

**DOCUMENT RESUME**

00095 - [A0751106]

[Actions Taken or Planned by Departments of Defense and Transportation on Recommendations in June 1975 Report on "Need to Improve Efficiency of Reserve Training"]. FPCD-77-30; B-178205. January 28, 1977. Released February 23, 1977. 7 pp.

Report to Rep. Thomas J. Downey; Rep. Charles A. Vanik; by H. L. Krieger, Director, Federal Personnel and Compensation Div.

Issue Area: Military Preparedness Plans: Military Forces Readiness (805).

Contact: Federal Personnel and Compensation Div.

Budget Function: National Defense: Department of Defense - Military (except procurement & contracts) (051).

Organization Concerned: Department of the Navy; Department of Defense; Department of the Army; Department of the Air Force.

Congressional Relevance: Rep. Thomas J. Downey; Rep. Charles A. Vanik.

Authority: 32 U.S.C. 502(a). 10 U.S.C. 2001.

Some actions have been taken and others planned on 1975 recommendations to improve the efficiency of reserve training. Findings/Conclusions: In a few instances, the Secretaries of Transportation and the Services have reduced training schedules for units with sufficient postmobilization time to upgrade their proficiency or for individual reservists whose military jobs are easy to learn. The services are generally not in favor of reducing scheduled training for units or individual reservists. Actions which have been taken to improve the use of available training time include: reduction of administrative workload on unit commanders, reevaluation and reduction of general military activities, situating high priority units where they can train with essential equipment, and increasing mutual support between the active services and the reserves. (RRS)

00095



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND  
COMPENSATION DIVISION

JAN 28 1977

B-178205

RELEASED

1/23/77

EXEMPTED FROM GDS to be released outside the General  
Accounting Office and the Department of the General  
Accounting Office.

The Honorable Thomas J. Downey  
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Downey:

By joint letter of August 24, 1976, you and Representative Charles A. Vanik requested that we inquire into the actions taken or planned by Departments of Defense and Transportation on the recommendations in our June 1975 report on "Need to Improve Efficiency of Reserve Training" (FPCD-75-134).

We interviewed responsible departmental officials and reviewed policies, directives, and regulations on Reserve training. As agreed with your staff, we did not measure the effect of changes made by the Reserve components.

TAILORING OF TRAINING

The secretaries of Transportation and the Services have, in a few instances, reduced training schedules for (1) units with sufficient postmobilization time to upgrade their proficiency, or (2) individual reservists whose military jobs are easy to learn. The Navy was motivated by funding constraints to increase the number of reservists in reduced training categories. The Air Force Reserve placed additional reservists on a reduced schedule who were not assigned to a unit and did not require a full training program of 48 drills. The following schedule shows the changes during the past two fiscal years:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Fiscal year 1974</u>		<u>Fiscal year 1976</u>	
	<u>Number of reservists</u>		<u>Number of reservists</u>	
	<u>Paid drill status</u>	<u>Reduced training categories</u>	<u>Paid drill status</u>	<u>Reduced training categories</u>
Air Force Reserve	45,930	5,319	47,541	6,884
Air National Guard	89,518	0	89,012	0
Army National Guard	385,115	0	362,773	0
Army Reserve	226,774	0	201,934	0
Coast Guard Reserve	11,618	566	11,670	346
Marine Corps Reserve	23,827	0	26,280	2
Navy Reserve	113,526	2,402	96,463	12,105
Total	<u>896,308</u>	<u>8,287</u>	<u>835,673</u>	<u>19,337</u>

The National Guard components, which comprise about 54 percent of the Reserve forces, are prohibited by law from reducing the scheduled training. Sections 502(a) and 2001, of Titles 32 and 10, respectively, of the U.S. Code, exempt the Army and Air National Guards from having their annual training reduced below 48 drills and 15 days of active duty. Within the past year, the Department of Defense submitted a legislative proposal to provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to prescribe the number of annual paid drills for the National Guard. This proposal was rejected by the four congressional committees to whom it was referred.

The services are generally not in favor of reducing scheduled training for units or individual reservists. Officials contend that reductions for units would be detrimental to their readiness, and reductions for individuals would impair unit training as well as the Reserves' ability to attract and retain reservists. We found no studies that would support the services' contention.

#### USE OF TRAINING TIME

The Departments of Defense and Transportation and the services have taken some actions which should improve the use of available training time. But, the services have not determined whether the Reserve components are using training time more efficiently now than in fiscal year 1974 when we last reviewed it. Some of the actions taken are discussed below.

### Reduction of administrative workload on unit commanders

The services have implemented actions which they believe have reduced the administrative workload on Reserve unit commanders.

Department of Defense representatives stated that a Reserve Component Common Personnel Data System, implemented in July 1974, has eased the administrative workload on unit commanders by about 3 to 5 hours per month.

Reserve officials identified the following actions taken to reduce the administrative workload:

- Upgrading of existing management data information systems.
- Reduction of recordkeeping at the unit level.
- Elimination or consolidation of some reporting requirements.
- Longer periods between inspections.

### Reevaluation of general military activities

Department of Defense representatives stated that they have suggested reductions in general military activities during monthly meetings with service representatives, but have issued no directives requiring reductions. Most of the service representatives claim that general military training has been reduced.

A Coast Guard Reserve official estimated that no more than one percent of a reservist's training time was spent in general military activities. This is a sizeable reduction from the seven to eight percent shown by our prior review. But the official was unable to identify specific actions taken to reduce such training.

Marine Corps Reserve officials believe that much of the general military training is essential. Since our prior review the Marine Corps Reserve has deferred until after mobilization the requirement that reservists receive a minimum of eight hours of classroom traffic safety instruction.

Navy Reserve officials have reduced the number of required general military training sessions from once a month to once a quarter and eliminated the requirement for physical fitness training and reporting. Navy Reserve officials estimated that these changes provided 20 additional hours for official job training annually for each reservist.

An Army representative stated that the Army Reserve and National Guard are instituting the new Army Training and Evaluation Programs, which do not require general military training. An Army National Guard official said that although there are no mandatory requirements some unit commanders may still be providing general military training.

The Air National Guard reported that in 1976, their units had been equipped with a closed circuit television capability which allows professionally produced video tapes to be used for general military training. This method provided a capability to train individuals when available without involving the entire unit.

#### Situating high-priority units

The Department of Defense guidance does not specifically tell the services to situate high-priority units where they can train with essential training equipment. We were told that the Department does not become involved with the geographical assignment of units as this is the services' responsibility.

Reserve officials generally believe that although the stationing of high-priority units where they can train with essential training equipment is desirable, it is not always attainable. It is their contention that Reserve units must be located near adequate recruiting areas, while the location of training areas is dependent on the availability of appropriate training space. We are exploring this matter in a separate review which will address the need for units to be located near high population areas.

It has been the Coast Guard Reserve's position that their reservists are receiving meaningful mission training because of their augmentation training program. Under this program, reservists either stand duty with active service personnel or take over the operation of the active service facility for the weekend. For fiscal year 1976 the Coast Guard Reserve reported that 3.1 million manhours or about 62 percent

of total training time had been spent in augmentation training.

Since our prior review the Coast Guard Reserve collocated 18 additional Reserve units with active service units. As of September 30, 1976, about 73 percent of Coast Guard Reserve units were actually collocated with active units or were located at Reserve centers which augmented one or more nearby active commands.

Marine Corps officials said they considered the availability of training areas when 17 Reserve units were relocated during 1976. As a result, the Marine Corps believes that all of their high-priority deployment combat/ combat-support units are now located as near to training sites as possible. The Marine Corps is also of the opinion that although the lack of closely situated training facilities for some Reserve units is an inconvenience, it does not prevent units from accomplishing their missions.

The Navy believes that generally their high-priority Reserve units are assigned to locations either having, or in close proximity to, the equipment on which they require proficiency. However, they also said this is not always feasible because Reserve units must be located near heavily populated areas because of recruiting needs.

According to the Navy Reserve, some supply, ordnance, security, and medical units have been relocated in order to train with essential equipment. For other units, the Navy Reserve cited the following as some examples of actions taken to insure that units train with essential equipment:

- 87 Reserve centers have or are programmed to receive trainer modules.
- Inland units receive weekend away training at active Navy sites.
- More Reserve units are drilling on a regular basis with their active duty counterpart.

Army Reserve and National Guard representatives said that their units are located where manpower requirements can be met. In lieu of relocating units because they are not able to train with essential training equipment, the Army is working on alternatives such as the following:

- Development of additional weekend training sites;
- Establishment of more equipment concentration sites;
- Development and availability of training devices and simulators.

The Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard believe that because most of their units are located at active Air Force bases and municipal airports, respectively, their units are able to train with mission essential equipment.

Mutual support between the active services and the Reserves

Department of Defense representatives believe the services are working to increase the active service support of the Reserves. The most recent guidance provided to the services was a June 1975 memorandum which directed the Army to study expansion of its affiliation program.

Since our prior report, the services have increased the coordination between Reserve units and active units. Some examples follow:

- The Army increased the number of Reserve component battalions in its affiliation program, from 26 in fiscal year 1974, to 97. The Army is considering expanding the program to include an additional 107 company and detachment size units.
- The Air Force Reserve has increased Reserve participation in the Military Airlift Command Reserve Associate Program, and since June 1975, has implemented four mutual support programs.
- Active Navy fleet weapons systems trainers now operate on a seven-day basis with increased daily operating schedules to provide dedicated training periods for Navy Air Reserve personnel. Previously, these trainers were used by reservists only if available.

We trust that this information will satisfy your request and we plan to meet with your staff to discuss possible questions for the forthcoming authorization hearings.

Sincerely yours,



H. L. Krieger  
Director



1107  
Name as 1176



UNITED STATES GENERAL ACCOUNTING OFFICE  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20548

FEDERAL PERSONNEL AND  
COMPENSATION DIVISION

B-178205

RELEASED

1/23/77

JAN 28 1977

CONFIDENTIAL - Not to be released outside the General Accounting Office without the approval of the Director of the Office of Congressional and Public Affairs

The Honorable Charles A. Vanik  
House of Representatives

Dear Mr. Vanik:

By joint letter of August 24, 1976, you and Representative Thomas J. Downey requested that we inquire into the actions taken or planned by Departments of Defense and Transportation on the recommendations in our June 1975 report on "Need to Improve Efficiency of Reserve Training" (FPCD-75-134).

We interviewed responsible departmental officials and reviewed policies, directives, and regulations on Reserve training. As agreed with your staff, we did not measure the effect of changes made by the Reserve components.

TAILORING OF TRAINING

The secretaries of Transportation and the Services have, in a few instances, reduced training schedules for (1) units with sufficient postmobilization time to upgrade their proficiency, or (2) individual reservists whose military jobs are easy to learn. The Navy was motivated by funding constraints to increase the number of reservists in reduced training categories. The Air Force Reserve placed additional reservists on a reduced schedule who were not assigned to a unit and did not require a full training program of 48 drills. The following schedule shows the changes during the past two fiscal years:

<u>Component</u>	<u>Fiscal year 1974</u>		<u>Fiscal year 1976</u>	
	<u>Number of reservists</u>		<u>Number of reservists</u>	
	<u>Paid</u>	<u>Reduced</u>	<u>Paid</u>	<u>Reduced</u>
	<u>drill</u>	<u>training</u>	<u>drill</u>	<u>training</u>
	<u>status</u>	<u>categories</u>	<u>status</u>	<u>categories</u>
Air Force Reserve	45,930	5,319	47,541	6,880
Air National Guard	89,518	0	89,012	0
Army National Guard	385,115	0	362,773	0
Army Reserve	226,774	0	201,934	0
Coast Guard Reserve	11,618	566	11,670	346
Marine Corps Reserve	23,827	0	26,280	2
Navy Reserve	113,526	2,402	96,463	12,105
<b>Total</b>	<b>896,308</b>	<b>8,287</b>	<b>835,673</b>	<b>19,337</b>

The National Guard components, which comprise about 54 percent of the Reserve forces, are prohibited by law from reducing the scheduled training. Sections 502(a) and 2001, of Titles 32 and 10, respectively, of the U.S. Code, exempt the Army and Air National Guards from having their annual training reduced below 48 drills and 15 days of active duty. Within the past year, the Department of Defense submitted a legislative proposal to provide the Secretary of Defense with the authority to prescribe the number of annual paid drills for the National Guard. This proposal was rejected by the four congressional committees to whom it was referred.

The services are generally not in favor of reducing scheduled training for units or individual reservists. Officials contend that reductions for units would be detrimental to their readiness, and reductions for individuals would impair unit training as well as the Reserves' ability to attract and retain reservists. We found no studies that would support the services' contention.

#### USE OF TRAINING TIME

The Departments of Defense and Transportation and the services have taken some actions which should improve the use of available training time. But, the services have not determined whether the Reserve components are using training time more efficiently now than in fiscal year 1974 when we last reviewed it. Some of the actions taken are discussed below.

### Reduction of administrative workload on unit commanders

The services have implemented actions which they believe have reduced the administrative workload on Reserve unit commanders.

Department of Defense representatives stated that a Reserve Component Common Personnel Data System, implemented in July 1974, has eased the administrative workload on unit commanders by about 3 to 5 hours per month.

Reserve officials identified the following actions taken to reduce the administrative workload:

- Upgrading of existing management data information systems.
- Reduction of recordkeeping at the unit level.
- Elimination or consolidation of some reporting requirements.
- Longer periods between inspections.

### Reevaluation of general military activities

Department of Defense representatives stated that they have suggested reductions in general military activities during monthly meetings with service representatives, but have issued no directives requiring reductions. Most of the service representatives claim that general military training has been reduced.

A Coast Guard Reserve official estimated that no more than one percent of a reservist's training time was spent in general military activities. This is a sizeable reduction from the seven to eight percent shown by our prior review. But the official was unable to identify specific actions taken to reduce such training.

Marine Corps Reserve officials believe that much of the general military training is essential. Since our prior review the Marine Corps Reserve has deferred until after mobilization the requirement that reservists receive a minimum of eight hours of classroom traffic safety instruction.

Navy Reserve officials have reduced the number of required general military training sessions from once a month to once a quarter and eliminated the requirement for physical fitness training and reporting. Navy Reserve officials estimated that these changes provided 20 additional hours for official job training annually for each reservist.

An Army representative stated that the Army Reserve and National Guard are instituting the new Army Training and Evaluation Programs, which do not require general military training. An Army National Guard official said that although there are no mandatory requirements some unit commanders may still be providing general military training.

The Air National Guard reported that in 1976, their units had been equipped with a closed circuit television capability which allows professionally produced video tapes to be used for general military training. This method provided a capability to train individuals when available without involving the entire unit.

#### Situating high-priority units

The Department of Defense guidance does not specifically tell the services to situate high-priority units where they can train with essential training equipment. We were told that the Department does not become involved with the geographical assignment of units as this is the services' responsibility.

Reserve officials generally believe that although the stationing of high-priority units where they can train with essential training equipment is desirable, it is not always attainable. It is their contention that Reserve units must be located near adequate recruiting areas, while the location of training areas is dependent on the availability of appropriate training space. We are exploring this matter in a separate review which will address the need for units to be located near high population areas.

It has been the Coast Guard Reserve's position that their reservists are receiving meaningful mission training because of their augmentation training program. Under this program, reservists either stand duty with active service personnel or take over the operation of the active service facility for the weekend. For fiscal year 1976 the Coast Guard Reserve reported that 3.1 million manhours or about 62 percent

of total training time had been spent in augmentation training.

Since our prior review the Coast Guard Reserve collocated 18 additional Reserve units with active service units. As of September 30, 1976, about 73 percent of Coast Guard Reserve units were actually collocated with active units or were located at Reserve centers which augmented one or more nearby active commands.

Marine Corps officials said they considered the availability of training areas when 17 Reserve units were relocated during 1976. As a result, the Marine Corps believes that all of their high-priority deployment combat/ combat-support units are now located as near to training sites as possible. The Marine Corps is also of the opinion that although the lack of closely situated training facilities for some Reserve units is an inconvenience, it does not prevent units from accomplishing their missions.

The Navy believes that generally their high-priority Reserve units are assigned to locations either having, or in close proximity to, the equipment on which they require proficiency. However, they also said this is not always feasible because Reserve units must be located near heavily populated areas because of recruiting needs.

According to the Navy Reserve, some supply, ordnance, security, and medical units have been relocated in order to train with essential equipment. For other units, the Navy Reserve cited the following as some examples of actions taken to insure that units train with essential equipment:

- 87 Reserve centers have or are programmed to receive trainer modules.
- Inland units receive weekend away training at active Navy sites.
- More Reserve units are drilling on a regular basis with their active duty counterpart.

Army Reserve and National Guard representatives said that their units are located where manpower requirements can be met. In lieu of relocating units because they are not able to train with essential training equipment, the Army is working on alternatives such as the following:

- -Development of additional weekend training sites;
- Establishment of more equipment concentration sites;
- Development and availability of training devices and simulators.

The Air Force Reserve and the Air National Guard believe that because most of their units are located at active Air Force bases and municipal airports, respectively, their units are able to train with mission essential equipment.

Mutual support between the active services and the Reserves

Department of Defense representatives believe the services are working to increase the active service support of the Reserves. The most recent guidance provided to the services was a June 1975 memorandum which directed the Army to study expansion of its affiliation program.

Since our prior report, the services have increased the coordination between Reserve units and active units. Some examples follow:

- The Army increased the number of Reserve component battalions in its affiliation program, from 26 in fiscal year 1974, to 97. The Army is considering expanding the program to include an additional 107 company and detachment size units.
- The Air Force Reserve has increased Reserve participation in the Military Airlift Command Reserve Associate Program, and since June 1975, has implemented four mutual support programs.
- Active Navy fleet weapons systems trainers now operate on a seven-day basis with increased daily operating schedules to provide dedicated training periods for Navy Air Reserve personnel. Previously, these trainers were used by reservists only if available.

We trust that this information will satisfy your request and we plan to meet with your staff to discuss possible questions for the forthcoming authorization hearings.

Sincerely yours,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "H. L. Krieger".

H. L. Krieger  
Director