



DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY

OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT SECRETARY

(MANPOWER, AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20350-1000

MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD

24 September 2004

MEMORANDUM FOR ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE NAVY (MANPOWER AND RESERVE AFFAIRS)

Subj: REPORT OF THE 2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD (MCRPB)

Ref: (a) SECNAVINST 5420.170L

Encl: (1) 2004 MCRPB Issues  
(2) 2004 MCRPB Members

1. Purpose. To provide the 2004 MCRPB annual report to the Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Manpower and Reserve Affairs) for staffing through the Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) and Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC), in accordance with the reference.
2. Background. The MCRPB met 13-16 May 2004 at San Diego, CA, 24 July 2004 at Miramar, CA for a town hall meeting, 19-24 September 2004 at Henderson Hall, Arlington, Virginia, and via virtual meetings using electronic mediums to examine Marine Corps Reserve policy issues and propose recommendations. The issues at enclosure (1) are provided for your information and staffing to the Commandant of the Marine Corps (CMC) and Chief of Naval Operations (CNO) for comment per the references.
3. Goal. The goal of the MCRPB is to provide you timely and effective policy recommendations to enhance Marine Corps Reserve and Active Component integration. Correct policies eliminate many barriers to Reserve service. Effective policy guidance may increase administrative efficiency, operational effectiveness, and the retention of our most valuable resource, our Marines.
4. Discussion. As Chairman, I was guided by the references and focused MCRPB deliberations on specific policies to enhance Total Force integration and quality of life. These issues will enhance the Total Force Marine Corps. The 2004 MCRPB communicated with commanders throughout the Marine Corps, leaders at Headquarters Marine Corps, the professional military organizations, and individual Marines and Sailors. Historically, the use of the MCRPB to recommend policy solutions

Subj: REPORT OF THE 2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD  
(MCRPB)

has contributed to the elimination of many barriers to Reserve service and increased the stature and quality of life of a Marine Corps reservist.

5. Personal Comments. Your continuous support for the Marine Corps Reserve and the Total Force policy has been immeasurable. With the expanded Global War on Terrorism and America's reliance on an all volunteer force, the Reserves are clearly an integral part in our nation's defense. Therefore, your welcoming reception of continued updates on developing issues that affect the Reserve community has been greatly appreciated. As the Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board (MCRPB) Chairman, it has been my continuing duty to keep you abreast of concerns that affect citizen soldiers. Your outstanding leadership has reduced past impediments and enhanced Reserve component operational readiness and the quality of life for all Marines, active and reserve.

6. Conclusion. I am deeply grateful for the assistance and sage counsel your Deputy Assistant Secretary of the Navy (Reserve Affairs), Mr. Harvey Barnum has provided. His deep and abiding concern for the Marine Corps Reserve and the Total Force concept guided our deliberations as this board sought to enhance the operational readiness and quality of life of the Reserve component. The MCRPB members in enclosure (2) are grateful for the honor of serving as members of the MCRPB. Thank you for the opportunity to serve as your 2004 MCRPB Chairman.

Very respectfully,



CORNELL A. WILSON  
Brigadier General, U.S. Marine Corps Reserve  
Chairman, 2004 Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board

2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD (MCRPB) ISSUE: 02-012/03-003/04-001

SUBJECT: DISTANCE LEARNING (DL) FOR RESERVE ADMINISTRATION AND TRAINING

MCRPB 2002 COMMENT: In 1999 the Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board recommended that the Marine Corps incorporate Reserve specific administrative requirements in the Administration MOS training school curriculum, and follow-on administrative courses.

The CMC comment stated that Distance Learning (DL) initiatives are being considered for this curriculum. SECNAV concurred with CMC to continue DL initiatives to ensure instruction of Reserve administration.

MCRPB RECOMMENDATION: That the Secretary of the Navy direct CMC to update the MCRPB on status of DL initiatives.

CMC COMMENT: Under the direction of the Marine Corps Distance Learning Center (DLC), a Technology Infusion Requirement Analysis of the Marine Corps Combat Service Support (MCCSSS) was conducted in May 2000, which identified the Senior Clerk Course (SCC) as a good candidate for asynchronous distance learning. At the invitation of Personnel Administration (PA) School, a follow-up Media Feasibility Study was conducted in July 2000, confirming the SCC as a good candidate for Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI), and/or Job Performance Aid (JPA)/Electronic Performance Support System (EPSS) mediums of delivery.

Once the SCC was identified, the PA School partnered with the DLC in Sep 2000 to replace the resident SCC, in its entirety, with IMI. This decision recognized that the number of potential SCC students far exceeded the actual throughput, in effect, creating a training gap. Out of necessity, this gap was historically addressed with significant content overlap between the SCC and the Advanced Personnel Administration Course (APAC).

The intended target audience for the SCC was the 20-30 year old active duty and/or Reserve Marine, MOS 0121 and 0151, with a high school diploma (98% of the audience), and 2 to 12 years of experience in the Marine Corps.

On 21 December 2000, a project kick-off meeting was held for the SC IMI at the DLC in Quantico, VA. The SCC IMI was to train Marines in a variety of subjects relating to the Administrative Field within the Marine Corps in order to increase their proficiency in accomplishing tasks required in the 0193 MOS. The five broad topics to be included in this IMI project were General Administration, Files and Directives, Pay and Allowances, Service Records, and Unit Diary.

In May 2002, development of the SCC was halted by the DLC. The two main reasons for this were (1) the vendor contracted to develop the IMI lacked the capabilities to produce a quality product, and (2) the course content was determined to be too unstable, often changing due to updates to administrative policies and procedures.

Enclosure (1)

In August 2002, DLC personnel conferred with LtCol Crittenden, CO PA School, MCCSSS, concerning the SCC. It was requested that the DLC not pursue further development of the SCC IMI and focus instead on the development of a DL product for a Reserve Administration Course.

Ongoing discussions are taking place between the PA School and MCI to determine if there is sufficient material and student requirement to produce a Reserve specific administration course. Currently, the Reserve Administration Course is a two-week course, taught three times a year (June, July, and August). MCI is being sent the Reserve Administration Course Program of Instruction to determine what additional course material may be required.

In addition, instructional designers from the DLC are currently conducting a gap analysis and a media feasibility study to ensure that the final DL product delivered would meet the requirements of MCCSSS. The Reserve Administration Course initiative is scheduled for presentation to the TECOM Selection Board for consideration during the Technology Based Training and Education Course Product Selection Process, scheduled in Jan 2003. Additional information concerning the Reserve Administration Course as a candidate for DL will be available after the results of the selection board are released.

**DASN (RA) COMMENT:** The MCRPB will continue to monitor the status of this recommendation until completed.

**MCRPB 2003 COMMENT:** During the investigation of this specific issue for the 2003 MCRPB, the broader issue of Distance Learning for Reserve Marines became the focus of the issue. Marine Corps Distance Learning is developed and managed by two entities, both overseen by the Training and Education Command (TECOM) – College of Continuing Education (CCE) and Marine Corps Institute (MCI).

In 2002, TECOM began delivering baseline Professional Military Education (PME) curriculum developed by resident schools; developing courses that provide training toward MOS qualification, personal development, business and informational technology training.

TECOM's website, "Marine.net" has become the portal for a multitude of distance learning courses. Marine.net is accessible via the Internet (no .mil account is necessary) and is available to Marines and dependents enrolled in DEERS. The benefits include: global access, self-paced study, interactive training, reduced learning time, and increased retention. Additionally, TECOM has exploited technology by providing Video Tele-conferencing, Learning Resource Centers, Deployable Learning Resource Centers and Automated Electronic Classrooms to Marines.

TECOM is responsible for the schoolhouses and the development of all education courses throughout the Marine Corps to include distance learning and resident courses. Course development recommendations are submitted by the schoolhouses and by individual submissions via TECOM's website and the Course Selection Board validates those recommendations. Courses developed by the CCE are reviewed regularly to ensure currency and accuracy.

Marine Corps Institute (MCI) facilitates the MOS training and education of individual Marines by distributing paper copies for most of the officer and enlisted PME courses, as well as many MOS enhancing courses. Additionally, MCI courses can be accessed via the internet through TECOM's marine.net portal. The MCI courses are programmed for updating on a 5-year cycle with those courses with a high enrollment being reviewed on a more frequent basis.

The resources and the budget for MCI are managed by the Commanding Officer, Marine Barracks, Eighth and I because of their concurrent mission of providing ceremonial support. Therefore, the curriculum oversight for MCI is directed and limited by the resources provided by the CO, Marine Barracks.

Additionally, there is no one command overseeing the course curriculum for the CCE and MCI. The result is similar and redundant courses that are not consistent in testing/course content. An example of this is the Command and Staff College Non-resident course. There is no overlap between CCE and MCI as to testing and validation of this curriculum. Another example is the administrative class, Pay and Entitlements; it is outdated and provides inaccurate information to our Marines.

There seems to be a disparity in promotion points and reserve retirement credit points. Courses completed through MCI are given credit for promotion and reserve retirement, however no credit is granted for courses taken through CCE Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI), except PME classes.

**MCRPB RECOMMENDATION:** DL is a necessity for the Reserve Component. With the capabilities of technology, our Reserve Marines can accomplish more with less cost and time. The impact is a greater citizen-soldier. In order to provide an overall program to better serve all Marines, the Commandant should review the Distance Learning programs within the Marine Corps to ensure they are complementary and consistent. This would probably involve a transition of the functions inherent within MCI to more closely align with those in TECOM (CCE). We believe TECOM is already going in the right direction with their IMI initiatives.

To enhance the DL program's overall functionality for Reserve Forces we recommend:

1. **Compulsory Training.** Provide more courses required as annual training requirements; for example, EEO/Diversity, Ethics, Water Safety, BST, etc. This training allows all Marines to complete these annual requirements on-line and thus eases the training burden to entire commands. Reserve Marines could complete the training off duty and not have to spend an entire drill weekend accomplishing basic training requirements.

2. **Enlisted PME (EPME).** Focus on all EPME requirements. The classroom material could be accomplished via Interactive Multimedia Instruction (IMI) prior to attendance at the EPME School. The school time could be drastically reduced, they could concentrate more attention on field training, and it would enable more Marines to attend.

3. **Reserve Specific Training.** Develop classes on Career Retirement Credit Report (CRCR), Promotion, Legal, and the Marine Corps Reserve. While these courses are pertinent to the Marine Corps Reserve, they serve to assist the I&I/Site Support Staff members in providing Reserve support as necessary.

4. Reserve Policies. Continue to evaluate the IMI to ensure reserve retirement credit points and promotion points are granted for applicable courses similar to the MCI courses.

5. Blended Course Packages. Use a blended approach to courses that provide DL training coordinated with mandatory attendance at formal school. Develop courses that will reduce the mandatory attendance at a formal school.

6. MCI. The oversight of the curriculum of MCI should be evaluated to ensure the courses provided to our Marines are updated/revised as appropriate on at least a yearly basis to ensure currency of material. Recommend the current MCI courses be reviewed and any courses that have not had a curriculum review within the last 2 years be pulled from rotation until an appropriate review can be accomplished. This will prevent our Marines from “learning” outdated/inaccurate processes.

CMC COMMENT: Under the direction of Training and Education Command, the following recommendations are hereby submitted:

(1) Compulsory Training and Enlisted PME. The MCRPB recommended that DL courses be developed to meet annual training requirements that Marines can take on-line, thereby completing compulsory training off duty so that a drill weekend does not need to be spent accomplishing basic training requirements.

(a) MarineNet ([www.marinet.usmc.mil](http://www.marinet.usmc.mil)) currently hosts a series of Operational Risk Management DL courses. Per CMC direction (ALMAR 060/03), completion of an ORM DL course will satisfy the annual ORM training requirement.

(b) Currently under development is an Information Assurance (IA) Awareness DL course. The IA course will be completed and hosted on MarineNet in Dec 03. Completion of this course will satisfy the annual IA requirement for all users of a government computer.

(c) While there is no current program to develop the annual Marine Corps Common Skills Training (MCCST) requirement for GySgt and below, MarineNet will soon host the examination that will be accessible during Dec 03.

(d) The College of Continuing Education (CCE) has courses in development that will address requirements for licensing (HMMWV & MTRV), driver safety (will replace current 8 hr AAA course required for Marines 26 years old and under), as well as many other MOS and specialty skill courses. Courseware status is updated regularly at the following website: [www.tecom.usmc.mil/dlc/CoursewareStatus.htm](http://www.tecom.usmc.mil/dlc/CoursewareStatus.htm).

(2) Reserve Specific Training. The MCRPB recommended the development of a DL course to address reserve administration and other courses applicable to the Marine Corps Reserve.

(a) As stated in the last year’s response to the MCRPB, the Reserve Administration Course (RAC) was presented to the TECOM Technology Based Training and Educational Course Product Selection Process in January 03. Approved by CG, TECOM for development, RAC underwent a detailed front-end analysis (FEA) by a contracted vendor. The FEA, which

was completed in Oct 03, was overseen by the CCE and MCCSSS (PA School). The development of the interactive multimedia instruction (IMI) course is set to go under contract in Nov 03, with an anticipated completion date of Sep 04.

(b) MFR and its subordinate units submitted 14 nominations to the Sep 03, TECOM Technology Based Training and Educational Course Product Selection Process. Many of the courses, which varied among numerous MOSs, were nominated in order to address the MFR's current MOS mismatch problem. The development of these courses is pending approval of CG, TECOM and funding from MFR.

(3) Reserve Policies. The MCRPB recommended that MarineNet courses continue to be evaluated to ensure that reserve retirement credit points and promotion points are granted for applicable courses similar to MCI courses.

(a) The CCE is currently working with Manpower (Enlisted Promotions) to get 15 self-education bonus points awarded for USMC specific MarineNet courses, the same value that MCI courses currently receive.

(b) The CCE is currently working with Manpower (Enlisted Promotions) to get 10 self-education bonus points awarded for non-USMC specific MarineNet courses (business, management, IT, etc.), the same value that off duty education courses currently receive.

(4) Blended Course Packages. The MCRPB recommended that DL courses be developed and used in conjunction with mandatory attendance at a formal school. These DL courses will serve to reduce the time spent at formal schools for reserve Marines.

(a) A series of MOS producing DL courses were nominated by MFR for future development by the CCE. These courses are to be used in conjunction with an abbreviated attendance at the MOS formal school, and are targeted to address MFR's MOS mismatch problem.

(b) CG, TECOM approval, MFR funding, and available CCE resources will have major impacts on the potential development of these nominations.

(c) Prior to any courseware development, coordination is required among MFR, CCE, and TECOM (GTB/ATB and formal schools) to ensure these are approved by the MOS producing school and will meet requirements and standards set forth in awarding an MOS.

DASN (RA) COMMENT: Commandant should review the Distance Learning programs within the Marine Corps to ensure they are complementary and consistent and work to enhance the DL program's overall functionality for Reserve Forces. The MCRPB will continue to monitor the status of this recommendation until completed.

**MCRPB 2004 COMMENT:** The Commandant should approve the newly established Reserve Distance Learning programs within MarineNet for they are complementary, consistent and work to enhance the DL program's overall functionality for Reserve Forces.

Under the direction of Training and Education Command, MarineNet ([www.marinenet.usmc.mil](http://www.marinenet.usmc.mil)) now provides for most of the recommendations from the 2002 and 2003 MCRPB. MarineNet underwent user testing and proved its utility through lengthy field use over the course of the last six months.

Reserve Specific training has been identified and various courses are ready for implementation within the next 60 days with needs identified by Marine Forces Reserve, in concert with TECOM, for future courseware development.

Recommendations identified regarding equity in reserve retirement credit points and promotion points for online courses in relation to paper-based courses are currently under review by TECOM.

**MCRPB RECOMMENDATION:** This issue should be considered complete, however, recommend TECOM provide notification to the entire Marine Corps of the courses as they become available either through MARADMIN, LES notifications scripts, and electronic methods such as Marine On Line notification screens.

**CMC COMMENT:**

**DASN (RA) COMMENT:**

SUBJECT: SYNCHRONIZATION OF THE TIMELY MOBILIZATION OF NAVY  
PERSONNEL IN SUPPORT OF MARINE FORCES RESERVE

DISCUSSION: The activation and synchronization of Program 9 Personnel (PG9: Navy Reserve's support of the USMC) during Operation Iraqi Freedom (OIF) revealed significant issues that negatively impacted the mobilization of Marine Force Reserve (MFR) units. "Synchronization" is the process of joining Navy personnel to Selected Marine Corps Reserve (SMCR) units in a timely manner in order to meet the unit's deployment schedule. PG9 includes medical, dental, religious and naval gunfire support personnel.

The mobilization timelines for Marine units and the corresponding PG9 personnel are significantly different. This resulted in PG9 and non-organic personnel not being afforded adequate personal time after notification, time for issuance of essential equipment (uniforms, T/E Gear) and required operational/tactical training prior to their deployment. Additionally, Sailors often arrive just prior to deployment, impairing their ability to achieve critical unit integrity. This frequently leads to the gaining command holding the Sailor in a backfill position while substituting another Sailor who is ready to deploy. The Sailor is then utilized in the next rotation, but unable to complete it without an orders extension. In effect, this wastes a second year of eligibility for one deployment. The net effect of an initial lack of synchronization is either sending an unprepared Sailor forward, or sacrificing a year of eligibility.

Specifically, the average total delay for a PG9 Sailor already affiliated with a unit ranged from 5 days to 12 days. The 24-month limitation on the mobilization of PG9 personnel creates the potential for even greater shortfalls in medical personnel. This will exert even greater pressure on assuring that activations allow appropriate time for Medical Augmentation Program (MAP) to be properly prepared and integrated into their supported Marine units.

The Marine Corps currently does not have ownership or control of the synchronization process. As a result, it has been difficult for the Marine Corps to change the activation process. As a result, some PG9 personnel are being activated on extremely short notice to fill shortfalls. On several occasions PG9 personnel have essentially received no notice prior to activation. These late notifications only compound retention problems, and do not afford the Sailor an opportunity to be integrated and/or operationally adapted to the supported unit.

MCRPB RECOMMENDATION:

1. Expedite the implementation of a web-based system to allow PG9 personnel to be processed on mobilization at their respective Naval Reserve Activity.
2. Appoint a Navy Advocate to review, monitor, and report on current changes and improvements that have been made to Program 9. This information should be reported directly to MARFORRES.
3. Improve the utilization of Navy Planners at HQMC, to aide in forecasting PG9 personnel and training requirements.

4. Convene a Navy Program 9 mobilization process review conference to examine and streamline the process to more closely mirror the mobilization timelines used by supported Marine units.

CNO COMMENT:

CMC COMMENT:

DASN (RA) COMMENT:

2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD (MCRPB) ISSUE: 04-003

SUBJECT: UNIQUE SERVICE NUMBER TO AVOID IDENTITY THEFT CAUSED BY SERVICE USE OF MARINES' SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER

DISCUSSION: Identity theft currently has risen to the point that there have been 9.9 million cases reported over the past year. The key element in identity theft is the use of the individual's Social Security Number. The Department of Defense Law of War working group met on December 16, 2003 to discuss DoD wide use of Social Security Numbers to identify members of the Armed Services. Although the working group did not reach a definitive decision, it did highlight the financial risk to individual military members and their families. For example, more than 40 Marine Corps General Officers and Navy Flag Officers have had their Social Security Numbers fraudulently used as a result of the posting of their numbers on the internet. One of the important consequences of identity theft is that repairing damage to an individual's credit history can take several years and cost thousands of dollars.

Currently, Marine Corps administrative practices do not routinely safeguard individual Social Security Numbers. Most administrative departments (S-1) do not safeguard Social Security Numbers that can readily be obtained from organizational correspondence, service record books, awards, and fitness reports. In particular, draft copies of these documents are routinely disposed of in the regular wastebasket, instead of being shredded or destroyed prior to disposal.

MCRPB RECOMMENDATION:

Interim Action:

- S-1 shops should be treated as classified (secured data) areas
- Social Security Numbers should be omitted from all organizational correspondence where individual privacy can not be assured
- All documents with Social Security Numbers should be destroyed in accordance with established classified material handling procedures
- Drop the first five digits from ID cards, checks, Leave and Earning Statements, promotion warrants, mailing labels, and certificates

Long Term Action: Initiate a long-term program to issue a service specific serial number and discontinue use of the Social Security Number as an individual unique identifier.

CMC COMMENT:

DASN (RA) COMMENT:

2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD (MCRPB) ISSUE: 04-004

SUBJECT: WARRANT OFFICER SUPPORT FOR COMPANY GRADE BILLET VACANCIES

DISCUSSION: In 2003, the Commanding General, Marine Forces Reserve requested a feasibility assessment to mitigate the chronic shortage of company grade officers in combat arms MOS's. This chronic shortage was specifically identified and has impacted the ability to fill vacant company grade officer billets in the following combat arms MOS's: 0302, 0303, 0802, 1302, 1802, and 1803.

The primary reasons for the shortage are systemic and are attributed to: (1) the requirement for almost all officers to first serve on active duty. Thereafter, these officers normally separate from the active component as senior First Lieutenants or junior Captains prior to affiliating with a reserve unit; and (2) the small number of direct commissions via the current Reserve Enlisted Commissioning Program (RECP). Today, having these billets filled by Captains, SNCO's and a small number of Majors typically mitigates these shortages. While addressing the "billet fill" concerns this solution has significant implications on career progression, promotion competitiveness, and MOS proficiency.

MARFORRES had proposed a solution unique to the Marine Corps Reserve by creating a cadre of professional warrant officers to fill the vacant company grade officer billets. This approach would require specific qualifying criteria for program selection.

Various departments within Headquarters, Marine Corps reviewed the proposal and did not concur with the program proposal. The primary reasons for non-concurrence were: (1) maintaining the distinction between restricted and unrestricted officers; (2) maintaining common structure between the Reserve and Active Components; and (3) the recommended proposal would exacerbate shortages in other Reserve Warrant Officer MOS's.

MCRPB RECOMMENDATION: Implement a limited scope test program to evaluate the feasibility and impact of using Warrant Officers to fill gapped Company grade billets. This would provide MARFORRES with the opportunity to evaluate the effectiveness of the use of Warrant Officers in non-traditional roles, and make an empirical determination about the viability of the program.

CMC COMMENT:

DASN (RA) COMMENT:

2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD (MCRPB) ISSUE: 04-005

SUBJECT: ENHANCED REEMPLOYMENT PROTECTION UNDER USERRA

DISCUSSION: The Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Rights Act (USERRA) 38 U.S.C. Sections 4301 – 4333 was enacted to provide employment protection for reserve members who are called to active duty. However, increasing numbers of National Guard and Reserve Troops who have returned from deployments in Iraq or Afghanistan are encountering difficulties with their civilian employers.

Importantly, some reservists are finding that USERRA does not afford them adequate reemployment protection after demobilization. In particular, in the case where a company experiences hardship once a reservist employee is called to active duty, it does not have a legal obligation to rehire the reservist. These employers can claim an affirmative defense to rehiring the employee under 38 U.S.C. Section 4312 (d)(1)(B). As a result, the employer can lawfully refuse to rehire the reservist, and the reservist is left without a job, and has no further remedy under current law.

MCRPB RECOMMENDATION:

1. The Department of Defense (DoD) should authorize the respective services to allow reservists the opportunity to return to active duty for up to 180 days while the reservist is completing administrative appeals with ESGR and the Department of Labor, and searching for new civilian employment; or
2. USERRA legislation should be amended to require the employer to rehire the reservist until the employer has applied for and received a certification of an affirmative defense from the Department of Labor authorizing the employer to refuse reemployment of the reservist.

CNO COMMENT:

CMC COMMENT:

DASN (RA) COMMENT:

2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD (MCRPB) ISSUE: 04-006

SUBJECT: MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION FOR RESERVISTS

DISCUSSION: It has come to the attention of the MCRPB that many Marine Corps Reservists are having difficulty registering their vehicles at Marine Corps bases.

1. This paragraph provides some examples of the problems encountered by Marine Corps Reservists who have tried to register their vehicles at Marine Corps bases. The sticking point for the below case scenarios is a result of the mixed interpretation of the Motor Vehicle Traffic Supervision Order, Marine Corps Order 5110.1C, which requires that a person must work aboard or require regular access to the base where they are seeking a decal.

a. When a Marine Corps Reservist tried to register his vehicle at Henderson Hall, he was informed that Henderson Hall does not issue stickers to Reserve Marines and that he would have to go to Fort Meyer to get an Army vehicle decal.

b. A Marine Corps Reservist reported that when he went to register his vehicle at Marine Corps Base Quantico, he was informed that he would have to renew his vehicle decal on a yearly basis. The Marine Corps Reservist questioned why Reserve vehicle decals expire after one year, while civilians who work at Marine Corps Base Quantico are issued vehicle decals for longer than one year.

c. A Marine Corps Reservist reported that when she went to register her vehicle, she was told by both Marine Corps Air Station Cherry Point and Marine Corps Base Camp Lejeune, that they only register vehicles for Reservists assigned to their installations. This particular Marine Corps Reservist is assigned to a Reserve unit in Louisiana, but lives in North Carolina. The Cherry Point and Camp Lejeune vehicle registration policies would have required her to obtain a visitor pass whenever she wanted to go on base to shop at the commissary or exchange.

2. In this time of increased activation of Marine Corps Reservists, it is imperative that Marine Corps Reservists be considered a part of the Total Force, and that they have equal access to register their vehicles at any Marine Corps base, whether or not they work at the base. Frequent access to Marine Corps bases is required by Marine Corps Reservists so that they can purchase uniforms, shop at the commissary and exchange, and avail themselves of all of their Marine Corps base benefits. Additionally, Marine Corps Reservists, in the course of their duties often require access to local Marine Corps bases for liaison purposes, coordination, education and other requirements associated with their Reserve duties.

MCRPB RECOMMENDATION: The MCRPB recognizes that many Reservists do not drill at the Marine Corps base that is closest to their home. As a result, MCO 5110.1C, does not address the current needs of Marine Corps Reservists. MCO 5110.1C is in the process of being revised. MCRPB recommends that Security, Law Enforcement &

Corrections, Plans, Policies & Operations Division (PP&O), Headquarters, U.S. Marine Corps, revise MCO 5110.1C to rectify the problems that Reservists face when trying to register their vehicles on Marine Corps bases. MCO 5110.1C should be revised to include verbiage that ensures that Marine Corps Reservists are able to register their vehicles any Marine Corps base, regardless of whether or not they work at the Marine Corps base. Additionally, a message or other communication should be sent to all Marine Corps Provost Marshall Offices to ensure that they are made aware of the revised motor vehicle registration policy, and so that they can update their standard operating procedure to incorporate the revised motor vehicle registration policy. Requiring all of the Marine Corps bases to follow the same motor vehicle registration policy will ensure uniform base security measures and will enhance the Anti-Terrorism/Force Protection posture of the Marine Corps.

CMC COMMENT:

DASN (RA) COMMENT:

SUBJECT: COMMON ACCESS CARD (CAC)

DISCUSSION:

1. Initial issuance of the new CAC (white card with chip) are to members of the Active Component and members of the SMCR, but not to members of the IRR.
2. Uniform DOD policy has yet to be determined regarding issuance of the CAC to members of the IRR.
3. Applicable references regarding the CAC are as follows:
  - a. MCO 5512.11C
  - b. MARADMIN 387/02
4. Current status/update on CAC:
  - a. The point of contact at OSD (Reserve Affairs and Public Information Officer) indicates CAC is currently undergoing beta testing in regards to a "generic" card, which will indicate neither Active Duty nor Reserve component. Testing will go through the end of CY 04. OSD (RA) intends to begin issuing new generic card during the beginning of CY 05.
  - b. OSD rationale for non-issuance of cards to members of the IRR centers on cost – memory chip embedded w/in the card is approximately \$8. Until efficiencies can be found in manufacturing the CAC, issuance of cards to IRR Marines prior to activation is unlikely.
5. Due to the long term requirements in support of the Global War on Terrorism (GWOT), the Marine Corps has significantly utilized members of the IRR. In addition, other services appear to have the intent to utilize their IRR members in a similar manner. Based on current procedures outlined above, Marines are required to change their CAC with each component change; as such, the service is incurring a greater expense reissuing the CAC. The ability to retain a CAC and change information on the memory chip will eliminate the need to issue/reissue the CAC upon each component change and will provide an efficient mechanism to track members of the IRR.

RECOMMENDATION: MCRPB recommends that the Secretary of the Navy discuss /coordinate with OSD (RA) the development of a flexible CAC for all members of the Reserve community (SMCR and IRR) that provides the ability to access the stored information of a Marine's rank, duty station, ECC, and other pertinent information within the memory chip. This will eliminate the need to reissue the CAC when information is updated or changed and gives the Marine the ability to retain a CAC regardless of

component status (i.e. transfer to and from active duty or transfer to and from a Reserve status). In addition, the MCRPB recommends the Secretary of the Navy coordinate with OSD (PIO) in order to update the MCRPB on the status of this issue at the next MCRPB meeting.

CMC COMMENT:

DASN (RA) COMMENT:

2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD (MCRPB) ISSUE: 04-008

SUBJECT: ELIMINATE MOBILIZATION IRA DEDUCTION PENALTY

DISCUSSION: Current tax law penalizes mobilized reservists once they have served on active duty for more than 90 days by eliminating the deductibility of their Individual Retirement Account (IRA) as an itemized deduction on their Federal Income Tax return. According to Internal Revenue Service (IRS) Publication 3, "Armed Forces Tax Guide": "For purposes of a deduction for contributions to a traditional individual retirement arrangement, Armed Forces' members (including reservists on active duty for more than 90 days during the year) are considered to be active participants in an employer-maintained retirement plan." Publication 3 at page 6 (*emphasis added*).

The result of the current tax law is a tax penalty on reservists once their period of active duty exceeds 90 days in any given tax year. The arbitrary cut-off of 90 days does not provide any additional retirement benefit to the reservist, but still results in the direct financial penalty associated with the loss of an important tax deduction.

MCRPB RECOMMENDATION: Eliminate the IRA mobilization tax penalty for reservists serving on active duty less than 365 days consecutively in a given tax year. This would provide tax law parity with the approach to the legal interpretation for active duty members of the Armed Forces, and eliminate the harshness of the penalty for mobilized reservists under the current tax scheme.

This policy change is described as follows:

"For purposes of a deduction for contributions to a traditional individual retirement arrangement, Armed Forces' members (excluding reservists on active duty for less than 365 days [366 days for leap years] during the tax year) are considered to be active participants in an employer-maintained retirement plan."

CNO COMMENT:

CMC COMMENT:

DASN (RA) COMMENT:

2004 MARINE CORPS RESERVE POLICY BOARD (MCRPB) ISSUE: 04-009

SUBJECT: PROGRAM 9 (PG9) MANNING SHORTFALLS IN FLEET MARINE FORCE (FMF)

DISCUSSION: Over the last year there has been a significant effort to resolve shortfalls in FMF 8404 corpsman. Throughout that process less attention has been paid to shortfalls in the remainder of the Program 9 (PG9) community. While we are monitoring the success of those changes, we are concerned that their effects may be unable to solve short-term requirements.

The Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board reviewed and discussed other areas of potential manning shortfalls. The Board concluded that recruitment and retention of medical officers was of particular concern. Increased utilization and frequent deployments are affecting the entire Reserve Force, however the income differential and lack of Uniformed Services Employment and Reemployment Act protection add to the difficulty of recruiting and retaining physicians.

MCRPB RECOMMENDATION:

1. Implement recruiting priorities and service incentives for training and retention of Medical officers and other essential Program 9 personnel.
2. Require quarterly reports to be submitted by OPNAV 095 to MARFORRES to update the Force on the progress of current PG9 initiatives.

CNO COMMENT:

CMC COMMENT:

DASN (RA) COMMENT:

**Marine Corps Reserve Policy Board**  
**2004 Roster**

**MAJGEN(Sel) Cornell A. Wilson, USMCR**

11624 Provincetown Drive  
Charlotte, NC 28277  
(H/W) (704) 814-9064  
(C) (910) 381-8430  
[WilsonCA@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:WilsonCA@mfr.usmc.mil)

**BGEN Harold T. Fruchtnicht, USMCR**

91 Longhorn Loop  
New Waverty, TX 77358  
(H) (936) 344-8082  
(W) 281 553-6365  
[hfruch@coair.com](mailto:hfruch@coair.com)  
[Fruchtnichtj@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:Fruchtnichtj@mfr.usmc.mil)

**COL Greg Patterson, USMCR**

23 Crossbow Drive  
Penfield, NY 14526  
(H) (585) 671-7932  
(W) (585) 671-9512  
[GPNY14526@yahoo.com](mailto:GPNY14526@yahoo.com)  
[Gpatterson@cemer.com](mailto:Gpatterson@cemer.com)

**COL Karen F. Hubbard, USMCR(AR)**

25 Limestone Way  
Fredericksburg, VA 22406  
(H) (504) 361-1650  
(W) (703) 784-9136  
[Hubbardkf@manpower.usmc.mil](mailto:Hubbardkf@manpower.usmc.mil)

**COL James D. McGinley, USMCR**

1001 E. Mountain Street  
Glendale, CA 91207  
(H) 818) 243-4009  
(W) (805) 988-5833  
(C) (818) 355-8229  
[mccginleyjd@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:mccginleyjd@mfr.usmc.mil)  
[bullet028@aol.com](mailto:bullet028@aol.com)

**COL(Sel) Andrew T. Fink, USMC(AR)**

DASN-RA  
12311 Oak Creek Lane #1511  
Fairfax, VA 22033  
(H) (703) 802-0033  
(W) (703) 693-0242  
(F) (703) 693-4959  
[Andrew.Fink@navy.mil](mailto:Andrew.Fink@navy.mil)

**LTCOL Scott Williams**

439 Paul Road  
Rochester, NY 14624  
(W) (585) 247-3330/8231  
[williamssp@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:williamssp@mfr.usmc.mil)

**COL Reginald H. Baker, USMCR**

20212 Overland Trail  
Olympia Fields, IL 60461  
(H) (708) 747-1802  
(W) (708) 210-4624  
[bakerrh@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:bakerrh@mfr.usmc.mil)  
[Overnel@aol.com](mailto:Overnel@aol.com)

**LTCOL James C. Seal, USMCR (AR)**

783 Anderson Road  
Aiea, HI 96701  
(H) (808) 486-3511  
(W) (808) 477-8468  
[Jason.Seal@usmc.mil](mailto:Jason.Seal@usmc.mil)

**COL Lynn Hicks, USMCR**

5950 S. Maxwellton Road  
Clinton, WA 98236  
(H) (360) 321-1320  
(W) (360) 331-5500 ext 264  
[hicksln@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:hicksln@mfr.usmc.mil)  
[lmhicks@whidbey.com](mailto:lmhicks@whidbey.com)

**LTCOL Ronald Bias, USMCR(AR)**

5710 Norland Ave  
New Orleans, LA 70131  
(H) (504) 392-2334  
(W) (504) 678-0529  
(C) (337) 351-6848  
[biasr@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:biasr@mfr.usmc.mil)  
[ronbias@bellsouth.net](mailto:ronbias@bellsouth.net)

**COL(Sel) Sheryl G. Williams, USMCR**

123 Plantation Blvd  
Jacksonville, NC 28540  
(H) (910) 455-6157  
(W) (910) 451-9516  
[Sheryl.G.Williams@usmc.mil](mailto:Sheryl.G.Williams@usmc.mil)

**CAPT Thom Merry, USNR**

1107 HWY 395 Suite D  
Gardnerville, NV 89410  
(W) (775) 782-1603  
(C) (775) 450-6997  
[merrytg@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:merrytg@mfr.usmc.mil)  
[topgunfs@aol.com](mailto:topgunfs@aol.com)

**CW04 Marjorie E. Trader, USMCR(AR)**

2205 Depot Drive, Bldg 3200, Suite 200  
Great Lakes, IL 60088  
(H) (224) 772-2840  
(W) (847) 688-7129 ext 2552  
(F) (847) 688-7155  
(C) (816) 679-5134  
[traderme@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:traderme@mfr.usmc.mil)

**SGTMAJ Ralph G. White, USMCR(AR)**

54 Meadowood Drive  
Stafford, VA 22554  
(H) (540) 720-6876  
(W) (703) 784-9100  
(F) (703) 784-9805

**SGTMAJ Robin W. Dixon, USMC**

224 Tarawa Circle  
Belle Chasse, LA 70037  
(H) (504) 392-9435  
(W) (504) 678-1580  
(C) (504) 914-9105  
[DixonRW@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:DixonRW@mfr.usmc.mil)

**MGYSGT Ralph F. Capen, USMCR**

1110 Hilton Drive  
Richardson, TX 75801-5635  
(H) (972) 669-0010  
(W) (817) 935-1679  
[recapen@earthlink.net](mailto:recapen@earthlink.net)  
[Capenre@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:Capenre@mfr.usmc.mil)

**HCMC Ronney A. Wright, USNR**

4400 Dauphine Street  
New Orleans, LA 70146  
(W) (504) 678-6378  
(C) (504) 914-9178  
[wrightra@mfr.usmc.mil](mailto:wrightra@mfr.usmc.mil)

**MGYSGT Gregrey DeBrecourt USMCR**

2113 N. Gentry St  
OBE  
Mesa, AZ 85213  
(H) (480)361-1664  
(C) (480) 209-8193  
[debrecourtgl@mfe.usmc.mil](mailto:debrecourtgl@mfe.usmc.mil) (Aug 04)  
[debrecourtgl@mfp.usmc.mil](mailto:debrecourtgl@mfp.usmc.mil)  
[E8N14@cox.net](mailto:E8N14@cox.net)