



Defense Advisory Committee on Women in the Services Articles of Interest for the Week of 23 October 2015

GENDER INTEGRATION

1. [The Navy's Uniform Changes Are Anything But Gender Neutral](#)

(14 Oct) Task & Purpose, By Anna Granville

The Navy's new uniform changes are supposed to be "gender neutral," but for officers and senior enlisted, they look much like the men's uniforms.

2. [3rd woman, and 1st female Reservist, dons Ranger tab](#)

(16 Oct) Army Times, By Michelle Tan

Maj. Lisa Jaster on Friday became the third woman – and first female Army Reserve officer – to earn the coveted black and gold Ranger tab.

3. [General to People writer: Army can't investigate claims against Ranger School if sources anonymous](#)

(17 Oct) Ledger-Enquirer, By Robin Trimarchi

Maj. Gen. Scott Miller's voice held frustration late Friday afternoon during a quickly arranged media roundtable on the fourth floor of McGinnis-Wickam Hall, headquarters of the Army's Maneuver Center of Excellence.

4. [Corps' fittest Marines conquer new high-speed gauntlet](#)

(19 Oct) Marine Corps Times, By James K. Sanborn

Two enlisted Marines have been named the Corps' top tactical athletes following the service's first-ever annual High Intensity Tactical Training Ultimate Tactical Athlete Championship — a grueling three-day CrossFit Games-style competition that pitted some of the service's strongest troops against each other.

CAREER PROGRESSION

5. [Early out chances for sailors to leave Navy double](#)

(19 Oct) Navy Times, By Mark D. Faram

Call it an early out explosion. Since the service began offering them 16 months ago, the numbers of monthly quotas for early tickets home have doubled, along with the number of discharges.

6. [One Sailor's Experience with Career Intermission \(Part 4\)](#)

(20 Oct) All Hands, By MC2 Amara Timberlake

Amara Timberlake is an MC2 currently taking advantage of the Career Intermission Program. This blog is part of a series.

PREGANCY AND PARENTHOOD

7. [Editorial: Boost leave for military's new fathers](#)

(17 Oct) Navy Times, By Military Times Editors

In this era of budget austerity, America's all-volunteer military faces several retention challenges, not least the stiff competition from a strengthening private sector where employee benefits packages are increasingly becoming more generous than those offered by the government.

8. [Local breastfeeding rules trumped by new Army reg](#)

(19 Oct) Army Times, By Kevin Lilley

The Army included few specifics in its official breastfeeding and lactation policy to allow greater flexibility for commanders to meet the nursing needs of new mothers, an Army spokesman said.

9. [Agency catching up on backlogged Army child care payments](#)

(20 Oct) Military Times, By Karen Jowers

About 92 percent of the backlogged invoices for the Army child care fee assistance program have now been paid, according to the General Services Administration.

10. [New system at MacDill AFB helps military parents find child care](#)

(22 Oct) The Tampa Tribune, By Howard Altman

On Wednesday, a new web-based system went online at MacDill that will help alleviate some of the hassles of trying to find childcare for families frequently on the move. MilitaryChildCare.com, a website run by the Defense Department, allows parents to register for existing on-base childcare services quickly and easily.

SEXUAL HARASSMENT & SEXUAL ASSAULT

11. [Defense seeks dismissal of sexual assault case transferred to Washington](#)

(17 Oct) Air Force Times, By Jeff Schogol

Defense attorneys will argue on Monday that a military judge should dismiss a sexual assault case that was transferred to Washington after a three-star general in Europe decided the matter should not go to court-martial.

12. [Coast Guard Officer Faces Court-Martial](#)

(19 Oct) The Beaumont Enterprise, By Eric Besson

A Coast Guard officer based in Galveston will face a military court in New Orleans on Monday over a string of allegations, including sexual assault, stemming from his time in Port Arthur, according to a Coast Guard news release.

13. [Army releases results of September courts-martial](#)

(22 Oct) Army Times

The Army on Friday released the results of courts-martial completed in September. Names of soldiers who were acquitted on all charges were not provided.

1. The Navy's Uniform Changes Are Anything But Gender Neutral

(14 Oct) Task & Purpose, By Anna Granville

There is one glaring issue with the Navy's significant shift toward gender-neutral uniforms: they aren't particularly gender neutral.

The uniforms are men's uniforms slightly redesigned for women. And female officers will be forced to pay out of pocket for them.

Secretary of the Navy Ray Mabus stated that the changes were driven by a priority to unify sailors and not divide them by gender. The Marine Corps has implemented similar uniform changes. "Uniformity is about ending the way we segregate women by requiring them to wear different clothes," Mabus said back in May. "In the Navy and in the Marine Corps, we are trending towards uniforms that don't divide us as male or female, but rather unite us as sailors or Marines."

It may come as a surprise to many servicewomen that wearing a tailored, professional, feminine, dress uniform made them less of a participant in the naval service compared to the men to their left and right. However, forcing female officers to be the only service members who will pay out of pocket for the changes immediately creates a division: only one group is significantly impacted. Male officers and chiefs are completely unaffected, and all enlisted personnel will receive a monetary allowance to cover the costs of new uniforms, leaving female officers paying for a uniform change few wanted in the first place.

The changes, which will kick in October 2016, include a new unisex service dress blue for all enlisted sailors. All who wear this uniform will be required to wear the men's "dixie cup" cover, effectively doing away with the female "bucket" cover and dress blue jacket by 2020. A new enlisted service dress white uniform will be phased in for wear by 2020. A new service dress white "choker" uniform with Mandarin collar will be available for female chief petty officers and officer in 2017 for required wear by 2020. All female chiefs and officers will be required to wear the "Alternate Combination Cover" — the male cover redesigned to better fit a head wearing a bun — by October 2016.

Enlisted sailors and chief petty officers will receive a clothing allowance to pay for the new uniforms. New accessions, including enlisted sailors graduating from boot camp and newly commissioned officers, will be largely unaffected financially by the changes. Both receive a one-time clothing allowance that covers the cost of buying thousands of dollars' worth of new uniforms.

The issue of expense for female chiefs has specifically been addressed in the new guidance, stating "Uniform allowances for female CPOs [Chief Petty Officers] will be adjusted to facilitate procurement of the new SDW [Service Dress White] coat prior to the mandatory wear date." None has been issued for female officers, which leads me to the assumption that female officers will be expected to pay out of pocket.

The cost of all the new uniform items has not yet been released. Only the alternate combination cover is available on the Navy Exchange website for \$71.99. It's certain that female officers will be expected to pay a minimum of \$200 to replace over \$300 worth in perfectly serviceable uniform items. That number is based on the cost of male uniforms, including the mandatory cost tailoring.

Currently, male officers pay \$69.99 for a combination cover, and \$164.99 for a service dress white jacket, for a total of \$234.98. Women pay \$89.99 for the current combination cover and \$238.99 for the service dress white jacket, for a total of \$328.98. That's already a 40% markup for female officers, and for a uniform that's rarely worn — I've worn mine twice in six years.

The new uniform items that female officers will be required to buy will likely cost the same as the current women's uniform items. After the cost of tailoring, the uniform changes will run female officers nearly \$700 out of pocket without compensation, all for a uniform that is worn less than once a year. That was a month's rent when I lived in Virginia Beach as an ensign.

It's a known fact that the military changes its uniforms all the time. The Navy's last major overhaul was during the rollout of the Navy working uniform type I and Navy service uniform in 2010, but smaller, incremental changes have occurred annually. These changes have come with the expectation that service members will then have to buy them. This wastes taxpayer money, enriches the manufacturers, and forces service members to spend their salaries on something that does nothing for national security. That said, it's a largely accepted frustration, and like many other changes that service members don't initially like, we get over it, used to it, and move on.

The Navy has been especially notorious for this in recent years, with the issuance of the working uniform type I and service uniform, now-defunct development of service dress khakis, working uniform type II and III to Navy ground forces, and flame-resistant coveralls. While frustrating, the changes either affected all sailors or were an optional expense. The Navy fitness suit, which will be required by 2020, is an example of the former, while a female khaki overblouse remains optional for female chiefs and officers.

An additional subject of frustration is that the changes were not something that had been particularly asked for, and there are mixed emotions about them. If you were to ask most female naval officers if there's anything about their uniforms they'd like to change, the answer is simple and nearly unanimous: pants that fit.

The khaki and summer white pants are notoriously ill-fitting and widely unpopular as they come all the way up to the natural waist. Otherwise, the female dress uniforms are sharp, professional, and distinctly feminine. One feels very confident when walking around in a uniform that has been largely unchanged in design since they were first issued to the Women Accepted for Volunteer Emergency

Service in World War II.

Despite ambivalence about the style of the new uniforms, millions have been spent on their development, and their introduction is inevitable. However, a few measures can be taken to make the changes more palatable and equitable:

Provide a uniform allowance for the purchase and tailoring of the new uniforms.

Enlisted personnel are already provided with uniform allowances at accession, annually, and then every three years. Female officers should be provided with the same allowance that female chiefs receive. While there is no precedent for this, there is also no precedent for only requiring one gender group to shoulder a significant expense.

Allow female officers who commission prior to 2016 to be “grandfathered” in, and make the new uniform items optional for them.

This means that anyone who joined the Navy before new uniform items became available will not be required to buy new ones. There is some precedent, as some obsolete uniform items, including the khaki “Ike” jacket, were authorized for wear well after they were no longer available for sale.

Incorporate more transparency and feedback into the uniform development process.

Millions are spent on uniforms that nobody wants or needs, but sailors have come to expect changes every few years. At the very least, changes could reflect significant feedback from the fleet. Currently the new uniforms are tested primarily on Naval Academy midshipmen, who have no basis for comparison, and a select few senior officers. If junior officers or mid-grade officers get to wear test the uniforms, it typically occurs in the Washington, D.C., area. The items are very rarely tested in other fleet concentration areas, and the feedback is not released to the wider Navy.

There’s precedent for feedback leading to a positive change, with a new lightweight Navy working uniform rolling out next year to humid, tropical locations such as Guam, Singapore, and Hawaii. Otherwise, recent changes have been executed with little transparency, without the results of wear tests being released. As far as we know, the changes could have occurred with complete disregard from the feedback of wear testers.

Maybe next time, we’ll get pants that fit.

<http://taskandpurpose.com/the-navys-uniform-changes-are-anything-but-gender-neutral/>

2. 3rd woman, and 1st female Reservist, dons Ranger tab

(16 Oct) Army Times, By Michelle Tan

Maj. Lisa Jaster on Friday became the third woman – and first female Army Reserve officer – to earn the coveted black and gold Ranger tab.

A total of 88 soldiers graduated from Ranger School during a ceremony Friday at Fort Benning, Georgia.

Jaster, a 37-year-old engineer, joins Capt. Kristen Griest and 1st Lt. Shaye Haver as the only women in the Army to have graduated from Ranger School. They are the only ones from a group of 19 female soldiers who started Ranger School in April as part of the Army’s [gender-integrated assessment](#) to successfully complete the punishing course.

Griest and Haver, who attended Jaster’s graduation ceremony, [graduated on Aug. 21](#).

All three women are West Point graduates.

The Army’s gender-integrated assessment of its storied Ranger School has drawn a [high level of scrutiny](#), with many questioning whether the Army is lowering its standards for the elite school, while many others have cheered on the female students.

Critics of the Army’s decision to open Ranger School to women – a school that until this year had only been open to men – have repeatedly bashed the effort online and in social media. Many have said the Army was relaxing its standards for the school or giving the female candidates an advantage by allowing them multiple attempts at the school’s three phases.

Army officials have long insisted that the [standards have not been changed](#) in any way.

The Army in September announced that Ranger School is now [open to all qualified soldiers](#), regardless of gender.

Jaster is an engineer for Shell Oil Co. in her civilian life and an Army Reserve individual mobilization augmentee with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in Huntsville, Alabama, according to information from the Reserve.

A cross-training enthusiast who practices Brazilian Jiu-Jitsu, Jaster enlisted the help of her husband and two children as she prepared for the physical demands of Ranger School.

Jaster's husband, Allan, is an officer in the Marine Corps Reserve.

"At my age, I've done a few things, so I've got a deep well of motivation that I can dig down into," said Jaster, a veteran of both Iraq and Afghanistan, according to an article posted by the Reserve. "Some people worry that having a family is a detriment or that will demotivate me, but I think having that will make me stronger and will push me through."

What remains to be seen is whether the Army will open its infantry, armor and special operations ranks to women. Senior Army leaders have submitted their recommendation to the Defense Department; a decision isn't expected until the end of the year.

The Army has already opened its combat engineer and field artillery military occupational specialties to women.

Ranger School is the Army's premier combat leadership course, teaching students how to overcome fatigue, hunger and stress to lead soldiers in small-unit combat operations. It is separate from the 75th Ranger Regiment.

Soldiers who have earned Ranger Tabs, male or female, are not automatically part of the regiment, which has its own requirements and assessment process.

<http://www.armytimes.com/story/military/careers/army/2015/10/16/3rd-woman-and-1st-female-reservist-dons-ranger-tab/74070360/>

3. General to People writer: Army can't investigate claims against Ranger School if sources anonymous

(17 Oct) Ledger-Enquirer, By Robin Trimarchi

Maj. Gen. Scott Miller's voice held frustration late Friday afternoon during a quickly arranged media roundtable on the fourth floor of McGinnis-Wickam Hall, headquarters of the Army's Maneuver Center of Excellence.

The commanding general of Fort Benning has been fighting allegations for months that female soldiers were given special treatment to pass Ranger School, the most physically and mentally demanding training offered by the Army.

Four hours after the third woman graduated, Miller sat front and center with Command Sgt. Maj. Timothy Metheny to his right and four members of the Airborne and Ranger Training Brigade, including the commander, Col. David Fivecoat, and Command Sgt. Maj. Curtis Arnold, on his left flank.

"There are some people who obviously have some concerns," Miller said. "I can't address them if they are opaque. These guys can't address them or fix them if they are opaque."

Among the three reporters was Susan Keating, a People magazine correspondent who has reported that multiple unnamed sources have told her there was unfair assistance given to the women.

The most telling moment came more than 50 minutes into an interview that lasted almost an hour and a half. Miller, who won the Bronze Star for Valor as Delta Force ground commander in the Battle of Mogadishu, was asked if his credibility had been damaged by the allegations.

"I have thick skin and I am a public figure, but I will tell you who doesn't deserve this is these guys," he said, pointing to the Ranger instructors. "They don't deserve this. ... I keep telling everybody I will put my name on anything I say or do. If they are not willing to put their name on it or come back to me. ..."

That sparked an exchange between Miller and the People correspondent, prompting Keating to ask Miller, "What if one of my sources comes to me and I say, 'You need to go tell Gen. Miller right now, you need to go knock on his door and tell him exactly what you are telling me, and give him the same specifics, dates and details that you are giving me'? What's the push back on that? Will he get repercussions?"

"He will not get repercussions," Miller responded.

“Will you come back and say, ‘Why did you give a go when you shouldn’t have?’” Keating asked the general.

“If he says he gave a go he shouldn’t have given, then he needs to report that,” Miller said.

“So, there would be repercussions for him, right?” Keating asked. “This is part of what we are up against. I have actually asked these people, why don’t you go knock on his door? He’s been in combat. He’s been around the block a few times, right? They say, ‘No. Our careers will be over. We will be ruined.’”

Arnold, the training brigade’s command sergeant major, seemed amused as he listened.

“I am sorry to laugh, ma’am, but I will tell you right now, no one has been threatened,” he said. “That is the funny part about this, ma’am. For a soldier to say that to you, I would have to challenge them — not that they gave the go and they are going to be in trouble. They are not going to get in trouble. My point is, we cannot have good order and discipline within a unit by allowing stuff like that to continue. I cannot allow a unit to think they cannot trust their chain of command.”

“There would not be repercussions?” Keating asked again.

“We would investigate them,” Miller said. “Quite frankly, I am at the point now where (Fivecoat) would not investigate himself, (Ranger instructors) would not investigate themselves. If I felt I was part of the allegation, I would go up and find someone above me to come down here and take a look at this. Part of that is you have to give up some of your anonymity.”

Keating has also broken two stories about the status of an inquiry that Oklahoma Republican Congressman Steve Russell, a retired Army lieutenant colonel with deep roots to the infantry and combat tours to Iraq and Afghanistan, sent a letter to Secretary of the Army John McHugh on Sept. 15. The Ledger-Enquirer obtained the letter from Russell’s office and published it on its website.

Among the documents Russell requested were patrol grade sheets, spot reports, phase evaluation reports and sick call reports, all “with Ranger Instructors’ comments for each and every phase to include every recycled phase and class.”

Russell also requested peer evaluations and “a complete breakdown of each female candidate’s recycle history and dates for each phase.”

Miller never addressed the inquiry from Russell in the news conference.

Fivecoat, the training brigade commander, said that if there was special treatment for the women it would have surfaced in complaints from the students.

“If one of the students had received hot chow or received a go when they didn’t deserve it, the students would have brought that up,” Fivecoat said. “They are brutally honest. They got nothing to hide. The students weren’t getting anything out of this.”

Earlier in the day, four Ranger School students including Maj. Lisa Jaster, the newest female graduate, met with the media. Jaster, Capt. Kristen Griest and 1st Lt. Shaye Haver have all received the tab. Another soldier who met with reporters was 1st Lt. Seth Clickner, a human resources officer in the 7th Special Forces Group. He has spent more than 150 days in the course and been in units or companies with all three women during the training.

“I was fortunate enough to get to do every phase of Ranger School twice,” Clickner said, drawing laughter. “I was in Shaye Haver’s squad the first time, Kristen Griest’s company for two go-throughs, and Maj. Jaster’s squad and company for the remainder. I saw no special treatment of the females. And if there was, I guess I must have missed out on that. I spent six months here and I saw nothing of the sort.”

One of the allegations Keating made was that a source said a general in January told subordinates “a woman will graduate Ranger School.” The general was not named.

Miller addressed that specifically.

“There’s been a lot of implications that there is top-down pressure. What I keep saying is there wasn’t top-down pressure,” he said. “... ‘We had an anonymous general come in and say someone will graduate.’ We are still looking for that individual, by the way. We are trying to figure out what may have been misconstrued that would lead someone to believe that. It wasn’t me, and it wasn’t (former infantry commandant) Jim Rainey, the best I can tell. I asked him if he ever went out there and inadvertently said something like that, and he said no.”

Lost in the allegations are the reputations of the three women who have passed the course, Miller said.

“Let’s not forget, there is Jaster, there is Haver and there is Griest,” Miller said. “Susan, your articles notwithstanding, I can guarantee you at the end of that pendulum it does not feel comfortable to sit there and be scrutinized for something that should be seen as a damn good accomplishment.”

<http://www.ledger-enquirer.com/news/local/military/article39621459.html#storylink=cpy>

4. Corps' fittest Marines conquer new high-speed gauntlet

(19 Oct) Marine Corps Times, By James K. Sanborn

Two enlisted Marines have been named the Corps' top tactical athletes following the service's first-ever annual High Intensity Tactical Training Ultimate Tactical Athlete Championship — a grueling three-day CrossFit Games-style competition that pitted some of the service's strongest troops against each other.

One male and one female Marine were crowned after proving themselves during the inaugural servicewide HITT Championship last month at the Marine Corps Air Ground Combat Center in Twentynine Palms, California. In all, 32 Marines from nearly every Marine installation squared off against each other in a series of events that tested their physical mettle.

Staff Sgt. Lauren Schoener, 25, and Cpl. Joshua Boozer, 22, pulled ahead, acing the five-stage championship that tested strength, endurance, agility, coordination and flexibility. Now they have champion belts — like those that boxers and UFC title champions win — to show for it.

Schoener, who serves in the provost marshal's office at Marine Corps Air Station Yuma, Arizona, is a CrossFit instructor in her off time. Boozer, an ammunition technician with 1st Tank Battalion at Twentynine Palms, was inspired by his sergeant major to get involved in basewide HITT competitions.

"When I won it felt great," Boozer said. "I had some guys in my unit come by to watch me. ...When they called my name I saw a big smile on [my sergeant major's] face."

It's the first time Marines have seen a Corps-wide fitness match on this scale, but it has been years in the making. Soon after the Marine Corps launched its HITT program in 2012, officials were looking at ways to create a servicewide event that would build camaraderie and tap into Marines' competitive athletic spirit.

At its core, the idea is to use the competition to get more Marines involved and push them to hone their combat conditioning.

"It is really getting Marines ready to do what we have to do when we forward deploy, and making a competition out of it," said Master Sgt. Daniel Jackson, the staff noncommissioned officer in charge for Marine Corps Community Services, who helped organize the event. "The HITT program was developed around combat readiness — this championship has all those elements."

Competition organizers are at work planning next year's event. Marines looking to compete will have a chance to match up with other Marines on their base. If they win that competition, they'll ship off to Twentynine Palms where they'll face off against the rest of the best, so the time to start preparing is now.

Finding the Corps' top athletes

The HITT Championship was designed to test all aspects of fitness that are necessary on a chaotic and unpredictable battlefield where Marines could be called on to run ammunition cans between fights, drag wounded comrades out of the line of fire or haul themselves over a wall in full battle rattle.

The competitors had to be physically well-rounded to succeed, said Ryan Massimo, Semper Fit's combat fitness program manager.

"The great part about having five events with very different goals is that it provides Marines the opportunity to show their strengths," he said. "But it also tests their weaknesses, and at the end of the day shows who is the ultimate tactical athlete."

HITT became part of Marines' physical training regimen in October 2012. The functional fitness program, somewhat similar to CrossFit, includes pre-set workouts with hundreds of exercises that complement the various phases of a Marine's deployment cycle. The exercises emphasize injury prevention through balanced fitness by incorporating endurance, flexibility and explosive strength.

Those elements could be seen across the competition, with Marines flipping Humvee tires, carrying 140-pound dummies, doing pullups while wearing weighted vests, and firing weapons between sprints.

Schoener said it was nerve wracking to compete against Marines she knew were top performers.

"The nervous jitters like most Marines feel before [Physical and Combat Fitness tests] was amplified because we knew we were competing against Marines who could probably out PT us on any given day," she said.

Boozer said his greatest struggle was endurance. During the tactical hill climb, the Marines were tasked with running 400 yards uphill in four 100-yard legs. Each leg, they were given a new item to carry: a heavy pack, a crew-served weapon, a dummy, and finally a Humvee tire.

At the top of the hill, Marines had to catch their breath and shoot using a weapon simulator. After they were scored on their shooting, they ran back down the hill.

Boozer said it was by far the most challenging event.

"I am weak when it comes to long-distance running," he said.

It "took a lot of heart" to push through events like that, Boozer said, so he developed a strategy to pull ahead in events more suited to his strengths: sprinting and heavy lifting.

"I excelled the most on day one where I knew the events would consist of a lot of sprinting and quick stuff," he said. "I knew I wanted to blow that out of the water and beat my competition there to start out well and make up for lost points on the other events."

The strategy worked. There is no question both Boozer and Schoener set the bar. Exactly what that bar was though is a bit of a mystery. While they unquestionably won, organizers say, the official carrying the score cards in his pocket was doused with a bucket of liquid during a post-competition celebration, ruining the written records.

For Schoener, events that required lifting oddly shaped objects were the toughest, she said. That included carrying a 90-pound ballistic rubber block, a 90-pound sandbag and a crew-served weapon. Some of those objects feel heavier or are more difficult to maneuver than standard exercise weights of a similar weight, competitors and organizers said.

Other events included a 25-yard dash, a standing long jump and agility cone drills. Marines also conducted a rigorous battle skills challenge, which included lifting heavy, oddly shaped objects like sand bags and ballistic rubber blocks.

Motivation through competition

Days after the first competition ended, Jackson and his team already began the planning phases for next year's competition at Twentynine Palms.

Like this year, they plan to first host a competition at every installation that will crown a top male and female competitor at each base. MCCA organized a standardized set of qualification events at every installation around the world, Massimo said.

Each installation held three events this summer. The first was a kettlebell-burpee challenge in which Marines had to complete a series of kettlebell swings and standard burpees. The second event was a 400-yard tactical course that included a tire flip, a sandbag carry, a fireman's carry and a sprint — each for 100 yards. The third was the standard HITT performance assessment, which tests power, agility, endurance and mobility. That included a standing broad jump; a kneeling power ball throw; a 25-yard dash; drills that require Marines to quickly change direction while sprinting; and balance and coordination tests.

The base and Corps-wide competitions are tough, but Jackson, the master sergeant who helped organize them, said Marine camaraderie was on display throughout.

"They are tactical athletes, warriors, out there," he said. "They are competing, but they are also cheering each other on. The morale is high. I don't think any of their peers would let them stop."

Both champions said competing against other athletic Marines helped motivate them.

"For me, I'm driven by my competitive spirit," Boozer said. "I love to compete. It is probably the only time you see me putting out my

most — when I want to show I'm better than my peers."

Schoener agrees, and said that sense of teamwork is a common theme in the Marine Corps.

"The way [my peers] pushed me, I would want every Marine to feel that camaraderie on a daily basis," she said. "We are our biggest supporters and also our biggest competitors. You wanted to win, but at the same time you were just as willing to yell and give advice to your potential competitor or somebody that could beat you."

Even those who weren't performing as well as the winners were determined to see each event through, Schoener said.

"Nobody would quit," she said. "Even if it took them 30 minutes to complete something it took someone else four, they just didn't give up. Everyone attacked their weaknesses and wouldn't take no for an answer. I think that was the most important part everyone learned from the competition — to just dig deep and get it done."

Next year, both champions said they plan to defend their titles.

"I will most definitely be back," Boozer said confidently.

<http://www.marinecorpstimes.com/story/military/2015/10/19/corps-fittest-marines-conquer-new-high-speed-gauntlet/72736466/>

5. Early out chances for sailors to leave Navy double

(19 Oct) Navy Times, By Mark D. Faram

Call it an early out explosion. Since the service began offering them 16 months ago, the numbers of monthly quotas for early tickets home have doubled, along with the number of discharges.

The Navy brought these back under a new Enlisted Early Transition Program in May 2014 that allows sailors in targeted ratings to leave the service up to two years before their commitment is up. Since then, 816 sailors have been approved to leave active-duty with an average of 14 months shaved off their enlistments.

Still, these early outs aren't being offered to everyone. The program is targeted at overmanned ratings and year groups, and is frequently adjusted to reduce those manpower clogs where advancement and reenlistment are exceptionally tough. The goal is to give sailors who'd like to leave this opportunity, and reduce the chances that those who stay in uniform will have their re-up rejected in rate or will suffer from paltry advancement and risk being forced out at their high year tenure cap.

"I'd say the program has been a success in what it set out to do and has contributed, along with other factors in many cases, to improving the health of ratings where we have offered opportunity," Capt. B. L. Deshotel, the head enlisted community manager at Navy Personnel Command, said. "I'm very positive in some ratings that if we put out more quotas we could get more applicants."

So if you are eligible for the program, now might be your time.

No "volun-told" here. Deshotel said that the early out program is 100 percent voluntary.

"This is a voluntary-force shaping measure and allows us to offer some sailors the chance to leave early and, as a result, free up greater opportunity for sailors desiring to stay Navy," Deshotel said.

Simply getting out early won't impact the kind of discharge you get — it will be a fully honorable discharge, officials say.

Still, there could be other consequences to consider. Whittling off active-duty time could impact on your GI Bill eligibility — or at least the amount of benefit you rate.

How it works

Officials aren't opening the doors to everybody. Only those in selected overmanned ratings, paygrades and year groups can apply to get a ticket home.

This early transition program is targeted to sailors with 14 years of service or less and in pay grades E-6 and below — those subject to re-up rules under the Career Waypoints re-enlistment approval system, known as C-WAY.

Sailors in eligible skills are able to leave the service up to two years early — often with as little as two years of service.

Early out quotas are set monthly by enlisted community managers who publish those vacancies on the Navy Personnel Command Web page.

As of Oct. 1, there's 755 offerings in 21 different ratings. Both of those tallies have doubled since the program was brought back last year, when 378 sailor quotas across 10 ratings were offered.

The ratings now eligible run the gamut: aviation; Seabees; engineering; surface operations and supply.

The ratings on the list change, so interested sailors should check the list every couple of weeks.

“There's a natural fluctuation in which ratings are on the list, so it's best that sailors check it often,” Deshotel said. “It goes to the purpose of the program, which is to bring down the numbers of overmanned ratings, so offering those who want to leave the chance will then open up advancement and retention opportunities for sailors who want to stay.”

With changes in manning levels, officials will tweak ratings and quotas in the future to target overmanned skills.

With retention still high, officials say they needed a way to relieve pressure on any rating or part of it that's 104 percent manned or more.

Officials now track manning down to paygrade and Navy Enlisted Classifications. Sometimes the most important category is year group, the year you entered the Navy. That alone could determine within a given rating or NEC skill whether you will be allowed to reenlist — or to go home early if you choose.

The Damage Controlman rating is a good example. They're overall manned at 102.3 percent of where they're required to be by the end of this fiscal year. That's considered "balanced" by Navy standards. First-term sailors, known as the zone A re-enlistment group, are manned at 100 percent and many are eligible for re-up bonuses.

But under the lid, there's problems in the DC rating. This is especially true at the E-3 and E-4 levels.

The problems lie in year groups 2012 and 2013. The 2012 year group is slightly over their manning and currently up to 20 of them from any paygrade are eligible for an early out.

The problem is worse among the 2013 year group, which has double the number of sailors needed. Of the nearly 600 sailors currently in the DC rating and in the 2013 year group, nearly half of them are E-3s. This is contributing to a much lower advancement shot to E-4 — 29.4 percent, nearly 10 percentage points under the Navy-wide average.

The 2013 yeargroup from DC isn't offered early outs yet, but it's likely they'll be on the list soon. Early outs could remedy an advancement slowdown. Without a remedy, clogs like this one will impact advancement with an increased chance of high-year tenure separations at eight years for E-4 and 14 years for E-5. There's also the possibility that re-enlistment opportunities could drop and these sailors won't be able to re-up in rate.

A total of 208 sailors were denied re-enlistment in fiscal year 2014, the latest year for which data was available.

On the other end of the spectrum are the Seabees, which have seen commands shuttered and billets cut in recent years.

And it's likely to be a year or more until opportunities improve in hard hit ratings like Utilitiesman, where advancement is well below Navy-wide averages.

" '05, '06 & '13 yeargroup will remain competitive for foreseeable future, consider all options including conversion and EETP," a September note on the NPC website read. The note also included conversion opportunities to fleet ratings.

As of September, UT was offering 34 quotas across eight year groups between 2003 and 2013. Only 2009 and 2011 are excluded along with anyone holding four critical NECs.

If a sailor believes his skill is overmanned but doesn't find it on the list, officials say it's OK to ask their community manager through their career counselor.

The sailor's request must be approved by their commanding officer before it gets to the community managers, who have the final say. If he or she says no, that's it: There isn't an appeals process and commands don't have to forward mixed requests.

First-come, first-serve

Critics have long argued that previous early-out programs failed because skippers don't want to let sailors go without a relief in sight.

That's still the case with this program. A relief isn't guaranteed until an early out sailor would have normally left their ship or the service. The current rules allow COs to discharge sailors up to three months early.

But Deshotel says that he hasn't heard complaints from the fleet about this and officials have said that though there aren't guarantees, efforts will be made to fill the billet as soon as possible.

"When I go on my fleet engagement trips, I have received no negative feedback from COs on the EETP," he said.

Having an unfilled billet would naturally weigh into a skipper's decision, but most seem to open to considering other factors, Deshotel said.

"Some COs have mentioned in their endorsements to us that the fact that they are going to probably suffer a [manning] gap for allowing their sailor to separate early, they feel that the action is in the best interests of the sailors and the Navy," he said. "We see that routinely."

If your CO signs off, applications that make it to the community managers have a 93 percent approval rate. Of the 881 who have applied so far to NPC, 816 have gotten the final OK.

Deshotel says most of those who've been turned down were because they weren't in an eligible rating. Another factor is if a sailor who holds a critical NEC that specifically excludes them from applying, even if they meet all other requirements.

"The overwhelming majority of disapprovals are due to the fact [that] sailors applying are not eligible for what they are asking for," he said. "For example, they are requesting to separate earlier than the required 24 months allowed or they're not meeting the parameters for eligibility set out in the NAVADMIN — we're even receiving some requests from sailors in ratings that there are no published quotas for."

In some overmanned ratings, sailors have been disapproved because the quotas have been used up.

"They're given out on a first-come, first-served basis, and once the quotas are removed, sometimes quotas are trickling in for a while after that and we have to disapprove them," he said.

Other factors that could exclude an otherwise eligible sailor from applying: those currently under permanent change of station orders; those identified to fill an individual augmentee assignment; or those currently on a Department of Defense area tour.

No early-out quota offerings come from ratings and paygrades offering Selective Reenlistment Bonuses. Should that change, sailors receiving SRBs who take the early outs would forfeit future bonus payments and could be ordered to repay bonuses for time they won't serve.

Once granted a quota, sailors won't be eligible to compete for advancement, and will be tagged in C-WAY.

Think twice before applying. Sailors with approved early outs who change their minds may find it tough to get their early out canceled. Those requests will be handled on a case-by-case basis. If allowed to stay, sailors will have to compete for re-enlistment in

the existing C-WAY system.

Complete details on early out eligibility are available in [NAVADMIN 103/14](#).

Right now this is the only voluntary early out offering in the Navy and there are no plans to offer further incentives to thin overmanned skills. The service has opted against allowing early retirements for sailors with 15 years or more. It has been used in a few cases for those discharged in 2012 after being cut by 2011 Enlisted Retention Boards. Don't expect to see any more early retirements offered, officials say.

GI Bill impact

Leaving early can have an impact on your education benefits, so carefully consider this factor.

Veterans with 180 days of active duty or more are already eligible for basic vets benefits. But education benefits are a little different. Under the Post-9/11 Veterans Education Assistance Act of 2008, sailors with a minimum of 90 aggregate days beginning on or after Sept. 11, 2001, become eligible to receive educational benefits. Full benefits are only available after 36 months of qualifying active-duty service and are prorated for those discharged prior the 36 months threshold.

A first-term sailor who opts to leave the service after only two years into a four-year enlistment, for example, will have only a 60 percent post-9/11 GI Bill benefit. By staying for one more year, to 36 months, that sailor would earn a 100 percent eligibility — worth thousands of dollars more a year.

In addition, sailors with obligated service because they've transferred their post-9/11 GI Bill entitlement to a family member must fulfill that obligation, otherwise the VA will not pay the benefits to that family member and also could try to recoup any benefits already paid to them.

<http://www.navytimes.com/story/military/2015/10/19/early-out-chances-sailors-leave-navy-double/73160194/>

6. One Sailor's Experience with Career Intermission (Part 4)

(20 Oct) All Hands, By MC2 Amara Timberlake

Amara Timberlake is an MC2 currently taking advantage of the Career Intermission Program. This blog is part of a series.

[One Sailor's Experience with Career Intermission - Part 1](#)

[One Sailor's Experience with Career Intermission - Part 2](#)

[One Sailor's Experience with Career Intermission - Part 3](#)

Fall is here, which means a new semester for me. College has been surprisingly easy and I'm excited to report that I'll have my associate's degree this December! I never thought I'd be this excited to be earning a two year degree but this is a benchmark of progress for me. This associate's means that I'm officially half way to a Bachelor of Arts in Communications and even closer to applying for an officer slot. Things are actually going according to plan, which is a refreshing change for me.

Financially, I'm getting back on track too. With my separation, moving and the holidays wiping out my wallet all at once, I got a job at a popular chain restaurant downtown serving up delicious deserts, which was the exact thing I said I didn't want to do. The people in my work-group turned out to be fun to work with and the money was quick but it was challenging for the restaurant to work around my school schedule. I was able to pay down some debt and put some cash in savings so after a short stint there, I quit.

I also quit because I found it really hard to fit into the corporate culture of that restaurant. I got really frustrated when others didn't share my priorities, but being the low man on the totem pole, (who is also brand new to the company), there wasn't too much I could do about it. That's one thing they don't tell you about getting out of the Navy; the next job you have might not be glamorous, and you probably won't be in charge, and no one is going to give a crap about what you did before you got there. No one cares that you got a NAM or a JCOM. They only hired you because they think a vet wouldn't walk out halfway through a shift because their new job sucks. I'll bet that's not unique to my particular experience. Based on a lot of people I see getting out, you're one of the lucky few if you land your dream job within the first eight months. I can see why more people have a tough time transitioning. I also quit because school is more important to me and I have a lot to fall back on, including going back to the Navy.

Needless to say, I'm really looking forward to returning to active duty. I miss doing what I'm good at and earning a decent paycheck for it. In the meantime, I'm tweaking my resume, networking and looking for the perfect opportunity to flex my communication skills.

If it takes as long to do my bachelors as it took for my associates, I'll be calling my detailer this time next year in search of some sweet sea duty. Until then, you can find me buried under a pile of books, job applications, or sand, because when I'm not working hard on trying to become an officer, I'm at the beach working on my tan.

http://www.navy.mil/ah_online/frStory.asp?issue=3&id=91624

7. Editorial: Boost leave for military's new fathers

(17 Oct) Navy Times, By Military Times Editors

In this era of budget austerity, America's all-volunteer military faces several retention challenges, not least the stiff competition from a strengthening private sector where employee benefits packages are increasingly becoming more generous than those offered by the government.

One shortfall the Pentagon can quickly and easily address is the amount of time off it provides to new fathers.

Some military services have recently updated their maternity leave policy, a valuable change that recognizes the obvious importance of accommodating new moms. The Air Force, for instance, now says that female airmen don't have to deploy for a year after giving birth. Sailors and Marines now get 18 weeks of maternity leave — triple what they had earlier this year. The Army says it is considering similar changes.

It's time for DoD to give new fathers a better deal, too. Becoming a father is a life-changing experience. A modest change, say doubling paid paternity leave from 10 to 20 days, is not only the right thing to do for military families, it will undoubtedly boost morale and, hopefully, improve retention. Companies such as Bank of America and Google offer new fathers a full three months of paid time off.

Such a change would be in step with Defense Secretary Ash Carter's push to modernize personnel policies so the military can better compete with the private sector for the country's premier talent. The "Force of the Future" proposal put forward by DoD's personnel and readiness division calls for a total of 18 weeks of paternity to be used during a man's entire career.

In the interim, unit commanders should, as a matter of course, default in favor of giving new fathers time off. In cases where deployments or other missions preclude the new father getting his due, the services should allow them to take it post-deployment or allow an extension of the benefit on a case-by-case basis.

Each year service members bring 144,000 children into their homes, through birth and adoption. This simple fix would send a strong message that DoD cares about its families and is committed to supporting their needs.

<http://www.navytimes.com/story/opinion/2015/10/17/editorial%20-%20boost-leave-militarys-new-fathers-paternity/73981868/>

8. Local breastfeeding rules trumped by new Army reg

(19 Oct) Army Times, By Kevin Lilley

The Army included few specifics in its official breastfeeding and lactation policy to allow greater flexibility for commanders to meet the nursing needs of new mothers, an Army spokesman said.

This could be good news for soldiers who require longer or more frequent breaks than detailed guidance might allow, but it could be bad news for existing policies on Army installations that offer breakdowns of the benefits that should be provided to nursing mothers.

The Fort Bliss, Texas, policy released in June, for example, says nursing moms should be "afforded the opportunity every 2-3 hours for 30-40 minutes to pump breast milk during a normal 8 hour workday." It also forbids the use of a bathroom as a pumping station; the Army policy allows it, providing the station is set up in a "fully enclosed, separate area" within the restroom.

The Bliss policy is under review "to ensure it is consistent with the Army's policy," installation spokesman Lt. Col. Craig Childs said in an email. Requests to speak with those who crafted the policy were not granted.

Staff Sgt. Stephanie Rosario, who played a leading role in the development a breastfeeding and lactation policy for Fort Huachuca, Arizona, said her team pulled specifics on break times, lactation facilities and other needs from other services' guidelines and federal

requirements as they assembled the directive.

Rosario, now on terminal leave after nine years of active duty and heading into the Army Reserve, said she reviewed the Army's guidance and was "shocked by its simplicity."

"I thought what they would've done was to look at all the other services and take away all the great things that the other services have already in place," she said. "I didn't see too much of that. I think it leaves too much room for interpretation."

The Fort Huachuca policy is undergoing legal review prior to final approval by the commanding general, a base spokeswoman said. She did not address questions regarding how such a review may be influenced by the Army-wide guidelines.

"The Army Directive is the only policy," Paul Prince, a spokesman with the Army's personnel branch, or G1, said in an email. "However, this policy is not too prescriptive as to afford commanders flexibility in supporting individual soldiers' needs/requests because their needs/requests may vary. Being too specific or prescriptive in policy may hinder commanders' flexibility to meet the unique needs of individual soldiers."

The establishment of a pumping station in a bathroom is within federal law, Prince said, citing a section of the Fair Labor Standards Act, amended by the [Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act](#), which states that employers must provide a place "that is shielded from view and free from intrusion from co-workers and the public, which may be used by an employee to express breast milk."

The legislation also states the provided location should be somewhere "other than a bathroom," while the Army guidance expressly rules out the use of a bathroom stall. Other services use their own vernacular – Navy guidance prohibits a pumping facility in "a toilet space," for instance – but critics say even introducing the idea of a pumping station in a bathroom in an otherwise-unspecific policy sends the wrong message.

"Where it says that you can use a restroom but it needs to be closed off – that is going to get overrun," said Robyn Roche-Paull, a certified lactation consultant, former enlisted sailor and author of a book on [breastfeeding in the military](#). "They're going to see 'restroom' and say, 'OK, you can use that. We cordoned it off, so go at it.' It should not say anything about a restroom."

Soldier feedback, advice from medical experts and existing policy all helped form the new guidance, Prince said, adding that additional feedback on the directive was welcome via [DA Form 2028](#). Commanders with questions regarding the policy or seeking resources on the issue can contact lactation consultants on their installation, Prince said.

Expanding that type of education is critical to establishing proper benefits for new mothers in uniform, said Rosario, who served as the noncommissioned officer-in-charge of her base's Pregnancy Postpartum Physical Training program before beginning work on the installation policy.

"If commanders and first sergeants had an understanding and an education of what breastfeeding and pumping breast milk entail, then the support just kind of falls into place," she said. "I've dealt with soldiers who've come to me and said, 'They think I can do it only once a day.' ... Either they're not parents, or they are parents and they've never experienced the process."

The directive will be included in the next update of Army Regulation 600-20, Army Command Policy.

<http://www.armytimes.com/story/military/2015/10/19/local-breastfeeding-rules-trumped-new-army-reg/73655282/>

9. Agency catching up on backlogged Army child care payments

(20 Oct) Military Times, By Karen Jowers

About 92 percent of the backlogged invoices for the Army child care fee assistance program have now been paid, according to the General Services Administration.

The Army is moving the fee assistance program back to the previous contractor, Child Care Aware, in the wake of failed efforts by the GSA to manage the program. The transition is expected to be complete by January.

By the end of July, some 9,100 backlogged invoices had not been paid to child care providers, causing frustration and financial

hardship for thousands of Army families, as well as for those providers.

According to a GSA Inspector General report, the program was in such disarray under that agency that many Army families were experiencing hardship — some forced to deal with collection agencies for unpaid bills from child care providers, some filing bankruptcy, and some spouses being forced to quit their jobs or put aside their education.

Pressed by lawmakers, a GSA official testified Sept. 10 that all the backlogged invoices to child care providers would be paid within 30 days.

By Oct. 7, GSA had paid 7,650 of the 8,274 invoices that were backlogged as of Sept. 10. The remaining 624 either are invalid or missing information necessary to validate the payment.

GSA is working with the child care providers and service members to resolve and pay valid invoices as soon as possible, an official said. Between Sept. 10 and Oct. 10, GSA paid \$7.4 million to child care providers.

The subsidy programs help eligible military families reduce the cost of child care in the community when child care is not available on an installation. It compensates for some or all of the gap between the costs of care on post and outside the gates.

Families must provide documentation certifying their eligibility, and child care providers must prove they are qualified to provide the care. Providers submit invoices to GSA each month for each child enrolled.

For years, Child Care Aware, formerly known as NACCRRRA, managed the program for the Army, and continues to do so for the Navy, Marine Corps and Air Force.

But from late summer to early fall of 2014, the Army transitioned its child care fee assistance program to GSA as a cost-saving move, according to an Army official who testified before the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform on Sept. 10.

Officials expected to save \$4 million to \$5 million a year, compared to the previous cost of \$8 million. But this year, through September, the Army's administrative costs for the program already had soared to \$8.4 million.

The GSA Inspector General said the backlog was the result of the agency's failure to plan adequately for the expansion. Previously, GSA administered the child care fee assistance program for about 200 Army families enrolled in federal child care centers outside military installations.

When GSA agreed to expand its administration for the Army to include families in private child care centers, the agency was on notice that the expanded Army program would add more than 9,000 families to the caseload, and that they would be working with private child care providers. As of August, more than 5,000 private child care providers were enrolled in the program.

GSA initially agreed to complete applications within three business days, pay invoices within seven to 10 business days, and respond to customer service inquiries within one day.

Instead, the increased workload resulted in the backlogged invoices. Phone calls and emails piled up from frustrated families at a rate that GSA could not respond to.

GSA's voice mail system became so clogged with messages that officials periodically deleted families' voice mails because of the system's size limitations, the agency's IG found.

<http://www.militarytimes.com/story/military/2015/10/20/agency-catching-up-backlogged-army-child-care-payments/74285770/>

10. New system at MacDill AFB helps military parents find child care

(22 Oct) The Tampa Tribune, By Howard Altman

Two years ago, Airman Jenay Randolph was stationed at Aviano Air Base in Italy when she was given orders to transfer to MacDill Air Force Base.

She had one small child and was eight months pregnant with her second.

Finding childcare 5,000 miles to the west at MacDill, Randolph says, was the most stressful part of her move.

“It was very difficult because I couldn’t get my child on a wait list until I actually got here, so as a single parent, it was stressful.”

On Wednesday, a new web-based system went online at MacDill that will help alleviate some of the hassles of trying to find childcare for families frequently on the move.

MilitaryChildCare.com, a website run by the Defense Department, allows parents to register for existing on-base childcare services quickly and easily.

Instead of the uncertainty of having to wait to get to a new base, or tracking down childcare development center numbers and making calls back and forth at a busy time of family upheaval, MacDill parents can go to the website and register.

“If I were able to do that from Italy would have been much easier,” says Randolph, 26, whose children, Jaylen, 3, and Jordyn, 2, are enrolled in day care at MacDill.

The base is in a second phase of Air Force centers joining the online registration program, says Susan Long, chief of Airman and Family Services at MacDill.

The website launched in January and overall, more than 50 bases in the U.S. and a few bases in the Middle East and Asia are now part of the program, expected to go worldwide at all U.S. military installations by December 2016.

Aviano is not yet on the list.

There are more than 500 children enrolled at MacDill’s three child development centers. Another 80 families are served by in-home child care providers and 84 children at Tinker Elementary School, on base, take part in pre- and after-school programs. There is also a 10-week summer camp program.

All of the MacDill childcare programs are staffed by providers who are licensed by the base and the National Association for the Education of Young Children.

Families who are already enrolled don’t need to register again through the website, says Long, adding that children from six months to 12 years are eligible.

MilitaryChildCare.com “is a lot easier for parents,” says Long. “If you are deployed and suddenly get orders to MacDill, you can do it from the website wherever you are. Before, they would have had to contact the child development center when they arrive. They would have to come to the facility, fill out a form and we would try to accommodate them if we have availability.”

Another advantage, Long says, is that instead of having to constantly check in with a childcare center to see if there is an opening, parents will get email notices as soon as an opening comes up. They would then have 48 hours to respond.

As of 1 p.m. Wednesday, the new system was running smoothly, Long says. Just one or two users were expected because the program is so new and summer is the busiest military transfer season.

Like Randolph, Tech. Sgt. Ali Rose says she wishes the website went online years ago.

For Rose, a 35-year-old mother of three, MacDill represents her fifth move — known in the military as PCS for permanent change of station — since enlisting in 1998.

“In the past, whenever I was PCSing, I started to research things on the Internet,” says Rose, whose children, Tyler, 15, Jason, 12 and Jacob, 4, have all been enrolled at one time or another in military childcare. “I had to figure out where to put my kids, track down a phone number and figure out what paperwork I needed to fill out to get on the list. It was a long, complicated process. It was very stressful.”

During deployments, she says, she was fortunate her husband, Mike Rose, a civilian contractor with Special Operations Command Central at MacDill, was able to take over the childcare arrangements.

But not every military parent is so lucky.

MilitaryChildCare.com, says Rose, “would help out” during the military’s frequent transitions.

“There are so many things you have to worry about. If I can do this one-stop shop and quickly get my child on the waiting list, and know they are good to go, that’s great.”

<http://www.tbo.com/list/military-news/new-system-at-macdill-eases-struggle-to-find-child-care-20151021/>

11. Defense seeks dismissal of sexual assault case transferred to Washington

(17 Oct) Air Force Times, By Jeff Schogol

Defense attorneys will argue on Monday that a military judge should dismiss a sexual assault case that was transferred to Washington after a three-star general in Europe decided the matter should not go to court-martial.

Senior Airman Brandon Wright has been accused of aggravated sexual assault in connection with a July 2012 incident. Air Force Times is not naming the alleged victim because of the sexual nature of the alleged offense.

Wright’s court-martial is slated to begin Monday at Joint Base Andrews, Maryland. The Air Force took the extraordinary step of re-investigating his case after former Lt. Gen. Craig Franklin dismissed the case against him.

Three days later, then Acting Air Force Secretary Eric Fanning transferred the case to Washington. The special victims counselor for the case complained that the alleged victim had been badgered and otherwise treated with bias by the investigating officer, and the convening authority refused to talk to her.

On Monday, Wright’s defense counsel will argue that the case was settled when Franklin decided not to prefer charges against him, said Maj. Jacob Ramer, one of Wright’s two military attorneys. Prosecutors declined to comment on the case prior to Monday’s hearing.

In 2013, Third Air Force’s staff judge advocate recommended to Franklin that there was not enough evidence to pursue charges against Wright, Ramer said.

“Article 34 of the Uniform Code of Military Code of Military Justice – a federal statute, of course – says that a charge cannot go forward unless warranted by the evidence,” he said. “When a staff judge advocate tells a commander that the evidence is not sufficient to move forward with trial, then a commander’s hands are in effect tied.”

Wright’s attorneys will also argue that unlawful command influence was a factor in the decision to transfer the case from Europe to Washington, said Ramer, who declined to elaborate before Monday’s hearing.

Franklin launched an controversy when he decided not to prefer charges against Wright. In February 2013, Franklin had overturned the sexual assault conviction of Lt. Col. James Wilkerson, a fellow F-16 pilot and an inspector general at Aviano Air Base, Italy. That June, the Air Force confirmed that Wilkerson had fathered a love child while having an extramarital affair nine years earlier.

Eventually, Maj. Gen. Sharon Dunbar, then commander of the Air Force District of Washington, preferred charges of rape and sexual assault against Wright, but the prosecution later withdrew the rape charge, said Capt. Patrick Hughes, Wright’s other military attorney.

The staff judge advocates for the 11th Wing and Air Force District of Washington both recommended to Dunbar that there was not enough evidence to pursue a rape charge against Wright, Hughes said. Defense attorneys persuaded the prosecution that it was improper for Dunbar to have preferred the rape charge against Wright against the staff judge advocates’ advice, he said.

<http://www.airforcetimes.com/story/military/2015/10/17/defense-seeks-dismissal-sexual-assault-case-transferred-washington/74063230/>

12. Coast Guard Officer Faces Court-Martial

(19 Oct) The Beaumont Enterprise, By Eric Besson

A Coast Guard officer based in Galveston will face a military court in New Orleans on Monday over a string of allegations, including sexual assault, stemming from his time in Port Arthur, according to a Coast Guard news release.

Chief Warrant Officer Richard M. Clark is accused of the following military code violations: five counts of aggravated assault, including assault with a loaded firearm; three counts of assault by battery; one count of sexual assault; one count of aggravated sexual contact; one count of drunken operation of a vehicle; one count of obstruction of justice; and four counts of conduct unbecoming an officer and gentleman.

Clark was assigned to the Marine Safety Unit in Port Arthur at the time of the allegations, the release says. He is currently administratively assigned to Coast Guard Sector Houston-Galveston.

The Eight Coast Guard District commander referred the case to a general court martial on June 4 following an investigatory hearing completed on April 24.

The court-martial will be convened at the Hale Boggs Federal Building.

<http://www.military.com/daily-news/2015/10/19/coast-guard-officer-faces-court-martial.html>

13. Army releases results of September courts-martial

(22 Oct) Army Times

The Army on Friday released the results of courts-martial completed in September. Names of soldiers who were acquitted on all charges were not provided.

The verdicts, grouped by judicial circuit:

First Judicial Circuit (Northeast and mid-Atlantic states)

Fort Knox, Kentucky, Sept. 2:

Name: Sgt. 1st Class Lawrence C. Carter

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his pleas, of two specifications of **derelection of duty**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-5, forfeit \$2,500 pay per month for two months.

Fort Drum, New York, Sept. 2:

Name: Spc. Vincent P. Degregori III

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **sexual assault**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for five years, dishonorable discharge.

Fort Campbell, Kentucky, Sept. 2:

Name: Sgt. Carlos Gloria

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his plea, of one specification of **attempted larceny** and one specification of **larceny**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for 12 months. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to eight months.

Fort Lee, Virginia, Sept. 3:

Name: Not provided (staff sergeant)

Acquittal: By a military panel composed of officer members of one specification of **assault with an unloaded firearm**.

Fort Knox, Sept. 18:

Name: Staff Sgt. Timothy Lewis III

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his plea, of one specification of **failure to obey a lawful general regulation**. Contrary to his pleas, the accused was convicted of one specification of **rape** and one specification of **assault consummated by battery**.

Acquittal: One specification of **rape**, one specification of **stalking**, one specification of **assault upon a noncommissioned officer**, seven specifications of **assault consummated by battery**, one specification of **obstruction of justice**, one specification of **kidnapping** and six specifications of **communicating a threat**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, forfeit all pay and allowances, confined for seven years, dishonorable discharge.

Fort McNair, Washington, D.C., Sept. 23:

Name: Not provided (major)

Acquittal: By a military panel composed of officer members of one specification of **conspiracy to commit larceny**, one specification of **false official statement**, one specification of **larceny of military property** and one specification of **wrongfully receiving stolen property**.

Fort Knox, Sept. 23:

Name: Pvt. Steven M. Tucker

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **conspiracy to obstruct justice**, one specification of **sexual assault**, two specifications of **providing alcohol to a person under the age of 21** and one specification of **obstruction of justice**.

Sentence: Confined for 42 months, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 36 months.

Fort Knox, Sept. 24:

Name: Pvt. Timothy G. MacDonald

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **conspiracy to obstruct justice**, one specification of **false official statement** and one specification of **obstruction of justice**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for 20 months, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to six months.

Fort Campbell, Sept. 29:

Name: Staff Sgt. Darwynn D. Palmer

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his pleas, of four specifications of **violating a lawful general regulation**, one specification of **false official statement** and one specification of **sexual assault**.

Acquittal: One specification of **sexual assault**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for eight years, dishonorable discharge.

Second Judicial Circuit (Southeast)

Fort Stewart, Georgia, Sept. 3:

Name: Sgt. Bradley S. McMullen

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **failing to obey a lawful order**, one specification of making a **false official statement** and five specifications of **wrongfully using a controlled substance**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for four months, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 78 days.

Fort Bragg, North Carolina, Sept. 4:

Name: Pfc. Robert C. Delmaster

Conviction: By a military panel composed of officer and enlisted members, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **false official statement**, two specifications of **rape of a child** and two specifications of **sexual abuse of a child**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, forfeit all pay and allowances, reprimanded, confined for three years, dishonorable discharge.

Fort Benning, Georgia, Sept. 8:

Name: Pfc. George D.B. MacDonald

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **resisting apprehension**, one specification of **murder**, one specification of **aggravated assault** and one specification of **assault consummated by battery**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, forfeit all pay and allowances, confined for 45 years, dishonorable discharge.

Fort Bragg, Sept. 10:

Name: Not provided (sergeant)

Acquittal: By a military panel composed of officer and enlisted members of one specification of **assault consummated by battery**, one specification of **rape**, one specification of **sexual assault**, one specification of **indecent language** and one specification of **solicitation to commit a sexual act**.

Fort Bragg, Sept. 11:

Name: Sgt. Christopher D. Bush

Conviction: By a military panel composed of officer and enlisted members, contrary to his pleas, of two specifications of **aggravated sexual assault of a child**, one specification of **aggravated sexual abuse of a child** and one specification of **obstruction of justice**.

Acquittal: One specification of **aggravated sexual assault of a child**, two specifications of **abusive sexual contact with a child**, one specification of **aggravated sexual abuse of a child**, one specification of **indecent liberty with a child** and one specification of **assault consummated by a battery**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, forfeit all pay and allowances, confined for 15 years, dishonorable discharge.

Fort Stewart, Sept. 14:

Name: Lt. Col. Michael D. Kepner II

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of two specifications of **assault consummated by battery** and three specifications of **conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman**.

Sentence: Forfeit all pay and allowances, confined for two years. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 120 days.

Fort Bragg, Sept. 16:

Name: Staff Sgt. Ronald E. Fosdyck III

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **going from his appointed place of duty without authority** and one specification of **misbehavior before the enemy**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, bad-conduct discharge.

Fort Bragg, Sept. 18:

Name: Spc. Aaron C. Sales

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **absence without leave terminated by apprehension** and one specification of **absence without leave**.

Sentence: Confined for four months, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 80 days.

Fort Benning, Sept. 22:

Name: Not provided (staff sergeant)

Acquittal: By a military judge of one specification of **dereliction of duty**, four specifications of **maltreatment** and one specification of **abusive sexual contact**.

Fort Gordon, Georgia, Sept. 24:

Name: Staff Sgt. Semaj B. Johnson

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **assault consummated by a battery** and two specifications of **adultery**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, forfeit all pay and allowances, reprimanded, confined for 90 days.

Fort Benning, Georgia, Sept. 29:

Name: Staff Sgt. Undra M. Bibbs

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his plea, of one specification of **violating a lawful general regulation**.

Acquittal: One specification of **violating a lawful general regulation**, two specifications of **maltreatment** and one specification of **abusive sexual contact**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-5.

Fort Bragg, Sept. 29:

Name: Not provided (sergeant)

Acquittal: One specification of **attempted destruction of nonmilitary property** and one specification of **rape**.

Fort Stewart, Sept. 30:

Name: Staff Sgt. Eric Bjorklund

Conviction: By a military panel composed of officers and enlisted members, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **assault consummated by a battery upon a child** and one specification of **child endangerment**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-4, confined for 30 days.

Third Judicial Circuit (Southwest and Midwest)

Fort Riley, Kansas, Sept. 1:

Name: Spc. Richard W. Talbot

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his plea, of one specification of **absence without leave**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, forfeit \$1,031 pay per month for nine months, hard labor without confinement for 60 days, confined for 120 days, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 90 days.

Fort Riley, Sept. 3:

Name: Spc. Alexander S. Cooper

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **destroying property with the intent to defraud** and one specification of **soliciting another to commit an offense**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1.

Fort Carson, Colorado, Sept. 3:

Name: Pfc. Isaiah L. Davis

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of two specifications of **unauthorized absence**, two specifications of **failure to obey an order**, three specifications of **wrongful use of controlled substances** and four specifications of **larceny**.

Sentence: Confinement for 21 months, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 15 months.

Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, Sept. 10:

Name: Spc. Eduardo Marquez

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **disrespect to a noncommissioned officer** and three specifications of **assault consummated by battery**.

Acquittal: One specification of **attempted abusive sexual contact** and one specification of **communicating a threat**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for three months, bad-conduct discharge.

Fort Carson, Sept. 10:

Name: Spc. Jordan M. Peters

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **drunk driving resulting in personal injury**, two specifications of **manslaughter** and one specification of **aggravated assault with a dangerous weapon**.

Sentence: Confined for 65 months, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 1,514 days.

Fort Leonard Wood, Missouri, Sept. 10:

Name: Not provided (private)

Acquittal: One specification of **attempted sexual assault** and three specifications of **sexual assault**.

Fort Polk, Louisiana, Sept. 11:

Name: Spc. Dalton J. Prather

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **conspiracy to commit larceny**, three specifications of **false official statement**, one specification of **selling military property**, three specifications of **larceny of nonmilitary property**, one specification of **larceny of military property** and one specification of **wrongful disposition of property**.

Acquittal: One specification of **accessory after the fact**.

Sentence: Confined for 135 days, dishonorable discharge.

Fort Hood, Texas, Sept. 17:

Name: Sgt. 1st Class Aaron D. Keller

Conviction: By a military panel composed of officer and enlisted members, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **conspiracy**, one specification of **maltreatment**, one specification of **false official statement**, four specifications of **rape**, two specifications of **abusive sexual contact** and one specification of **indecent exposure**.

Acquittal: One specification of **conspiracy**, one specification of **violating a lawful general order**, four specifications of **sexual assault**, two specifications of **abusive sexual contact** and one specification of **wrongfully soliciting another to violate a lawful general order**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, forfeit all pay and allowances, confined for 10 years, dishonorable discharge.

Fort Hood, Sept. 18:

Name: Spc. Joshua Benitez

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of two specifications of **selling military property**, two specifications of **larceny of military property** and two specifications of **unlawful entry**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, \$700 fine, confined for 14 days, bad-conduct discharge.

Fort Sill, Oklahoma, Sept. 18:

Name: Pvt. Thomas J. Gendron

Conviction: One specification of **absence without leave**, one specification of **wrongful distribution of cocaine**, one specification of **wrongful use of cocaine**, one specification of **wrongful use of marijuana** and one specification of **wrongful use of methamphetamine**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for 26 months, dishonorable discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 16 months.

Fort Hood, Sept. 18:

Name: Pvt. Benjamin C. Olson

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **conspiracy to wrongfully distribute controlled substances**, three specifications of the **wrongful use of controlled substances** and three specifications of **wrongfully distributing controlled substances**.

Sentence: Confined for 13 months, dishonorable discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to nine months.

Fort Hood, Sept. 22:

Name: Not provided (specialist)

Acquittal: By a military panel composed of officer members of one specification of **sexual assault**.

Fort Hood, Sept. 24:

Name: Staff Sgt. Saul S. Astrada

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his plea, of one specification of **absence without leave**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-4, confined for 90 days, bad-conduct discharge.

Fort Carson, Sept. 24:

Name: Lt. Col. Patrick S. O'Mahoney

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his plea, of **violating a lawful general order**. Contrary to his plea, the accused was convicted of one specification of **attempting to view pornography involving a minor**.

Sentence: Confined for 60 days, reprimanded.

Fort Hood, Sept. 28:

Name: Pfc. Seth A. Weber

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of four specifications of **desertion** and one specification of **absence without leave**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for five months, bad-conduct discharge.

Fort Riley, Sept. 29:

Name: Pvt. Kevin Greytunkl

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his plea, of one specification of **sexual assault**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for five years, dishonorable discharge.

Fort Polk, Sept. 30:

Name: Sgt. 1st Class Anthony W. Heimpel

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **attempting to sell military property** and one specification of **larceny of military property**.

Sentence: Reprimanded.

Fourth Judicial Circuit (Far West and Far East)

Defense Language Institute Foreign Language Center, Presidio of Monterey, California, Sept. 2:

Name: Sgt. 1st Class Paul D. Hunsinger

Conviction: By a military panel composed of officer and enlisted members, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **false official statement** and one specification of **larceny of military property**.

Acquittal: One specification of **false official statement**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-6, forfeit one month's pay, reprimanded.

Camp Zama, Japan, Sept. 2:

Name: Maj. Mark A. Greschel

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **maltreatment**, one specification of **assault consummated by a battery** and one specification of **conduct unbecoming an officer and a gentleman**. Contrary to his plea, the accused was convicted of one specification of **abusive sexual contact**.

Sentence: Confined for six months, dismissal from service.

Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington, Sept. 2:

Name: Pfc. Aaron R. Kalior

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **absence without leave**, one specification of **disrespect to a noncommissioned officer**, two specifications of **false official statement** and two specifications of the **wrongful use of marijuana**.

Acquittal: Two specifications of **wrongful appropriation** and two specifications of **making a check without sufficient funds**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for 135 days, bad-conduct discharge.

Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Sept. 9:

Name: Pfc. Terrence J. Frierson

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his plea, of one specification of **sexual assault**.

Acquittal: One specification of **false official statement**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for 28 months, dishonorable discharge.

Fort Irwin, California, Sept. 9:

Name: Not given (sergeant first class)

Acquittal: By a military panel composed of officer members of one specification of the **wrongful use of marijuana**.

Army Garrison Yongsan, South Korea, Sept. 9:

Name: Pfc. Juan M. Tabares

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **failure to obey a lawful general regulation** and four specifications of **assault consummated by a battery**.

Sentence: Confined for 23 months, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 14 months.

Wheeler Army Airfield, Hawaii, Sept. 9:

Name: Staff Sgt. Kristopher S. Wood

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **attempted sexual assault**, one specification of **false official statement**, one specification of **sexual assault** and one specification of **abusive sexual contact**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, confined for 40 months, dishonorable discharge.

Camp Casey, South Korea, Sept. 10:

Name: Pvt. Joseph A. Warren

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **wrongful possession of marijuana**, one specification of **wrongful distribution of marijuana** and one specification of **wrongful use of marijuana**.

Sentence: Confined for 135 days, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to three months.

Wheeler Army Airfield, Sept. 15:

Name: Not provided (specialist)

Acquittal: By a military panel composed of officer and enlisted members of one specification of **disobeying a lawful general order**, one specification of **rape**, one specification of **sexual assault** and one specification of **abusive sexual contact**.

Joint Base Lewis-McChord, Washington, Sept. 18:

Name: Pfc. David A. King

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **absence without leave**, four specifications of **wrongful distribution of marijuana**, one specification of **wrongful possession of marijuana**, one specification of **wrongful possession of cocaine**, three specifications of **wrongful use of marijuana**, three specifications of **larceny**, 14 specifications of **forgery** and one specification of **communicating a threat**.

Sentence: Reduced to the grade of E-1, forfeit all pay and allowances, confined for 51 months, bad-conduct discharge. As part of an

offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 48 months.

Camp Humphreys, South Korea, Sept. 23:

Name: Pfc. Kenneth B. Boyd

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of five specifications of **sexual abuse of a child** and one specification of **wrongfully possessing child pornography**.

Sentence: Confined for 32 months, dishonorable discharge. As part of an offer to plead guilty, a pre-trial agreement limited confinement to 20 months.

Fort Huachuca, Arizona, Sept. 24:

Name: Sgt. 1st Class Albert E. Amador

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **violating a lawful general regulation**, one specification of **violating a lawful general order** and one specification of **maltreatment**.

Acquittal: Four specifications of **maltreatment**, one specification of **sexual assault** and one specification of **abusive sexual contact**.

Sentence: Reduced the grade of E-5, confined for five months.

Fort Wainwright, Alaska, Sept. 24:

Name: Pvt. Justin S. Williams

Conviction: By a military judge, contrary to his pleas, of one specification of **assault consummated by a battery** and one specification of **underage consumption of alcohol**.

Acquittal: One specification of **drunken operation of a vehicle**, one specification of **aggravated assault**, one specification of **assault consummated by a battery** and one specification of **communicating a threat**.

Sentence: Forfeit all pay and allowances, confined for six months.

Fifth Judicial Circuit (Europe and Southwest Asia)

Wiesbaden, Germany, Sept. 1:

Name: Sgt. 1st Class Francisco Galvan

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of three specifications of **aggravated sexual assault of a child**, one specification of **taking indecent liberties with a child** and one specification of **producing child pornography**.

Sentence: Confined for 16 years, dishonorable discharge.

Vilseck, Germany, Sept. 9:

Name: Staff Sgt. Henry L. Benton

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his plea, of one specification of **drunken operation of a vehicle**.

Sentence: No punishment.

Kaiserslautern, Germany, Sept. 23:

Name: Pfc. Daehyouk Kwon

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his pleas, of one specification of **false official statement**, one specification of **abusive sexual contact** and three specifications of **sexual assault**.

Sentence: Confined for 30 months, dishonorable discharge.

Katterbach, Germany, Sept. 29:

Name: Pvt. Colby A. Davis

Conviction: By a military judge, pursuant to his plea, of one specification of a **sexual abuse of a child**.

Sentence: Confined for eight months, bad-conduct discharge.

<http://www.armytimes.com/story/military/crime/2015/10/22/army-releases-results-september-courts-martial/74047928/>