

Statement of President Thomas H. Hueg of the Department of Virginia, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, before the National Commission on the Future of the Army – June 18, 2015

Good Afternoon, Chairman Ham, Vice Chairman Lamont, and distinguished members of the Commission. I am Thomas Hueg, Colonel, United States Air Force Reserve, retired, and currently President of the Department of Virginia, Reserve Officers Association of the United States. I represent over 2,600 members who reside or work within the Commonwealth. Roughly 1,500 members are Army Reserve, and about 350 of those are still actively serving.

You heard comments from ROA's Executive Director, Mr. Jeffrey Phillips, on May 20 and from my counterpart in North Carolina, LTC Mike Moose, on June 10. They provided three recommendations to the Commission and I would like to add my voice as well, since these points bear repeating and will be important to your deliberations about the future of the Army.

The first recommendation is that the Commission embraces the imperative of an operational Reserve. As an Airman, I would argue that the description of a "decade of war", in which the Active Components and Reserve Components worked very well together, should actually be two decades, since there were Air Force Reserve and Air National Guard Airmen patrolling the skies over Iraq alongside their active duty colleagues—seamlessly I might add—since the end of Operation Desert Storm. But please remember that Army Reserve and Army National Guard units rotated into NATO missions in Bosnia-Herzegovina and in Kosovo, working alongside active Army units in the mid- to late-1990s.

It has been said previously that Reserve units cost approximately one-third of a comparable active unit. In my opinion, it is primarily because the members of a Reserve unit are already trained and qualified. Soldiers (or Airmen or Sailors for that matter) transitioned from the active Army to a Reserve unit for a myriad of reasons but they arrive at a Reserve unit already mature and professional as mid-level enlisted or officers dedicated to the mission and motivated to continue serving their country. The added dimension of their civilian career enhances their military career. I work at National Defense University and help run the Reserve Components National Security Course, a two-week course offered three times each year. The course borrows the professors from National War College and the Eisenhower School for National and Resource Strategy and they often comment to me that they enjoy working with Reserve and National Guard students because their civilian backgrounds bring an additional piece to the course that they don't see in their resident students. I should also note that as Reservists come from their communities, we forge a link between our uniformed colleagues and a populace that is further removed from the military.

The second recommendation is that the Army needs to fully embrace the Army Total Force Policy, evident in its organizing, training, equipping and manning. My experience in the Air Force and Air Force Reserve was one of Reserve Association – Reserve and active units flying and working on the same aircraft. Even Reserve units with their own equipment fly the most up-to-date aircraft, and in some cases the Reserve aircraft are better maintained! It is important that

Statement of President Thomas H. Hueg of the Department of Virginia, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, before the National Commission on the Future of the Army – June 18, 2015

the policy is understood and implemented throughout the force, especially in headquarters that allocate resources and equipment.

Active and Reserve Component units worked successfully together these many years. It is important that they continue to train and work together rather than going to their separate corners. You train the way you intend to fight, and you fight the way that you trained.

The third recommendation to the Commission is to preserve the separate identities, roles, and missions of the Army Reserve and the Army National Guard. The two components have fundamentally different roles and each performs them well. Rather, strive to continually develop cooperation between the components and efficient use of their complementary strengths in support of the Army and the nation.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide these comments. ROA looks forward to helping the Commission as you consider the ways and means to shaping the Army Total Force.