

## NCA Symposium 15-16 June 2009

### **1. STE and HYT (N130)**

I have several Sailors facing E5 HYT. PSD requires a reenlistment request denied up the chain of command to initiate Involuntary Separation Pay (ISP). For those Sailors who are just shy of HYT (i.e. 1-3 months) and required a Short-Term extension, I have submitted one and initially it was denied. With that Sailor entitled to ISP, albeit not the same as at HYT, PSD still requires the denied reenlistment request. Because that Sailor is not at HYT, PSD gives that Sailor an RE-4 code on the DD 214. Now, that Sailor cannot join the Reserves due to the Re code and serve in the Reserve to an extended HYT. Title 10 also entitles the Sailor to serve until 14 years. How can we help Sailors that fall into this situation?

NC2 (AW) Mailyn Juhlin, FRCNW ([mailyn.juhlin@navy.mil](mailto:mailyn.juhlin@navy.mil))

#### **Response:**

This question identifies some possible discrepancies between policy and implementation in regards to HYT and separation pay, and between PSD and individual commands. N130 will discuss this issue in greater detail with PERS-8 and the Navy Pay and Personnel Support Center (NPSSC) to review current separation procedures and to modify where necessary. The following issues will be addressed:

1. Sailors shy of HYT who are denied an extension to continue service past HYT.
2. PSD requirement to have command submit a denied reenlistment request.
3. Ensuring proper RE-code to support Sep Payments and reserve enlistment requirements.

### **2. SRB's and OTT's (N130)**

Are members with Approved OTT still eligible to reenlist for an SRB?  
CPO Martinez, CIDD Monterey, CA

#### **Response:**

Sailors with approved OTTs are still eligible to submit their request via OPINS and will be evaluated on a case by case basis.

### **3. Flight Deck Screening (N132G)**

Special Screenings IAW 1306-618- Aviation depth perception for Flight Deck Screening. None are conducted until training is completed and Sailor reports to Command. Can Flight Deck screening be conducted at MEPS or at Great Lakes before training starts?

NCCM Cynthia Reynolds, CPPD CCC School Norfolk,  
([cynthia.reynolds@navy.mil](mailto:cynthia.reynolds@navy.mil))

#### **Response:**

Mr. Bob Castle (CSD RTC Great Lakes Classification Director) has confirmed that RTC Medical (Red Rover) administers the Depth Perception test for all new accessions in aviation ratings as well as JOG ADEK, AMEK and EL4 ratings that require the test per MANMED. Additionally, individuals reclassified into those ratings at RTC are administered the Depth Perception test prior to finalizing the reclassification. If a Sailor reports to a Command and fails Depth Perception testing, the Command should

contact the Navy Selection and Classification Office so that a closer, Sailor specific review of the process failure can take place.

Sofiya Velgach, N132G, S&C Office ([sofiya.velgach@navy.mil](mailto:sofiya.velgach@navy.mil))

#### **4. RESCORE (OCNR)**

What is happening with the RESCORE program in the future? Members come off active duty and join the Reserves, change their rate, promise to go to A School within 18 months, and they get a \$20K bonus. Why do members get their bonus before they even complete A school? I'm finding about half of these people are poor performers, they only want the money, and get admin discharges before going to school without repayment.

CE1(SCW) Joseph McDougall, CBMU 303, ([joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil](mailto:joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil))

##### **Response:**

Policy is under development within OCNR and OPNAV N1 to revamp the RESCORE program to address many of the issues you raise. Stakeholders include OCNR, RESFOR, Pers-9, BUPERS-3, CNRC, NETC, and others. A MILPERSMAN article will be the overall directive that will govern the program from all aspects.

The plan is to address A school and non-A school rates, the relation of the program to the CREO NAVADMIN, bonus eligibilities, requirements to make rates permanent, program eligibility, training pipeline management, and other program-related issues.

Those within the program currently have signed a page 13 annex to their contract, which is binding and is to be honored/enforced. The only item being changed in current contracts is the requirement to administratively separate members for failing to make their rate permanent. Many Sailors have annex page 13s that say to discharge if they fail to complete the requirements. This is unenforceable unless the member is being processed for a valid reason under MILPERSMAN 1910 articles. As such, PERS 913 routinely disapproves these requests for ADSEP for RESCORE-R failure and instead, has them transferred out of pay. All other items on the annex page 13 are to be honored and enforced. If you have a question on how to handle a specific issue, first see if it's covered on the page 13. Most situational contingencies are covered there with specific directions.

For other RESCORE-R questions/clarifications that are not covered in the Annex page 13, the following points of contact will be useful:

For members requesting A Schools: CNRFC N7: (757) 322-6621

For members with A School Requirements: PSCS Jennifer Mack: (901) 874-4508

For members without A School Requirements: PSCM Stacey Johnson: (757) 322-2002

#### **5. Additional Training Points (ATPs) (OCNR)**

I've noticed that some units were given ample ATP's, but my unit, the largest unit in the San Diego, CA NOSC, did not get any enlisted ATP's paid. ATP's paid are critical part of getting unit ready for a successful drill weekend. What can be done to spread out the ATP money more equitability?

CE1(SCW) Joseph McDougall, CBMU 303, ([joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil](mailto:joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil))

**Response:**

Additional Training Periods (ATPs) are part of the discretionary RPN funding and are captured and distributed through the Operational Support Plan which all OSO's participate in. The ATPs are managed at RESFOR/N3 and then distributed to the Active Component through their OSO's, which are then further distributed to their particular Reserve units.

\* In particular, some additional and relevant data points to research for specific unit issues are:

- How many ATPs (Officer and Enlisted) have been distributed to the unit? What is the Unit manning?
- Does the OSO have additional ATPs under his/her cognizance that can be re-distributed from lower priorities?
- Is there a requirement/need, from the OSO's perspective, for the unit to receive more ATPs?
- Have additional ATPs been requested from RESFOR by the OSO?

The two best courses of action if you have a concern about the distribution of ATP funding are to request support from the unit's chain of command, and check with the OSO, who is the unit's representative/advocate in this process.

**6. Optimal Manning (USFFC)**

LPD 17 Class ships are manned to optimal manning of 332 enlisted and 28 officers. How can BA and NMP decrease on an already optimally manned ship with the latest and greatest technology and training pipelines that last up to 2 years for FC/OS for example. My latest EDVR shows our manning as BA 313, NMP 308, and NMP POB9 is 287.

CE1(SCW) Joseph McDougall, CBMU 303, ([joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil](mailto:joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil))

**Response:**

The Surface Warfare Enterprise (SWE) makes every effort to ensure Optimally Manned (OM) ships are fully funded to the NAVMAC determined requirements (Billets Authorized (BA) equals requirements). LPD 17 class ships are not OM ships and funding restrictions force their BA to be less than requirements.

Individually, LPD 17 class ships are all built with slight modifications with the delivery of each hull. The LPD 17 class Preliminary Ship Manpower Document (PSMD) lists 328-332 enlisted requirements (varies by specific hull) of which 316 are funded (BA).

In regards to the Navy Manning Plan (NMP), NMP or "fair share allotment" for each unit/command is determined by the Manning Control Authority (MCA) which is USFFC and is based on the distributable inventory (DI) (sailors) by paygrade, rating and NEC. Navy Personnel Command (NPC) recently conducted a review and verified there is "friction" in the distribution system (LIMDU, underfunded training pipelines, GSA detailing, pregnancy, etc) causing NMP to be less than BA regardless of the number of billets authorized.

## 7. IA's (USFFC)

We are still receiving IA Request taskers although we have an upcoming deployment. IA's count against manning for the duration including dwell time. If the Sailors are in essence fulfilling GSA jobs, why can't we change the orders from IA to GSA assignments to not only assist the command but the Sailor as well.

CE1(SCW) Joseph McDougall, CBMU 303, ([joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil](mailto:joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil))

### **Response:**

CNSF does not have the authority to convert an IA to a GSA assignment. If a conversion were to take place, it would be at or above the USFFC level, as the Global Force Manager (GFM). GSAs are filled by detailers when the requirements are stable over time. All other requirements are tasked as IA. CNSF receives IA tasking from USFF(GFM) via CPF and works to determine fills that present the least impact from an overall Force perspective. The first option is always shore units, then afloat units to fill IA requirements. Further, of the afloat units, we seek to fill the requirement with units in extended maintenance availabilities and outside pre-deployment work-up cycles. Only as a last resort and after a reclama to CPF, are units tasked that are within 120 days of deployment.

## 8. PFA (N135)

Why are Sailors who are separated for PFA failures entitled to ISP?

CE1(SCW) Joseph McDougall, CBMU 303, ([joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil](mailto:joseph.mcdougall@navy.mil))

**Response:** The Navy adheres to DOD policy concerning the payment of ISP. The DoD FMR Vol 7a, Ch. 35 Section 350201.B. authorizes the payment of Half Separation payments to members of the Regular and Reserve Components who involuntarily have separated from active duty due to Weight Control Failures. PFA failures do not automatically qualify a member for ISP. In addition to the PFA failure the member must ensure the following stipulations are met in order to be eligible for ISP:

1. Separation must be characterized as "honorable" or "general".
2. Separated involuntarily by the Navy through either a denial of reenlistment or the denial of continuation on active duty. Denial must only be for PFA failure and not based on performance or other non-PFA issues.
3. The member must also meet one of the criteria for active service that is outline in the DoD FMR Vol 7a, Ch. 35 Section 350201.A.1

## 9. Special Duty Assignment Pay (N130)

Why do submarine Command Career Counselors receive SDAP and others do not? NCCS(SW/AW) John Wise, ATG Norfolk, ([John.wise2@navy.mil](mailto:John.wise2@navy.mil))

### **Response:**

Per DoDI 1304.27, SDAP assignments are based on the following criteria: extremely demanding personal effort, a greater than normal degree of responsibility or difficulty, or the requirement of special qualifications is met through rigorous screening and or special schooling. Submarines do not have assigned NCs to provide counseling to sailors; therefore, they rely on existing personnel to fill the position as a collateral duty, in addition to their normal responsibilities. Because this job is seen as critical to supporting

our underway sailors, and the job requires a submarine sailor to fill additional responsibilities, we provide SDAP to incentivize personnel to support this role. They only receive this pay if they do not already receive SDAP as a Nuclear Trained Operator or Supervisor.

**10. Perform-To-Serve (PMS Program Manager/BUPERS-32)**

PTS should include a requirement that a PTS approved Sailor reenlist into the next zone (like the SRB program).

NCC(AW) Doug Bass, NAF Washington DC, ([douglas.bass1@navy.mil](mailto:douglas.bass1@navy.mil))

**Response:**

BUPERS-32 disagrees that Sailors receiving an in-rate or conversion quota should be required to reenlist into the next reenlistment zone. For Sailors in a rating receiving SRB, this requirement is already taken care of via SRB requirements. For Sailors in non-SRB ratings, Title 10 allows these Sailors to reenlist for an increment from two years to six years. The ability to reenlist for a two-year period should not be taken away from Sailors in non-SRB ratings as it allows Sailors who are unsure of their long-term plans to make a shorter reenlistment commitment, and then re-weigh their options at the end of that reenlistment period.

**11. Recommend BM to MN why? (BUPERS-32)**

HMCM is hesitant to recommend a conversion because that rating may become overmanned. It might be better to remain in current rating until situation improves. Why should he recommend conversions?

HMCM (FMF) Ronald Naidia, NERA, ([Ronald.naidia@navy.mil](mailto:Ronald.naidia@navy.mil))

**Response:**

Encouraging Sailors to convert from overmanned ratings to those that are undermanned helps to properly shape enlisted ratings and allow a Sailor to move from a rating where his/her advancement and career opportunities are limited into a rating where his/her opportunities for a Navy career and a retirement pension are much improved. BUPERS-32 manages all enlisted ratings and provides conversion quotas for ratings that are undermanned. As Sailors accept conversion quotas and the rating's manning inventory improves, conversion quotas are reduced and/or eliminated so that the undermanned rating cannot become overmanned.

**12. Continuation Board (N132)**

I work in a very top heavy command where 40 E7 and above are going before the continuation board. My question is with this large number facing possibility of going home in June 2010, is there a plan in place to replace them?

OS1 Kurtz, ATF Mayport, ([Thomas.kurtz@navy.mil](mailto:Thomas.kurtz@navy.mil))

**Response:**

The Performance Based Continuation Board for E7-E9 with 20 Years of Active Service is focused on a Sailor's performance. Some of those attributes are listed in NAVADMIN 096/09. There are no quotas associated with the board. For those Sailors not selected to continue, they have until June 2010 to transfer to the Fleet Reserve. This provides ample time for the distribution system to identify replacements. Since this board is focused on performance, we expect the majority of all Sailors to be recommended for continuation.

### **13. IA orders (PERS-4G)**

Individuals that go IA at their previous command, the member doesn't have a copy of orders and they are not in their service records. Is there a way for orders to be under BOL to get a copy for verification for advancement?

PS1 Denise Belvry, HSM-70 NAS Jax, ([denise.belviy@navy.mil](mailto:denise.belviy@navy.mil))

#### **Response:**

Archived orders cannot be kept on BOL once executed. Commands should contact PERS-4G for verification of IA orders for advancement purposes. CDR Hanna, PERS-4G, 901-874-2877

### **14. PFA and CFL's (N135)**

Just as NC's are senior subject matter experts in position to help guide Sailors in their careers, why isn't there a PT subject matter expert rate?

NC1 Katie Juhl, USS Cole, ([juhl@ddg67.navy.mil](mailto:juhl@ddg67.navy.mil))

#### **Response:**

In January 2008, a request for a CFL rating was proposed to senior leadership but, due to the current manning environment, was denied. N135 Physical Readiness Program Office submitted a package for a Physical Readiness NEC and it was also denied. However, the Physical Readiness Program Office is developing a Physical Readiness Control Officer (PRCO) initiative to be launched later this year. The PRCO is proposed as a collateral duty position on the staffs of Echelon II and III commands. The PRCO will oversee the Physical Readiness Program in their AOR and function as the conduit/point of contact with the N135F Physical Readiness Program Office.

Echelon 2 and 3 Commanders, through their PRCO, will be able to:

- Ensure Physical Readiness Programs are properly implemented and maintained in accordance with the OPNAVINST 6110.1 series and,
- Maintain accountability and oversight of subordinate command Physical Readiness Programs.

### **15. Overmanned ratings (N132/ECM)**

Is there anything being done for advancement in overmanned ratings at the E8/E9 level? PS in particular?

PSCS(SW) Steffenhagen, USPELMC NATO,  
([jay.steffenhagen@usdelmc.army.mil](mailto:jay.steffenhagen@usdelmc.army.mil))

#### **Response:**

All enlisted advancement quotas are approved by CNP. Quota development is completed by BUPERS 32 in conjunction with OPNAV N13. Common practice for E8 and E9 quota development is to advance to vacancies created by known losses for a given fiscal year. If a rating is overmanned and there are no vacancy quotas, the rate is reviewed to determine if additional quotas carry an acceptable risk. If it is determined by the quota development teams that additional quotas are an acceptable risk, then those quotas are briefed to CNP for approval. However, if it is determined that any quotas beyond

vacancy will be detrimental to future advancement opportunity, no additional quotas will be granted.

Manning is a significant factor in the advancement process. The PS rating is projected to lose about 500 billets per year in FY10 and FY11 (specifically, 20 E-9s and 26 E-8s). All E-8 and E-9 personnel are in Zones D and above, where there are no force stabilization tools like Perform-To-Serve (PTS) to help control manning in already overmanned ratings. To support optimum advancement opportunity for overmanned ratings, BUPERS 32 enforces High Year Tenure Policy and when feasible approves time in grade waivers for those requesting to retire earlier than normal. BUPERS 32 also disapproves requests to rescind approved retirement/fleet reserve transfer dates to assist with overall rating manning. These policies created a slightly improved promotion opportunity for PS at the E8 and E9 pay grades. Results from the performance-based continuation board may also have an impact on manning, opening promotion vacancies and improving advancement opportunities at the E8 and E9 pay grades.

**16. Online NCC tools (PMW240)**

NSPS, CIMS, ESR, FLTMPS, etc, should be more user friendly and combined to one stop shopping tool. Is there any way to centralize support provided by the online tools?

CMDCM (SW/AW) Marie Clark, NRD New York, ([marie.clark@navy.mil](mailto:marie.clark@navy.mil))

**Response:**

Pending.

**17. Advancement Announcement Procedures (N132)**

Why isn't the command leadership team provided advancement results 48 hours in advance of public release any longer? Why can't we set specific dates to publish advancement results?

CUCM (SCW) Michael Dyer, Camp David CMC ([MPDyer@whmo.mil](mailto:MPDyer@whmo.mil))

**Response:**

The 48 hour early notification policy was designed for Commanding Officers to counsel Sailors that were not selected before the list was published. Feedback from the fleet and improvement in connectivity resulted in this policy being eliminated. Current policy is to release all results as soon as possible for everyone as soon as they are available. If the Navy were to reinstitute the policy of informing the CO 48-hours in advance, publication of the results would be delayed two days.

Regarding specific publication dates, E4/5/6 advancement results are normally released prior to Thanksgiving (September exam) and Memorial Day weekend (March exam). There are no hard deadlines because there always exists the possibility that a problem may arise that forces the release date to be extended.

E7/8/9 release dates are largely contingent upon selection board schedules and do not have a set deadline.

Sailors should be assured that all advancement results have the highest priority and are moved through the approval process and released as quickly as possible.

### **18. PFA Separations for Nuclear Trained Personnel (N133)**

Seven nukes from USS ENTERPRISE with 6-8 PFA failures each were recommended for separation. However, they were all retained by the Navy. Why?

#### **Response:**

Per Navy policy and appointment letter from CNP, the Nuclear Propulsion Program Manager bears the responsibility to N1 and Naval Reactors for issues dealing with nuclear-trained personnel. All nuclear enlisted Sailors with three or more PFA failures are individually assessed by the community manager to determine their potential for further service and the impact on the ship and community at large if they are determined to be unfit for further service. Although Navy policy is that Sailors with three or more failures cannot reenlist or transfer, N133 determines whether the Sailor will stay onboard until their EAOS to support the nuclear mission and watch bill. In the case of those Sailors who have previously reenlisted for a Selective Reenlistment Bonus (SRB), that determination also allows the Navy to get the full contractual time in service that was paid for by the SRB. The Navy invests a significant amount of money in the training and retention of nuclear Sailors and N133 usually requires those Sailors to finish their contractual obligations.

In the case of USS ENTERPRISE, as of 23 June 2009, there are three nuclear rated Sailors in ENTERPRISE Engineering and Reactor Departments with 6-8 PFA failures in the last four years. One of those three has an existing readiness waiver from 2007. The other two were granted a waiver from N133 in Feb 2009. AIRFOR is working to reconcile the differing numbers reported by the ENTERPRISE CCC and the Reactor and Engineering Departments.

### **19. PTS – connecting from sea (PMS Program Manager/BUPERS-32)**

Comment on actions taken to prevent disadvantaging Sailors at sea with connectivity issues.

#### **Response:**

BUPERS-33 has had very few reports of connectivity issues by ships and squadrons preventing them from getting applications into the PTS system or reports of Sailors losing opportunity to get PTS looks due to connectivity issues. There are numerous methods by which commands can submit PTS applications for their Sailors. If there are connectivity issues with the preferred method, commands are encouraged to utilize one of the alternative methods. The following is a list of approved methods for submitting PTS applications (these policies have been in place since PTS's inception in 2003):

1. Web based application (Preferred method)
  - a. PTS - Individual or Excel Spreadsheet applications
  - b. Fleet RIDE - Individual applications (Currently disabled)
2. Email
  - a. Excel Spreadsheet applications
  - b. Data in text of email (As outlined in NAVADMIN 050/03 and modified in

NAVADMIN 161/09)

3. Naval Message (As outlined in NAVADMIN 050/03 and modified in NAVADMIN 161/09)

4. Telephonic

5. Ships in EMCOM that only have SIPRNET capability should send classified email to their ISIC/Squadron for submission of application into the PTS program or submission by spreadsheet to NPC per NAVADMIN 161/09.

**20. Orders for Reserve Personnel who are assigned duties at USNA/NAPS (N13SP)**

- a. Need a better process for order writing. Currently recruiters write orders to get the SELRES Sailor to USNA/NAPS. Those orders are then cancelled and new orders are generated by USNA/NAPS staff. Isn't there an easier way to do this?
- b. Fleet returnees to USNA/NAPS have car payments, credit cards, etc. It can sometimes be a difficult sell to get them to go to USNA/NAPS and take the pay cut. Is it possible for them to keep their fleet pay for the 1<sup>st</sup> two years?

**Response:**

Pending.

**21. PFA and the highly skilled (N135/N133/N13SP)**

For nukes with 2 PRT failures, can the SRB/ESRP payments be held in abeyance until successful completion of the next PRT?

**Response:**

Per U.S. Code 37, DODI 1304.21 and 1304.29, DODFMR Volume 7A, and OPNAV Instruction 1160.8A, there are no legal avenues to withhold contractually obligated payments for SRB and ESRP due to two PRT failures. In order for a payment to be withheld or recouped, a Sailor must either fail to complete the term of enlistment for which the bonus was paid, or lose his/her technical qualification for which the bonus was paid. All specific references to PFA detail actions that occur after the third failed PFA. There are no legal actions detailed for fewer than three failures.

**22. Any discussion of TERA for Zone D? (N130)**

**Response:**

Temporary Early Retirement Authority (TERA) expired in 2001 and there has been no discussion to seek new statutory TERA authority.