



## **National Commission on the Future of the Army**

2530 Crystal Drive, Zachary Taylor Building, Suite 5000  
Arlington, VA 22202

**SUBJECT:** National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Minutes Institutional Subcommittee Meeting 18 August 2015

**Date:** 18 August 2015

**Time:** 1330-1700hrs

**Location:** Taylor Building, Arlington, VA

**Format:** NCFA Staff Briefing

### **Attendees:**

LTG (Ret) Jack Stultz- Subcommittee Chair  
GEN (Ret) Carter Ham – Subcommittee Member  
SMA (Ret) Raymond Chandler - Subcommittee Member  
MG Ray Carpenter – NCFA Executive Director  
Mr. Don Tison – Commission Designated Federal Officer (DFO)  
LTC Michael A. Lockwood – Subcommittee DFO  
Mr. Johnny Thomas-NCFA Staff  
LTC Brian Stevenson - NCFA Staff  
LTC Barry Vincent – NCFA Staff  
LTC Brian Rice - NCFA Staff  
MAJ Doroneth White - NCFA Staff  
Mr. Scott Sharp -NCFA Staff  
Mr. Tony Boyda – NCFA Staff  
Mr. Sankar Bhattacharjee – NCFA Staff  
Mr. Keith Kaspersen- NCFA Staff  
Mr. Eric Magnell - NCFCA Staff  
Mr. Kerry Schindler – NCFA Staff

### **Documents Provided to Subcommittee:**

1. “Institutional Subcommittee Submission on the Distribution of Authority and Responsibility for ARNG Force Structure” information paper
2. “Institutional Subcommittee Submission on Fully Burdened Costs” information paper
3. “Institutional Subcommittee Submission on the Integrated Pay and Personnel System – Army (IPPS-A)” information paper
4. “Institutional Subcommittee Submission on the Process for Allocating Army National Guard Personnel and Force Structure” information paper
5. “Allocation of ARNG Research” slides
6. “Reserve Component Trainees, Transients, Holders, Students” slides
7. “Recruiting Brief for Institutional Subcommittee” slides
8. “State Level Population Recruit Eligible Population Auths Data” slides

**SUBJECT:** National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Minutes Institutional Subcommittee Meeting 18 August 2015

### **Meeting Summary**

The NCFCA Staff provided the Institutional Subcommittee status on the research, problem definition and potential proposals for three issues:

- 1) Evaluation of the allocation of ARNG personnel and force structure and interpretation of the data.
- 2) Feasibility of a Trainee, Transient, Holdee and Student (TTHS) account in the Army National Guard.
- 3) Feasibility of consolidating recruiting or specific recruiting functions across Army components.

At 1330hrs, the Subcommittee Chair convened the meeting without the two other subcommittee members present. There were no external briefings or attendees beyond subcommittee members and NCFA staff. The DFO reminded the subcommittee that FACA still applies.

The discussion started with review of the Subcommittee presentations during the Commission's Open Meeting early that day. The Chair stated that we should begin looking ahead to final Subcommittee output. He tasked the staff to answer the following at the September Subcommittee meeting:

- 1) What are our recommendations/proposals?
- 2) How does the Army become more efficient?
- 3) What institutional capabilities can the Army not afford to reduce or eliminate?
- 4) How does the Army become more efficient with underutilized training capacity?
- 5) A key issue addressed during the Open Meeting presentation on the evaluation of the "Process for Allocating Army National Guard Personnel and Force Structure," was including conflict resolution in the process. What happens if the States disagree with the decision from HQDA as reflected in the Army Structure Document (ARSTRUC) which is signed by the Secretary of the Army?

The discussion on conflict resolution, number five above, provided a transition into Mr. Kaspersen's presentation on the ARNG force structure and personnel distribution among the states and territories. Mr. Kaspersen presented data indicating that since 1990, with exceptions of Pennsylvania, Indiana and Mississippi, the ARNG process adequately aligns force structure with a State's (1) total population, (2) recruit eligible population, and (3) ability to fill allocated force structure. The Chair directed the staff to research the following proposals and present at the September Subcommittee meeting:

- 1) How do we resolve conflict resolution between the States and HQDA structure decisions?
- 2) What needs to be codified in the structure allocation and what laws, if any, do we propose to change?

**SUBJECT:** National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Minutes Institutional Subcommittee Meeting 18 August 2015

- 3) Consider proposing an external Army agency such as the IDA to review the ARNG allocation.

As the discussion concluded on the ARNG distribution data, the two other Subcommittee Members arrived at 1430hrs. After a brief review of the discussions from the previous hour, LTC Vincent began his presentation on the viability of a TTHS account in the ARNG. LTC Vincent reminded the Subcommittee a primary reason for researching the viability of a TTHS in the ARNG was the Director, ARNG, statement that “a TTHS-like account is one of my priorities.”

LTC Vincent explained a TTHS is a readiness reporting tool to more accurately reflect when Soldiers are manning positions within units vice attending courses, etc. LTC Vincent proposed the bottom line question as, “Does the Army leadership want active component like personnel readiness reporting in the Army National Guard?” He also added the Director ARNG and the Adjutant Generals Association have indicated yes, as long as the personnel account does not come out of existing force structure (i.e. maintaining end strength is more important than having ARNG TTHS account). Due to budgetary constraints, no one anticipates HQDA supporting adding force structure to ARNG to create a TTHS account. The Chair added the fiscal environment may dictate the answer. If we are reducing force structure across the Army, does additive TTHS make sense? The Chair directed the staff to prepare a paper for the September meeting on this topic; ensure the paper addresses any legal issues and examines the feasibility of a pilot program for TTHS in a State filled in excess of 100% manning.

Mr. Magnell then presented information addressing the consolidation of the recruiting functions across all Army components, including the laws and policies facilitating or hindering such a consolidation. Mr. Magnell noted the staff found no laws against consolidation of recruiting (ARNG and AC). However, an earlier Army Judge Advocate General review on this topic stated “Congress has not given the authority for the merger.” He explained the Commission could recommend a merger, and ask Congress to affirm or deny. The Chair asked, ‘What are the right and left limits on the recruiting statutes and policy? Once we understand and know the left and right limits we can develop proposals.’

The Chair directed the NCFA Staff to provide for approval, prior to the September meeting, the following papers for presentation to the full Commission at an Open Meeting:

- 1) Recruiting – Unity of Effort. Defining and Understanding the "Left and Right Limits" with respect to Statutes and Policy determining how far consolidation could occur. Does merger of recruiting across the Army require Congressional approval? The Institutional Subcommittee will review recent ARNG recruiting changes in policy and operations that have been implemented since 2012.
- 2) TTHS - Ask the Commission "Does the Army leadership want active component like personnel readiness reporting in the ARNG?" The Institutional Subcommittee will

**SUBJECT:** National Commission on the Future of the Army (NCFA) Minutes Institutional Subcommittee Meeting 18 August 2015

present several TTHS alternatives for the Commission to consider including no TTHS for ARNG.

- 3) Training Capacity - What question/issue are we attempting to solve? Efficiency and Unity of Effort similar to recruiting questions? Understand the amount of training capacity to determine if there is excess capacity? How much are we spending to send Soldiers to training when there are more cost effective means? For example the Regular Army 68W MOS Soldiers at Fort Bragg attending school in Texas, while the Regional Training Institute (RTI) at Fort Bragg teaches 68W course. How often does this scenario happen? Also address other RTI issues: (1) States contracting to build RTI facilities and not using the Army Corps of Engineers; (2) Uniform Code of Military Justice Authorities within multi-component RTI; (3) RTI statute, policy and fiscal challenges; (4) review equivalency training, especially based on 1973 law as three years to complete a course does not meet feasibility assessment; (5) Has TRADOC complied with 2006 direction to correct many of these issues identified in the Army's "Review of Education, Training and Assignment for Leaders (RETAL)" report?
- 4) ARNG Allocation. Establish a written policy that specifies personnel and force structure decision process with a clear articulation on how to address conflict resolution between the States and HQDA structure decisions? Identify any changes to laws to modify for this structure allocation process and what laws to propose for change?

The meeting adjourned at 1700 hrs.