

**HEARING TO RECEIVE TESTIMONY ON RE-
SERVE-COMPONENT PROGRAMS IN REVIEW
OF THE DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION RE-
QUEST FOR FISCAL YEAR 2011 AND THE FU-
TURE YEARS DEFENSE PROGRAM**

WEDNESDAY, MAY 12, 2010

U.S. SENATE,
SUBCOMMITTEE ON PERSONNEL,
COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES,
Washington, DC.

The subcommittee met, pursuant to notice, at 10:02 a.m. in room SR-222, Russell Senate Office Building, Senator Jim Webb (chairman of the subcommittee) presiding.

Committee members present: Senators Webb, Hagan, Chambliss, and Graham.

Committee staff members present: Leah C. Brewer, nominations and hearings clerk; and Jennifer L. Stoker, security clerk.

Majority staff members present: Jonathan D. Clark, counsel; Gabriella Eisen, counsel; and Gerald J. Leeling, counsel.

Staff assistants present: Jennifer R. Knowles, Hannah I. Lloyd, and Brian F. Sebold.

Committee members' assistants present: Nick Ikeda, assistant to Senator Akaka; Roger Pena, assistant to Senator Hagan; Clyde A. Taylor IV, assistant to Senator Chambliss; and Walt Kuhn, assistant to Senator Graham.

OPENING STATEMENT OF SENATOR JIM WEBB, CHAIRMAN

Senator WEBB. Good morning. The subcommittee will come to order.

The subcommittee meets this morning to receive testimony on the Guard and Reserve programs of the Department of Defense.

We'll have two panels this morning. The first panel, we'll welcome The Honorable Dennis McCarthy, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs; General Craig McKinley, Chief of the National Guard Bureau; Lieutenant General Harry Wyatt III, Director of the Air National Guard; and Major General Raymond Carpenter, Acting Director of the Army Guard.

On the second panel, we'll have the Chiefs of the Reserve, and we'll introduce them when we bring in the second panel.

I should point out that we are expecting three consecutive rollcall votes to begin any time right now, and we're going to do our best to keep the hearing going rather than having to suspend it. That actually—that sounds like a vote being called. And if we reach the

point where we can't do that, then we're just going to have to declare a recess. But, we'll do our best, here.

The Guard and Reserve continue to transform from a Cold War-era strategic force to an operational force manned and equipped to face both the traditional and asymmetric threats of the 21st century. It's a transformation that started well more than 20 years ago, when the "total force" concept replaced the force structure that we had during conscription.

I was a part of this transformation, as many of you know, during the Reagan administration. I was the first Assistant Secretary of Defense for Reserve Affairs. It was one of the great leadership experiences of my life, quite frankly, to have put that office online. When we inherited the upgrade, it was composed of 14 full-time staff, plus a lot of IMAs and others that we were able to use from time to time, but we took great care, back in 1984, in designing the structure of the staff and trying to put it into those functions that were necessary, should we have to mobilize and go into a full-out wartime environment. And I believe that the office has survived the test of time and adapted to the issues that we face.

I used to say, during the first year, when you have all seven Guard and Reserve components, all four Active services, political appointees and career civilians on one staff, it was like trying to hold a meeting in Yugoslavia; there were so many different points of view at the table. But, it seems to have—I see the—I see some knowing nods, here. [Laughter.]

But, it's been a great addition to the Department of Defense, and we welcome the current leadership in those roles, today.

More than 2 years ago, the Commission on the National Guard and Reserve delivered its final report to Congress. One of its conclusions was that there is no reasonable alternative to the Nation's continued reliance on the Guard and Reserve, for missions at home and abroad, as a part of an operational force. The question this raises is whether this level of operational use is sustainable in the future. Will the Guard and Reserve still be able to recruit and retain the quality individuals they need, given their increased operational tempo? How will this evolution impact the military's relationship with civilian employers?

The operationalization of the Guard and Reserve also raises questions about their capacity to respond to unforeseen events, like Hurricane Katrina or the earthquake in Haiti, which require surge capacity and specialized skills that the active component may not be able to provide.

The use of the Guard and Reserve has increased, in large part, to ease the stress on the active components, but we run the risk of overly stressing guardsmen and reservists, who, in addition to their military duties, hold down civilian careers.

After 9 years of overseas commitments, the Guard and Reserve remain stressed, including dwell times closer to 1-to-3 than the stated goal of 1-to-5, and we need to look at these issues, and many others.

And I'm going—I have a longer statement that I'm going to submit into the record at this point, but, in the interest of time—and also, I want to get into the views of our witnesses—I would like to

just submit this into the record and call on a ranking Republican, Colonel Lindsey Graham——

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you. I——

Senator WEBB.—to give his opening statement.

STATEMENT OF SENATOR LINDSEY GRAHAM

Senator GRAHAM. I move I be promoted. [Laughter.]

I think I'd lose, two to one. [Laughter.]

Senator WEBB. I think you're looking at the——

Senator GRAHAM. Yes.

Senator WEBB.—right people on the other end of the table for that.

Senator GRAHAM. Anyway, I know we have to go vote, here.

The legal authorities that you would need to be able to activate the Reserves in a less bureaucratic manner, I want to hear about that. The Guard and Reserve, as Senator Webb said, is an indispensable part of this war effort. Civil affairs, military police, you name it, the Guard and Reserves are on the front lines of what you need in Iraq and Afghanistan. And as you build out the 21st century threats, the Guard and Reserve are completely indispensable. The cold war model has to be changed, because the Cold War—thank God, we won that; we need to win the war we're in now.

Senator Chambliss has some proposals about earlier retirement. I couldn't support his idea more. We need to deliver for the troops, here.

Secretary Gates is a fine man. Don't even think about cutting military pay. That's on the active-Duty side. From the Guard and Reserves point of view, you're the best bang for the buck for the American taxpayer, about 25 cents on the dollar, in terms of Active-Duty cost, and you hit way above your weight. So, I want to talk to you about—when we have a chance, here—deploying the National Guard along the border. Is that feasible? Do you think that would make a difference? And could you do it?

So, with that, Mr. Chairman, I'd just end with saying that our Guard and Reserve members and their families—we're doing the best we can take care of you. TRICARE has been a good addition to the benefit package available to Guard and Reserve members and their families.

And America should be very proud of the commitment of the citizen soldier. I know I am.

Thank you.

[The prepared statement of Senator Graham follows:]

[SUBCOMMITTEE INSERT]

Senator WEBB. Thank you very much, Senator Graham.

Secretary McCarthy, welcome.

**STATEMENT OF HON. DENNIS M. MCCARTHY, ASSISTANT
SECRETARY OF DEFENSE FOR RESERVE AFFAIRS**

Mr. MCCARTHY. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, Senator Graham, members of the subcommittee. I appreciate the opportunity to testify today and to engage with you about the direction and the future role of our Nation's Reserve components.

I'm honored to be present with my colleagues in uniform, all seven of the Reserve Chiefs. It's a pleasure to serve with them. And

I know they'd all join me, or will all join me, in saying thank you to the subcommittee for the everything that you have done for the men and women in uniform, both Active and Reserve, and DOD civilians.

As we've all discussed many times, I think we're at a very significant point in our—the history of our Reserve components, and, frankly, at a point of great opportunity. I think there's three main themes that we ought to touch on, and I'll just summarize them.

First of all, every man and woman serving in uniform today has either enlisted or reenlisted since September 11. They've made a conscious decision to serve, with full understanding of what service in today's environment means. They know it means service in combat, they know it means repeated deployments; and, for members of the Reserve component, they know that it means, not just stress on themselves and their families, but also on their employers. And yet, they have continued to make that decision to serve.

Second of all, because we've had over 750,000 Reserve and Guard members mobilized since 9/11, we've got the most experienced, best-trained, best-equipped Reserve component we've had in anybody's recent memory. But, to sustain this force, we need to continue to support our families, the families of those in uniform, and their employers.

And, third, I think there is an emerging consensus that, even after the demand—the high demand—for forces in Afghanistan and Iraq come down, it still makes sense to utilize our Reserve components on a rotational basis. We've made a significant investment in them. They've made a significant investment. And we should continue to use that so that we get return on that investment.

I would say that it's not just indispensable, which it is, but it's also a sensible use of this great Reserve component that we have. But, to do that, we're going to have to find some new ways to do things. And, as has been mentioned, finding a way to assure that we have access, and that those who plan for the use of Reserve-component forces can make those plans confidently, knowing that they will be able to get access to the forces, is very important. We need to find a sound—constitutionally sound method to authorize that access.

We need to make progress on this thing that we've been talking about for years, the continuum of service, the ability of an individual to flow on and off of full-time duty without jeopardizing their pay or their medical care.

We need to find ways to continue to support families and employers, and, in particular, support employers so that they will continue to support us, as they have so tremendously up until now.

Almost everything that is in that laundry list of things to do relates back to a recommendation that was made by the Commission on National Guard and Reserve, and was approved by the Secretary of Defense. Quite frankly, we haven't made as much progress in implementing those recommendations as I would like, but I guarantee you, we are working hard on that.

Turn to my colleagues in uniform for their comments, but I do look forward, Senators, to answering your questions.

[The prepared statement of Mr. McCarthy follows:]

Senator GRAHAM [presiding]. Well, thank you, Mr. Secretary.

I apologize, I think the best thing for us to do now is to recess, because time's about out. I'll go vote. We'll come back. And so, we'll stand down for a few minutes.

We'll be in recess. Thank you.

[Recess.]

Senator WEBB [presiding]. The hearing will again come to order.

I was informed by staff that, Secretary McCarthy, you were able to finish your statement and we've—

Mr. MCCARTHY. I was.

Senator WEBB.—not yet begun with General McKinley

So, General, let me start by saying—I understand there's only one statement from the National Guard. Is that correct?

General MCKINLEY. Sir, I have brief remarks, and I was going to let the Director of the Air and the Army just make very brief remarks, also, if that—

Senator WEBB. Well, I would encourage them to do so. We—I was told by staff that we only got one written—

General MCKINLEY. No, sir. I—

Senator WEBB.—statement.

General MCKINLEY. I will introduce the two directors, and they represent the bulk of our portfolio.

Senator WEBB. So, they would—is there a written statement from either—

Voice:—

General MCKINLEY. Right, we have one written statement, and then we were going to make three verbal statements.

Senator WEBB. All right.

General MCKINLEY. Is that okay?

Senator WEBB. Proceed.

General MCKINLEY. Thanks, Senator.

**STATEMENT OF GEN. CRAIG R. MCKINLEY, USAF, CHIEF,
NATIONAL GUARD BUREAU**

General MCKINLEY. Chairman Webb, it's an honor and privilege to be here today to discuss the National Guard's personnel issues related to its ongoing role as an operational force.

The evolution of today's threat environment has made it essential for the National Guard to strike the proper balance between operational force and strategic hedge. The asymmetry of our adversaries require us to have an adaptable force that is capable of efficiently engaging in the current fight while maintaining a cost-effective surge capability prepared for tomorrow's threat.

Today, there are about 460,000 members of the Army and the Air National Guard. Our strength is good, and our retention is even better.

With me today is Lieutenant General Bud Wyatt, the Director of the Air National Guard and a former adjutant general of Oklahoma. Also with me is Major General Ray Carpenter, the acting Director of the Army Guard from South Dakota, and Major General Mike Summeral, Director of our National Guard Joint Staff from Alabama, and a former adjutant general.

As the United States Armed Forces continue to conduct operations in Iraq, Afghanistan, and elsewhere around the world, units of the Army and the Air National Guard are participating as total

force partners in that effort. And I'd like to personally thank General Schwartz and General Casey and the Secretaries of the Army and the Air Force for including the National Guard in their force, as planning constructs, and all they do for the National Guard.

The National Guard has repeatedly, over the past decade, proven itself to be a ready, accessible, and, I would include, a reliable force. We have validated the total-force concept by showing that the men and women in our formations are ready to answer the call, to be mobilized, or, in the case of the Air National Guard, to be volunteered to deploy overseas, return home, and then become prepared to do it again and again.

The citizen soldiers and airmen of your National Guard are adding value to America every day that they serve. The capabilities they bring to bear would not have been possible without the strong support of this committee, and we thank you all very much for that support, to include your support of Yellow Ribbon and other personnel programs that take care of soldiers and airmen and their families.

The most critical part of the proven capability, however, is our National Guard men and women. Today's men and women volunteer to join or stay in the National Guard, fully expecting to be deployed. This shift in expectation is a central aspect of the National Guard and, I would argue, with my colleagues from the other Reserve components, shift to becoming a fully operational force, and no longer merely a strategic Reserve. Indeed, the soldiers and airmen of your National Guard now serve with that expectation, and are proud of it. They want to remain central players in the Nation's defense, and would, indeed, be resistant to any move to return to a role limited to a strictly strategic Reserve.

Overall, we can say that the budget request for fiscal year11 meets the critical needs of the Army and the Air National Guard in this era of persistent conflict overseas, and the ongoing threats to American lives and property here in the homeland.

One of the longest-running joint programs in the National Guard, one which employs both Army and Air National Guard capabilities, is the National Guard Counterdrug Program. This unique program provides a mechanism under which National Guard military experience can be employed to assist civilian law enforcement agencies to fight the corrosive effect of illegal drugs in American society. Funding for our Counterdrug Program is included in the fiscal year11 budget request, and we would ask for your full support of that request. As we've seen with recent incidents along our southwest border, the scourge of drugs migrating across our borders constitutes a real threat. Consequently, our National Guard Counterdrug Program fills a very vital need.

We are well aware that last year, as it has done in previous years, this committee supported significant additional funds for that Counterdrug Program to fund capability enhancements. Nearly a quarter of the capability of the National Guard Counterdrug Program exists today because of additional funding provided in the past by Congress.

I would now like to turn to my colleagues from the Army and Air National Guard for their brief verbal comments. To my friend and flightmate Bud Wyatt.

[The prepared statement of General McKinley follows:]

**STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. HARRY M. WYATT III, USAF,
DIRECTOR, AIR NATIONAL GUARD**

General WYATT. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, thank you very much for the opportunity to discuss issues of vital importance that impact—

Senator WEBB. General Wyatt, welcome. Let me just reiterate what I said a minute ago. It's my understanding this is the first time that there's not been separate written statements by all three witnesses from the National Guard.

General WYATT. Yes, sir. But, I would assure the Chairman that my written inputs were included in those of General McKinley. I did have input in—

Senator WEBB. Well, it's traditional to receive separate written statements, and we would expect that. We'd certainly want to see that, next year.

General WYATT. Yes, sir.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

General WYATT. Mr. Chairman, Air National Guard airmen are volunteering at unprecedented rates and risking their lives daily because they believe strongly in what they're doing for their country and their communities.

Since September 11, 146,000 Air National Guard members have deployed overseas, many of them on second and third rotations to the combat zones. In the past year alone, we have deployed 18,366 servicemembers to 62 countries and every continent on the face of the Earth, including Antarctica.

The Air National Guard continues to prove the availability and accessibility of the Guard to our Nation and to our communities. In the past year, Air Guard members helped their fellow citizens battle floods, mitigate the aftermath of ice storms, fight wildfires, and provide relief from the devastating effects of tsunamis.

Early last year, Guard members from Kentucky, Arizona, and Missouri responded to debilitating ice storms, which resulted in the largest National Guard callup in Kentucky's history.

Last spring, North Dakota, South Dakota, and Minnesota Air National Guard members provided rescue relief and manpower in response to Midwest flooding. And similar efforts continue this year, with the recent flooding in Tennessee and surrounding areas.

Last September, the Hawaii Air National Guard sent personnel from their CERFP, a command-and-control element, and a mortuary affairs team to American Samoa, in response to an 8.4-magnitude-earthquake-generated tsunami.

These are just a few of the examples of how the Air National Guard provides exceptional expertise, experience, and capabilities to mitigate disasters and their consequences. Without the stewardship of your committee, our airmen would have an incredibly difficult time doing their jobs and taking care of their families. We're thankful for everything that you and the committee have done, and continue to do, to let our members know that America cares about them and is grateful for their services.

In conclusion, with the continued support of Congress, the Air National Guard will continue to develop and field the most capable,

cost-effective force that serves with pride and distinction at home and abroad. It's an honor and privilege to be here this morning, and I look forward to answering any questions that you or the committee may have.

Thank you, sir.

[The prepared statement of General Wyatt follows:]

Senator WEBB. Thank you, General Wyatt.

General Carpenter, welcome.

STATEMENT OF MG RAYMOND W. CARPENTER, ARNG, ACTING DIRECTOR, ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

General CARPENTER. Thank you, sir.

Mr. Chairman, I am honored to represent more than 362,000 citizen soldiers in the Army National Guard. As I speak, we have over 52,000 of our soldiers deployed, mobilized, and on point for this Nation. The sacrifice of those soldiers, their families, and employers, is something we must not only acknowledge, but certainly appreciate.

The National Guard of today is a far cry from the one I joined. The last 8 years have seen the Guard transform to an operational force. The enablers for the Army National Guard have been provided and sustained by congressional initiatives, and we thank you for your continued support.

Today, we would like to highlight our requested increased in nondual-status technicians. These civilian technicians have emerged as being more important, as the Army Guard has shifted from being a strategic Reserve to being a frequently deployed operational force. The President's budget for fiscal year 2011 requests an increase in Army National Guard nondual-status employees from 1600 to 2,520. We ask the committee to provide this increase in its mark of the National Defense Authorization Act for 2011.

We also want to talk about accessibility today. We feel that our deployment numbers speak for themselves. In July 2009, mobilizations reached the highest point since 2005, of more than 65,000 soldiers. An additional 5,500 soldiers were mobilized for other contingency operations in Bosnia, Kosovo, Sinai, and the Horn of Africa, and also for domestic operations. The National Guard has been there when called. We are accessible.

Many have expressed concern about the Army Guard's ability to continue to deploy and meet future requirements. I believe our personnel numbers answer the question. We continue to exceed recruiting goals, and our retention rate averages 110 percent. The men and women who serve in the Army National Guard today do so with full understanding that they are likely to be deployed overseas. Some of them join for that very reason. The shift in expectation is a central aspect of the National Guard's shift to being a fully operational force.

Today's Army National Guard soldiers join and reenlist with the expectation of serving at home and abroad, and they are proud of it. I appreciate the opportunity to be here today and look forward to your questions.

[The prepared statement of General Carpenter follows:]

Senator WEBB. Thank you very much, General Carpenter, and all of you, for your testimony.

I note, in the bios, that General McKinley and General Wyatt both went to SMU. It—is there something in the water down there that—

General MCKINLEY. Coincidental, sir. [Laughter.]

General WYATT. Sir, I'm actually a couple of years ahead, but obviously he's a much faster burner than I am.

General MCKINLEY. Yes, thanks. [Laughter.]

Senator WEBB. I also notice that General Carpenter studied Vietnamese language, before he deployed to Vietnam, in the Navy. Is that—

General CARPENTER. Yes, Senator, that's—

Senator WEBB. [Said something in Vietnamese.]

General CARPENTER. Sir, that was 30 years ago. [Laughter.]

Senator WEBB. Well, we appreciate all of your service, and yours also, Secretary McCarthy.

General McKinley, it's been, I think, 2 years since your position was elevated to a four-star position. You're the first four-star to serve in this position. Would you like to tell this committee how these changes have affected your role, what difference they've made?

General MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I think what I have sensed over the past 14, 15 months in the position is, the position has allowed me to enter discussions and forums that were not previously afforded my predecessor. To be very specific, I'm a member of the Defense Advisory Working Group, which Deputy Secretary Lynn chairs. Going through the Quadrennial Defense Review, that was a programmatic session, where I was able to shape and influence, for the 460,000 guardsmen, those things which I felt were important for the Quadrennial Defense Review. And I've also been included by the Chairman, Admiral Mullen, in all of the tank discussions. I'm not a voting member, but I'm certainly able to offer my best military advice to the Chairman and to the Secretary, through the Defense Senior Leadership Conferences that Secretary Gates holds to specifically address the needs of the National Guard force. That, coupled with the fact that Secretary McCarthy and I are working extremely close together, and along with Secretary Stockton, the venues and the numbers of meetings, and the number of forums available to me now has grown exponentially. So, to take that into context in the Department of Defense, that has made a significant improvement in my quality of advice to the senior leaders of the Department.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

Secretary McCarthy, when I held the position that you have right now, I sat on what was then called the Defense Resources Board. I'm not sure the same board exists. But, do you sit on that board, or on an equivalent?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Short answer: No, sir. I don't think the Defense Resources Board exists. If it does, I'm not aware of it. I think that the Defense Advisory Working Group that General McKinley mentioned is perhaps a comparable forum today. And I do not routinely sit on that. Quite frankly, I'm working closely with both Under Secretary Stanley, and occasionally with Secretary Gates, to figure out what the right level of my participation is.

Senator WEBB. Well, the Defense Resources Board, at the time that I was in the Pentagon, had input on all budget recommendations of all services at the level of \$60 million or higher during the formation of the budget. And it was very important, when this position was created, that someone overseeing the Guard and Reserve programs had that sort of direct input. Is there any similar forum where you can have direct input today?

Mr. MCCARTHY. No. No, sir, there is not. Not today.

Senator WEBB. All right. I may have a followup question for you on that.

General—actually, I'd like to ask General Wyatt and General Carpenter, separately, a couple of questions, just datapoints—the percentage of the Air Guard and the Army Guard that are prior service, and the percentage that are over the age of 40.

General WYATT. Senator, we have about a 60-percent prior-service membership in the Air National Guard. I think that question, and the answer, points out the—one of the benefits of having an operational and robust National Guard. It is that it does allow for this active- Duty members who want to continue serving their country—it affords them the opportunity to do so when they, perhaps, make that choice not to serve in a full-time capacity.

And the second part of your question, sir?

Senator WEBB. The percentage of the Air Guard that is over the age of 40.

General WYATT. I can't get you the exact percentages, but we are an older force, with more experience than then Active component. But, if I could take that for the record, sir, I'll get you the exact percentages.

Senator WEBB. What—actually, what I would request is—Secretary McCarthy, if you could get me a breakdown of the Guard and Reserve components, in terms of age breakdown.

[The information referred to follows:]

Senator WEBB. When I had your position, it was one out of five was over the age of 40. And it impacted a lot of policies, such as over-40 stress testing and that sort of thing. I mean, it's one that you would expect, particularly on the aviation side, to have a higher number of prior service and a higher age level. It's amortizing a very precious asset that you don't have to retrain over and over again. But, I'd like to be able to see the numbers.

And, General Carpenter, do you have—

General CARPENTER. Senator, a couple of—

Senator WEBB.—data on those two points?

General CARPENTER.—a couple of specific comments on that, on your questions.

One is, we have seen the age—average age of the force in the Army National Guard become younger. And that's a function of increased deployments and a change in the culture from where were at before 9/11. We were an average of over 30 years old, in terms of our force, and we're now somewhere around 29 years of age. And so, we've become younger, and it's a function of the OPTEMPO.

The other datapoint that's probably of note here is the number of prior service. Before September 11, we recruited a lot of prior-service soldiers into our organization, and that was one of our mainstays. Frankly, after September 11, what's happened is that

people leave the Army, and they want to leave the entire mobilization piece. And they know that the National Guard is a mobilizing and deploying force, and so, we have had to turn more to the non-prior-service market, in terms of where we go to recruit and sustain our end strength.

Senator WEBB. How does that affect your ability to train up a ground soldier?

General CARPENTER. Sir, I think the offset of that is the mobilization and the deployments that we've seen inside the Guard. We have over 60 percent of our soldiers that are combat and deployed veterans inside of our formations. Now, we haven't seen that kind of a statistic since World War II. So, we have not necessarily gotten the experience level that you allude to from the active component in—coming into our ranks. We've actually gotten firsthand experience, in terms of the deploying units.

Senator WEBB. All right.

General McKinley, I know that Senator Graham is going to have some questions on this, but I would be interested in your thoughts on the border security and drug interdiction efforts that—the different areas where the Guard can participate in that.

And, Secretary McCarthy, if you had thoughts on that, I'd hear the—like to hear them, as well.

But, General McKinley, specifically with the Guard; and if Secretary McCarthy has something broader.

General MCKINLEY. Mr. Chairman, I'm sure you're well aware of the—of Operation Jump Start, which my predecessor worked with the Department on to put up to 6,000 members of the National Guard on the border. It was originally planned for a 1-year event; it ended up 2 years.

The express mission assignment was to relieve the stress on the Custom and Border Protection Agency so that they could hire more agents. And, from all accounts, that was accomplished.

I have had no personal discussions in the Department on any future mission along the southwest border. That doesn't mean that our Governors along the southwest border have not sent me copies of letters that they've sent to Secretary Gates. And so, we know that many of the Governors along the southwest border are seeking some support.

We have small footprints of National Guard forces serving today along the border, under the Governors' consent. And those are mainly counterdrug personnel assigned to that mission I referenced in my opening remark.

We have had preliminary planning sessions to discuss capabilities that we might afford. But, without specific tasking, I believe I would—I would offer my personal opinion that any future mission involving National Guard would be different; the circumstances are different, the complexities along the border have changed dramatically since Operation Jump Start. But, personally, I've not been involved in any discussions. I know that Secretary Napolitano, Secretary Gates, and their staffs, have had some discussions. But, until given official tasking, I think it would be premature for me to speculate on any specific missions that the National Guard can perform, other than to say, the Governors are interested in seeking that support.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.
Secretary McCarthy?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Senator, the most direct responsibility for this is really in the lane of Assistant Secretary Paul Stockton, Homeland Defense. But, he and I work extremely closely together, and one of the things that I believe is—best states current policy is that the requirements on the border, as we see them right now, are law enforcement rather than military. And so, I don't believe that there is any plan—and I talked to Secretary Stockton as recently as Monday of this week—I don't think there's any current plan or inclination to change that assessment.

Senator WEBB. I have about 3 minutes before the second vote ends. What I'm going to do is—since Senator Graham isn't back, I'm going to have to interrupt the hearing again. And what I would—when I come back, I think what we'll do is just get the second panel up, except, Secretary McCarthy, I'd like for you to stay so I can follow up on some of the DOD policy.

Gentlemen, thank you very much for your testimony. We may have some followup written questions. But, we appreciate the data that we requested.

And again, my best to all of the men and women who are serving under your jurisdiction.

I'll be back in—

Voice: Thank you, sir.

Senator WEBB.—after the second vote. [Recess.]

Senator Graham [presiding]: Ladies and gentlemen, I want to apologize, but Senator Webb is voting. I just voted. I'm going to have to leave; he'll come back. But, we'll get this done.

So, where were we at?

Voice: The first panel was dismissed. However, Secretary McCarthy was asked to stay.

Senator GRAHAM. Okay.

Voice: And so, we're ready for opening statements.

Senator GRAHAM. Well, let's start with the next panel, starting with the Army and working our way downstream.

General STULTZ. Yes, sir.

STATEMENT OF LTG JACK C. STULTZ, USAR, CHIEF OF ARMY RESERVE; AND COMMANDING GENERAL, U.S. ARMY RESERVE COMMAND

General STULTZ. Yes, sir. In the interests of time, because I know that we are trying to be as concise as possible, we have submitted our written statement, and I would just say that, on behalf of 208,000 soldiers that are in uniform for the Army Reserve today, first and foremost, thanks for the support that we're getting from you, from Congress, in terms of our compensation, in terms of our medical, in terms of the other benefits, in terms of the ability to be trained and ready when the Nation needs.

We do have, as I mentioned, 208,000 soldiers, which puts us in a situation today of being 3,000 over what our authorized end strength is. And that is a reflection of the tremendous success we've had in recruiting, but also the tremendous success we've had in retention. Our retention goals right now are at 124 percent.

Senator GRAHAM. How much do you think that's due to the job situation?

General STULTZ. Sir, I think there is a portion of that that is economically-related. But, I would submit to you, I think a lot of it is in—due, in fact, that the soldiers we have today in the Army Reserve feel good about what they're doing—

Senator GRAHAM. Great.

General STULTZ.—serving their Nation. And all they're asking me is, really, when I get around the world, traveling—and I've been in 11 countries since January, visiting Reserve soldiers that are on duty for this Nation, and they tell me two things. One, "Give me some predictability so that—because I do have a civilian job"—

Senator GRAHAM. Right.

General STULTZ.—"I do have a family." And, number two, "Don't waste my time. If you're going to use me, use me. If you're going to train me, train me."

Senator GRAHAM. Fair enough.

General STULTZ. Yes, sir.

[The prepared statement of General Stultz follows:]

Senator GRAHAM. Admiral?

Well done.

STATEMENT OF VADM DIRK J. DEBBINK, USN, CHIEF OF NAVY RESERVE; AND COMMANDER, NAVY RESERVE FORCE

Admiral DEBBINK. Chairman Graham, thank you for the opportunity to appear before you this morning.

I definitely want to start out by expressing my appreciation for the support of this Congress for the 65,671 members of the Navy Reserve sailors and their families.

Of course, my written testimony will go into great length describing the programs that we utilize to ensure the Navy Reserve is a ready and capable force, responsive to the needs of the Navy/Marine Corps team and joint forces for both strategic depth and operational capabilities, while providing the necessary support to our sailors and their families, and also showing our appreciation for our sailors' employers' support.

As the Chief of Naval Operations, Admiral Gary Roughead, has said, "We are one Navy with an Active component and a Reserve component." And as you know, as I testified this morning, Navy Reserve sailors are operating in every corner of the world, shoulder to shoulder with Active-Duty sailors, as well as airmen, coast-guardsmen, marines, soldiers, and, I think, importantly, inter-agency personnel.

On any given day, more than 30 percent of your Navy Reserve is providing support to Department of Defense operations. The Navy Reserve is ready now, anytime, anywhere, as our motto—

Senator GRAHAM. What's your—

Admiral DEBBINK.—and our sailors—

Senator GRAHAM.—biggest challenge?

Admiral DEBBINK.—proudly claim.

Senator GRAHAM. What's your biggest challenge, as a head of the Naval Reserve?

Admiral DEBBINK. Our biggest challenge right now, today, is our pay and personnel system and our travel claim system, sir. And

we're working hard to develop an integrated pay and personnel system, Future Pay and Personnel System, as it's called. And we appreciate the opportunity to move off of the DMHRS—

Senator GRAHAM. Are you going to get us some ideas about how to fix that?

Admiral DEBBINK. Yes, sir. We're working right now on a number of alternatives, analysis of alternatives. We think we've got a couple of solutions that we're very close to being able to implement.

Senator GRAHAM. Okay.

Admiral DEBBINK. We believe it'll take probably until at least 2012 for initial operating capability—

Senator GRAHAM. Will you need legislative action to change it, or can you do it internally?

Admiral DEBBINK. We can do it internally, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. Okay.

Admiral DEBBINK. We simply need the funding to be able to do it, of course.

Senator GRAHAM. From the recruiting/retention point of view, are you similar to where the Army's at?

Admiral DEBBINK. Yes, sir, we're doing very well, overall, with our recruiting and our retention. The challenges we have right now are in our medical programs—specialty medical officers and Nurse Corps. Two challenges there are, we have very few coming off Active Duty, which is a primary source of recruiting for us, as well as, I think all of us have experienced the same problems with medical. Otherwise, we're doing very well.

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you.

General?

[The prepared statement of Admiral Debbink follows:

STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. JOHN F. KELLY, USMC, COMMANDER, MARINE FORCES RESERVE; AND COMMANDER, MARINE FORCES NORTH

General KELLY. Sir, good morning. It's certainly an honor to be here this morning and to appear—

Senator GRAHAM. Congratulations, by the way.

General KELLY. Thank you, sir.

A couple of details, sir. I command 39,600 drilling reservists, an additional 55,000 IRR reservists, 83 locations around the country. In the 6 months I've been in command, certainly the—my sense is, the strength of the Marine Corps Reserve is that it's got a relatively large number of prior-service marines that serve. We invest in a—

Senator GRAHAM. What percentage of—how much do you depend on the active Duty going to the Reserve for your recruiting? How big a part of that?

General KELLY. On the officer side, it's almost 100 percent. We've had some shortfalls, recently, that we're making up with a couple of small programs—

Senator GRAHAM. So, 100 percent of the Marine Corps Reserve officers are former Active-Duty people.

General KELLY. Have had some length of—at least 4 years—

Senator GRAHAM. So, with a downturn economy, General Kelly, does that present problems? People are less likely to get off Active Duty?

General KELLY. No, sir. In fact, the problem we had, in terms of maintaining officer numbers, is that when the Marine Corps was growing—and it's just completed that—up to 202,000—

Senator GRAHAM. Right.

General KELLY.—the encouragement was to stay in the Marine Corps. So, the pool of individuals getting off Active Duty just wasn't there; they were staying in the Marine Corps. In fact, we were going into the Reserve, encouraging reservists to also go back on Active Duty.

Senator GRAHAM. Okay. So, you really don't have a problem with that. You have the opposite problem.

General KELLY. Right. Exactly right.

Senator GRAHAM. Okay.

General KELLY. And to just finish up, I've experienced a total-force Marine Corps, in terms of—we don't think in terms of reservists and Active Duty. And I know all of the other services—

Senator GRAHAM. Right.

General KELLY.—do that, as well. And I would just end with—because I know time is of the essence—that the recruiting is good, troops are good and happy, and so are the families.

And I stand by to answer your questions, sir.

[The prepared statement of General Kelly follows:]

Senator GRAHAM. Okay. Thank you.

General?

**STATEMENT OF LT. GEN. CHARLES E. STENNER, JR., USAF,
CHIEF OF AIR FORCE RESERVE; AND COMMANDER, AIR
FORCE RESERVE COMMAND**

General STENNER. Senator Graham, pleased to be here today on behalf of the 70,000 reservists. And we are, in fact, I believe, a very strong strategic Reserve that we leverage on a daily basis to provide the operational force around the world.

Senator GRAHAM. What percentage of aircrews in the air right now are reservist?

General STENNER. Percentage of aircrews in the—

Senator GRAHAM. The nonfighter force—in transportation, airlift, and refueling.

General STENNER. Yes, sir. In the—I'll get you exact percentages—

[The information referred to follows:]

General STENNER.—but, we have roughly—between the Guard and Reserve, depending on the actual airframe, whether it's 130s or KC-135s, anywhere from 40 to 60 percent of that capability.

Senator GRAHAM. Well, I hope people understand what you just said. Between 40 and 60 percent of the people flying KC-135s are reservists or Guard members. Is that correct?

General STENNER. I'll get you the exact numbers, sir, but it's a fairly significant—

Senator GRAHAM. Same for the 130 force?

General STENNER. Yes, sir. Actually a little larger in the 130 force.

Senator GRAHAM. Okay. What about the transport side, the C-17s?

General STENNER. Same thing, sir. And part of the Air Force Reserve—we have 43,000 of our 70,000 folks that are associated with the air mobility piece of the house.

Senator GRAHAM. What percentage of the Reserve flying component has reached their 2-year activation limit, but still continue to serve voluntarily? Do you know?

General STENNER. Sir, I will get you the exact numbers that have reached the limit, but we are 80-percent volunteers right now. We have 20 percent that we—

Senator GRAHAM. The point I'm trying to make is that we have statutory limitations on how much you can—how often you can be called up. I think—is that 2 years? Is that right? No?

General STENNER. On a specific mobilization authority, 2 years is the limit.

Senator GRAHAM. Okay. So, at the end of the day, a lot of these people could hold their head up high and walk away, basically say, you know, "I've done my time." They continue to serve voluntarily. Is that correct?

General STENNER. That is absolutely true. We have higher retention on those that have served than we have on those that have not had an opportunity to—

Senator GRAHAM. I just want us to understand, structurally, as a nation, that we have statutes that we've sort of blown by the cap, and people continue to serve, which is a testament to them, but we need to figure out how to address this problem. Okay?

General STENNER. Yes, sir.

Senator GRAHAM. Anything else from the Air Force's point of view, in terms of retention?

General STENNER. Retention is very good, sir; and recruiting is very good. We're growing. We are an Air Force Reserve that's growing in all new mission sets, so we have added a few recruiters, but we have no problem bringing the folks in. They want to serve.

Senator GRAHAM. Are most of your reservists people coming from Active Duty?

General STENNER. No, sir. We're getting—60 percent of our folks are prior service. We still get some—

Senator GRAHAM. Forty percent.

General STENNER. Forty percent are nonpriors.

Senator GRAHAM. Okay, great.

[The prepared statement of General Stenner follows:]

Senator GRAHAM. Admiral?

**STATEMENT OF RADM SANDRA L. STOSZ, USCG, ACTING
DIRECTOR OF RESERVE AND TRAINING, U.S. COAST GUARD**

Admiral STOSZ. Good morning, Senator Graham. And on behalf of the 8,000 Coast Guard reservists, I am pleased to have this opportunity to appear before you today to discuss the Coast Guard Reserve, its contribution to national defense and homeland security, and the issues that face the men and women of our Reserve Force.

Thank you for including the Coast Guard Reserve when considering armed service personnel issues, and for your continued support of our military men and women.

Our Reserve component serves as an—as a responsive and flexible force multiplier at home and abroad. In addition to our mobilization capability under Title 10, the integration of our Active and Reserve components in the 1990s enables us to respond quickly when and where operational Reserve Forces are needed, aided in part by the unique authority vested in the Secretary of Homeland Security under Title 14.

Recently, in response to the earthquake in Haiti, the Coast Guard Cutter Forward arrived on scene within 24 hours, while Coast Guard reservists prepared to mobilize, pending presidential recall authorization under Title 10. The Port Security Unit, number 307, deployed just 48 hours after receiving that recall notification to provide port safety and security in Port-au-Prince and nearby Haitian ports. As a deployable surge capability, the Coast Guard Reserves port security unit force package was vital to ensuring the safe passage of relief supplies and shipping commerce.

Senator GRAHAM. Admiral, your written statement, we've got. And, to all of you, Haiti was a major effort, and I couldn't be more proud of the active and Reserve components helping the people of Haiti.

Admiral, from your point of view, what's your biggest challenge to keep these 8,000 people retained, and recruit in the future?

Admiral STOSZ. Senator, I think our biggest challenge is to keep them well trained and equipped. We use operational-unit training and equipping. As you know, our Reserves augment—

Senator GRAHAM. Do you have ships in the Reserve units that are specific to Reserves?

Admiral STOSZ. No, we don't. Except for our Port Security Unit force packages, our Reserves are individual augmentees that go out and augment our operational Coast Guard stations. They use the equipment at those stations.

The only problem we have is, Reserves stationed in the Great Lakes in the wintertime, we have to deploy them down somewhere warm to train on the boats that they need to keep their qualifications up. So, that's probably our biggest challenge, is keeping that training going with a geographically constrained workforce, when you also have the employment challenges of an employer, where you can't send them TAD, temporary duty, for that long, to get the training somewhere else, outside that geographical area.

Senator GRAHAM. The equipment problems in the Coast Guard seem pretty serious to me. I mean, we've got an aging fleet.

Admiral STOSZ. Yes, sir, our aging fleet. But, our small boats are much newer, so our capital cutters, the bigger ships that reservists don't serve in, are the aging assets, and our new smaller boats are the boats that our reservists man and deploy.

Senator GRAHAM. But, your recruiting and retention is okay right now?

Admiral STOSZ. Yes, sir. We have 87 percent enlisted and 93 percent officer—

Senator GRAHAM. Okay.

Admiral STOSZ.—retention.

[The prepared statement of Admiral Stosz follows:]

Senator GRAHAM. Well, I've got just a few minutes til I've got to vote and—we got your written statements. And I don't mean to cut this short, but, at the end of the day, we've got to find out what the real problems are, how are you doing, why are you doing so well, and what's likely to change.

Mr. Secretary, tell me about the legal structure, in terms of accessing the Guard and Reserves. What does Congress need to do, with the administration, to change that dilemma? Am I right about the 2-year limit? You can be called up for 2 years—

Mr. MCCARTHY. No, sir.

Senator GRAHAM.—involuntarily, right?

Mr. MCCARTHY. No, sir, not exactly. There is—

Senator GRAHAM. How does that work?

Mr. MCCARTHY.—a 2-year limitation, but it's interpreted to be 2 years of consecutive service. So, you can't involuntarily mobilize a member of the Guard or Reserve for more than 2 years, consecutively, but there is no—the interpretation that we are using is that there is no cumulative limit.

But, you're absolutely right that—

Senator GRAHAM. Well, you know, I'm not so sure that's the intent. I mean, maybe not. I mean, you could serve for 20 months, 10 times?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I'm sorry, you can serve for—

Senator GRAHAM. I mean, could you call—

Mr. MCCARTHY.—20—

Senator GRAHAM.—could you call somebody up for 20 months and get 2 years—I mean, that doesn't count toward the 2 years, right?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Well, it—20 months is not—obviously doesn't—

Senator GRAHAM. Not 24—

Mr. MCCARTHY.—exceed the 2-year—

Senator GRAHAM.—yes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Not 24.

Senator GRAHAM. I mean—yes.

Mr. MCCARTHY. But, the interpretation that we've used since September 11 has been that the 2-year limit was consecutive rather than cumulative. And—

Senator GRAHAM. From the military point of view, here, most people understand that? Or do they care? From the Army's point of view.

Admiral DEBBINK. Yes, sir. The—you know, the Secretary of Defense came out with a policy on the 12-month mobilization, which I think is the—did the most for us, in terms of putting some structure around—

Senator GRAHAM. Right.

Admiral DEBBINK.—the question you're asking, because the question was, Is it 2 months concurrent, consecutive, or cumulative? And I think—you know, Secretary Gates now has said the mobilization period will be 12 months. And then, the goal is to get a 1-to—currently, a 1-to-4 ratio, and eventually a 1-to-5 ratio, so that the soldier would know, 12 months every 4 to 5 years.

Senator WEBB [presiding]. I guess I came in in the middle of this discussion, so I'm not quite sure where it's going.

Let me pick up on a couple of things that I was talking about before, just to begin my questions.

First, Secretary McCarthy, the 2009 National Defense Authorization Act required the Secretary of Defense to submit to Congress a strategic plan to enhance the role of the National Guard and Reserves no later than April 1, 2009. This plan was to include an assessment of the findings of the Commission on the National Guard and Reserves, as well as an assessment of certain legislative proposals, particularly the National Guard Empowerment and State National Defense Integration Act of 2008.

On March 25, 2009, your predecessor testified, quote, "A detailed description of the actions being taken by the Department in response to the recommendations made by the Commission is contained in the report required by Section 906 of the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2009, which will be submitted to Congress next month."

Despite numerous requests for this report, we still have not received it. This report is considered by many to be critical for the Congress to carry out its oversight. Can you tell us where that report is?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Yes, sir. First of all, with regard to the timeliness of the report, I'm absolutely defenseless. I know we are way late. I've signed out a new report, differently, entirely, from the one that was previously prepared, and it is being staffed in the Pentagon right now. And I know that sounds exactly like what Tom Hall said, a year ago. I will tell you, sir, that the Commission on National Guard and Reserve report is, if not my highest priority, it's one of my highest priorities, in terms of implementing it, and implementing it effectively.

And when I looked at the state of our implementation plan, when I arrived in July, I realized that we had not made anywhere near the progress of substantive implementation. We had a lot of process, but we didn't have much substance. And we have worked hard on that. And I think that you will see, when we do get this report to you, that there has been substantive progress on many issues, there's hard work on others, and that we are taking the CNGR report with 100-percent seriousness.

Senator WEBB. Do you know when we're going to receive it?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Sir, I would hope that it will be to you within the month. It is a big, thick report. It's staffing around the Pentagon right now. I checked on it, right before I came over here, and I'm hopeful that we will have it to you within the month.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

For all of the Reserve-component heads, the questions that I asked of the people in the Guard, I would like to reiterate, that we'd like to get some demographic data, as well, on the different Reserve components—percentage prior service, percentage over the age of 40, and percentage of those who were in other-than-organizational billets. General Stultz, you and I had a discussion about that yesterday when you visited. Just to get the demographics of the Guard and Reserve down so that we can have a way to understand the population

General Stultz, what percentage of the Army Reserve has deployed?

General STULTZ. It's a—sir, it's somewhat of a moving target, but right now approximately—if you use the latest figures we have, it's around 50 percent. Now, that sounds like, well, we haven't used half the force, so there's this plethora of people out there. When we take the numbers and say, "Okay, let's look at—of the ones that haven't deployed, where are they?" First and foremost, there's about 14- to 15,000 that are in initial military training; those are the new recruits. There's another 15- to 20,000 that are preparing to deploy; they just haven't gotten there yet. There's another percentage that are in some kind of status, on a medical hold or something else. And it gets down to—there's around 52,000 soldiers that I have in my 208,000 right now that are available and have not deployed.

And, furthermore, when you break that down—and I don't mean to get into too much detail, but we study this all the time, because the question comes up—of that 52,000, 86 percent are E-5 or below. It's a lot of our young soldiers that are new recruits, and they are dispersed throughout the force, so it's not as if I can assemble an MP company or a transportation company out of this 50,000. You know, our force is very seasoned and very used.

And what we have done is, we've arrayed the Army Reserve across a 5-year model to give our soldiers, one, predictability, but, number two, to give the Army predictability about what kind of capacity and capability we can give you each year. The problem is, that's a supply-based system; we're reacting to demand right now, where the demand is higher than the supply.

But, we keep very, very tight control over how many of those soldiers are out there that are available that we have not used.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

General Kelly, would you have a number on that for the Marine Corps?

General KELLY. It's very, very high, sir. I would—first of all, the—all of the battalions and squadrons have been overseas—100 percent. Considering turnover and whatnot—in each one of those units today, 70 percent of the marines have deployed overseas. The ones that haven't, simply because they've just joined the unit and they're just forming on the rotation. So, it's very, very, very high.

Majors and above, virtually 100 percent have gone overseas at least once—many, multiple times—either as individual augments or parts of units. And what we find is, when another unit—as we get ready to deploy someone, we have a great many volunteers that want to switch units, get into that unit to go back over again. So, it's a very, very high percentage. And, frankly, we don't see any strain on the force, the way it's working.

Senator WEBB. Admiral Debbink?

Admiral DEBBINK. Sir, we have approximately 65,671 in the Navy Reserve today. We've deployed over 66,000 mobilizations since September 11. That accounts for about 45,000 sailors. Some have done two, three, and four pumps.

Having said that, with a flow through the force over the last 9 years, we have approximately 26,000 that are available today for mobilization.

Senator WEBB. So, of the total number in the Naval Reserve today, how many have deployed?

Admiral DEBBINK. I'll get back to you on that—

[The information referred to follows:]

Senator WEBB. A snapshot.

Admiral DEBBINK. Yes, sir.

Senator WEBB. Okay.

General Stenner?

General STENNER. Sir, I will also get back with you on the exact numbers.

[The information referred to follows:]

General STENNER. But, I would like to just put a little bit of a context on this one, as well.

We have, on any given day, roughly 7,000 folks on orders; 2600 to 3,000 of those are deployed to the AOR. But, when you look at remotely piloted aircraft, when you look at the command-and-control—there's a lot of deployed in place, folks who are on orders, but they're right here in the CONUS. So, folks who have done their job are the folks who are staying with us, the retention piece; and I'll get you the demographics on how that works out.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

Admiral Stosz?

Admiral STOSZ. Senator, we have our—we have augmentees that augment Active-Duty Coast Guard units. And when they are recalled, they, generally speaking, become part of the total force. Eighty percent of our reservists serve as part of the total force when they're augmented. We do have our port security units that deploy overseas to serve as part of the MSRON; and those units go one at a time, and there's about 120 people in each of those. I'll have to get you the exact figure, sir, on how many Reserves we've deployed overseas in recent years.

[The information referred to follows:]

Senator WEBB. Well, recognizing, at the outset, that each one of these components has its own personality and its own way of conducting operations. I mean, it's—it is a—it's a question that varies, just in terms of the way people use—I fully recognize that, going in. But, I'd be curious to see the data on it.

There's been a lot of discussion about the impact of these multiple deployments on employer relations. I know, General Stultz, you and I had a long discussion about some of the innovations that—putting in place in the Army Reserve. I'm curious to hear thoughts on where this issue is in the other components, and what might be done.

General Kelly, start with you.

General KELLY. Sure. The first program, the Marine For Life Program, is—has proven effective, certainly since General Jones implemented it, some years ago. And other aspects of employer engagement have been very positive. We—in fact, we're all plugging into, now, Jack Stultz's program, in terms of reaching out to employers. So, within the Marine Corps Reserve right now, very little strain, in terms of jobs and employers and that kind of thing.

The one thing that I've learned, that I wasn't aware of before and does concern me, is, as these men and women deploy overseas, the one thing we can't capture—and they don't complain about it, but—

is the opportunity lost. You know, they're overseas when an opening comes up that they would normally at least have the opportunity to bid on, that would raise them up in the company. The companies—the employers can't wait, in many cases, for them to come back, and they're exactly the kind of an employee they'd want to have advanced. And I was not aware of that before. I don't think there's any way to get our arms around that, other than to just hope. And I find this is the case, that the employers are doing the best they can to hold these positions open.

Senator WEBB. Very good.

Admiral?

Admiral DEBBINK. Sir, we believe that our employers remain very supportive of our Navy reservists. We know that over 85 percent of those who deploy return back to their jobs. We hear, anecdotally, about issues and problems; but, every time we drill down into it—and I try to make employer visits in all of my travels—I hear nothing but strong support, provided that, when we employ our reservists, that we're validating the billet that we're sending them to, and that we're giving them real and meaningful work to do, so when they come back, they report back to their employer that, "I was well utilized."

And the other thing that we're trying very hard to do is to stay to a 1-to-5 dwell, because that's also our promise to the sailor, to his family—his or her family—and to the employers.

Senator WEBB. General?

General STENNER. Sir, we've got a very strong employer-relation, family-relations program that goes along with all of our units. We have "Boss Lifts." We have a strong relationship with the Employer Support in Guard and Reserve, Freedom Awards. The anecdotal evidence that we get is that the employers are doing a fantastic job, making up differences in pay, and, in some cases, full pay and allowances for folks who are on orders. It's part of the fabric of how we're doing this Nation's business.

If I was to suggest anything, though, sir, I'd say that the USERRA law, that was created many years ago, wasn't necessarily written for the operational force that we've got right now; it was written for that strategic Reserve. And some of the numbers in there, and some of the nuances—might be helpful if we could take a look at that and perhaps help our employers out in that respect—as well as our military members.

Senator WEBB. Admiral?

Admiral STOSZ. Mr. Chairman, when we recall our Reserves, oftentimes it's for shorter periods of time, as they're integrated in for hurricane relief, or Haiti, or, now, the Deep Horizon—Deepwater Horizon oilspill. So, it's not much of a time that they're gone from their jobs that—the ones that deploy overseas are a smaller percentage. We haven't had a—any problems with our employers, that have come to my level. We, in fact, had 15 of our reservists put in their employers for the Freedom Award last year. So, we do local outreach in our local communities, and our reservists are probably spread far and abroad, more so than most of the other services, to small towns. And we do the smalltown local outreach, and it seems to be working.

Senator WEBB. General Stultz, I didn't mean to overlook you, since we had a long discussion yesterday. But, you've been something of a groundbreaker in this area.

General STULTZ. Yes, sir. The employer program we've—we started out—and, as I mentioned earlier, it's kind of snowballed on us, so now we have included all of the Reserve components as part of that—really has been a success story for us, because what we're finding, and what we have raised to the awareness of the business world, is, we have a treasure of talent, a treasure of talent in the Reserve components, that are drug-free, they're physically fit, they're morally fit, they've been given leadership, they've been given responsibility, they've been given self-confidence. And it's a tremendous workforce out there. And, in a lot of cases, we've given them skill sets that apply in that civilian sector. And so, now the civilian business world is waking up to that and saying, "Wow, we really haven't taken advantage of this workforce out there."

For us, in the military, we can translate those civilian skills back into the military, because, in a lot of cases, if that engineer is working in the civilian workforce, he's probably working state-of-the-art, probably levels higher than the active Army engineer force is working, because they just don't have that same level of technology. Especially, we see that in the medical side.

And so, we're getting that embracing, now, from the civilian workforce of saying, "Let us take advantage of your soldiers. Bring us your talent." And we've got the partnerships with over 1,000 companies now across America who have said, "We want to use the Reserve components as our force of choice for the workforce."

I am a little concerned that, as Charlie Stenner said, what the employers tell me is, "Okay, we want to partner with you, but we need some predictability to run a business." And in today's environment, we have a lot of soldiers who are volunteering for duty. And so, those employers say, "You told me he was only calling—calling him up once every 4 years, but he just came back, and now he's gone again. How can I run a business?" And so, some of those situations, we've got to take a look at. And, as John Kelly said, we're also seeing—I get resignations from officers, every month, that have completed their mandatory service obligation and have decided to get out. And I read each one of those, the individual's statement as to why they're leaving the service. In a lot of cases, it's family issues, it's other things like that, but, in some cases, they're saying, "I don't think I'm going to have the opportunity to reach the level, in my civilian job, if I stay in the Reserve, because of the commitment. I'm going to be taken away and miss opportunities." So, there are still concerns in that—the employer world, of: Are we, in some cases, not maintaining faith with the employers, in terms of our predictability, because of our volunteer situation? And then, second, are we not maintaining faith with our soldiers, in terms of, "They're not going to get, necessarily, all the opportunities in their civilian job?" So, it's not a perfect world.

Senator WEBB. Secretary McCarthy, would you have a—an overarching thought on that?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I'd just second everything that people have said. And I congratulate the Chiefs on this initiative; and Jack, in particular.

But, I think that the world is changing. The idea of a rotationally available Reserve, whether there is a war on or not, or whether there's a hot war on or not, is going to change the way we relate to employers. Everything that we've done, historically, in ESGR, has been about sustaining existing employment relationships. And that's very, very important, and it has to continue.

We have to broaden, though, what we do in this Employer Support of Guard and Reserve to think about creating employment relationships, as well as sustaining the existing ones. And we're focused on that.

As everybody has said, people come back, they have increased skills, they have increased capacity, they have increased confidence, and the job they left may not be the one they want to go back to. Many will come back and take advantage of the GI Bill, improve their education. And again, the job they left may not be the one that they want, because of their new education. And we've got to figure out a way to accommodate that.

I think we also—the only other thing I would say is, I think we also have to understand that, if you want to have a career in this new era of Reserve, that's going to have some influence on what kind of employment. In the days when it was one weekend a month and 2 weeks in the summer, that could be accommodated to just about any kind of employment. A rotationally available force may have to reshape the way they think about their own personal employment if they want to make a career in that sort of a force. And that's going to be a transition force.

Senator GRAHAM. Is there anything—and I don't mean to interrupt, but that's—

Senator WEBB. No, it's your—

Senator GRAHAM.—a good thought.

Senator WEBB.—your turn.

Senator GRAHAM. Is there anything, legally, we can do, in terms of making it—if we're going to go to that model, which makes sense to me, quite frankly, given where we're at and the threats we face, then do we need to adjust our laws?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Sir, there are a number of things that are working their way through the Department's legislative generation process. And I won't get into details, but I do think that there is an area of opportunity for us, relative to healthcare.

One of the things that, for many, many years, we've talked about, in terms of this continuum of service—on-again/off-again sort of service—is maintaining the continuity of family healthcare. And if we can figure out a way to combine what we're doing with TRICARE Reserve Select and employer needs with regard to furnishing healthcare, there may be an opportunity for us to help both employers and Reserve component members. But, the specifics of that are very complicated. There's a lot of people over there working on it. But, I think that that, in the not-too-distant future, may be something that the Department will want to talk to the Congress about.

Senator WEBB. Thank you.

Senator Hagan.

Senator HAGAN. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And thank you for holding this hearing.

And thank all of you.

Under the current law, servicemembers that receive educational assistance in the form of an ROTC scholarship, or that graduate from one of our service academies, are still eligible for full educational benefits under the post-9/11 GI Bill. However, members of the Selected Reserve that received educational assistance under Chapter 1606 of the Montgomery GI Bill prior to receiving a commission and serving on Active Duty are not similarly entitled to 4 years of benefits under the post-9/11 GI Bill.

My question for all of you is, Are the Reserve components concerned that the significant disparity in benefits may dissuade college students who are interested in a commission from participating in the Selected Reserves while attending college?

Mr. McCARTHY. Senator Hagan, I'll just try to take—

Senator HAGAN. Okay.

Mr. McCARTHY.—just very, very generally, and then let the Chiefs hit the specifics.

But, I think that we all recognize that, as we work into the post-9/11 GI Bill, there's probably some adjustments that need to be made. I know that a number of them are being looked at. I'm not familiar with the specific one that you've mentioned, but it sounds like something that we should be, and perhaps are, looking at.

But, I think that, overall, everybody is tremendously pleased with the post-9/11 GI Bill, but we recognize that there are probably some adjustments that need to be made, going forward.

General STULTZ. I'd just speak from the Army's perspective. And I kind of echo what Senator McCarthy said. I don't know the specific details—

Senator HAGAN. Yes.

General STULTZ.—of the situation you're explaining. I do know that the post-9/11 GI Bill has been a huge—

Senator HAGAN. It's huge.

General STULTZ.—benefit. As we conduct townhall meetings, soldiers that—the one they—or, the several things they say is, one, the retirement, they're concerned about that; the education benefits for the—now, for their families, so they see this as enabling them to give something to their families; and the continuum of healthcare. Those are the three big issues that they say—you know, if we can solve those—I think we can pay for a lot of those, because we will not have to pay the retention incentives and some of the other incentives, to the degree that we're paying now, because the incentive for being in the Reserve and staying in the Reserve is going to be education benefits, healthcare benefits, and retirement benefits.

Senator HAGAN. Anybody else, on that particular issue?

I've actually talked to individuals, and I know that our—the post-9/11 GI Bill is generous to a vast majority of servicemembers; and I hear from people, all the time, how pleased they are with the funding that they're getting to go back to school. But, there are certain groups within the armed services that, based upon the programs that they entered through, are not fully served under the legislation that—as it's currently written, despite providing this—these individuals providing the same military service as their counterparts.

I'm actually looking at introducing a bill on this pretty soon which aims to address, I think, just this act of disparity and this issue. So, hopefully we'll be hearing a little bit more about it.

There's also a tremendous cost associated with recruiting and retaining—recruiting and training our servicemembers, which becomes even more pronounced when replacing midgrade noncommissioned and commissioned officers. And, General Stultz, I was wondering, are there statutory or policy changes that can be implemented, with respect to continuum of service, that would make it easier for Reserve-component soldiers to voluntarily serve on Active Duty?

General STULTZ. I think most of it is policy, not statute. But, I think the—and General Debbink can—or, Admiral Debbink—I'm promoting him to the Army side—[Laughter.]

Admiral Debbink and I were talking earlier about this, that the Navy, for instance, in the Naval Reserve and the Active naval component, have come much further than we have, in my opinion, on the Army side, in a continuum of service, where we have made it fairly easy for servicemembers to move from Reserve into the Active Force, but we have not made it as easy for the servicemember to move from the Active back into the Reserve Force.

And one of the things that we're working with Secretary McCarthy's office, and with the G-1, and other personnel in the leadership of the Army is, we truly have to get a continuum of service, where soldiers can flow from Active into the Reserve, to take a knee, into the Inactive Reserve, the IRR, to further take a knee, if they want to, and then be able to have the confidence to flow back into the active Force, if the opportunity is there, because, in some cases, they—there's not a need, and the active Force simply says, "I can't take any more of these." But, if the opportunity is there, to flow back and maintain that continuum of service.

I think the—the other thing that we've discussed, and I know I've talked with Senator Graham about, is in the retirement. I would like to see a system where we reward soldiers who are eligible to retire in the Army Reserve—they have their 20 years of service—but we retain them past that 20 years of service by lowering, eventually, their retirement age, because, again, that is a retention tool that doesn't have an immediate cost. It has a long-term cost, but we retain that talent that we've invested so heavily in.

Currently, with the operational tempo, a soldier gets his 20 years of Active service, he may not be able to draw his retirement for another 25 years, and there's no incentive for him to stay, except that his love of his country and his love of the service. But, he's got to confront that spouse at home and say, you know, "Why are you re-upping when they're not going to give you anything except another deployment?" Somehow, we've got to put something out there.

And when I talk to soldiers about, "What if we rewarded you for staying beyond 20 by lowering your retirement age?" That rings home to them. Now, the caveat I've put on 'em is, selective retention—

Voice: Right. Right.

General STULTZ.—that you may not get to stay as long as you want if you haven't served your country and done your education and physically fit and all the other requirements.

Senator HAGAN. Sure.

General STULTZ. So, "The fact that we may be able to put a carrot at the end of the table here for you, you're going to have to earn it." Senator Hagan: Thank you. And I look forward to continue working with you as your command is relocated to Fort Bragg.

General STULTZ. Yes, ma'am.

Senator WEBB. Thank you, Senator—

Senator HAGAN. Thank you.

Senator WEBB.—Hagan.

Just let me, as the Chair, make a couple of comments.

First, also, as the person who wrote the GI Bill, and then who worked hard with Senator Graham to put some of these other provisions in that the—you know, we know there's places where we need to refine it, but the—there were two original intentions, when it came to the Guard and Reserve components. First of all, was to include them for the first time in a GI Bill. It never happened before. And we've done that. And then, there was a big discussion with respect to ROTC scholarship programs, service academy programs, where the initial period of service was actually a payback for having received an education. So, the question was, Do you double count that first 5 years of Active service for a GI Bill when the education had already been the result of the Federal Treasury? So, that's an issue, it sounds to me, like you were asking a question about here, with the ROTC programs and the Reserve.

Just as a matter of clarification, General Stultz, I don't—I've never heard the IRR termed the "Inactive Ready Reserve."

General STULTZ. Individual.

Senator WEBB. Individual Ready Reserve. I mean, it—I hear this a lot, and I think it's important to—

General STULTZ. Yes, sir.

Senator WEBB.—to clarify it. That's basically a SELRES without it being in a unit. And it led to a question that I wanted to ask both you and General Kelly, and that is, you—what percentage of today's IRR do you consider to be of the physical quality to be deployed?

General STULTZ. Yes, sir, we have come great strides, in terms of getting our hands around the Individual Ready Reserve in the Army. As you may know, the Individual Ready Reserve for the Army does not belong to the Army Reserve, it belongs to the active Army; it's under Human Resources Command for the Army. We help administer the program.

What we started—and it's part of the initiatives that you started, years ago, when—I think, when you were Secretary of the Navy—is, the muster formations. In the past 2 to 3 years—

Senator WEBB. Actually, when I was Assistant Secretary of Defense, we did—

General STULTZ. Yes, sir.

Senator WEBB.—the first callup of the IRR—1-day callups, just to try to get the addresses down and get a physical and get people 1-day pay, travel, and proceed, find out where they are, see if they're actually a mobilizable asset.

General STULTZ. Yes, sir. And we, in the past 2 to 3 years, have really gotten very active in the musters around the country. We've gotten very good results in the muster formations. And so, we have

improved our overall accountability and our overall readiness in the Individual Ready Reserve (IRR), but we've also seen the numbers in the IRR decline significantly as people elected to get out of the IRR, didn't realize they were in the IRR, because they had not resigned their commissions, in some cases. And so, the IRR numbers for the Army Reserve—or, for the Army right now, that we're overseeing, is about 68,000, where it used to be several hundred thousand.

Senator WEBB. Yes.

General STULTZ. And so, those numbers have gone down. But, the individuals that are there, we feel very confident that they're available for service, if needed.

Senator WEBB. General Kelly?

General KELLY. Yes, sir. Senator, the—I have 55,000 in the Marine Corps IRR. They essentially belong to me; I manage them. My Mobilization Command is very aggressive in, as you've described, contacting them periodically, bringing them in for a day. Actually, for what we really need them to come in for, it takes about 20 minutes; and that is, to look at them and make sure they haven't gotten—you know, their hair is not too long, and they haven't grown a beard and put too much weight on.

We use the rest of the day, though, actually, to bring an awful lot of agencies in—the VA and people like that—you know, where they weren't so interested in meeting with these folks of various agencies, they would just—when they decided to get out of the Marine Corps—they were just intent on getting out—as young men and women—just wanting to start something new. When we bring them in for these musters, they're very, very interested, at that point. And, as I say, we bring in various job search agencies—the police, and recruiters, and the—you know, everybody. And we have a very, very high response, and those that come in—the people that do this to—with thousands of these IRR marines every year—as a general rule, they remain in pretty good shape. And, as I say, an awful lot of them do respond.

During the war, we've involuntarily called up 3800. And I think, as of today, there's probably zero. There was a few residual that were getting off. All of them that we called up, in the period starting about 5 years ago, all came to the Colors ready to go, and were in very good shape. And very, very, very few of them did we have to not bring on. They were all candidates to bring back on. Very few of them had any problems with the police or medical or whatever. So, it's a good program. It's a—another part of the IRR, of course, is, when people can't drill anymore, but want to stay associated, affiliated, they'll drop to the IRR; and then periodically we'll go looking for them, and they'll come out of the IRR and go to either individual augments or start drilling again. So, it's kind of an in- and-out thing. Overall, very successful.

Senator WEBB. Good, thank you.

Senator GRAHAM, do you have any—

Senator GRAHAM. Yes. It's been a great hearing. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

One last thought and I'm going to have to run. And y'all been very informative.

Mr. Secretary, this idea of mobilization and the way the law works, apparently the Coast Guard sort of has a different system. I think we need to look long and hard at finding a way to call people in from the Reserves to Active Duty for limited periods of time without presidential consultation, because we're more in an operational mode than ever. So, I would just, you know, challenge the Department to sit down with us and find a way to adjust these laws to make it more flexible for these—for our reservists to be able to be utilized, because, as General Stultz said, that they want to be used if they're going to be trained. And I want to make sure they can be used in a logical way.

And so, I look forward to getting your input as to how to change the law, because I think the law needs to be changed, quite frankly.

Mr. MCCARTHY. We're anxious to work with you on that, sir, because getting access under this new paradigm—

Senator GRAHAM. Right.

Mr. MCCARTHY.—of rotational availability is high on, I think, everybody's priority list.

Senator GRAHAM. Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Senator WEBB. Good. Thank you, Senator Graham.

And I'd like to express my appreciation to all of you for your testimony today, and for the leadership that you are bringing to your different components.

And we may have follow-on questions. The hearing record will be kept open until close of business tomorrow, in case other Senators may have questions for the record.

But, appreciate your testimony and also having had to wait for us today.

[Whereupon, at 11:33 a.m., the subcommittee adjourned.]