AD-A192 500

(2)

STUDY PROJECT

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

DTIC FILE COPY

NEW ACTIVE GUARD/RESERVE (AGR) MANNING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD

BY

LIEUTENANT COLONEL FRANCISCO J. ESTRADA, ADA

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

DTIC
ELECTE
APR 29 1988
S D
D

25 MARCH 1988

U.S. ARMY WAR COLLEGE, CARLISLE BARRACKS, PA 17013-5050

88 4 20 012

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO. A192500

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)

New Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) Manning Requirements for the National Guard

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED

Military Studies Program

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s)

LTC Francisco J. Estrada

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, PA 17013-5050

10. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS

Same

12. REPORT DATE

25 March 1988

13. NUMBER OF PAGES

46

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS(if different from Controlling Office)

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)

UNCLASSIFIED

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

With the tremendous growth in the National Guard and the modernization and reorganizations taking place, a heavy responsibility has been placed on the leadership for full-time support. With the current trend of active force end strength reduction and more missions being given to the National Guard, it is imperative to have the proper mix of AGR full-time manning and M-day soldiers. New and sophisticated equipment is being placed in the hands of the Guard and Reserves with increased emphasis on maintenance, training, and readiness. The

DD FORM 1 JAN 73 1473 EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

UNCLASSIFIED

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

AGR full-time support system has grown immensely since its inception in 1979; from an initial 2,000 billets to the now 39,054 spaces authorized by Congress in the 1988 Onmibus Continuing Resolution Bill. Even with this growth, it is difficult to determine the proper mix of AGR and M-day soldiers required in the new high technology organizations of today. High priority missions, new Force Activity Designators (FAD), higher Department of the Army Master Priority List (DAMPL), and Time Phased Deployment Listings (TPFDL), all have great impact on the required full-time manning. This paper will highlight those important aspects required in determining the proper full-time manning. It also points out shortcomings of the present system and will assist in establishment of guidelines for determining the proper mix.

USAWC MILITARY STUDIES PROGRAM PAPER

The views expressed in this paper are those of the author and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Department of Defense or any of its agencies. This document may not be released for open publication until it has been cleared by the appropriate military service or government agency.

NEW ACTIVE GUARD/RESERVE (AGR) MANNING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD

An Individual Study Project

by

Lieutenant Colonel Francisco J. Estrada, ADA

Colonel Gordon Perkins
Project Adviser

DTIC COPY INSPECTED 1

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT A: Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

U.S. Army War College
Carlisle Barracks, Pennsylvania 17013
25 March 1988

Accession For
NTIS CRA&I ☑
DTIC TAB ☐
Unannounced ☐
Justification
By
Distribution /
Availability Codes
Dist
A-1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		ii
LIST OF TABLES		iii
CHAPTER I.	THE AGR FORCE IN THE NATIONAL GUARD	1
	HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF AGR PROGRAMS	1
	The Need for an AGR Force	2
	Origins of the AGR Program	4
	AGR Growth	5
	CHAPTER I ENDNOTES	7
II.	NEW ORGANIZATIONS & NEW MANNING REQUIREMENTS	8
	The ROLAND Battalion (5th BN 200th ADA)	8
	CHAPTER II ENDNOTES	14
III.	The HAWK BATTALIONS	15
	ADA Reorganization for New Mexico	15
	7th Bn 200th ADA (HAWK) NMARNG	15
	Feasibility Study	16
	Working Group Committee	17
	2nd BN 265th ADA (I-HAWK) FLARNG	20
	CHAPTER III ENDNOTES	22
IV.	THE CHAPARRAL BATTALIONS	23
	1st BN 200th ADA (Chap) NMARNG	23
	4th BN 200th ADA (Chap) NMARNG	23
	3rd BN 200th ADA (Chap) NMARNG	24
	2nd Bn 200th ADA (Chap) NMARNG	24
	6th BN 200th ADA (Chap) NMARNG	24
	1st Bn 265th ADA (Chap) FLARNG	25
	3rd Bn (-) 265th ADA (Chap) FLARNG	25
	CHAPTER IV ENDNOTES	27
V.	FULL-TIME SUPPORT (FTS) STAFFING PROCEDURES	28
	Reserve Component Study Group	28
	CHAPTER V ENDNOTES	31
CONCLUSIONS		32
	CONCLUSION ENDNOTES	34
RECOMMENDATIONS		35
BIBLIOGRAPHY		36
APPENDIX		40

ABSTRACT

AUTHOR: Francisco J. Estrada, LTC, ADA

TITLE: Active Guard/Reserve (AGR) Manning Requirements for the National Guard

FORMAT: Individual Study Project

DATE: 25 March 1988 PAGES: 46 CLASSIFICATION: UNCLASS

With the tremendous growth in the National Guard and the modernization and reorganizations taking place, a heavy responsibility has been placed on the leadership for full-time support. With the current trend of active force end strength reduction and more missions being given to the National Guard, it is imperative to have the proper mix of AGR full-time manning and M-day soldiers. New and sophisticated equipment is being placed in the hands of the Guard and Reserves with increased emphasis on maintenance, training, and readiness. The AGR full-time support system has grown immensely since it's inception in 1979; From an initial 2,000 billets to the now 39,054 spaces authorized by Congress in the 1988 Omnibus Continuing Resolution Bill. Even with this growth it is difficult to determine the proper mix of AGR and M-day soldiers required in the new high technology organizations of today. High priority missions, new Force Activity Designators (FAD), higher Department of the Army Master Priority List (DAMPL), and Time Phased Deployment Listings (TPFDL), all have great impact on the required full-time manning. This paper will highlight those important aspects required in determining the proper full-time manning. It also points out shortcomings of the present system and will assist in establishment of guidelines for determining the proper mix.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE PAGE

1 National Guard Full-Time Force (1986-1988). 6

2 Full-Time Manpower Space Requirements for Roland Battalion. 10

3 Full-Time Manning Levels for New Mexico Army National Guard HAWK Battalion 17

4 Full-Time Manning Levels for Chaparral Battalions . .23

NEW ACTIVE GUARD/RESERVE (AGR) MANNING REQUIREMENTS FOR THE NATIONAL GUARD

CHAPTER I

THE AGR FORCE IN THE NATIONAL GUARD

The purpose of this research paper is to determine the most appropriate AGR mix in unit manning models for the Army National Guard in its new expanded role in the Total Force. This will be accomplished by analyzing current National Guard manning models to include the Roland Air Defense Battalion of the New Mexico Army National Guard, the newly activating Hawk missile battalions of the New Mexico and Florida Army National Guard and the reorganization and conversion of M-42 Duster Battalions to Chaparral Battalions of the New Mexico, and Florida Army National Guard. Finally the impact of the future utilization of AGR personnel in the high technology units being reorganized and activated in the National Guard will be addressed.

HISTORICAL PERSPECTIVE OF AGR PROGRAMS

The integral role of the Reserves in our Nation's security is often misinterpreted. Under the Total Force Policy, the National Guard and Reserve forces will be used as the initial and primary augmentation of the Active Forces in the event of mobilization. In many instances, the Active Forces would be unable to accomplish their mission without

Reserve augmentation. The Guard and Reserve today are expected to provide nearly one-half of the total Army's combat power and two-thirds of its combat support, and combat service support structure.[1]

THE NEED FOR AN AGR FORCE

In this climate of increased reliance on the Reserves, Congress identified four specific areas of concern in the existing Reserve program: recruiting the force; administering the force; training the force and organizing and maintaining the force.

With more reliance being placed on the Reserve forces for additional missions due to the active component reductions in end strength, recruiting of well qualified personnel to fill the new expanding roles became a major issue. Yet overall Reserve recruiting and retention was declining. Every Annual Report by the Secretary of Defense from 1973 through 1979 noted a major problem in maintaining a sufficient number of Reserves.[2] This was attributed principally to the elimination of a major incentive for joining the Reserves, the Draft.

With the advent of increasing missions and no additional full-time support, the administration process of organizations became a nightmare. Additional full-time manning was badly needed to meet the demanding requirements of administering maintenance, supply, mess, personnel and other records.

Between 1973 and 1975 a "Total Force Study" was conducted to determine what was needed for actual capabilities to support the new theory of their use. The report identified several major areas of which training and mobilization planning were listed at the top.[3]

In a Comptroller General Report to the Congress in 1979, the Army National Guard had 9.5% full-time support of its total force and the Air National Guard had 25.9% full-time support of its total force. Comparing the readiness of the Army and Air National Guard units, the Air Guard was much more favorable by being 45% fully ready, with the Army Guard only being 6% fully ready.[4]

In December, 1979, as part of Public Law 96-154, the Army Guard's Additive Full-Time Manning (AFTM) program evolved. The objective of this new AGR program was to provide additional full-time personnel to the unit commander to assist in improving training, administration, logistics and maintenance; all the areas in which military technicians (MT) and a small number of Conversion to Full-Time Manning (CFTM) had started earlier in November 1978.[5]

In 1978, MG Ansel M. Stroud Jr., The Adjutant General of Louisiana, requested a study on the Full-Time personnel requirements of Reserve Components. The study identified four levels of manning: present, minimal, adequate and optional.[6] Using recommendations from the Stroud Study, National Guard Bureau (NGB) and Forces Command (FORSCOM) established manning levels at the "adequate" level (4-6 for

company/battery and 6-9 for battalions). The Study also recommended that additional full-time manning be provided NGB to quantify readiness improvements in units.[7]

The cost savings in converting Military Technicians (MT), the current support force of the Reserve, to AGR status had already been determined by the Defense Manpower Commission (DMC) Study of 1976 and the Reserve Compensation System Study (RCSS) of 1978. The DMC reported that military technicians could be replaced by active duty Guardsmen at a considerable cost savings ($270 Million in FY75 dollars). The RCSS reported no significant differences between the cost of AC military in a full-time support role and the civilian MT force.[8]

Origins of the AGR Program

The first congressional step in the creation of the AGR program was the Department of Defense appropriation Authorization Act of 1979.[9] After acknowledging the need to increase the active-duty manpower strengths, The Office of the Secretary of Defense directed the Army National Guard and the Army Reserve to increase their full-time strength. Congress approved an increase in the active-duty end-strength of the Army that exceeded the Administration's request. The higher authorization included provision for 2,000 of the 4,100 Reserve recruiters then serving on special active duty for training.[10]

The following year, this new category, the Active Guard/Reserve program, was confirmed in the Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1980. The House Committee on Armed Services described the new provision in the following terms:

> For the first time, and at the direction of the statement of the managers in last year's conference report on the Defense authorization legislation, there is a separate authorization for Reserve component members serving on full-time active duty for the purpose of organizing, administering, recruiting, instruction, or training the reserve forces. The category essentially encompasses all full-time support personnel of the Reserve components who are paid from reserve appropriations. It does not include civilians providing full-time support.[11]

AGR Growth

The phenomenal growth of AGR personnel strength from 1980 to 1988 has resulted in a force that makes it possible to fulfill commitments and give credibility to deterrence. As the Honorable Edwin Meese III, U.S. Attorney General, stated recently "Today, as perhaps never before in a peace time situation, the National Guard is manned, equipped, trained and counted on as an integral and vital part of our total military force".[12] Since the beginning of the AGR Full-Time Manning program the AGR force in the National Guard has grown to over 25,129 for the Army National Guard (ARNG) and 7,631 for the Air National Guard (ANG). The table below indicates the Guard's Full-Time Force:

Table 1

	FY 86 Strength	FY 87 Strength	FY 88 Request	87 to 88 Growth
ARNG				
TOTAL PAID	446,872	452,681	458,800	6,119
DRILL	423,026	427,621	432,411	4,790
AGR	23,846	25,060	26,389	1,329
TECHNICIANS	27,376	27,129	27,620	491
ANG				
TOTAL PAID	112,592	113,419	116,700	3,271
DRILL	105,494	105,798	108,794	2,996
AGR	7,098	7,631	7,906	275
TECHNICIAN	22,491	23,221	23,252	31

The National Guard (NG) had requested an increase of 1,329 AGR full-time manning for FY88 while the Reserve has sought a boost of 1,843. Congress, however, limited the increase to 664 for the Guard and 921 for the Reserve. The increase in AGR strength to 39,054 was authorized by Congress in the 1988 Omnibus Continuing Resolution Bill.[13]

With the advent of sophisticated high technology weapon systems coming into the NG along with force structure changes, new units, new equipment and increased demands in mission training with CAPSTONE and ROUND-OUT organizations, requires continued growth in both drill strength and AGR full-time manning support. "If we accept such missions without the resources to accomplish them, we may be programming ourselves for failure--a failure that could have been a success except for scarce resources."[14]

CHAPTER I ENDNOTE

1. Thomas F. England Maj., The Active Guard/Reserve Program: A New Military Personnel Status, U.S. Army Jag., 1984 p.7.

2. Ibid., p.8.

3. Department of Defense, Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense on Reserve Forces, FY75, p.10

4. Wayman D. Robertson LTC., The Importance of Full-Time Manning in the Army National Guard, p.11.

5. Joseph Galioto Col, "in Search of An Identity" National Guard, Jan, 1988, p.23.

6. Ansel M. Stroud MG., Study on the Full-Time Personnel Requirement of the Reserve Components, Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Army for Reserve Affairs, 31 Dec. 1977.

7. Ibid.

8. Reserve Compensation System Study (RCSS), U.S. Department of Defense. Deputy Assistant Secretary Reserve Affairs. 30 June 1978, p. VIII 10 & 21, also Galioto, p.21

9. U.S. Laws, Statutes, Etc., Public Law 95-485.

10. England, p.10-11.

11. H.R. Rep. No. 166, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. 121 (1979).

12. "What They Said", National Guard, December 1987, p.22.

13. Larry Carney, "Active Guard Reserve to ADD 1,585 Positions", Army Times, 25 Jan. 1988, p.18.

14. Lavern E. Weber LTG. (Ret), "Growth in the Guard's Full-Time Force", National Guard, January 1988, p.12.

CHAPTER II

NEW ORGANIZATIONS AND NEW MANNING REQUIREMENTS

The ROLAND Battalion (5th BN 200th ADA)

In August 1982, the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans (DCSOPS), proposed in the FY 84-88 Program Objective Memorandum (POM) the allocation of the Roland Battalion to the Army National Guard.[1] This was initially proposed due to the termination of the Roland program for the Active Forces and the availability of one battalion worth of the new Air Defense weapon systems coming from the contractors Boeing and Hughes which had already been procured. It was not feasible for the Active Component (AC) to field this battalion due to foreseeable personnel turbulence and cost of retraining the new Military Occupational Specialties (MOS's).

Evaluation of the proposal by the DCSOPS regarding Roland to the Army National Guard (ARNG), indicated a number of advantages in addition to manpower savings for the AC:

- It solved a potentially serious personnel rotational base problem by removing from the active establishment difficulties inherent in the fielding of a one battalion force with unique military occupational specialty requirements.

- It solved a training/retraining problem for the Active Army by eliminating a need to retrain Roland cadre returning from alternate non-Roland assignments.

- This gave the National Guard a modern system with a high visibility mission.

The Army National Guard (ARNG) accepted the Roland battalion with the understanding that the Army was committed to fully support this activation. "There is no precedent in the recent history of the ARNG for the introduction of a modern weapons system, e.g. Roland, that had not previously been fielded by the Active Army. Consequently, this fact, coupled with the one-of-a-kind nature of the Roland battalion, generates understandable concern for determining as much as possible about the total implications related to the acceptance of this unique unit".[2]

In June 1982, the DCSOPS tasked the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), Department of Army Readiness Command (DARCOM), and Forces Command (FORSCOM) to evaluate the feasibility and supportability of this proposal. The tasking included all aspects of the concept involving training, personnel, operational readiness, unit Rapid Deployment Force (RDF) mission availability, procurement, logistics, and facilities. It was envisioned that the Roland Battalion would have a RDF mission.[3]

Based on guidance received from the Active Army, concerning the projected mission(s) of the Roland Battalion a high level of AGR full-time manning was developed for this

unique, one-of-a-kind unit. On 8 July 1982, the Training and Doctrine Command (TRADOC), recommended 100% full time manning at Authorized Level of Organization (ALO) one (1). As a result of a Roland Battalion Table of Organization and Equipment (TOE) review conducted 28-30 September 1982, at Ft. Bliss, Tx, a full time manning level of 78% (308 AGR out of 394 authorized fill) was agreed upon. Those present at the review included representatives from the Army Air Defense School, The National Guard Bureau, and the New Mexico Army National Guard. It should be noted that no other Army National Guard unit is manned at so high a full time manpower level. The basis for this level rests primarily on projected mission requirements and the technical/training aspects of the Roland system.[4]

Based on the recommendations from the TOE review conducted at Ft. Bliss, Tx., NGB requested the 308 AGR full-time manning billets and 22 Military Technicians to support the Direct Support Maintenance at the Maintenance and Training Equipment Site (MATES). The table below summarized the manpower end-strength requirements for the successive FYs indicated:[5]

Table 2

Full-Time Manpower Space Requirements

	FY83	FY84	FY85
Total	31	330	330
AGR	21	308	308
MT*	10	22	22

* Military Technician

The Department of the Army assigned its first and only Roland Air Defense Battalion to the New Mexico Army National Guard (NMARNG). The assignment of this battalion to the NMARNG, with the requirement to retain approximately 80% of its personnel on a full-time basis, plus its "-one-of-a-kind" uniqueness, required some additional functions and grade structure increases not normally found in a comparable Active Army Air Defense organization. This paper will also examine aspects that were unique to this battalion as compared to standard Army Doctrine for air defense units: 1) Increasing the grade structure of some key positions to enhance the Army National Guard's ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel, 2) establishing a personnel records section to maintain the ARNG personnel records for all personnel to include Full Time Manning (FTM) and non FTM members and 3) developing a training section to provide training for newly recruited operators and organizational maintenance personnel which the active army could not provide after the Initial Operation Capability (IOC) date.

Due to the battalions RDF mission and high Department of Army Master Priority List (DAMPL) priority, the unit was immediately required to maintain a constant high state of readiness and proficiency. Initially a total of 308 AGR personnel were required to meet all contingency plans and to maintain full proficiency. With the introduction of the Intermediate Maintenance Platoon (IMP) for logistical support and maintenance, 28 additional AGR personnel were

added to the TOE for a total of 336 AGR full-time manning and 113 Inactive Duty for Training (IDT) soldiers. This brought the MTOE for the battalion to 449 personnel.

To enhance the NMARNG ability to recruit and retain qualified personnel in this unique organization, several positions were upgraded other than that specified in AR 611-201. Specifically they were: NBC NCO, MOS 54E30, E-6 rather than E-5; 16G personnel in Roland squads: 27 E-6 squad leaders rather than E-5; 27 E-5 senior gunners rather than E-4 and 27 E-5 gunner/drivers rather than E-4. The Roland systems mechanics were also upgraded from E-7 for the seven (7) Roland mechanics in each battery for a total of six E-8s and 21 E-7s in the three firing batteries of the battalion.[6]

A Personnel Records Section was also authorized which consisted of one Warrant Officer, Unit Personnel Technician, SSI 771A, one SSG Personnel Senior Sergeant, MOS 75Z30, two SP5 Personnel Records Spec., MOS 75D20, and one SP4 Finance Spec., Mos 73C10, all on AGR status.

The fielding of only one Roland battalion introduced unusual training and proficiency requirements. A subjective review of the requirements suggested that the least costly approach was for the NMARNG to train its own soldiers. A Combat Proficiency Training Section was added to train personnel recruited and assigned to the battalion as replacements and to maintain proficiency training. This section is composed of two E-7 field proficiency trainers

16G40 MOS to train Roland operators and two E-7 field proficiency trainers 24S40 MOS to train maintenance personnel. Due to the battalions Rapid Deployment Force mission and high DAMPL priority, it was imperative to maintain a high level of training proficiency for this sophisticated high technology missile unit.[7]

The 5th Battalion (Roland), 200th Air Defense Artillery of the New Mexico Army National Guard, added another chapter to its history as it became certified operationally ready. Their new status was made official in ceremonies conducted December 20 at McGregor Range, New Mexico, When MG Edward D. Baca, The Adjutant General of the State of New Mexico and MG Donald R. Infante, Fort Bliss Commanding General, signed the documents declaring 5/200 "Operational Capable".[8] "What a great day this is for the Total Army" said MG Infante. He lauded their accomplishments, citing such examples as an outstanding operational readiness rate, a caring attitude and an esprit that is evident. "If the Total Army wants to know what readiness is, what the epitome is, then they have to come to McGregor Range and look at 5th Battalion, 200th ADA."[9]

CHAPTER II ENDNOTES

1. Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, Roland to the Army National Guard, Ltr. dtd. 3 Aug 1982.

2. Director Army National Guard, Roland to the Army National Guard, Memorandum for Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, dtd. 25 Aug 1982.

3. Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, Roland for the National Guard, Msg. CDSN USA736, dtd. R 222232Z Jun 1982.

4. Deputy Director Army National Guard, Roland to the Army National Guard, Memorandum for Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, dtd. 8 Nov. 1982.

5. Director Army National Guard, Request for Additional Full-Time Manpower to Support Roland--DECISION MEMORANDUM, Memorandum for Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, dtd. 29 Nov. 1982.

6. TOE 44465L000, Air Defense Artillery Battalion (Roland), Executive Summary, Oct. 1985.

7. Francisco J. Estrada LTC., New Mexico's New Roland Battalion, 10 March 1983, p.4.

8. Jim Tice, "Roland Battalion Certified to Perform Mission", Army Times, Jan 1986.

9. Bill Darrah MSG., "200th ADA 1st with Roland Missile System", Monitor, Dec. 1985.

CHAPTER III

THE HAWK BATTALIONS

ADA Reorganization for New Mexico
7th Bn 200th ADA (HAWK) NMARNG

In October 1985, the Vice Chief of Staff of the Army (VCSA), directed the Air Defense force structure in the NMARNG to:[1]

- One Roland Bn. (5-200) - No Change
- Four Chaparral BN (1-4-200) conversion
- One Hawk Bn. (7-200), EDATE 870616 - Activation

During the Hawk In Process Review (IPR) at Redstone Arsenal held 1-3 Oct 1985, representatives of the National Guard Bureau's Manpower Division reiterated their previous recommended full-time manning levels for the 7-200 Hawk Battalion. The manning levels were established at 18% based on visits by the NGB manpower personnel to a Reserve Marine Corps Battalion in California and established Full-Time Unit Support (FTUS) criteria. The 18% FTM levels equated to a requirement of 56 total maintenance positions.[2] The initial FTUS was recommended at 16-18% level based upon:[3]

- Established FTUS criteria for existing units
- Established maintenance requirements
- NGB ARM-R visit to USMCR unit
- FTUS Philosophy:
  FTUS is intended to permit accomplishment of routine daily functions in operations, training, supply and personnel.

New unit manning should not be greater than existing units with similar requirements.

"Mix-of-the-force" Guidelines should be maintained.

Feasibility Manning Study

In May 1985 The Adjutant General of New Mexico was concerned about the capability of being able to field and sustain such a high technology unit with such a low number of full-time personnel. At that time he requested a feasibility study to determine the required manpower to field a hawk battalion with a mission such as the one proposed for this battalion.[4]

The Directorate of Training and Doctrine at the United States Army Air Defense Artillery School (USAADASCH) conducted the study as requested and the following recommendations/alternatives were made and endorsed by the Commanding General of Ft. Bliss, Tx.[5]

- Alternative 1 (Column A at Table 3) established a level of 324 spaces which is 58.7% of TOE authorized strength. This recommendation imposed a moderate risk to mission accomplishment.

- Alternative 2 (Column B at Table 3) established a level of 446 spaces which is 80.7% of TOE authorized strength. This recommendation imposed a minimum risk to mission accomplishment. A complete comprehensive listing of Table 3 will be found at appendix.

Table 3

Proposed FTM Levels for the NMARNG Hawk Bn

	Alternative 1 Moderate Risk	Alternative 2 Minimum Risk
TOTAL	324	446
% OF TOE	58.7%	80.7%

During the IPR held at Redstone on 1-3 October 1985, a mission statement prepared by DA DCSOPS was presented that established the mobilization mission for the Hawk Battalion. A review was conducted by United States Army Ordnance Missile and Munitions Center and School (USAOMMCS) to access the capability of the DS Maintenance Company to adequately support the mission. The assessment determined the manning levels as established for peacetime support were inadequate to achieve and maintain the required readiness posture. Therefore, based on that assessment the USAOMMCS could not support the NGB's full-time manning level for the 804th Ordnance Company (DS) (HAWK). The USAOMMCS recommended full-time manning levels be increased to 100% of the TOE authorizations for MOS's 24H, 24J, 24K, 24L, 24V, 223BV, and a commensurate level for the remaining MOS's prior to achieving Initial Operational Capability (IOC). [6]

Working Group Committee

A Working Group (WG) was assembled in the Office of the Directorate of Reserve Components (DRC) Ft. Bliss Tx. in

December 1985. Extensive discussions were held regarding equipment, training, fielding and manpower requirements for the Hawk Battalion. Fundamental to the discussion was the assumption that the unit would have a Rapid Deployment Force mission. In the final analysis this mission was the primary determinate for the full-time manning recommendation.

National Guard Bureau Manpower Branch visited USAADSCH and an active component Hawk unit at Ft. Bliss, Texas to validate currently accepted requirements. Essential finding were:[7]

- Hawk system is in fact technologically demanding and maintenance intensive.

- Mission dictated level of training expertise and system complexity is a critical FTM determinate.

- Given the assigned RDF mission, the degree of risk to the mission can be measured by the levels of personnel training and mission-critical equipment readiness.

During the WG discussion at FT. Bliss, third and forth alternatives/recommendations were presented to NGB for consideration:[8]

- Alternative 1-Recognized requirements at "minimum acceptable" 58% level (324 positions).
- Alternative 2-Recognized requirements at "Preferred" 80% level (446 positions).
- Alternative 3-Recognized requirements at 53.6% (284 AGR, 16 Military Technicians).

- Alternative 4-Use of Active Duty Title 10 soldiers to fill full-time requirements.

The final recommendation from the WG was to go with alternative 3, manning requirements at 53.6% (284 AGR, 16MT positions). The rational behind the selection was:[9]

- Continued adamant opposition to lower levels of manning.

- Probable recommendation from fielding agency to terminate Hawk to the Guard if manning level was not increased.

-Provides minimum manpower impact consistent with modified FTUS criteria.

-Will permit fielding of majority of Hawk specific personnel from full-time personnel and provide the nucleus for round-out by the M-day soldier.

-Will provide means to establish experiential data from which increases or decreases to manning levels may be made as appropriate.

In early January 1986, the NMARNG requested additional full-time manning through a Program Development Incremental Package (PDIP). Reflected below is the original PDIP information developed by NGB personnel on 15 January 1986.[10]

POSITION DISTRIBUTION BY CATEGORY

	HHB	A	B	C	DS	GS	TOTAL
AGR	71	71	71	71	30	0	314
MT	4*	4*	4*	4*	0	10**	26
M-DAY	104	50	50	50	176	0	430
TOTAL	179	125	125	125	206	10	760

* IN SUPPORT OF THE BN AT ORGANIZATIONAL MAINTENANCE SHOP
** IN SUPPORT OF THE BN AT COMBINED SUPPORT MAINT. SHOP

PROJECTED RESOURCE PHASING

	FY86	FY87(1st)	FY87(2nd)	FY88	TOTAL
AGR	112	65	65	72	314
MT	10	8	5	3	26
TOTAL	122	73	70	75	340

As of this writing the 7th Battalion (Hawk) 200th ADA of the New Mexico Army National Guard had been authorized 210 AGR positions and were awaiting release of an additional 104 AGR positions for FY88. According to the Support Personnel Manager for the NMARNG, the 26 MT maintenance personnel had not been authorized and of the 314 total authorizations, 45 would be going to the 804th Ordnance Company.[11]

The activation of the battalion has been hampered by the slow down in AGR accessions and the ability to get the personnel trained. In May 1986, DA made a proposal to NGB for the utilization of active component personnel for 7-200 ADA (Hawk).[12] The proposal was the use of active component positions being offered by DA to support the fielding of the 7-200. The soldiers would be available in E-5 and above positions and in Hawk specific MOS's and SSI's. The active component positions offered by DA to support the fielding of the 7-200 ADA were in addition to the 48% AGR/FTM manning levels approved by NGB. This proposal was ultimately rejected because of projected MOS shortages in the active component air defense personnel structure at the time of the activation of the two battalions.

2nd Bn 265TH ADA (I-HAWK) FLORIDA ARMY NATIONAL GUARD

The 2nd Bn-265th ADA (I-Hawk) of the Florida Army National Guard (FLARNG) is scheduled for EDATE on 1 Oct 89.

It will comprise a HHB, A,B, and C batteries and a 265th Maint Co. This new battalion will be under the same MTOE as the 7th BN 200th ADA in New Mexico and has been authorized the same FTM (314) as was the 7-200 BN. The 2-265th like the 7-200th will have a high priority mission and with all the "high technology" equipment, will require a high degree of FTM to ensure readiness and proficiency with the equipment. The 2-265th will follow the projected time schedule by which the NGB will provide FTM support:[13]

		AGR RESOURCES			
ORGANIZATION	AUTH	FY88	FY89	FY90	FY91
2-265TH ADA BN (I HAWK)	314		90	180	44
HQS BTRY	72				
3-FIRING BTRYS	63EA				
MAINT CO	53				

CHAPTER III ENDNOTES

1. Chief of National Guard Bureau, "NMARNG Reorganization Plan", Msg. NBR-0BD1-005698, dtd. 241806Z Oct. 1985.

2. The Adjutant General of New Mexico, Recommended Full-Time Manning Levels, Ltr. dtd. 23 Oct. 1985.

3. Nippell, G. D. Maj, "Trip Report on Site/Information Visit to the Office of the Air Defense Proponent (OADAP)", 11 Dec. 1985.

4. The Adjutant General of New Mexico, Full-Time Manning Levels for the NMARNG Hawk Battalion, Ltr. dtd. 15 May 1985.

5. Director of Training and Doctrine, Full-Time Manning Levels for the NMARNG Hawk Battalion, Ft. Bliss, Tx., 12 Jul. 1985.

6. U.S. Army Ordnance Missile and Munitions Center and School, AGR Full-Time Manning for 7-200 ADA Bn (Hawk) and 804th Ordnance Company (DS) (Hawk), Ltr. dtd. 4 Mar. 1986.

7. Director of Reserve Components (DRC), Working Group on Hawk Battalion for the NMARNG, Ft. Bliss, Tx., 11 Dec. 1985.

8. Ibid.

9. Ibid., p.8.

10. National Guard Bureau Manpower Division, Hawk Battalion PDIP Support Information, Msg. RPEEAADD 5544, dtd. 18 Oct 1986.

11. Interview with Ruby Gonzales, CW2, Support Personnel Management Office, NMARNG, Santa Fe: 18 Dec. 1987.

12. The Adjutant General NMARNG Utilization of Title 10 Personnel for 7-200 ADA (Hawk), NMARNG, Msg. NBR-0A61-00B14C, dtd. 291400Z May 1986.

13. Florida Army National Guard, Florida Air Defense Artillery Concept Plan, dtd. 1 Sept. 1987.

CHAPTER IV

THE CHAPARRAL BATTALIONS

1st Bn 200th ADA (Chaparral) NMARNG
4th Bn-200th ADA (Chaparral) NMARNG

The 1-200th and 4-200th ADA BN's of the NMARNG have completed EDATE and are to complete Initial Operational Capability in FY88 and FY89. These are Echelon Above Division (EAD) units and are to provide air defense of the Corps Area. These two ADA battalions are not the norm in that they are pure Chaparral instead of the Chaparral/Vulcan Mix found in TOE 44-325 (for heavy divisions), and TOE 44-725 (Non-Divisional).

These units do not have high priority missions with less than M+30 and consequently have been given full-time manning in consonance with the FTUS Staffing Criteria established by NGB.[1] The following table shows the FTM for a MTOE: 44445LNG00, ADA BN (CHAP/CORPS W/STRENGTH:479).

Table 4

GRADE	DESCRIPTION	SSI/MOS	REQ
04	S3/XO	14B00	1**
03	S1/ASST S3	14B41	1
03	S4	14B92	1***
E8	OPNS SGT	16Z50	1
E7	BN SUPPLY SGT	76Y40	1
E7	PAC SUPERVISOR	75Z40	1
E6	NBC NCO	54E30	1
E6	PSNCO	75B30	1
E6	PROPERTY BK NCO	76Y30	1
E5	PERS ADMIN SPEC	75B20	1
E4	PERS ADMIN SPEC	75B10	1

E3	PERS ADMIN SPEC	75B10	1
E4	LEGAL SPEC	75D10	1
E4	CLERK TYPIST	71L10	1
E4	OPNS ASSIST	16H10	1

HHB

E7	TRAINING NCO		1*
E6	SUPPLY SGT	76Y30	1
E5	TRAINING NCO		1
E4	ARMORER	76Y20	1

ADA BTRY (3)

E7	TRAINING NCO		3*
E6	SUPPLY SGT	76Y30	3
E5	TRAINING NCO		3*
E4	ARMORER	76Y10	3

* Unit Training Officer and NCO MTOE positions will be designated by the unit commander and reported through channels to NGB-ARM-R for documentation.

** S3 Officer requirement may be filled by XO; in that case, the S1 requirement will be filled by the Assistant S3.

*** S4 required as PBO only when Battalion is not supported by Automated Supply System.

3rd Bn 200th ADA (Chaparral) NMARNG converting FY88
2nd Bn 200th ADA (Chaparral) NMARNG converting FY89
6th Bn 200th ADA (Chaparral) NMARNG activating FY90

The 3-200th and 2-200th battalions scheduled for conversion from the antiquated M-42 Dusters to the Chaparral weapon systems will have the same FTM authorizations as the previously converted battalions. The full-time personnel currently in place with the Duster battalions will become MOS qualified in the Chaparral peculiar MOS structure and remain after the conversion process. The 6-200th ADA, a new activating battalion with a EDATE of 16 Jan 90 has already hired 15 of the authorized 31 in order to have the soldiers

MOS qualified to receive, train, and maintain the equipment.[2]

1st Bn 265th ADA (Chaparral) FLARNG
3rd Bn (-) 265th ADA (Chaparral) FLARNG

1st Bn 265th ADA will change weapons systems from M-42 Duster to Chaparral, EDATE 1 Oct 89, but will not relinquish their ADA wartime mission with the 42nd IN. Div. Therefore, the battalion must maintain operational mission capability until relieved from it's CAPSTONE mission relationship with the 42nd IN. Div. A CAPSTONE mission change is expected to occur on 1 Oct 89 which would include a second trace as a Corps Asset, assuming the equipment is on hand and the assigned personnel are MOS qualified.[3]

The 3rd Bn (-) 265th ADA has an EDATE of 1 Sep 89 with an aggregate strength of 213. This unit will have the following FTM personnel: BN HQ-(9 AGR), HHB-(5 AGR), A Btry-(7 AGR). The filling of these required personnel must be done in sufficient time to allow the personnel to become MOS qualified in their new MTOE occupational specialty.

The manning requirements for the 1-265th and 3-265th FLARNG, were also derived from the FTUS Staffing Criteria from NGB with the exception of six AGR personnel per battery instead of the traditional four.[4] The two additional positions are for missile equipment maintainers. They are one(1) 24N Chaparral Missile Mechanic, and one(1) 224B

Chaparral Missile Warrant. Two(2) 27G Senior Chaparral Mechanics are also included in the HHB (BN).

The new ADA units being organized would not be considered deployable until they achieve certification and Initial Operational Capable. If mobilization should occur prior to these units achieving the deployable criteria, the units would move to a mobilization station, receive required additional equipment, and accelerated training with an objective of being validated for deployment. It is envisioned that the units would need a maximum of 60 days to be validated for deployment. The training time needed would be reduced as the units get closer to their official organization date.[5]

CHAPTER IV ENDNOTES

1. National Guard Bureau Manpower Division, FTUS STAFFING CRITERIA, dtd. 21 May 86.

2. Support Personnel Management Office, NMARNG, AGR Full Time Positions, Office of Military Affairs, NMARNG dtd. 30 Nov. 1987.

3. Florida Army National Guard, Florida Air Defense Artillery Concept Plan, dtd. 1 Sept. 1987.

4. Ibid.

5. Ibid. p. F-1.

CHAPTER V

FULL-TIME SUPPORT (FTS) PROGRAM STAFFING PROCEDURES

Reserve Component Study Group

In November 1983, the Director of the Army staff approved the recommendations submitted by the RC Management Study Group for staffing.[1] The VCSA had already approved the recommendations on September 1983, and the recommendations were to be incorporated into Army Regulations and staffed with appropriate commands and Army staff agencies. The Deputy Chief of Staff Personnel (DCSPER) assumed overall personnel management responsibility for RC Full-Time personnel and the Deputy Chief of Staff Operations (DCSOPS) assumed overall responsibility for determining RC Full-Time Support (FTS) requirements.

The study group methodology for developing a new model provided for a standardized base manning level geared to type unit and readiness requirements with "local tailoring" by NGB/FORSCOM for differences in unit authorized strength, location, CAPSTONE alignment, and mission. The model would include standard positions for like type units and provide for some tailoring by NGB to meet specific unit needs.

In January 1984, a work plan was developed to establish a rational model for FTM and reconcile differences in FORSCOM/NGB models before FY85 budget hearing. During this time frame, FORSCOM anticipated completing the FTM

requirements models for Guard and Reserve units in August 1984.[2] NGB at this time had already developed a model but DCSOPS wanted 'a rational base model and a capacity to explain differences".[3]

In an information paper by Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans on reconciliation of Guard and Reserve Full-Time Unit Support (FTUS) Models the following main issues were observed:[4]

- Striking similarities exist between Guard and Reserve models.

- The only major remaining difference between Guard and Reserve FTUS manning models is the treatment of unit maintenance personnel.

- FORSCOM wants maintenance positions in the models, while NGB prefers to use Military Technicians (MT) assigned to facility TDAs in lieu of AGR in FTUS positions.

- Office of The Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, recommended reconciliation include maintenance positions in the FTUS model. This will allow Staffing by either AGR or MT and would permit the future attrition of MT, if desired.

In September 1984, the ODCSOPS published the Full-Time Support (FTS) Program Staffing Procedures to be utilized by NGB and FORSCOM in their development of unit staffing guides. The concept was for staffing guides to identify ARNG positions which may require FTM and not to act as manning documents. The FTS requirements information was to be maintained in an automated data base and unit staffing guided would be updated annually.[5] Of particular interest in the program staffing procedures was the issue of flexibility. To permit flexibility in tailoring FTS

requirements for specific unit need, FORSCOM and NGB could grant exceptions to their FTS staffing guides. These exceptions are as follows:[6]

- Exceptions will be based on unique unit considerations such as; new and special equipment, unit conversions, high technology, geographic distribution, CAPSTONE relationships, proximity to support/training facilities, and other considerations deemed appropriate by the Commander.

- Exceptions will not exceed 10% of the total FTS positions on the unit staffing guide or one position per unit whichever is greater.

- Requests for exceptions in excess of 10% will require HQDA (ODCSOPS) approval and will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

As of this writing HQDA is in the process of reviewing and revising all HQDA FTUS staffing criteria to include revision of the letter of instruction dated 14 Sept 1984, subject: FTS Program Staffing Procedures.[7]

CHAPTER V ENDNOTES

1. Office of the Chief of Staff, Reserve Component (RC) Management, Action Memorandum for DCSPER dtd. 18 Nov. 1983.

2. Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training, Develop a Rational Model for FTM and Reconcile Differences in FORSCOM/NGB Models Before FY85 Budget Hearing, Talking Paper for ADCSOPS, dtd. 16 Jan. 1984.

3. Ibid.

4. Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Training, Reconciliation of Guard and Reserve Full Time Unit Support Models, Information Paper, dtd. 3 July 1984.

5. Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, Full-Time Support (FTS) Program Staffing Procedures, Ltr. ODCSOPS, dtd. 14 Sept. 1984.

6. Ibid.

7. Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, Full-Time Support Staffing Criteria/Model Review, Msg. 0321625, dtd. R 011508Z Feb. 1988.

CONCLUSIONS

1. The issue of constrained resources will challenge Department of Army and the ARNG for developing the future Army and for fielding requisite warfighting capabilities.

2. The Army of Excellence (AOE), calling for restructuring of the Active Army and Reserve Component forces, is putting readiness constraints on the Army National Guard due to reorganizations and receipt of new equipment.

3. Given the proper FTM support, high technology units, can be activated, maintained and meet all contingency missions as required by Department of the Army.

4. High technology units, cannot meet activation and keep proficient on the equipment to meet high priority missions without proper FTM. Daily, weekly, and monthly maintenance requirements drive FTM levels in these type units.

5. Mission requirements for newly organized and activated units are not being addressed early on to establish the appropriate FTM requirements.

6. High priority missions are being assigned to ARNG units, with minimum FTM support.

7. Congress is reducing the growth in the Full-Time Manning while missions in the ARNG are growing, new equipment is being received and new units are activating.

Continued growth in AGR and M-Day soldiers will create highly professional organizations capable of performing their missions by providing the proper FTUS necessary for training, maintaining, and administering the force.

8. There are still shortcomings in the FTUS Staffing Criteria.

9. Increase in full-time manning support spaces has impacted positively on the readiness of our NG forces (79% of NG units at C-3 or better in 1987)[1] AGR personnel take an active interest and display a dedication and professionalism that was not seen prior to the Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1980. "The increases in AGR personnel have definitely improved proficiency, professionalism and overall readiness. This past summer (1987), New Mexico conducted a major mobilization exercise with its National Guard. During this exercise, all Annual Training goals were met, a feat made possible by the increased number of AGR personnel. Additionally, during a JCS directed mobilization exercise (Proud Scout 88), the units that were best prepared were those with the higher percentage of AGR personnel assigned."[2]

CONCLUSION ENDNOTES

1. "Better Resource Management Is Key To Combat Readiness", National Guard, January 1984, p. 35.

2. Donald R. Infante, MG, USA, MSP Questionnaire, Question #2.

RECOMMENDATIONS

1. With over half of the Army's total deployable force in the ARNG and USAR it is of paramount importance to provide the required FTM to ensure readiness to meet the threat. With more emphasis being placed on the ARNG to take on additional responsibilities it is imperative that Department of the Army recommend and support through the budget process the ARNG in its request for the appropriate FTM to meet the additional requirements. Without the support, the ARNG cannot continue to grow and cannot continue to accept additional missions without degradation.

2. That HQDA seriously take into consideration the FTM support studies conducted by Proponent Schools (i.e. The Air Defense Artillery School study for I HAWK) when revising their FTM Staffing Criteria. That the FTM Staffing Criteria be completed as soon as possible to ensure mission accomplishment.

3. The Army Staff should use Proponent Schools to establish the required FTM for new high technology weapon systems in order to maintain readiness and proficiency.

4. Once established high priority units should be given sufficient FTM to ensure accomplishment of missions.

5. Mission requirements for newly organized and activated units must be addressed early on to establish the appropriate FTM requirements.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

PUBLIC DOCUMENTS

1. Director of Reserve Components, Ft. Bliss, Tx. Working Group on Hawk Battalion for the NMARNG. El Paso: 11 Dec 1985.

2. Director of Training and Doctrine, Ft. Bliss, Tx. Full-Time Manning Levels for the NMARNG HAWK Battalion. El Paso: 12 July 1985.

3. England,Thomas F., MAJ. The Active Guard/Reserve Program. Washington: U.S. Department of Defense, 1984.

4. Florida Army National Guard. Florida Air Defense Artillery Concept Plan. Orlando: 1 Sept. 1987.

5. National Guard Bureau. 1986 Annual Review of the Chief National Guard Bureau. Washington: 30 Sept 1986.

6. National Guard Bureau. 1987 Annual Review of the Chief National Guard Bureau. Washington: 30 Sept 1987.

7. Nippell, George D., MAJ. Trip Report on Site-Information Visit to the Office of the Air Defense Proponent (OADAP), Washington: 11 Dec. 1985.

8. Reserve Forces Policy Board. Fiscal Year 1985 Annual Reports. Washington: 14 Feb 86.

9. The Secretary of Defense. Annual Report of the Secretary of Defense on Reserve Forces. Washington: 1975.

10. U.S. Congress. House. Committee on Armed Services. Department of Defense Authorization Act of 1979. H. Rept. 166, 96th Cong., 1st Sess. Washington: Government Printing Office, 1979.

11. U.S. Department of Defense. Reserve Compensation System Study (RCSS). Deputy Assistant Secretary for Reserve Affairs. Washington: 30 June 1978.

12. U.S. Department of Defense. Study on the Full-Time Personnel Requirement of the Reserve Components. Office of the Deputy Assistant Secretary of Army for Reserve Affairs, 31 Dec. 1977.

13. U.S. Laws, Statutes, etc., Public Law 95-485. "Authorization Act of 1979".

PERIODICALS

1. "Better Resource Management is Key to Combat Readiness" National Guard. Jan 1988, p. 35.

2. Carney, Larry. "Active Guard Reserve to Add 1,585 Positions". Army Times, 25 Jan. 1988, p. 18.

3. Galioto, Joseph, LTC, "In Search of an Identity." National Guard. Jan 1988, p.23.

4. Tice, Jim. "Roland Battalion Certified to Perform Mission." Army Times, Jan. 1985.

5. Weber, LaVern E., LTG. (Ret.). "Growth in the Guards Full-Time Force." National Guard, Jan 1988, p. 12.

6. "What They Said" Nation Guard. Dec. 1987, p. 22.

INSTITUTIONAL OR ORGANIZATIONAL REPORT

1. Support Personnel Management Office, NMARNG. AGR Full-Time Positions. Santa Fe: 30 Nov 1987

LETTERS, MEMORANDUMS, AND MESSAGES

1. Chief National Guard Bureau. NMARNG Reorganization Plan. Message to The Adjutant General of New Mexico, 24 Oct. 1985.

2. Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. Develop a Rational Model for FTM and Reconcile Differences in FORSCOM/NGB Models Before FY85 Budget Hearing. Talking Paper for ADCSOPS, 16 Jan 1984.

3. Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. Reconciliation of Guard and Reserve Full-Time Unit Support Models. Information Paper. Washington: 3 July 1984.

4. Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. ROLAND to the Army National Guard. Letter to Director Army National Guard, 3 Aug. 1982.

5. Deputy Director Army National Guard. ROLAND to the Army Nation Guard (ARNG). Memorandum to Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, 8 Nov. 1982.

6. Director Army National Guard. ROLAND to the Army National Guard. Memorandum to Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans, 25 Aug. 1982.

7. Director Army National Guard. Request for Additional Full-Time Manpower to Support ROLAND--DECISION MEMORANDUM. Memorandum to Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Personnel, 29 Nov. 1982.

8. National Guard Bureau Manpower Div. Hawk Bn PDIP Support Information. Message to The Adjutant General of NM, 18 Oct 1986.

9. Office of the Chief of Staff Army. Reserve Component (RC) Management--Action Memorandum. Memorandum for Deputy Chief of Staff Personnel, 18 Nov 1983.

10. Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. Full-Time Support (FTS) Program Staffing Procedures. Letter of Instruction for National Guard Bureau, 14 Sept 1984.

11. Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. Full-Time Support Staffing Criteria/Model Review. Message to FORSCOM, 1 Feb. 1988.

12. Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans. ROLAND for National Guard. Message to Commander TRADOC. 22 Jun. 1982.

13. The Adjutant General of New Mexico. Recommended Full-Time Manning Levels. Letter to Chief National Guard Bureau, 23 Oct. 1985.

14. The Adjutant General of New Mexico. Full-Time Manning Levels for the NMARNG HAWK Battalion. Letter to Commanding General Ft. Bliss, Tx., 15 May 1985.

15. The Adjutant General Of New Mexico. Utilization of Title 10 Personnel for 7-200 ADA (HAWK) NMARNG. Message to Chief National Guard Bureau, 29 May 1986.

16. U. S. Army Ordnance Missile and Munitions Center and School. AGR Full-Time Manning for 7-200 ADA Bn (HAWK) and 804th Ordnance Company (DS) (HAWK). Letter to Office of Military Affairs, State of New Mexico, 4 Mar. 1986.

MSP QUESTIONNAIRE

1. Infante, Donald R., MG. Commanding General Ft Bliss, Tx. MSP Questionnaire. El Paso: 12 Jan 88 (Cited with special permission of MG Infante.)

ARMY DOCUMENT

1. U. S. Department of the Army. TOE 44465L000: Air Defense Artillery Battalion (Roland): Washington: Oct. 1985.

INTERVIEWS

1. Gonzales, Rudy, CW2. Support Personnel Management Office, NMARNG. Personal Interview. Santa Fe: 18 Dec 1987.

STUDENT RESEARCH PAPERS

1. Estrada, Francisco J., LTC. New Mexico's New Roland Battalion. Essay. Ft. Leavenworth, Ka. Command and General Staff College, 10 Mar 1982.

2. Robertson, Wyman D., LTC. The Importance of Full-Time Manning in the Army National Guard. Thesis. Carlisle Barracks: U.S. Army War College, 15 Apr. 1983.

APPENDIX

SOURCE: Full-Time Manning Study, Director of Training and Doctrine, Ft. Bliss, Tx., 12 July 1985.

Table 3

PROPOSED FTM LEVELS FOR THE NMARNG HAWK BN

MOS	ALTERNATIVE 1 MOD. RISK	ALTERNATIVE 2 MIN. RISK	DESCRIPTION/POSITION
14D00	27	27	BN CDR, BTRY CDR, XO PLT LDR, TD, TCO
14D41	1	1	S-1
14D54	1	1	S-3
14D92	1	1	S-4
223BO	7	7	BN EMMO, BTRY SYS WO
225BO	1	1	C2 TSQ-73 WO
22A00	1	2	C&E OFFICER
35A14	1	1	S-2
56A00	0	0	CHAPLAIN
62A00	0	0	MEDICAL
630A0	2	4	BN & BTRY MOTOR WO
74A00	1	1	NBC
761A0	1	1	TECH SUPPLY WO
00Z50	1	1	SGM
16D10	13	49	LAUNCHER CREWMEMBER
16D20	11	17	LCHR CRMBR (LOADER)
16D30	7	7	LCHR CRMBR SECT CH
16D40	6	6	PSG
16E10	4	21	FIRE CONTROL OP
16E20	10	10	FIRE CONTROL OP
16E30	6	7	FIRE CONTROL SECT CH
16H10	3	6	ADA OP-INTEL ASSIST
16H40	1	1	ASSIST OPS SGT
16S10	2	5	STINGER OP
16S20	2	4	STINGER OP
16S30	1	2	STINGER SECT CH
16Z5M	3	4	1SG
16Z50	1	2	INTEL SGT
24C10	13	13	FIRING SECT MECH/MSL RESUPPLY
24C20	6	6	FIRING SECT MECH
24C30	6	6	FIRING SECT MECH
24E10	2	2	PAR
24E30	1	1	SIMULATOR TPQ-29
24G10	6	6	FIRING CONTROL MECH
24G20	6	6	FIRING CONTROL MECH
24G30	6	6	FIRING CONTROL CHIEF
24R40	8	8	SYSTEM MASTER MECH BN/BTRY
24R50	1	1	BN EMMO
25L10	2	4	C2 OPER/MECH TSQ-73
25L20	2	2	SR OPER/MECH TSQ-73
25L30	2	2	SYS OPER/MECH

25L40	1	1	OPERATIONS SUPV
26H10	1	1	IFF MECH
31C10	3	6	RADIO TELE OPER
31C20	1	2	RADIO TEAM CH
31K10	5	11	WIREMAN
31K20	4	4	CBT SIG TEAM CH
31M10	16	21	M-CHANNEL MECH
31M20	9	12	M-CHANNEL TEAM CH
31M30	5	5	M-CHANNEL COMMO CH
31N10	1	2	TAC CIRCUIT CONTROL
31N20	1	1	TAC CIRCUIT CNTRL CH
31V10	4	4	TAC COMMO SYS OPR
31V30	3	3	TAC COMMO CH-BTRY
31V40	1	1	TAC COMMO CH-BN
31V50	1	1	TAC COMMO CH-BN
31Z40	1	1	COMMO ELEC OPS CH
36M10	1	2	WIRE SYSTEMS
OP44B10	0	0	WELDER
52C10	2	2	AIR COND MECH
52C20	1	1	AIR COND MECH-BN
52D10	12	15	POWER GEN MECH
52D20	1	1	SR PWR GEN MECH
52D30	3	3	PWR GEN SUPV-BTRY
54E20	2	3	NBC NCO-BTRY
54E30	1	1	CHEM NCO-BN
63B10	16	16	LT VEH MECH
63B20	4	8	LT VEH MECH
63B30	3	4	MOTOR SGT BN/BTRY
63B50	1	1	SR MOTOR MAINT SUPV
63J10	1	1	QM-CHEM EQUIP MECH
63Y20	2	4	TRACK VEH MECH
71D20	0	0	LEGAL CLERK
71L10	1	1	CLERK TYPIST
71M10	0	0	CHAPLAIN ASSIST
75B20	0	3	UNIT CLERK
75Z40	1	1	PERSONNEL NCO
76C10	10	14	PLL/EQUIP MAINT CLRK
76W10	4	7	PETROLEUM SP
76Y10	4	6	ARMORER
76Y20	1	1	SUPPLY SP
76Y30	3	5	SUPPLY SGT-PBO
76Y40	1	1	SUPPLY SGT
91A10	1	0	AMBULANCE DRIVER
91B20	1	0	EMERG TREAT NCO
91B30	1	0	MEDICAL SECT NCO
94B10	4	8	COOK
94B20	4	4	COOK
94B30	1	1	FIRST COOK
94B40	4	4	FOOD SERV NCO BN/BTY
TOTAL	324	446	
% OF TOE	58.7%	80.7%	