

- Chairman Ham, Vice-Chairman Lamont, Commissioners and Commission staff. I appreciate this final opportunity to speak with you. With me today is LTG Tim Kadavy, the Director of the Army National Guard.
- I know that your task has taken you all over the world in search of information to help you get to the answers that you need to provide to our Congress. I can speak for all 54 states, territories and District of Columbia in thanking you for the effort and diligence that you have shown in carrying out your mission....a mission tremendously critical not only to the Army, but to the nation.
- I'm sure you don't need to be convinced about the importance of your work. But I was reminded of your efforts when I read the wise words used by former Chief of Staff of the Army Gordon Sullivan in his 11 October Defense One article entitled "Seven Things Our Army Needs, Right Now". He begins by saying...

"The world outside the U.S. is in turmoil. Our Army is getting smaller, and we have no clue when our force size will hit bottom."

- And I was reminded of your work when I recalled the words used collectively by 50 Governors in their February 2014 letter to the President. They said:

“The modern National Guard is a highly experienced and capable combat force and an essential state partner in responding to domestic disasters and emergencies. A return to a pre-9/11 role squanders the investment and value of the Guard and discredits its accomplishments at home and as an active combat force.”

- If you are not familiar with General Sullivan’s article or the Governors’ letter, I highly encourage you to read them. In my opinion, their thoughts do not apply just to the Army of today, but also to the Army we need in 10-20 years.
- My viewpoint on the commission’s work remains the same that I articulated to you in May. Your goals are significant and challenging given the compressed timeline. But what may be just as important for the Commission to illuminate are the much larger thoughts behind those goals, namely:
 - What does the nation need from its dominant land force, the greatest Army in history? Is Congress aware of the perilous

position that sequestration places the Army within, and is it truly appreciated?

- Is the nation ready to accept a smaller land force....one that has less combined arms capacity and capability across many major combat platforms, including Brigade Combat Teams and Aviation? Is the nation aware of the irreplaceable capability they provide both in conflict and homeland response?
- Is the nation ready to accept this amidst the most challenging global security environment I have ever seen?
- When you present your report to Congress early next year, I hope that your efforts will reflect recommendations that don't just lift us over today's hurdles, but address the Total Army that the nation needs for tomorrow's challenges.
- With that backdrop, in our time together today, I don't intend to cover issues we discussed in depth during our May meeting...nor will I cover in detail the points I made in the 21 September paper I provided to you. But I do want to highlight and emphasize 4 points needing further elaboration....namely accessibility, operational utilization, full time support and I will conclude with my thoughts on relationships.

- One of the themes that I know you have picked up on during your site visits is the desire of Army Guard Soldiers to continue to be utilized. I'm not surprised...they tell me the same thing. In my travels, I have not yet found a Soldier who is tired from overuse. Few, if any, Soldiers perform only 39 duty days annually. Most seem willing to do more.
- What I have found are Soldiers with a completely different set of expectations than when I joined the National Guard. I hear time and time again, "when am I going to get the chance to deploy?" Today's Guardsmen expect to train hard and expect to be employed as part of the total Army. In fact, over half of today's Army Guard Soldiers have never served in a combat theatre of operations. They are part of the combat reserve of the Army that fights the nation's wars, secures the homeland and builds enduring partnerships both at home and abroad....and they want to remain that way.
- At the highest level, I hope we realize the tremendous strategic hedge this force provides the nation in its inherent expansibility. The past 14 years have taught us innumerable lessons; to include those on AC/RC integration and utilization. Beyond the headlines of recent friction is a story that we don't tell well enough, nor take enough credit for. Look no further than 2005, when our Army was in the midst of transforming its force structure while concurrently fighting in both Iraq in Afghanistan.

- To complete that transformation, active forces needed the time and ability to reset themselves to their new modular configuration. Consequently in the spring of 2005 we had over 100,000 Army Guard Soldiers mobilized. And half of the BCTs fighting in Iraq were Army Guard BCTs.
- 4-5 months later, Hurricane Katrina hit. While 80,000 Army Guard Soldiers were mobilized in the warfight, roughly 50,000 Army Guardsmen ultimately responded from all 54 states, territories and the District of Columbia .
- This rapid expansibility provides our nation with an absolute advantage over potential adversaries critical to sustaining a credible deterrence; one needed more than ever with the continued global uncertainty.
- Another lesson we have learned in the post 9-11 era is regarding accessibility. Accessibility is about authorities; and we seem to have that about right. Fortunately, today we have a full suite of authorities available to our civilian leaders to gain access to its reserve component Soldiers, not the least of which is 12304(b), which enables us to utilize RC Soldiers for some pre-planned operations.

- Utilization is about the will to use us and the funding to make it happen. I think it's within the mission set of predictable or rotational presence operations where there is opportunity for fundamental paradigm change within the Army – GEN Milley and I have already started discussions on this matter. Much like the readiness problem we had in 2005 due to transformation that I just spoke about, we as an Army have a different, yet just as significant readiness challenge today.
 - This didn't happen intentionally....this challenge is born out of a resource driven readiness hole coupled with a tremendously high global demand for Army forces. As Secretary McHugh summarized at AUSA last week, "We are simply consuming that readiness as soon as it is produced."
 - But much of this demand is being satisfied using mostly active forces. If we are continually using these forces, they don't have the time and space to recover full spectrum readiness to meet fight tonight requirements.
 - Similar to 2005, I believe the Army Guard can be part of the answer today. When you look at many of the global presence missions that are being accomplished today, they do not require the highest levels of collective readiness. And we should

minimize, to the extent possible, the disaggregation of the Army's most ready BCTs to conduct these lower echelon missions.

- What I'm suggesting is a different paradigm – one that maximizes the inherent strength of the Total Army. Essentially, for the rotational missions that require the highest readiness levels, we preserve our most ready BCTs. For the missions that require dispersed or smaller forces, and possibly a lesser readiness level, we orient them toward the appropriate units that can successfully meet the requirement. This may sound familiar since we are already doing this with the Guard in similar missions in Kosovo, the Sinai, and the Horn of Africa. But there are many other similar missions ongoing currently that are ideally suited for the levels of readiness readily produced by ARNG formations.
- I believe this change in paradigm would enhance the overall readiness of the total Army. It keeps your Guard forces operationally engaged and it potentially could maximize state partnership program relationships, especially in reassuring NATO allies and coalition partners. And it enables us to maintain rapidly deployable and ready forces for a world that may need that capability on any given day to respond to a near peer competitor.... I am painfully aware that this will require tough fiscal decisions to identify the resources and align them

in the proper accounts to maximize the use of the RC. But this is work that needs to be considered.

- Let me shift focus to a topic that is absolutely vital to the readiness of the Army National Guard...that is full time support. During budget debates, our full time support tends to be a popular subject and often looked to as a billpayer target. With that in mind, I'd like to clear up a few possible misconceptions regarding our full time force.
- The full time force generates and maintains the Army Guard foundational readiness. They manage complex Army systems and programs that maintain unit readiness and deliver programs to units, Soldiers, and Families, much like an active installation; but the large majority of these same members serve in our units. A critical lesson learned during the last 14 years of war is that building foundational readiness is directly linked to preparedness for mobilization in support of combatant commanders and for the "fight tonight" role we have in the homeland.
- Most importantly, the ARNG has not experienced permanent, wartime-related full time support growth. Let me say this again...the ARNG has not experienced permanent, wartime-related full time support growth. HQDA and Congress initiated the FTS ramp as part of an overall effort to address pre-9/11 readiness requirements. That ramp was

established in 1999 and oriented to the strategic reserve of that era...not the operational force that exists today.

- We need to resist the temptation to view our full time program as a billpayer. Anything less than the FY16 level puts Army Guard readiness at significant risk.
- I'd like to conclude my comments by addressing relationships among the three components of the Army. Let me make my position very clear... there must be only **one Army** – the **Total** Army. We cannot go backwards. The term Total Army must have deep meaning to all of us that reflects a truly integrated force – it cannot be just a popular phrase.
- Meeting the challenges of both today and tomorrow will take nothing less than a concerted total Army effort – Active, Guard and Reserve. The Guard is committed to being part of that team. GEN Milley and I have spoken about this point on several occasions....as recently as 72 hours ago. Regardless of the outcome of this commission, I am confident that this relationship will move forward in a positive way.
- That said, despite the militia forming the origins of our American military nearly 379 years ago, I continue to find an alarming number who do not understand the very basic ways the modern day Guard

works and interacts across the 54 states, territories and the District of Columbia.

- Governors take their role as the Commanders in Chief of the Guard forces in their states very seriously. I applaud the Commission's efforts to get to know the Governors, and as you likely experienced, they will be the staunchest advocates you will find for their Soldiers and Airmen. The 54 Adjutants General work directly for their Governors. I represent them on a daily basis here in DC, but they are accountable to their Governors. They are seasoned, experienced and committed military professionals who truly want nothing more than what is best for the nation.
- These state relationships, from the Governors, to TAGs and most importantly, our units, maintain our critical linkage to the American citizens. The lessons of Creighton Abrams are just as valuable today as they were when the Abrams Doctrine was conceived. It is critical today, after 14 years of war, that we stay connected to the American people and use the National Guard in as many operations and exercises as possible. This will continue to help connect America to our military.
- Additionally, some misunderstanding lies in how I operate in the homeland. This one is simple. The overwhelming majority of all

emergencies are handled at the state level. Most of these emergencies never make the headlines here in DC, but the recent trend is that we have anywhere from 4000-6000 Guardsmen on duty every day in the homeland. TAGs are making it happen for the Governors and they keep me informed.

- But I'm sure you WILL recall a few of those state level emergencies that you took notice of, such as the Boston bombing, tornadoes in Moore Oklahoma, much of the recovery efforts in Superstorm Sandy, the civil unrest in Ferguson and Baltimore....and most recently, the flooding in South Carolina.
- These emergencies certainly drew the attention of the 3 SECDEFs and the 2 Chairmen that I have worked with; most recently as last week. TAGs keep me informed, and I provide information to them before issues arise.
- Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the committee, our national security demands the capacity and capability that the Army, Army National Guard and Army Reserve provide. At this critical juncture in our economic and security environment, the Army Guard is committed to being part of the one Army solution. The phrase Always Ready, Always There is more than just a motto – it should be a collective and individual expectation.

**CNGB Verbal Statement to the National Commission on the Future of the Army
22 Oct 15**

- Thank you for the opportunity to appear before you today. If the National Guard can assist the Commission as you complete your important work, please do not hesitate to ask. I look forward to your questions.