

Chairman Ham, Vice Chairman Lamont, distinguished members of this Commission:

My name is Andrea Peterson, and I am the Legislative Affairs Manager for Army Programs at the National Guard Association of the United States. NGAUS is proud to represent its nearly 45,000 members and the approximately 455,000 brave men and women in the Army and Air National Guard.

NGAUS had the privilege to testify in May, and we thank you for that opportunity. I am here before you today because many members of our Association are concerned by the written testimony provided by the Secretary of the Army and Army Chief of Staff on May 19, 2015.

We make this assertion while acknowledging that we are at a point of transition atop our Army. Nevertheless, we believe we should bring our concerns directly to you.

I submit for the record a matrix that directly addresses the sections of testimony that include the areas that have generated the deepest concern. Most concerning are the assertions that full-time personnel do not contribute to collective or individual training, that the National Guard is not cost-effective, that the Army National Guard is a purely “complementary” force, and that reserve-component units are simply unable to execute complex missions.

In this matrix, NGAUS presents data, information, as well as policy and statutes, that we believe counter these assertions.

NGAUS believes that the Army’s testimony presented an inaccurate picture of how the Army National Guard trains, mobilizes, and maintains its readiness. We believe some critical facts were missing from the testimony, which has led to the misleading representation of how the Army National Guard can contribute to our Total Army going forward.

On behalf of NGAUS, I thank this Commission for its hard work and commitment to maintaining an open mind during this process.

Thank you for the opportunity to present this information for the record.