

## **Reserve Forces Policy Board Meeting Minutes**

March 23, 2011

Pentagon: OSD Multipurpose Room (Rm 3E863)

Pentagon: Move to OSD RA DSC (Rm 2E579)

**Members Present (See Attached)**

**Member Representatives (See Attached)**

**Invited Guests (See Attached)**

**RFPB Staff Present (See Attached)**

### **OFFICIAL OPENING OF THE ANNUAL MEETING:**

Lt Col Small, Designated Federal Officer (DFO), opened the March 23rd, 2011 meeting at 7:51 AM and welcomed the Reserve Forces Policy Chairman, Board, and distinguished visitors. The DFO presented an overview of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) opening meeting rules. Lt Col Small introduces Mr. William S. Greenberg, Chairman, Reserve Forces Policy Board.

### **RFPB CHAIRMAN WILLIAM S. GREENBERG WELCOME AND OPENING REMARKS:**

Chairman William S. Greenberg welcomed everyone to the day's session and made the following remarks in reference to Secretary McCarthy's dinner speech the previous evening, which focused on employers and families.

- Secretary wants us to dig a little deeper into issues that affect the families and employers
- Encouraged board members to take RFPB pamphlets and distribute them to fellow members
- Need to take care of our wounded warriors...great representative group at the evening event

### **Maj Gen Anita Gallentine, USAFR Board Member comments:**

- Recommend involving the reservist's families in next year's events
- Recommend inviting enlisted members and Company Grade Officers to the annual event next year so they can voice their concerns
- Explained that there are reserve families who are not located near military communities and that school counselors really don't know how to work with children whose parents are deployed

### **RDML Sandra Stosz, USCGR Board Member comment:**

- Families are affected by Post Traumatic Stress Syndrome (PTSD) too...consider including this topic at a future meeting that includes family discussions

### **Mr. Dennis Biddick, ASN Representative comments:**

- R/C Military Children - How do we take care of them...especially in non-military community school systems
- What services are available to single R/C military parents and their children

### **Maj Gen James Stewart comments:**

- These family programs will be tough to fund in a budget constrained environment
- Family programs may need to be cut in order to upgrade/buy new weapon systems

**CHAIRMAN GREENBERG INTRODUCES THE NEXT TWO GUEST SPEAKERS:**

Mr. Gary J. Leeling and Mr. Richard F. Walsh, Senate Armed Service Committee, Subcommittee on Personnel, Majority and Minority Professional Staff Members

**Chairman Greenberg comments:**

- Asked our guest speakers to address broad issues for RFPB consideration. RFPB currently has three main objectives:
  - Make recommendations to the SECDEF
  - Review all issues impacting reserve components
  - Create an annual report
- The RFPB 2010 Annual Report was signed out by the SECDEF two weeks ago...five specific recommendations were sent to SECDEF

**Mr. Leeling comments:**

- Reserve Components have performed tremendously during the past years
  - Critical component of the Total Force
  - Proven themselves operationally
  - Growing appreciation within Congress for reserve component contributions
- Asked the question, “What does an “Operational Reserve” force mean?”
  - Challenged the Board to define what it means and what authorities are needed to make it happen
- Talked about the findings of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserve in 2007
  - RFPB not providing useful info to SECDEF or Congress
  - The Board has military people tied to their respective service stovepipes giving the same advice to SECDEF as his primary Service representatives
  - There is no fresh, “out of the box” thinking on the use of R/C forces in the future

**Mr. Walsh comments:**

- Looking for the Board to propose fresh, new historic ideas/advice
- Need inputs from outside groups representing employers, families...need ideas from business leaders who have experience maximizing resources
- Need to define “Operational Reserve”
  - Specifically, the legislative authorities needed in order to move forward
  - Promised approval on legislation needed to utilize guard and reserve for specific domestic/national security missions
  - Title X, USC 12304 is limited to contingency operations
    - Specific time limit on the recall to active duty
    - Up to a year - decent amount
    - Still discussing the approval level for authority

**MajGen Darrell Moore comment:**

- Reference the “Operational” use of the reserve component, this information is needed for planning the FY13 POM

**Mr. Walsh comments:**

- Agreed...if authority used, Congress needs additional funding and manpower needs
- Additionally, what impact does “Medical Readiness” have on the “Operational” R/C force?
  - Are the current programs in place sufficient to ensure our personnel are medically qualified?
- “Continuum of Service” is still an issue that needs addressed by all the Services
- Suicides in Guard/Reserve forces is being closely watched/tracked on the Hill

- Think of ideas/courses of action to solve the problem so we can keep it away from legislative solutions
- Anxiously awaiting the Quadrennial Defense Review to see OSD's plans for guard/reserve
- Looking for RFPB to address issues and come up with resolutions
  - In recent past, they have not seen the type of analysis they need from the Board
- New Board makeup compromise...advocates for reserve components wanted to keep the Board the way it is currently structured
- Current RFPB membership looks like another JCS organization

**Maj Gen TC Coon comments:**

- Before taking a Board position, it was explained to me that I was not coming here with my service chief's agenda
- Position was created to bring my comments/concerns to the table using my own knowledge and experience
- I have never gone back to my service chief and discussed what happens in these meetings

**Mr. Walsh comments:**

- Board producing typical OSD legislative line-up without really putting thought into proposals
  - Officer Career Progression
  - Predictability of deployments
- We hear from the Guard on a daily basis...they are very active on the Hill
- The Services and the States have methods to produce the types of leaders/GOs for our future
  - What are the "real" issues/roadblocks to consistent, reliable production of future leaders?
  - What's the process for development?
    - I don't think you want legislation in the Officer Career Progression arena...in fact it can be very harmful
  - Worst thing you can do is to put someone in a leadership position that is not ready
  - Look at what type of experience these people need in order to fill a leadership position
    - There is Congressional concern about the individuals that Guard/Reserve leadership places in certain positions...being placed in complex positions they are not ready to fill
- Certain Title 10 issues need to be addressed
- Sanding down areas of conflict is a good thing, but when one reserve component goes forward with an issue, it seems it's not a wholeisitic view for all R/Cs
- Economically the "Operational Reserve" makes sense, but if they are not ready to deploy, it defeats the purpose of paying for it

**BrigGen James Lariviere comments:**

- Funding is an issue when trying to keep our members trained to the same A/C standards

**Mr. Walsh comments:**

- Congress's concern is the more you use the Guard/Reserve, the more costly they are
- If we decide to fight for a "Operational Reserve" due to funding, there will be push back

**MajGen Darrell Moore comments:**

- We are well into the FY 13 POM cycle and the constant dynamic playing out in this forum is every dollar you put toward a Reserve/Guard member is one dollar that doesn't go to active duty
- It's a dynamic that is difficult to square; however, the Marines are competing well for FY 13 dollars because they are not big numbers

**Mr. Walsh comments:**

- If A/C wants to use R/C members, they need to plan and budget for them in their baseline
- What about the rest of the R/C force that is not “Operational”... what do we do with them when not on active duty orders? It’s backward planning at that point
- Additionally, we are constantly peppered to increase benefits for the Reserve/Guard, but the disadvantage to doing this is the better the benefits, the more costly the R/C becomes

**RDML Sandra Stosz comments:**

- One big difference between A/C and R/C is that a R/C member can earn a 20 year retirement, but can’t collect until age 60...the A/C receives theirs immediately
- Real advantage of R/C is our lifecycle costs are less, but we need to have the proper mix of forces
- RFPB needs to be more like the Defense Business Board with an academic think tank type view

**MG Luckey comments:**

- A discussion on capabilities and where they need to be located (A/C or R/C) needs to occur
- A discussion on the A/C having more of a R/C type retirement also needs attention
- Depending on what capability you are talking about, there is tremendous capacity that exists in R/C forces that we need to have and are worth spending taxpayer dollars to maintain
- A “Total Force” integration effort is needed, but financially we need to discuss who does what and when

**Mr. Leeling comments:** - Issues Congress is interested in:

- Employer Support of the Guard and Reserve – what is the affect on R/C after 10 years of war...will support remain strong?
- USERRA – any increase in violations
- Post deployments – impact on R/C members and their families
- IRR
  - Who commands IRR
  - Suicides in IRR
- Due to the impending draw-down, there may be a shifting in capabilities between A/C and R/C forces

**Mr. Walsh comments:**

- Benefits are a key topic that will be discussed
- R/C retirements - many changes have been requested, but cost of R/C personnel has steadily risen
- Lowered R/C retirement age in 2007 with passage of Defense Authorization Act...able to lower the retirement age by three months when a member works three month on orders
  - This didn’t hurt us too bad.
- Demand for retroactive benefits is high
- Congress has made their policy decisions, but the mandatory spending authority is gone and there are big ticket inequities. In this economy, I think we are going to see a reduction in benefits

**BrigGen James Lariviere comments:**

- You run a risk by increasing benefits for R/C members
- Why would you get AD benefits for part time work?

**Mr. Leeling comments:**

- There will not be a significant change or decrease in benefits while we are at war
- Families are already stretched enough
- After the wars, this topic of decreased benefits may be brought to the table

**Chairman Greenberg comment:**

- How can the RFPB help Congress?

**Mr. Walsh comments:**

- Don't waste your time on old issues
- Bring new issues with viable solutions to the table
- RFPB can be very effective as an oversight body
- Tell us what is really happening instead of what has already been documented in other reports
- How important is the recommendation to achieving "Total Force" goals, and how are we doing service by service
- Give us a status on the progress being made in achieving/resolving your goals/issues
- QDR Review- RFPB assessment of the QDR would be very valuable

**Chairman Greenberg comments:**

- Our objective is to analyze the QDR, but regrettably it has not been issued by SECDEF yet
- You will get our comments once we are given access

**Mr. Leeling comments:**

- Not sure when it will be released, but hoping you can get a look at it in time to make a difference
- If timing works where you cannot make comments, others will take the initiative and make recommendations that could complicate things for R/C

**Mr. Walsh comments:**

- There are three R/C chiefs who should be fighting for R/C
- These individuals should address the R/C's role in Homeland Security and Defense
- Need to ensure everyone is moving in the same direction
- Recommend useful dialogue with governors/members of Congress on R/C way ahead

Chairman Greenberg thanks them for attending and sharing important perspectives

**GUEST SPEAKER:**

- **LTC Jason K. Dempsey, USA, First Lady's White House Fellow**
  - First Lady and Dr. Biden's Initiative on Military Families and Veterans

Chairman Greenberg Introduces LTC Jason K. Dempsey

**LTC Jason K. Dempsey comments:**

- On campaign trail, the First Lady did a lot of listening and learning about military spouses
- Trying to learn about unique sacrifices made by the military community and their families
- Active in supporting military spouses, pointing out what a great talent pool they are for employers
- First Lady Challenges:
  - How do you help people understand the importance of a military spouse/family
  - She wants to make sure that sustainable programs are put in place for the military spouse and family
- Encouraged outside organizations to support military families
- In mid-April, the First Lady and Dr. Biden will host an event to kickoff a sustained initiative to encourage civilian communities to engage with military families

- Three different places the civilian community can help:
  - Employment:
    - How do you help spouses maintain their professional careers as they move
    - How do you balance military member/spouse dual careers
  - Education:
    - Military children - educate school administrators on children's unique needs
    - Principal and Teacher Initiative
    - Using community colleges near military bases in order for spouses to get accreditations
  - Wellness:
    - Most essential piece, but biggest problem
    - Lots of family and self-help programs need improvement
- Bottom Line – First Lady is trying to help military spouses/families cope with the unique stresses inherent with military life
- She doesn't have all the answers, but she does have access to the folks who do

**Question:** Maj Gen James Stewart asked, “Has the First Lady and Dr. Biden worked with Dr. Keller and her Military Child Education Coalition?”

**Reply:** LTC Dempsey replied, “Yes, they have spoken and they work together”

**Question:** Chairman Greenberg asked, “Is this initiative a money raising or awareness campaign?”

**Reply:** LTC Dempsey replied, “Absolutely not money driven, but we do need money. The First Lady wants to educate organizations who actually want to help military families, how they can do so. Some organizations have had good experiences working with military families, and others have had bad!”

- What do we need from you, the RFPB?
- As a representative organization for the Guard/Reserve, you have access to the civilian community
- We need your help in identifying local groups who are making a difference for military families who need assistance
- If you know of small organizations who want to help send them to Serve.gov
  - Community Service Portal of the Government
  - You can put in what you're interested in, and it brings up a host of volunteer opportunities

**Question:** RDML Sandra Stosz asked, “Do you see the administration going away from networking and concentrating more on a legislative route in reference to such issues as:

- Spouses professional licensing
- Spouses who are losing income to take care of wounded soldiers”

**Reply:** LTC Dempsey replied:

- First Lady can't lobby Congress, but in reference to licensing, that is a state to state issue
- We can gather information and then work with the states in order to overcome the challenges
- Any and all connections you have would help us to promote this initiative
- You are a unique community and can help us reach out to various networks

**Question:** Maj Gen Anita Gallentine asked, “Are the First Lady and Dr. Biden working initiatives for male spouses of military members or dual military couples?”

**Reply:** LTC Dempsey replied, “We are not at a level of granularity in reference to dual spouses, but looking for any and all comments or recommendations on this topic.”

Chairman Greenberg extends the Board’s appreciation for LTC Dempsey’s time and accomplishments.

**GUEST SPEAKER: (SLIDES)**

- **Mr. John Hastings, Director, Resources, Office of the Assistant of Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, Resources**
  - “Funding the Reserve Component as an integrated Operational Force; Concepts to Consider”

**Mr. Hastings comments:**

- Want to share with you the work we did last summer on QDR 2010
- Out of the QDR effort, took a relook at the Guard and Reserve
- Benefited quite a bit from each of the Services costing methodologies

Mr Hastings introduced:

- **Mr. Trey Carson, Principal Director, Resources, Office of the Assistant of Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs, Resources**

**Mr. Carson’s comments:**

- A lot of work being done in OSD Reserve Affairs comes from the CNGR Recommendations
- We did not use the historical 50/50 force mix cost analysis on the Strategic R/C

**Mr. Hastings comments:**

- Used FY10 Operational Reserve Funding
- \$63 Billion dollars for 100,000 personnel-used as the base
- The Guard/Reserve provided 44% of the manpower for 8% of the budget
- There is not clarity on FY11 numbers and comprehensive review will be done soon
- In FY13, the R/C budget will be a baseline budget...don’t expect OCO funding

**Honorable Terry O’Connell comments:**

- “It is important for us to move quickly in reference to the R/C budget for FY13 before it’s too late to react.”
- What does the “Operational Reserve” cost? (slide five)
- Need to develop a cost model to price out one war fighting community at a time (Example Navy Seabees)
- On slide 5, you need to find the correct force mix and the bottom of the green curve in order to get the right capability (the blue line)

**Maj Gen James Stewart comments:**

- You are quantifying the risk a decision maker is taking when making a decision
- So what you are essentially saying is: what risk am I taking, am I getting the right capability, and how much is it going to cost me?

**Chairman Greenberg question:** “Are you the only organization within DoD using this model or are all R/C organizations using it?”

**Mr. Hastings comment:**

- WE are formulating a proposal that has modeling capabilities to be used by all R/C organizations (we are in the middle of the crawl/walk/run stage)

**Mr. Dennis Biddick, ASN Representative comment:**

- Our operational R/C has been funded by supplementals, and now the Services will be forced to figure out another way to fund it

**Mr. Hastings comments:**

- The Notional Community Mix Balancing Model is not just our typical 39 day R/C model, it uses a mix
- Secretary McCarthy asked us to think outside the box in order to fund our “Operational” R/C, which means new data and new numbers. Congress uses funding lines and not balancing models to determine cuts

**GUEST LUNCH SPEAKER (SLIDES)**

- **Mrs. Patricia Greenwalk, Chairman of the Wounded Warriors Program, The Friars Foundation Wounded Warriors Program**
  - *“The Gift of Laughter”*
- Designed a program to bring entertainment to all Wounded Warriors, but specifically those from Iraq and Afghanistan
- Used her association with the Friars Club, one of the oldest clubs for American Entertainment, to find entertainer volunteers to do shows and to visit wounded warriors in hospitals to put smiles on theirs, their families, and caregivers faces

**GUEST SPEAKER (SLIDES)**

- **Mr. Thomas C. Voegtle, Deputy Director, DES Operations, Wounded Warrior Care and Transition Policy OSD (P&R)**
  - WWCTP, IDES, Integrated Disability Evaluation System

**Mr. Voegtle comments:**

- The objective of IDES - accomplish only one physical that can be used for both medical evaluation and VA benefits
- IDES is not universally implemented yet
  - IF DoD finds that an individual is 30% or more disabled, the member gets Tricare benefits for themselves and family
  - If less than 30%, then there are no Tricare benefits
- SECDEF has a personal interest in this program - This is high on his priority list
- The goal is a processing time of 295 days; we are currently at 360 days
- At any point in the IDES process, members are able to appeal the findings

**Chairman Greenberg comment:**

- Referenced the RFPB 2010 Annual Report Recommendation #5 to the SECDEF, which states that military members be provided with a military lawyer to pursue findings of MEB and PEBs might be helpful in this situation

**Mr. Voegtle comment:**

- Stated that this service will be available to all members soon
- Memorandum (DOTM) should be signed by Dr. Stanley next week

**Chairman Greenberg question:**

- Most of our wounded soldiers are Army National Guardsmen/women, who appoints them lawyers?

**Mr. Voegtle comments:**

- A total of 22,000 members are either in the IDES or legacy systems
- The overseas plan is still not resolved
- DoD MTFs support IDES
- SECDEF and VA directed last week a plan to send medical surge teams out to locations where we have the largest backlogs in order to speed up the process
- The goal is 50% of reserve service members will go through the IDES process in 360 days
- SECDEF has requested data in reference to how many combat wounded members are in IDES system
- Majority of our members in the IDES are not combat wounded, which means we generally do take care of the combat wounded warriors
- The Navy is the slowest in working thru the process, because when the service member sees the compensation they are going to receive, they decide they want to stay on active duty

**SPEAKER**

- **Maj Gen James M Stewart, Military Executive, Reserve Forces Policy Board**
  - Reserve Forces Policy Board Outreach - The Way Ahead

**Maj Gen Stewart comments:**

- Two year calendar is important; we are all very busy and need to ensure the RFPB schedule is deconflicted with other important activities
- July 2011 meeting
  - Focus on a date for transition between old board members & newly appointed members
- The calendar is foundational; we need all members present
- A late July date was suggested for the next RFPB (26-28 Jul 11)
  - Hold future meetings on Tuesday/Wednesday schedule to allow for Congressional visits
- Funding source needs to move from OSD/RA to WHS to meet intent of Congressional language (RFPB independent body) and intent of SECDEFs Track Four Efficiencies (each Board/Committee will have a separate funding code)
- Four possible courses of action are being considered for funding in future
- RFPB will be relocated outside of the Pentagon due to lack of space
  - Chairman and Military Executive along with working space for two staff officer's will remain within OSD/RA for future use
- Working to encourage participation of the reserve component chiefs in future meetings
- Outreach to Senior Service Schools
  - Laying ground work for future research help by Guard/Reserve students attending Senior Service Schools

**Chairman Greenberg Closing Remarks:**

- Received general agreement from members present to review OSD/RA's Comprehensive Review
- Board will not comment on it until signed by SECDEF

**Maj Gen TC Coon recommends:**

- NEAR TERM – Look at QDR directed review of Reserve Forces, and Reserve Forces – a part of the Operational Force!
- LONG TERM – Consider how do we make General/Flag officers in an Operational Reserve force, and what is the future role of the Reserve Forces in Homeland Defense?

**Chairman Greenberg comments:**

- Funnel all comments or concerns through Maj Gen Stewart
  - Ensure that any input or concerns that you have about the Comprehensive Review need to be for "public view"
  - Our recommendations need to provide options, and then SECDEF will give us what he needs us to do next; we'll formulate a plan of attack based on his direction
- 
- Chairmen Greenberg and Maj Gen Stewart thanked the staff and volunteers
- 
- Chairman Greenberg adjourned the meeting at 2:06 PM.

SIGNED:



WILLIAM S. GREENBERG  
Chairman