timothy McKeithen, ARNG, G34 (Force Protection) United States Army
5. COL Doug McCollum, USA, G35 (Global Force Management) United States Army
6. LTC Susan Bacon, Policy and Initiatives Branch, Mobilization Division, Army G-3
7. CSM John Gipe, ARNG, Senior Enlisted Advisor to the ASD (RA)
8. CSM Richard Burch, ARNG, CSM of the ARNG
9. SGM Robert Ireland, Army Reserve CSM Executive SGM
10. FORCM Chris Wheeler, USNR, FORCM, Navy Reserve Forces
11. SgtMaj James Booker, USMC, SgtMaj of Marine Forces Reserve
12. CCMSgt Kathleen Buckner, USAFR, CMSgt of the Air Force Reserve Command
13. CCMSgt Denise Jelinski-Hall, NGB Senior Enlisted Leader

14. CMC Kurt Shoemaker, Coast Guard Reserve

RFPB Staff

1. Col Michelle Obata, USAFR
2. COL Robert Preiss, ARNG
3. Col Mary Salcido, ANG
4. CDR Steve Knight, USNR
5. LtCol Kenneth Olivo, USMCR
6. LTJG Stephen Cheng, USCGR
7. CWO4 George Rubesha, USCGR
8. SMSgt Joyce Voyles, USAFR
9. Mr. Paul Briggs

RFPB Staff Support

1. Col Dona Iverson, USAFR
2. Maj Darryl G. McLean, USAFR
3. Capt Samantha M. Pitman, USAFR

Public Observers

1. MG Richard Wightman, USAR (Ret), ASD (RA)
2. RADM David R. Callahan, USCG
3. BG Larry Pride, USA, ASA (M&RA)
4. LTC John Paul Cook, USAR
5. LtCol Andrew Ryan, USMCR, OASN (M&RA)
6. CDR Kyle Gatzmeyer, USN, OASN (M&RA)
7. CPT Terica Rusher, USA
8. Mr. Clark R. Lystra
9. Mr. Thomas LaCrosse
10. Mr. Patrick Tennis

0720 – 0800 **Administrative Time**

0800 – 0810 **Chairman's Opening Remarks**

MajGen Arnold L. Punaro, USMCR (Ret), *Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board*

- The RFPB meeting was called to order by Chairman Punaro. He informed attendees that: ***“As required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, the Designated Federal Officer is present and has pre-approved the opening of this meeting and its agenda.”***
- He further stated that the RFPB is an “open book” and ASD (RA) leaders are always welcome.
- The Chairman introduced Mr. David McGinnis and Ms. Jessica Wright.

Mr. David L. McGinnis, *Acting Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs*

- Mr. McGinnis remarked that he was pleased to support the independence of the newly restructured RFPB and noted that he helped champion the Board's independence. He further stated that Reserve Affairs has a “great relationship” with the RFPB and are big supporters of its work. He stated that he had been frustrated in the past by other entities within the Pentagon trying to force the RFPB to “come out” with a predetermined or desired outcome.
- Mr. McGinnis emphasized the significance of maintaining an operational reserve despite the institutional friction present in the Pentagon, particularly the institutional friction between the Services and their Reserve Components.
- He noted that there are currently two active surveys of interest to ASD RA: The Annual Status of Forces and the Employer Perceptions of the Guard and Reserve.

- Also worthy of note was his mentioning that the President’s recent national strategy document includes three priorities relevant to the RC; partnerships, peacekeeping and economy of force.
- **Mrs. Jessica L. Wright**, *Principal Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs*
- Mrs. Wright echoed Mr. McGinnis’ thoughts and further stated that the RFPB is independent, but enjoys a unique connection with ASD (RA).
- Clarifying she stated: “While the RFPB no longer reports through RA, and there is a dividing line, it is important that a separate but ‘dotted line’ be maintained between the two.” She gave as an example of good collaboration, her recent meeting with the RFPB Homeland Subcommittee regarding implementation of the new 12304(a) authority.
- She continued her emphasis on partnership noting that both the RFPB and RA insure the National Guard and Reserve Forces are “taken care of” appropriately, and assured the Board that RA is working hard to implement recommendations made in their recently published Comprehensive Review of the Future Role of the Reserve Component and the 2008 findings of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves. She closed by stating: “The importance of the Board’s ability to go directly to the Secretary of Defense cannot be overemphasized”.
- **Chairman Punaro** remarked that although independent, the RFPB must work in a collaborative manner within DoD for the Board to be successful. Unlike other boards, we can task ourselves, but to be successful, we cannot burn bridges or steamroll anyone. If someone disagrees with the RFPB that fact will be reflected in our reports. The RFPB cannot be one-sided!

0810 – 0825 **Oath Administered to New Members**

MajGen Arnold L. Punaro, USMCR (Ret), *Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board*

Today we swear-in three new members of our Board: Major General Darrell L. Moore, USMCR, who is currently serving as the Director of Reserve Affairs, Headquarters, Marine Corps; Rear Admiral Russell S. Penniman, USNR, who is currently serving as the Reserve Deputy Commander and Chief of Staff for the U.S. Pacific Fleet; and Sergeant Major Gary L. Martz, USAR, who will serve as the Senior Enlisted Advisor to the Board and as a non-voting member. These three new members bring to us an important, diverse, uniformed reserve perspective, which is so vital to our credibility as an independent adviser to the Secretary.

- *“I, [name], do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office upon which I am about to enter, so help me God.”*
- **MajGen Darrell L. Moore, RADM Russell S. Penniman, and SGM Gary L. Martz** all recited the oath as stated above.

0825 – 0835 **Farewell to Members/Presentation of Gifts**

MajGen Arnold L. Punaro, USMCR (Ret), *Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board*

Today we will say farewell to Major General Jeffrey W. Talley, USAR, and Rear Admiral Steven E. Day, USCGR. Major General Talley and Rear Admiral Day have served with distinction on the Reserve Forces Policy Board for three years. We wish them well and look forward to working with them in their future endeavors.

- **MG Jeffrey W. Talley, USAR**: The board is successfully evolving and is more focused in its work. The Board is also connecting well in the building and he is looking forward to working with the Board in the future.

- *RADM Steven E. Day, USCGR*, stated: “I am disappointed to be leaving; however, I will remain active with the Board. You have great momentum especially within the subcommittees.”

0835 – 0920 **Cost Methodology Project Update**

MajGen Arnold L. Punaro, USMCR (Ret), *Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board*

- Chairman Punaro emphasized to the Board that this project is not an attempt to adjust pay or retirement benefits, nor to down-size the active component. He merely wants an accurate accounting of the individual “fully burdened” costs of both Active and Reserve members so that senior decision makers have an accurate accounting of overall costs.
- He believes that statements made by senior Service officials are not accurate when they say that Guard and Reserve members can cost as much, if not more than their active component counterparts when mobilized. Chairman Punaro stated that with 837,000 reserve component members called to active duty since 9/11, he wanted to know how many new hospitals, schools, child care centers, commissaries, golf courses, and military family housing units were added and then taken down since that time? His answer – zero!
- There has been great cooperation among the Services, M&RAs and ASD (RA) on this project. The project goal is to identify individual “fully burdened” and “life-cycle” costs for both component members. Why? Because this is the “full” cost of maintaining the force!
- The Chairman reiterated that this effort is not an attempt to say to DoD leadership and the Service Chiefs “use the Guard and Reserves”. The project is merely an extension of work done by the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves and ASD (RA’s) 2011 Comprehensive Review of the Guard and Reserves. Instead of providing a cost comparison based on units, it will look at the individual component member costs.
- It is a very difficult and complex task to develop the “full cost” to the government; however, there is currently a temporary policy [Directive-Type Memorandum (DTM) 09-007] that CAPE has in place that is being used as a starting point. It does not include all relevant cost factors, but the task force will find the gaps and ensure that all costing elements are included in the “fully burdened” cost.
- Chairman Punaro described the difficulties DoD has had in the past trying to get agreement from the Services on what to include in the total cost. GAO has also identified this difficulty as well.
- The RFPB has a very open approach, reaching out to all Services to arrive at sound methodology with accurate vetting. The Services, The Joint Staff J8, CAPE, GAO, CBO and other experts will also be consulted on this project to ensure accuracy and buy-in.
- A project update briefing will be provided to the entire Board at the June meeting.
- *VADM John G. Cotton* stated that Congress only judges DoD by one criterion – the execution of funds. Incentivized behavior will not change until rewarding prior year execution is changed. How do you change Congress? Admiral Cotton commented that in 2004, when he was Chief of the Navy Reserve, he made an agreement with the Chief of Naval Operations that the active and activated reserve components cost the same in pay and allowances; the difference is how they are used within Navy resources.
- *Mr. David L. McGinnis* believes Service Reserve Components should receive budgetary credit for retaining capability and providing cost avoidance in training needs. It saves the government money. For example, a fighter pilot transitioning into the reserve components saves DoD \$8M; a helicopter pilot saves them \$4.5M; and an infantryman saves \$225K. We need to track costs and preserve our investment.
- *Chairman Punaro* described critical policy concerns that have surfaced and pointed out that there was some dissent to the development of a “Fully Burdened” cost for senior leadership comparison. He pointed out that the project approach is like a layered cake, starting with the reserve components, and then vetting through the military services, the Office of the Secretary of

Defense's staff, and finally outside the DoD, to include GAO, CBO, CRS, and OMB. The desire is to develop a sound methodology that identifies all cost elements.

- *MajGen Leo V. Williams III* agreed; there is a need to have a standard. However, who is supporting this effort with energy and money?
- *Chairman Punaro* stated that the reserve component chiefs are providing the manpower and resources. Today, the Services know that the fully burdened cost for the active component is a large bill, but every day the Services are making fundamental decisions without accurate information on exactly how much. The Chairman described the initial observations of project members, which included the overall life cycle savings of Reserve forces versus Active Duty forces.
- *Dr. John Nagl* stated that costs will remain a driver at the policy level. This effort “couldn't be more important and timely”.
- *Mr. Sergio Pecori* commented that there needs to be agreed upon definitions of what constitutes overhead costs and an understanding of what costs are inherently governmental.
- *Chairman Punaro* commented that if it doesn't “break things and kill people”, it's overhead. He noted that OMB still hasn't “run to ground” the definition of inherently governmental costs. He strongly agreed on the need to identify those costs and start the dialogue and debate in this area.
- *RADM Penniman* commented that it's important that certain needed skill-sets be maintained by the Reserve Component, since the active component will not have the time nor the skill to grow this capability quickly. We cannot afford to lose experience at the tactical and operational levels. We need to maintain the skill-sets and the surge capability.
- *The Honorable Grier Martin* emphasized the definite need for project team members to spend quality time properly defining and clarifying standards used on this project.
- *Chairman Punaro* commented that it is important to identify all of the different costs, especially Base Operations Support costs. He acknowledged that it will be particularly difficult to break these costs out at the individual level.
- *Maj Gen Stewart* acknowledged that properly identifying individual cost elements is the key to success for this project.
- *Mr. Sergio Pecori* noted that if you go outside DoD, it may “muddy the waters” and be difficult to properly identify the true “overhead” business costs.
- *Chairman Punaro* commented that he would wait and see what the task force comes up with.

0920 – 0950 **Top Issues Brief - Army G3**

BG Timothy M. McKeithen, ARNG, *Director, Army G34 (Force Protection)*

Brigadier General Timothy M. McKeithen assumed duties as the Director, G34 (Force Protection) for the Army staff on July 01, 2011. He is responsible for Army protection-related programs and functions. Prior to his current assignment, General McKeithen served as Chief of Staff, Army National Guard, Arlington, Virginia, comprised of over 1,600 personnel and responsible for staff operations in support of the Director, Army National Guard, Deputy Director and the 54 states, territories and District of Columbia.

- *BG McKeithen* introduced Col Douglas McCollum (Chief, Global Force Management Division, Army G3) and LTC Susan Bacon (Policy and Initiatives Branch, Mobilization Division, Army G3) as co-briefers.
- *Colonel McCollum*, whose primary duty is that of an Army planner, presented the following major issues:
 - Likelihood that in the future Army will plan for use of both Active and Reserve Components for both major named operations (such as in Afghanistan) and for surge capacity.
 - There is a draft Army Total Force Policy that has completed staffing and is awaiting signature by the Secretary of the Army.

- The Army will move to a single, 9-month deployment length for both Active and Reserve Component units through FY 18, then steady state as per SECDEF guidance (one year deployed and two years dwell) for AC and one year mobilized and five years dwell for RC.
- He also stated: “Dwell ratios impact costing models, capital expenditures and overhead”.
- *LTC Bacon* briefed three elements of Change 1 to DoD Instruction 1235.12. They include:
 - RC units would get 180-days notification where it was operationally feasible to do so.
 - Units who planned overseas deployment missions that were canceled would be redirected to another mission requirement; ideally at least 90 days before their scheduled mobilization date.
 - There is a plan to mitigate individual hardships caused by mission cancellations.
- She also described four hardship types; contractual (leases, etc.), educational deferral, family healthcare needs, and adverse employment situations. If the reason is found valid, the individual could be redirected to another global requirement.
- *MG Talley* challenged the term “global requirement” and expressed his view that Contingency Expeditionary Force (CEF) missions such as Combat Training Center rotations in the United States could also be a type of duty to which a hardship affected soldier could be redirected.
- *BG McKeithen* briefed that the Army was working with NORTHCOM to modify the access controls at some military installations (including RC bases) in order to expand public access. This modification would entail the creation of security zones. The Army will produce a prioritized list of installations and then apply a “cut line” based on available resources. A key meeting on this process will take place in April.

0950 – 1015 **Top Issues Brief - Air Force**

General Philip M. Breedlove, *Vice Chief of Staff of the Air Force*

General Philip M. Breedlove is Vice Chief of Staff of the U.S. Air Force, Washington, D.C. As Vice Chief, he presides over the Air Staff and serves as a member of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Requirements Oversight Council and Deputy Advisory Working Group. He assists the Chief of Staff with organizing, training, and equipping 680,000 active-duty, National Guard, Reserve and civilian forces serving in the United States and overseas.

- The number one issue in the Air Force is “How do we shrink the Air Force and maintain capability?” This decision affects our Reserve (Air Force Reserve and Air Guard) and Active Duty components. “These are tough decisions.”
- We haven’t seen a change in the demand signal in the past 21 years. Fiscal resources are compressing during a time when future demand is increasing. The Air Force mission does not stop with the withdrawal of ground troops (i.e. no fly zones, surveillance, etc. is still needed).
- Over the past 10 years, other services have increased while the Air Force has steadily gotten smaller in the top line. Supply of capability is established by dwell policy. For example, an active duty member deploys for one Air Expeditionary Force (AEF) cycle (currently 179 days) and is home for two AEF cycles (one year) (dwell 1:2), while reserve component members deploy for one AEF cycle (179 days) and are home for five AEF cycles (two and one half years) (dwell 1:5).
- The Air Force is proposing a two percent overall reduction. Options explored on how to meet the demand within the fiscal constraints were narrowed to three options: (1) dramatic shift to active duty, (2) increase reserve component rotation (however, this would possibly drive a mobilization to support the increased rotation and was not deemed acceptable), and (3) 2% Reserve Component missions realigned to active duty (where we landed).
- *General Breedlove* posed the next question: “How do we solve the maintenance problems?” Bolstering reserve components with active associations where active duty works side-by-side with reserve component members is an answer. The Air Force is planning to add 15 active associations and implement a “4-40” plan, which associates 4 active duty pilots and 40 active duty maintainers with Reserve and Guard flying and maintenance units. The Active Component has younger

pilots/maintainers, while the Reserve Component has more seasoned pilots/maintainers that stay in units longer. Through associations, the Active Component members work side-by-side with more seasoned Reserve Component members. The goal is to maximize the talent on both sides.

- *Chairman Punaro* commented that it's a strategic imperative of the "Continuum of Service" concept that personnel be allowed to flow back and forth between components (AC to RC and RC to AC).
- *General Breedlove* further stated that today, we cannot conduct daily operations without the Guard and Reserve. Day-to-day, the reserve components are operational, but mostly in volunteer status. "We can't break our success with volunteerism", stated General Breedlove. He also mentioned that Guard and Reserve units will deploy 3 units for 60 day intervals to cover a six month mission, called "rainbowing". However, there are inefficiencies and associated costs of generating and standing down three units instead of one unit for the entire 180 day deployment. One key differentiator between Active and Guard is that the base operational support (BOS) for active duty is fixed and operational (24 hrs a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year); whereas, the Guard base has to activate BOS personnel to support the generation and stand-down of each unit. Also noted was the cost of moving equipment in and out of theater.
- *Maj Gen Edwards* commented that all operational requirements must be assessed, to include equipment and manpower support for Homeland and Civil Support. Requirements for Defense Support for Civil Authorities (DSCA) have not been identified to the Department of Defense. This is a factor that drives rainbowing so that some portion of capability is always available for any DSCA missions. He posed the question, "how do we change it (the lack of identified DSCA requirements to DoD)?" Maj Gen Edwards recommended that the Adjutants General of each state approach the USNORTHCOM Commander (General Jacoby) and bring forward unidentified and unfunded DSCA requirements. General Breedlove commented that access to active duty airplanes for domestic emergencies is not an issue. Rather, it's more about process.
- *Maj Gen Edwards* stated that it's not all about the airplanes; it's about all elements tasked to support DSCA and local authorities.
- *Chairman Punaro* commented that the location of Guard units is key to their role as first responders.
- *Maj Gen Gallentine* expressed concern about current budget choice implications/impact on small business, the aging pilot force and multiple/extended deployments for maintainers/BOS personnel.

1015 – 1040 **Insuring a Ready, Capable, Available and Sustainable Operational Reserve Subcommittee**

VADM John Cotton, USN (Ret), Subcommittee Chair

VADM Cotton briefed the following items: 1) Develop a common definition for an Operational Reserve; 2) Standardize RC Medical Readiness Requirements and Reporting; and 3) Propose Policies, Practices and Legislation to accomplish adopted recommendations.

- *VADM Cotton* stated that each Service has a different definition of "Operational Reserve", and there is no common personnel system that supports an operational reserve force. There are legacy systems in place that deal with individual policies, practices and procedures for handling recruiting, assignments, incentives, budget development and budget execution, but it's not done universally.
- *MajGen Moore* emphatically stated: "We need to stop talking about 'operational reserve'." "Language is very important and that term has been frequently thrown around the building, meaning different things to different people".
- *MajGen Stewart* stated that there needs to be an evaluation of service required roles and missions; where is the "best fit" for RC personnel. The services have not addressed this task. The folks in each of the Services' Operations and Plans divisions need to sit down and discuss. He also pointed out that there are a number of tools available to determine readiness, both objective and subjective.

- *VADM Cotton* next discussed the lack of standardization in medical requirements and reporting. He pointed out that computer systems designed to track Individual Medical Readiness (IMR) are not consistent within the Services (Air Force/ANG/AFR or Army/ARNG/ARR do not have a common system). The consensus of the group was that the requirements and tracking systems should be standardized.
- *Board members* had a lengthy discussion about reserve dental issues. Who pays what? It was determined that each service RC handles the issue differently. Additionally, several Board members recommended adoption of an already existing medical tracking system or create a new repository. Finally, the question arose as to who is responsible for individual medical readiness; the member or the unit? Most board members agreed that it was an individual responsibility, but needed to be tracked by leadership.
- *Mr. McGinnis* briefed the Board on the status of the new VA joint medical readiness reporting system. He stated that his RA folks would be meeting with VA to discuss their system by the end of the week. He also mentioned that the study on reducing the number of RC statuses allowing for easier movement into and out of AD was progressing well; the goal is a reduction to four statuses for Title 32 and two for Title 10.

1040 – 1100 **Supporting Service Members, Families and Employers Subcommittee**

Ms. Paulette Mason, Subcommittee Chair

Ms. Mason briefed the following items:

- There are duplications of effort in many family support programs and initiatives within every Service component. The Subcommittee will work with ASD (RA) and USD/P&R to consolidate. The Subcommittee is working with ASD (RA) to identify revisions to the Yellow Ribbon DoDI 1342.28. Again, the focus is on efficiencies and duplicative efforts.
- The USERRA law was last revised in 1994. The question remains whether the current law is correctly structured to protect the rights of a Service member serving in the current ‘Operational Reserve’ environment. The Subcommittee is monitoring progress on the ASD (RA) sponsored DD Form 214 Working Group. Substantial progress has been made in identifying existing and potential future methods for documenting RC service member participation. Having a DD 214 helps with VA benefits and employment.
- A quick review of the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA) was covered. Ms. Mason emphasized to Board members that FMLA only applies to companies with greater than 50 employees.
- In the area of Wounded Warrior care, there is a lack of RC representation at the primary Warrior Transition Units (WTUs) and community based WTUs. The subcommittee will explore the reasons why and see if changes to policy are needed.

1100 – 1230 **Noon Break – Senior Enlisted Advisor (SEA) Remarks**

Chairman Punaro introduced SGM Gary Martz, RFPB SEA, and commented on the dependence of our forces on enlisted members. He firmly voiced his appreciation to the RC component SEAs for their service and time expended to brief the RFPB. He then turned the floor over to SGM Martz.

SGM Martz introduced the SEA representatives from each of the seven RCs and the SEA from ASD Reserve Affairs, and extended the opportunity for each SEA to provide brief comments followed by Q & A from the board members.

CSM John Gipe, ARNG, Senior Enlisted Advisor to the ASD-RA

- **DD Form 214:** OSD RA is leading a DD Form 214 Working Group to determine what changes need to be made to the DoDI, the form, and the processes to support today's operational environment and continuum of service. The focus of the group is to work with the VA to ease their transition and reduce their workload. Thus, an improved form will ensure a smoother transition for all Service members, standardize data entry, and provide the VA with the data it needs to ensure all periods of active service that counts towards VA benefits are accurately reflected on the DD Form 214.
- **Heroes to Hire (H2H) Program** was initiated to consolidate job initiative programs under one umbrella with coordinated oversight. Unemployment compensation is a concern due to high unemployment rates of RC service members. It is projected to cost the DoD \$1.2-\$1.4 billion in the next fiscal year. This money is not budgeted and comes out of discretionary spending accounts. The senior leadership of the Department must start recognizing the contributions employers are making to support DoD. When the Afghan and Iraq drawdowns are complete, 53% of our Army Reserve Component members will return to a civilian employer. If employer support for their RC employees dries up, the operational reserve concept will fail and that is a National Security concern. With the state of the Nation's economy and our current budget woes, we cannot afford a large Active Duty force to support all mission requirements.
- **Yellow Ribbon** funding must be secured in the base budget and be expanded to include Outreach Programs. With changes to the NDAA such as 12304(b) (allowing easier access to Reserve Component forces), the Yellow Ribbon program is an enduring mission that will continue into the foreseeable future.
- **SEJPME:** ASD Reserve Affairs is addressing CNGR recommendation #14 by working to expand RC curriculum in the Senior Enlisted Academies and to provide representation for the RC on the EMERC, which is the body that addresses JPME training. As an update – Just today I was informed that the SEA, ASD (RA) position will be included as a member of the EMERC and will act as an advisor on RC issues.
- **Quick Compass Survey:** This is a survey of the RC to provide metrics that support (or don't support) the recommendations made within the ASD (RA) 2011 Comprehensive Review. The survey is complete and data is being "mined" – results are expected in June. I will ensure the RFPB gets copies for its members.
- **Civilian credentialing for military training:** There is movement (to include legislation) to provide civilian credentials for military training. This is an effort to address the unemployment concerns and to provide veterans with a "leg up" when they leave the Service. With the NDAA mandating the development of a civilian skills tracking mechanism, I recommended that the CEI database, which is housed in DMDC, be expanded to include the civilian credentials of RC members.
- **SOF Training issues:** Current law restricts the amount RCs can pay for bonuses to transitioning AC members at \$15,000. In order to provide RC SOF forces with the opportunity to recruit fully qualified SOF members leaving the AC, the law needs to be changed to allow for a RC recruiting bonus of \$50,000. The AC currently pays up to \$150,000 to recruit and retain SOF force personnel. Based on the fact that it costs a minimum of \$225,000 to get a SOF troop fully qualified, the savings to DoD would be significant if we can retain these experienced personnel.
- **INCAP pay for RC Service Members (SMs):** All Services, to varying degrees, are taking RC SMs who become wounded, injured or ill while on active duty, and transitioning them to INCAP status (to include those wounded in action). The DODI that addressed INCAP for the RC was written prior to 9/11 and its language is very vague. The DODI (if accepted) will ensure RC SMs receive the proper medical care they deserve while on active duty and the language reflects that INCAP is to be used only for those RC SMs who are performing IADT or AT.

CSM Richard Burch, ARNG, CSM of the ARNG

The priorities of the Director, Army National Guard are as follows: make 2012 the year of ARNG Readiness, emphasize the ARNGs value to our nation and communities, balance our force, strengthen our soldiers and families, and develop transformational and adaptive ARNG leaders.

Medical Readiness

- Inter-agency interoperability with all systems facilitate better continuity of care, as well as provide visibility of potential conditions that may limit duty performed by our Soldiers.
- Over medication – Behavioral Health (BH) – Suicides: all are concerns of the ARNG as we continuously monitor the force to ensure medical readiness stays at the top of our list.
- Continuity of Care – Inter-Agency interoperability – DoD, VA, and Civilian: we need automated systems that cross talk so we can better monitor the health of the force.
- Quality of Care – Medical Protocols: there is inconsistency in protocols and cross checks between service providers that affects the quality of care provided to our Soldiers.
- Disability Evaluation System: backlogs concern ARNG leadership. Hopefully, processes currently in place will reduce the backlog and expedite future evaluations.

Cost savings in technology versus accessibility to RC Soldiers

- Expectation management: leadership cannot expect all Soldiers to be able to afford technology; Soldiers are not expected to sacrifice family needs to acquire technology.
- Technology access is limited in rural America.
- Learning Center availability is virtually non-existent in the RC. Negative career impact may result due to technology limitations in the RC; technology requirements are linked to readiness, leadership position opportunities and promotions.
- Need equitable compensation such as retirement points to match training expectations. The definition of "required training" needs to include the NCO Education System (NCOES), since we expect Soldiers to attend required training to progress through the ranks and assume positions of greater responsibility.
- Strategy and resources must be developed to support requirements for RC Soldiers.
- Training required for mobilization readiness, duty MOS qualification, critical functional and professional development is needed to develop adaptive and agile RC leaders.

Operational Reserve/Total Force

- I see four elements to providing an Operational Force: Predictable -- Proportional -- Practical -- Professional (P4).



THE 4 LEGGED STOOL: family responsibilities, Soldier's personal and professional goals (civilian/military), unit requirements (ARFORGEN), and employment obligations.

- *Family responsibilities:* base support, spouse career, dependent support and development/education.
- *Soldier personal and professional goals (civ/mil):* education, civilian employment career progression, and military career progression.
- *Unit requirements (ARFORGEN):* PME and progressive readiness [RESET (Individual/Team), Tier 1 (Team/Squad), Tier 2 (Squad/Platoon), Tier 3 (Platoon/Company), AVAILABLE (Mission Set)].
- *Employment obligations:* predictability is number one, small business impact, local government (Police, EMT, First Responders, etc), temporary hire, off ramp, and re-mission. ARNG members question whether Contingency Expeditionary Force (CEF) soldiers will see the same support as Deployment Expeditionary Forces (DEF)? Also, will Soldiers be able to find jobs post-deployment.

CSM Michael Schultz, USAR, CSM of the Army Reserve
(Represented by SGM Robert Ireland, Army Reserve CSM Executive SGM)

SGM Ireland echoed many of the statements made and requirements needed by his distinguished colleagues. He stated that time spent doing distance learning should receive retirement credit. He also emphasized the need for OSD policy on Joint Military Education, duty Occupational Specialty, and Professional Military Education compensation. Currently, the Army Reserve has very limited resources to fund this training [Additional Training Assemblies (ATAs) – max 10 per year cover approx 60% of training]. An increase to 12 ATAs per year would cover much more, but is not all that is needed. There is a need for more IDT and man-day funding, as the 39 days per year falls short of readiness requirement needs. USAR must operate through tiered readiness to cover what is imperative.

FORCM Chris Wheeler, USNR, FORCM, Navy Reserve Forces

Mr. Chairman, Board members, thank you for the opportunity to speak to you today. On behalf of your Navy Reserve, thank you for your interest in the programs so critical to our 63,971 Reservists. Operationally, the Navy Reserve is dynamic, adaptive and ready to serve based on the requirements needed, from peace to war. Right now, 3,990 mobilized or deployed Navy Reserve Sailors are providing about half of the Navy's ground forces serving in the U.S. Central Command and in other critical roles worldwide.

I believe the top three avenues to improve the Quality of Life of Navy Reserve Sailors are: Continue support for Training and Equipment so our Sailors can maintain their readiness; Provide families the tools needed to remain resilient; and Invest in programs that enable a true continuum of service.

Continue support for Training and Equipment

- Our Navy Reserve is relevant and capable today because we made conscious decisions to invest in our people and our equipment. We have assigned Sailors real and meaningful work, and honored the support of our families and our employers. In the future, we need to ensure our Sailors continue to have the training and equipment they need to maintain their readiness.

Provide families the tools needed to remain resilient

- One such tool is the Returning Warrior Workshop (RWW). All Sailors returning from overseas mobilizations are encouraged to attend a RWW, the Navy's "signature event" within DoD's Yellow Ribbon Reintegration Program (YRRP). Supported by the Bureau of Navy Medicine and Surgery (BUMED), the RWW is a part of psychological health services for reservists.
 - The RWW is a dedicated weekend with the Sailor's family designed to facilitate reintegration of Sailors returning from combat zones. Staged at a high-quality location at no cost to the participants, the RWW employs trained facilitators to lead Warriors' discussions to address post-combat stress and the challenges of transitioning back to civilian life. Defining resilience as more than just simply returning to former levels of functioning, these events help service members recognize what is called "post-traumatic growth"—positive changes made as a result of going through the deployment experience. During FY11, 20 RWWs were conducted, serving 1,233 RC/AC Sailors, 37 other Service Members and 1,045 family members/loved ones. Twenty-one events are scheduled in FY12. Pioneered by the Navy Reserve, these workshops are available for all Navy AC and RC members. RWWs are a true success story, honoring our Sailors and their families.

It is important to ensure this program continues to have both the full support of Navy leadership and the widest possible participation by all returning Sailors.

- RWWs serve as a key component of the BUMED Navy Reserve Psychological Health Outreach Program (PHOP). The PHOP employs dedicated teams of mental health professionals to provide psychological health assessments, outreach, and education, including Operational Stress Control (OSC) and Suicide Prevention training for the Navy and Marine Corps Reserve communities. Regularly scheduled encounters are held at Deployment Readiness Training events to screen service members prior to and after deployment. The program is designed to identify potential stress disorders, facilitate early intervention, and provide access to psychological health support resources. The availability, quality, and effectiveness of psychological services utilized by Navy/Marine Corps Reservists and their families are closely monitored. In FY 11, the Navy Reserve deployed a user-friendly webpage providing both Sailors and their family members an easy-to-access database of PHOP points of contact.
- During FY 11, 714 Reservists were referred for PHOP services, of these 668 became ongoing clients. The PHOP teams also attempted calling 3,815 recently demobilized Reserve Sailors, of these 2,173 were successfully contacted and were provided support. PHOP team members also made 193 visits to NOSCs and 129 visits to NMPS sites in Norfolk, VA and San Diego, CA, where they received referrals and conducted mental health screenings. They also provided briefings to 30,246 Navy Reservists, unit staff/leadership and family members during DRT events.

Invest in programs that enable a true continuum of service

- We have to enable a true Continuum of Service (CoS) to allow the Navy and our Nation access to the capability and capacity we have invested in. In the recent past, we talked about on-ramps and off-ramps to describe transitions between different service statuses. We are now using the analogy of “lane changes” to describe the goal of a seamless transition between the Navy’s Active and Reserve Components, and between different statuses in the Reserve Component. Where barriers are identified to this vision both in policy and law, we will work to eliminate these obstacles and establish a robust Continuum of Service. A top priority and a critical goal in this effort is to resolve a path toward a future Integrated Pay and Personnel System.
- Recruit Sailors once and retain them for life through variable and flexible service options that provide a career continuum of meaningful and valued work.
- The Career Transition Office (CTO) in the Navy Personnel Command continues to be one of the most exciting developments for CoS. The goal of the CTO is to counsel Sailors before they leave Active Duty and help them to take advantage of the opportunities in the Navy Reserve. By catching our fully qualified, world-wide assignable personnel before they leave Active Duty, CTO personnel work the transition as a retention transaction instead of a drawn-out process that requires a Navy recruiter, thus reducing the cost and manpower hours associated with recruiting Navy Veterans. In FY11 the CTO transitioned 746 enlisted Sailors from the AC to the RC.

Mr. Chairman and board members, thank you, again. I am proud to be in the Navy Reserve, and I am humbled by the commitment of the men and women of your Navy Reserve. There has never been a better time to be part of the Navy-Marine Corps team, and our Navy Reserve is clearly an integral part of this hard-working, high-spirited, and amazingly capable force. On behalf of the Sailors, civilians, and contract personnel of the Navy Reserve, we thank you for the continued support and your commitment to the Navy Reserve and our Navy.

SgtMaj James Booker, USMC, *SgtMaj of Marine Forces Reserve*

I concur with each Service's Senior Enlisted Adviser (SEA). We all have common issues and concerns. They all seem to be rooted in money. We are working to find solutions to both pay and education issues internally within Marine Forces Reserve (MFR) and the Total Force (USMC).

- As the OCO money goes away, we have to get our requirements into the baseline budget of the USMC or there will be fewer reserve Marines available to deploy and fewer opportunities to attend Profession Military Education (PME) schools. During the last eight years, we made schools a requirement for promotion, but did not fund additional drill periods. Instead, we paid for these schools with activation orders that will no longer be available. In the future, we will be limited to using only the annual training for two weeks of school.
- Currently budgeted for only two weeks training and 48 UTAs, we will need more funding to do anything beyond that level of training.
- If USMC drops below 179K end-strength, it will affect overall USMCR capability.
- The USMCR is looking at doubling IRR, NORTHCOM Operations opportunities and leveraging technology in the future.

CCMSgt Kathleen Buckner, USAFR, *CMSgt of the Air Force Reserve Command*

CCMSgt Buckner echoed her counter parts and highlighted the following issues:

- Medical readiness standards differ between AC/RC. We are finding that RC service members may not disclose medical issues due to the impact of perceived civilian employer reaction.
- Yellow Ribbon (YR) is working well, but an extra day is needed in YR for family integration.
- ESGR is working well.
- R&R downtime for geographically dispersed service members is a topic that must be addressed (an example was provided of an Airman living in Switzerland).
- Distance learning should receive retirement credit.

CCMSgt Christopher Muncy, ANG, *CMSgt of the Air National Guard* (*Represented by CCMSgt Denise Jelinski-Hall, NGB Senior Enlisted Leader*)

Good day...honor to speak to this esteemed audience. I am sitting in as the wingman for, CMSgt Chris Muncy (ANG CCM), representing the 106,700 Airmen in the ANG.

Three areas of discussion: Budget, Training, and MEDCON (Medical Continuation)

- **Budget:** Difficult time for our nation and difficult times for the ANG. The budget, mission changes/deletions, and how fast it happens all affect the men and women of the ANG. It has a big impact on the force...families...communities. 5,100 Airmen will be directly affected as the FY13 presidents budget is upon us. BRAC 2005 was yesterday for us. Our units/Airmen feel like targets. Being a community based organization, mission changes or taking down a flag has a significant impact on our Airmen and communities. Through the budget reductions and reshaping, the ANG must be resourced to maintain our operational capability...balanced with active, guard and reserves.
- **Training:** Must be funded and must be balanced with Active Component (both slots and funding). **Unfunded Requirements:** ANG Leadership has historically added MILPERS funds during the year of execution to keep the Formal School Program fully-funded. While the core training program is fully-funded, the overall formal training program remains "Yellow" because of a continual \$48.5M MILPERS shortfall in ANG Seasoning Day Program funding (OJT for newly-minted technical or

flying training school graduates to perform AFSC-specific fully-mission/mobility-ready requirements). The ANG pulled approximately \$25M “out-of-hide” from our Formal School Program to meet approximately 40-50% of the actual requirements. The ANG is funded at a much lower rate than our AF Reserve counterparts. The NGB recently conducted a full review/validation of the Seasoning Day Program with all 2-digit Deputy Directors and ANG FAMs to determine potential internal re-allocations for critical AFSCs. There is no doubt that the ANG needs the Seasoning Days to meet training requirements/missions.

- **MEDCON (Medical Continuation):** We thought we had a new AF policy, but we are hearing that AF/A1 will not incorporate our new changes; thus once again, we will have wounded warriors without coverage. The convoluted system in place now takes the focus off of healing and causes great stress to many of our Airmen and their families. The time it takes from the end of current MEDCON orders to obtaining 30 day extension orders is excessive and it causes much turmoil for our families and the units. The gap of time in between leaves many of our members ineligible for Tri-care benefits. The process must be changed!
- ANG no longer has the authority to update the DEERS system. Due to inherent delays caused by the lack of qualified personnel who do have authority to enter information into the DEERS data base, many ANG members and their families cannot receive medical care. The overall processing “lag time” is too long.
- There are differences in the interpretation of AF/A1’s fitness standards for Active Duty and ANG personnel. “Fit for duty/continued service” is what active personnel use, while ANG personnel use “Fit for Duty and worldwide qualified”. Bottom line: ANG members must be fit and deployable.
- Decisions made by the Air Force Medical Operations Agency (AFMOA) or AF/A1 are not shared with ANG unit leadership, which leads to confusion on who will/won’t pay the member. Thus, it is up to the member to sort out for themselves, usually through an appeal to the Air Force Board of Corrections for Military Records (AFBCMR).
- Good news is on the horizon! We are hopeful that change is coming. AF has proposed that a MEDCOM Operations Cell be established at AFPC June 2012. The new process will reduce the amount of time needed to update all stakeholders and cover all key steps.

MCPO-CGRF Mark Allen, USCGR, MCPO of the Coast Guard Reserve
(Represented by CMC Kurt Shoemaker)

The Coast Guard Reserve is currently authorized 8,100 in end-strength and currently stands at 7,900 assigned. The USCGR is all about its people and family. 87% of our members are assigned to AC units with 13% assigned to expeditionary forces.

- Yellow Ribbon is working well and is being recommended for expansion to include CONUS deployments.
- Medical and Dental readiness continue to be a challenge.
- USCGR leadership is focusing on operational readiness and parity for pay and benefits.
- **Chairman Punaro:** We must view the AC drawdown as a transition rather than separation in order to gain highly skilled and experienced prior service personnel to fill RC hard to fill positions. Thus, recruiting quotas for prior service personnel should increase while non-prior service applications should decrease. He pointed out that by law, RC incentives are lower than those provided to the AC. We need to fix this situation since we are now an Operational Reserve.
- **Chairman Punaro:** thanked the SEAs for participating in the RFPB panel. He advised that SGM Martz would summarize SEA topics of discussion for common themes/threads. This information will then be validated by the SGM and presented to decision makers for action.

Dr. Paul Stockton with brief by **Mr. Robert Salesses**, *Deputy Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense (HDI&DSCA)*

Dr. Paul N. Stockton was nominated by President Barack Obama to be the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Homeland Defense and Americas' Security Affairs on April 28, 2009 and was confirmed by the Senate on May 18, 2009. In this position, he is responsible for the supervision of homeland defense activities, defense support of civil authorities, and Western Hemisphere security affairs for the Department of Defense.

- **Dr. Stockton:** Feels that while DoD is good at responding to typical disasters, the Department would fall short in responding to “Complex Domestic Catastrophes” such as the recent Fukushima disaster in Japan or possible major earthquakes along the New Madrid fault in the US. He further discussed realistic failures possible for the next natural catastrophe “Domestic Complex Catastrophe”, which included the “possible cascading failure of infrastructure” such as power (electric grid), communications, fuel and water.
- Recognized the Indiana National Guard for its response and efforts during recent tornadoes.
- Briefed that DoD needs new tactics, techniques and procedures. He further stated that there are capabilities at all levels, but there is the lack of plans, coordination and developmental planning.
- Is focused on providing Governors with the support they need.
- Has been tasked by SECDEF to provide policy recommendations by the end of April.
- Stated that he was a “huge supporter” of the Board and applauded the “unity of effort” shown.
- **Mr. Salesses:** DoD made major investments in National Guard Joint Force Headquarters, Defense Coordinating Officers and Emergency Preparedness Liaison Officers (EPLOs). There is a lot of capability but it is not integrated. He believes that National Joint Force Headquarters will be the key to implementing the Regional approach. Integration at the state level within FEMA regions is viable.
- Many DoD transactional processes for responding to disaster requirements would be overwhelmed in complex catastrophe.
- The Global Force Management system (which is now mainly focused on Title 10 operational missions) and even DoD installation capabilities should be part of the DoD response.
- Focus areas are: DoD catastrophe planning; improved speedy access to capabilities; improved use of installations and other DoD capabilities; and Doctrine, Training, Education and Exercises. Seventy-five DoD leaders were interviewed and all support this effort.
- Possible new catastrophe Execute Order (EXORD) is being worked. The current DoD system for selecting or “sourcing” units for overseas missions is not good for Defense Support to Civil Authorities (DSCA) missions as it does not consider the proximity of units to a disaster site.
- **Maj Gen Stewart:** Asked both gentlemen why none of the Services were pushing Homeland Defense requirements in their FY 13 POM submissions. It was obvious to him that these requirements were not articulated to NORTHCOM and were not passed to Service programmers.
- **Chairman Punaro:** Part of the challenge to making changes in DoD is that there is no requirement for DSCA, seemingly because DHS has not articulated its requirements to DoD or USNORTHCOM. This requirement would then presumably need to be validated by the Joint Requirements Oversight Council and then assigned to the Services as a tasking. Until this occurs, there will probably be no funding for this purpose. This point was acknowledged by both gentlemen.
- **Mr. Taylor** stated that the DoD budget does not reflect the concerns raised by the Secretary and Mr. Salesses. He also stated that DoD has the ability to turn off bad policies, but has not done so.
- **Mr. Salesses:** OASD-HD needs the RFPB to highlight policies that need to be changed.

- *Mr. Taylor:* If there were to be another BRAC round, DoD would almost certainly and completely ignore the value of RC installations in supporting DSCA as it went about the business of proposing base closures. This is a fact gleaned from the last round of BRAC. DoD should address that requirement now!
- *RADM Penniman:* Voiced his concern about the capacity to respond, citing specifically the medical capabilities knowledge base.
- *Ms. Vorel:* Explained the Geographical framework used by FEMA; the “Outcomes Based Design” where all must agree on the same required outcome from local, state and federal governments, in harmony with private industry.

1315 – 1330 **Break**

1330 – 1510 **Subcommittee Briefs**

Chairman Punaro: *As required by the Federal Advisory Committee Act, this meeting is open to the public. We welcome those members of the public who have chosen to attend this part of the meeting. No interested persons have submitted requests to appear before the Board so we will move to Subcommittee Briefs as reported in the Federal Register.*

- The RFPB Charter, approved by DoD, authorizes the establishment of Subcommittees. As Chairman, I have elected to establish four subcommittees. Two of our subcommittees have reported that they have draft recommendations to present to the Secretary of Defense for the Board to now deliberate and consider for approval.
- The newly revised statute governing the RFPB states that, "The Board may act on those matters referred to it by the chair and on any matter raised by a member of the Board or the Secretary of Defense." For the first time, the newly independent RFPB will now take formal action under this new authority.
- First up, Major General Marty Umbarger will present the report of the Subcommittee on Enhancing DoD's role in the Homeland.
- Following that, Major General Anita Gallentine will present the report of the Subcommittee on Creating a Continuum of Service.
- Before beginning this segment, Chairman Punaro introduced Ms. Janet St. Laurent from the Government Accounting Office (GAO) who sat in on this session.

1330 – 1440 **Enhancing DoD's Role in the Homeland Subcommittee**

MG R. Martin Umbarger, ARNG, *Subcommittee Chair*

- Recognized subcommittee members.
- Reviewed research process and interviews of DOD and Non DOD officials.
- Discussed Homeland requirements versus capabilities versus actual funding received to accomplish mission. Felt these disconnects merited further examination and clarification from DoD.
- **Recommendation # 1 -- Accelerate implementation of the DoD Policy for Use of Reserve Forces in Disasters** (see detailed report).
- Discussion ensued on how guard/reserve forces are supposed to be mobilized versus today's reality - 'bypassing' guard/reserve leadership and dealing directly with individuals. Process of personnel notification needs attention.
- *Maj Gen Stewart* explained the current process used by the Air Force Reserve; one of centralized control of all Reserve manpower through their Force Generation Center (FGC). This organization processes all requests that come to it through NORTHCOM from Governors and Federal Authorities and delivers needed expertise within 72 hours; often reacting within 24 to 48 hours depending on the expertise needed.

- *RADM Penniman* suggested that DoD consider streamlining the mobilization process by decentralizing the authority to local commanders in order to speed up the processes. Motion to accept recommendation made by Maj Gen Stewart/Seconded by VADM Cotton; Approved by Full Board.
- **Recommendation # 2 – Update Regulations to Authorize Training Events with Operational Benefit.** There was general discussion on situations where it would be beneficial to use training exercises to pre-position and/or prepare National Guard forces before disasters, such as hurricanes. Because the recommendation is specifically focused on the National Guard, there was general discussion as to whether this recommendation was appropriate for Secretary of Defense review. Chairman Punaro opted to defer action on this recommendation until the end of the report.
- **Recommendation # 3 – Publish DoD Guidance and Criteria for Title 32 Operations.** Chairman Punaro directed that the final report clearly emphasize recommended criteria of events being catastrophic in nature, national in scope and requiring a multi-state response. The intent is to provide assistance for disasters and similarly catastrophic events; not for routine, non-emergency civil support for state and local authorities, such as a state fairs and so forth. Motion to accept made by RADM Day/Seconded by MajGen Gallentine; Approved by Full Board.
- **Recommendation # 4 – Update the Emergency Response Fund.** The Board agreed by unanimous consent to modify the recommendation to insert the word “domestic” in the recommendation title in order to clarify its view that any Congressional revision of the authority for funding should be focused on disasters in the United States, its territories and protectorates; and that this distinction should be specified in the final report as well. The recommendation will be changed to read, “Unbudgeted Domestic Disaster Requirements”. Motion to accept with changes made by [Inaudible]/Seconded [Inaudible]; Approved by Full Board.
- **Recommendation # 5 – Clarify FEMA Reimbursement of DoD.** COL Robert Preiss was directed by MG Umbarger to brief the Board on current FEMA policy on reimbursement per the Code of Federal Regulations. Motion to accept made by MajGen (Ret) Williams/Seconded by RADM Day; Approved by Full Board.
- **Recommendation # 6 – Urge FEMA to Increase Reimbursement of States for National Guard Operations.** Motion to accept made by RADM Day/Seconded by Maj Gen Edwards; Approved by Full Board.
- **Recommendation # 7 – Urge States to Equalize Protections for National Guard Personnel on State Duty.** Benefit inequities were explained by providing Board with real life situations. Representative Martin discussed protections, benefits and pay to personnel/family; suggested DoD needs to take an active role encouraging statutory change by State governments. Discussion among the board emerged with the example of NGB’s earlier development of model statutes for State adoption and the DoD’s recent work with State legislatures on other military topics needing modification to State law. Chairman Punaro directed that the final report emphasize that this recommendation is a potential cost-saver for the government. Motion to accept with reflective ‘cost saver’ emphasis was made by RADM Day/Seconded by MajGen (Ret) Williams; Approved by Full Board.
- **Reconsideration of Recommendation #2** – The Board re-visited its discussion of this recommendation. The chair opined that since the substance of the recommendation involved reconciliation with a DoD-level policy, that it was an appropriate recommendation to provide to the SECDEF, but with the proviso that the Board’s expectation was that NGB would “move out on this” and coordinate with higher authorities in the Services and OSD as appropriate. Motion to accept made by RADM Day/Seconded by MajGen (Ret) Williams; Approved by Full Board.

1440 – 1510 **Creating a Continuum of Service Subcommittee (CoS)**

Maj Gen Anita Gallentine, USAFR, Subcommittee Chair

- Maj Gen Gallentine reviewed the work of the CoS Subcommittee in preparation for submission of the “Avoid Past Drawdown Mistakes to Enhance Future Total Force Capabilities” information paper to the RFPB Board for further consideration by SECDEF. Included in the presentation was a synopsis of their four meetings where they covered common issues such as: the development of a common definition and programs for a Continuum of Service, development of processes which address the AC/RC mix and preserve the nation’s manpower investments, “transition points”, comprehensive human capital management strategies, portable benefits/systems reform, and proposed policies, practices and legislation to accomplish recommendations.
- Additionally, she outlined subcommittee processes, interviews and research used in formulating the sub-committee’s paper and recommendations. Information was gathered from personnel and readiness data, historical data, lesson learned from previous drawdowns, interviews with DoD Officials/subject matter experts (SMEs), and non DoD officials/experts.
- Maj Gen Gallentine noted that the current force is operational, trained, equipped, integrated and an assimilated all volunteer force. A key point was: “It is imperative that our nation preserve resources, capabilities and expertise; the reserves must maintain viability as the active component cannot be a ‘Go at it Alone Force’”.
- Noted and attached, as a supporting document to the Board, was the DoD Force Reduction Objectives published 27 February 2012, which did not address the reserve components. Maj Gen Gallentine further clarified that countless research/position papers, cost models, DoD directives, even SECDEF public engagement speeches highlight the value of the Total Force, yet the Services actions have not reflected policies to support continued utilization. She further stated that active duty end strength will be reduced and the opportunity to preserve military skill sets and experience in the RC will be missed. She again emphasized that easing the movement between AC, RC and Civilian life over the duration of a career is an important key to continuum of service.
- Maj Gen Gallentine reviewed the eight recommendations in the ‘drawdown’ paper with the board. She concluded by emphasizing that this paper should be submitted immediately, as timing was critical.
- Motion to accept the ‘Avoid Past Drawdown Mistakes to Enhance Future Total Force Capabilities’ paper and recommendations for submission was made by RADM Day/Seconded by Maj Gen Edwards; Approved by Full board.

1510 – 1520 **Reserve Forces Policy Board Military Executive Updates**

Maj Gen James N. Stewart, USAFR

- Hailed new members of the staff and advised that the staff stands ready to assist.
- Said farewell to outgoing members and staff, personally thanking them for the many hours of dedicated service.
- Clarified the rollout procedures for Board recommendations; specifically, he will mirror the Defense Business Board practices.
- Advised the full board that the minutes will be placed on the RFPB web site after approval by Chairman Punaro and review by the Secretary of Defense.

1520 – 1530 **Closing Remarks – Summary / Guidance**

MajGen Arnold L. Punaro, USMCR (Ret), Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy

Next meeting currently scheduled for 6 Jun 12. There is a possible conflict with the NGB Senior Leaders Conference so alternative dates will be explored.

- There was a discussion on options for future meeting dates; “wobble room” in order to allow for SECDEF/DEPSECDEF attendance versus predictable dates for next three years.

- Further discussion ensued on the meaning/interpretation/use of the term 'OPERATIONAL FORCE'.
- Further discussion occurred on the meaning/interpretation/use of 'TOTAL FORCE'.

1525 **Board Adjourned by Chairman Punaro**

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Arnold L. Punaro", with a long, sweeping flourish extending to the right.

Arnold L. Punaro
MajGen, USMCR (Ret)
Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board