



**NATIONAL COMMISSION ON MILITARY, NATIONAL, AND PUBLIC SERVICE**

**Minutes of January 2019 Commission Meeting**

The National Commission on Military, National, and Public Service (the Commission) held a meeting on January 23-25, 2019, at the Commission's offices in Arlington, VA, and at other locations in the vicinity. Portions of this meeting concerned organizational and other pre-decisional and deliberative matters and were closed to the public pursuant to Public Law 114-328, section 554(b)(3). The Commissioners agreed to make a separate version of these minutes available to the public.

**Attendance**

Commissioners present:

- Mr. Edward Allard
- Mr. Steve Barney
- The Honorable Dr. Janine Davidson
- The Honorable Mark Gearan
- The Honorable Dr. Joseph Heck
- Ms. Jeanette James
- Mr. Alan Khazei (as indicated)
- Mr. Thomas Kilgannon
- Ms. Shawn Skelly
- The Honorable Debra Wada

Commissioner absent:

- The Honorable Avril Haines

Staff present:

- Kent Abernathy, Executive Director
- Paul Lekas, General Counsel
- Jill Rough, Director of Research and Analysis
- Keri Lowry, Director of Government Affairs and Public Engagement
- Peter Morgan, Director of Operations
- Other Commission staff

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

**January 23, 2019**

**Interim Report Release Event**

In the morning of January 23, 2019, the Commission convened at the Newseum in Washington, D.C., for a press briefing and public event to accompany the release of the Commission's Interim Report.

**Business Meeting**

From approximately 1150 to 1230 ET, the Commission convened at the offices of the Department of Labor in Washington, D.C., for a business meeting. The Chairman moved to close this and other business meetings to occur on January 23-25, 2019 because pre-decisional and organizational matters would be deliberated. A motion was made and seconded, and all Commissioners present agreed.

Chairman Heck moved to approve minutes from the December 2018 Commission meeting. The Commission voted unanimously to approve the December 2018 minutes with minor technical edits.

Commissioners began by discussing the Interim Report release event. Chairman Heck applauded the exhaustive work that went into preparing for the event and appreciated efforts made to ensure Commissioners were adequately prepared to fulfill their roles in the event.

Vice Chair Gearan praised his fellow Commissioners for bridging experience and ideology to connect with each other in a bipartisan fashion. He cited the experience of the Commission as a story in itself. Other Commissioners echoed these sentiments.

Chairman Heck then informed the Commission that an updated website went live on January 22 and will enable the Commission to improve the amount and quality of information it disseminates to visitors. The Chairman then reviewed the agenda for the remainder of the January meeting.

**Interim Report Briefings**

Following the business meeting, Commissioners held discussion and listening sessions with representatives from an array of organizations. These sessions provided an opportunity for Commissioners to discuss the Interim Report and receive feedback from organizational representatives. Four sessions were held at locations across Washington, DC, and included the following participants:

From approximately 1330 to 1500 ET, Commissioners Allard, James, Skelly, and Wada met with representatives from the following organizations: General Federation of Women's Clubs, National Conference of State Legislatures, National Governors Association, United State of Women, Victory Fund, and Young Invincibles.

From approximately 1330 to 1500 ET, Commissioners Barney, Davidson, Gearan, Heck, and Kilgannon met with representatives from the following organizations: Arizona State University & McCain Institute for International Leadership, Aspen Institute, Bipartisan Policy Center,

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Brookings Institution, Cato Institute, Center for Strategic and International Studies, Heritage Foundation, and U.S. Global Leadership Coalition.

From approximately 1530 to 1700 ET, Commissioners Allard, James, Skelly, and Wada met with representatives from: All-Volunteer Force Forum, American Bar Association, Blue Star Families, Center for Military Readiness, National Women's Law Center, Student Veterans of America, and Veterans for American Ideals.

From approximately 1530 to 1700 ET, Commissioners Barney, Davidson, Gearan, Heck, and Kilgannon met with representatives from: ALL IN Campus Democracy Challenge, Center for Civic Education, College Board, Education Commission of the States, iCivics, and Obama Foundation.

Accounts of these sessions are set forth in separate memoranda for the record (MFRs).

**January 24, 2019**

**Work Group Deliberation**

From 0800 to 0945 ET, Commissioners Davidson, James, Khazei, Kilgannon, and Skelly held a meeting of the Ends, Ways, and Means Work Group. An account of this session is set forth in an internal MFR.

**Mock Hearing**

From approximately 1000 to 1130 ET, the Commission convened at the offices of the United Way in Alexandria, VA, to hold a mock hearing in preparation for the public hearings the Commission will hold beginning in February 2019. Ms. Haines and Mr. Khazei were not present.

At the conclusion of the mock hearing, Commissioners discussed approaches for the public comment portion of each public hearing. They agreed that members of the public interested in speaking during the public comment portion would receive a raffle ticket at the hearing's sign-in desk and that numbers would be drawn at random. Those chosen would have two minutes each to make comments. Commissioners also confirmed that the public comment portion would last for at least 30 minutes and would extend longer if Commissioners did not use the full allocation of time to address questions to the hearing panelists.

**Legal Update**

Commissioners reconvened at the Commission's office. From approximately 1300 to 1315 ET, Mr. Lekas and Ms. Rikleen provided a legal update and ethics training. Mr. Lekas informed the Commission that the Federal Register would not accept the Commission's notice of public hearings due to the partial government shutdown. He said that the notice had been posted on the Commission's website, thus satisfying the Commission's statutory obligation, and that further notice would be published in the Federal Register when the shutdown ends. Mr. Lekas informed the Commissioners that the legal team had begun work towards the development of legislative

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

language based on the proposals under consideration by the work groups. Ms. Rikleen then provided Commissioners with ethics training focused on the misuse of position rule.

**National Service Deliberation**

From 1315 to 1445 ET, Commissioners Allard, Barney, Davidson, Gearan, Heck, James, Kilgannon, Skelly, and Wada convened for an internal deliberation on national service benefits and policy changes that could enhance the service experience and remove barriers to entry.

Annie Rorem, Deputy Director of Research and Analysis, opened the meeting by explaining that this deliberative session would focus on trade-offs between removing barriers (for example, by increasing living stipends and other benefits) and growing the number of individuals involved in national service (by allocating resources to increasing numbers rather than increasing benefits to individuals). Ms. Rorem noted that the conversation would assist in preparing Commissioners for the February and March hearings and would also assist the Commission and staff in understanding priorities as the work groups continued to explore policy alternatives.

John Lira, Research Team Lead for National Service, provided an overview of existing benefits for national service participants. He explained that AmeriCorps provides a living stipend that may be used, among other things, to offset the cost of housing, food, and transportation. He noted that the size of the stipend could prove a barrier to service. He explained that legislation created VISTA as a poverty-service program and capped the living stipend so that VISTA members would reside in the same socioeconomic conditions as those whom they would serve. He added that AmeriCorps State and National Program caps living stipends at 200 percent of the VISTA amount, noting that living stipends are cost-shared, with grantees paying 24 percent initially and increasing to a 50-50 share with CNCS over time. Mr. Lira stated that the living stipend fluctuates considerably depending on locality. For comparison, he noted, the highest stipend is \$27,000 in San Francisco and the lowest is \$13,000 in San Antonio. Additionally, he noted that participants in some programs do not receive a living stipend.

Mr. Lira next addressed the childcare allowance offered to some service members. He explained that some service members have access to full childcare, while others—such as NCCC participants—receive a childcare allowance capped at \$400 per month. He described the eligibility standards as relatively strict: the child cannot be over 13; the household income (not including the living stipend) cannot exceed 75 percent of the median state income; and the service member cannot be receiving any other source of funding for childcare including from family.

Mr. Lira noted that among other policy alternatives, the Propensity to Serve Work Group is exploring ways to provide childcare assistance to national service participants more akin to how the military treats military dependents. Dr. Davidson asked why the Commission would recommend a change that gives additional pay or allowance to the person rather than the childcare provider. Mr. Lira explained that this approach would create a more fungible allowance, especially for opportunity youth who might prefer to patch together different types of care or choose to pay grandparents or family members for care. Vice Chair Wada asked for

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

clarification on how this childcare allowance recommendation would connect to the military benefit, noting that the military benefit described applies to housing, not children. Ms. Rorem responded that the benefit would create an additional allowance for dependents to be used at the discretion of the individual. Vice Chair Wada noted that in the military experience, a benefit like this has the unintended consequence of encouraging people to have families earlier.

Mr. Barney cautioned against equating childcare for national service and military service as the nature and term length for the military is very different from that of AmeriCorps. He noted that military benefits are structured to allow service members to be able to maintain a relationship and some semblance of a family life over the course of a four-to-six-year term, which he recommended distinguishing from the needs of someone serving for an 11-month term strictly in a domestic capacity.

Mr. Lira then addressed the education award (known as the Segal Award), which is available to national service participants in certain programs. He explained that the award is relatively small and is taxed by state and federal governments. He noted that the Work Group is examining policy alternatives to make the education award tax-free and to increase the amount of the award to cover one year of in-state tuition or pegging it to Pell grants. Chairman Heck advised that in developing policy alternatives, the Work Group should take care to note that in-state tuition may at times be less than the Pell grant amount, as in Nevada, and cautioned against pegging the education award to this figure.

Chairman Heck asked about any Congressional Budget Office scoring of a tax-free Segal Award proposal. Staff said the CBO had estimated that removing the tax would cost approximately \$30 million over ten years in mandatory spending.

Mr. Lira asked Commissioners to consider which benefits they believed would most attract young people to join a national service program. Vice Chair Wada felt that it depends to a large degree on the population that the Commission seeks to attract to national service. She noted that opportunity youth have a greater need for income than an educational stipend. If the Commission wants to break down barriers to enable everyone to experience service, then it must provide benefits to address different populations through different wrap-around services. She recommended that the Commission offers a cafeteria menu of benefits, where the participant has a choice as to what makes the most sense to them up to a pre-defined limit. Chairman Heck liked the approach laid out by Vice Chair Wada, noting that it could work like a flexible savings account with a lump sum distributed bi-weekly as CNCS does with the current living stipend. Mr. Allard also endorsed this approach to give younger Americans more input on how to use funds.

Commissioners asked about the attrition rate for people who begin but do not complete their national service programs and for clarification on whether individuals need to complete their terms to receive the education award. Sandy Scott, Commission Advisor on detail from CNCS, confirmed that virtually all participants are required to complete their term before receiving the education award, and said that the number who do not complete their term is relatively small though he did not know the exact figure. Ms. Rorem noted that more than one third of eligible

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

national service participants do not use the education award, suggesting that a cafeteria-style program would likely come with a higher cost.

Ms. James commented that under the military construct, everybody receives the same pay based on rank with a locality adjustment. She asked why AmeriCorps volunteers do not follow a similar pay schedule. Chairman Heck explained that AmeriCorps service members receive a living stipend to defray expenses, not a salary. Mr. Scott added that AmeriCorps also differs from the military because it is really a composite of many different organizations. He explained that CNCS receives more than 2000 applications from unique organizations, each of which sets its own cost of living. He noted that “starvation funding” from Congress over the last two decades has incentivized applicants to reduce cost per member as low as possible.

Mr. Scott continued by noting that since 1995, the cost per member to the federal government has continuously decreased. Ms. Skelly asked if CNCS could compare the cost-per-member decreases to the demographics of national service participants to show its impact on who serves. Mr. Scott explained that while CNCS has demographic data, it does not maintain data on socio-economic status because it has no method of obtaining data relating to, among other things, the income level of those serving. This makes it difficult to assess whether AmeriCorps is pricing people out of potential service. He noted that opportunity youth have few alternatives, often carrying a criminal record and an unemployment rate much higher than the national average at about 20 percent.

Ms. Rorem summarized the cafeteria-menu option floated by Vice Chair Wada as well as the lump-sum payment approach and asked Commissioners for other ideas.

Vice Chair Gearan asked if staff had an analysis of benefits across military, public, and national service, noting that he was inspired by the way the common thread of service was intertwined in the John McCain video debuted at the Interim Report launch. He then questioned whether it makes sense to quibble over the Segal Award when CNCS had been on the chopping block multiple times. Vice Chair Gearan recommended that the Commission shine light on the bigger picture rather than get into the patchwork of a few minor changes. Ms. Skelly noted that removing the tax on the education award was not inconsequential as it would increase the overall amount by more than one-fifth, which might equate to another class at a community college.

Mr. Barney commented that funding through mandatory spending makes things difficult. He stated a cafeteria plan, without altering the taxable status of the education award, would provide service participants with more flexibility and reduce obstacles to service. He also thought this approach could serve as a middle ground that might avoid resistance by the House Ways and Means Committee due to mandatory spending concerns. He asked his fellow Commissioners for their views on the congressional angle. Chairman Heck agreed with Mr. Barney, noting that the Segal Award is probably administered by the House Education and Labor Committee. Vice Chair Wada suggested that the Commission recommend changing the benefit from mandatory to discretionary spending.

Vice Chair Gearan explained that the Segal Award began as a way to increase access to education for national service participants and was modeled after the GI Bill. He questioned

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

whether a shift away from an education award to a cafeteria-style menu of benefits would alter the overall motivation for the program.

Dr. Davidson commented that the menu plan felt like forcing people to choose between food today or education in the future. Comparing the focus on individual components to fixing a deck chair on the Titanic, she recommended that the Commission back up and reflect on the state of national service. She noted that Congress charged the Commission to examine what would be good for the country and consider changes to rules that would accomplish that objective. If the Commission wishes to make a big statement regarding service, it should state clearly that the nation must make a significant investment if it truly values national service.

The discussion returned to the cafeteria-style alternative. Mr. Lira asked for existing models of cafeteria-style programs. Brian Collins, Research Team Lead for Public Service, suggested looking at Medicare programs that follow a cash-and-counseling model in which recipients work with a case manager to ensure effective use of the benefit.

Vice Chair Gearan commented that while he was not opposed to the cafeteria option, he felt it was not enough to fundamentally enhance or create an ethos of service. He did support vetting the proposal, however, noting that he has yet to meet an AmeriCorps member who does not receive alternative financial support. Mr. Scott noted that eliminating the tax on the education award could prove helpful to national service participants. He further noted that the proposal has attracted bipartisan support, noting key past support from President Bush and Senator McCain and current support from Senator Grassley.

Mr. Barney remarked that providing national service participants with flexibility in choosing their benefits could serve as an incentive to serve. Vice Chair Gearan, agreeing that a cafeteria would provide flexibility, recommended that, if adopted by the Commission, the proposal be accompanied by a strong critique of government funding for national service, noting that Americans remain willing to commit to national service even though the nation is not honoring its commitment to them. He recommends the Commission frame this argument as an indictment: “We, as a nation, are not honoring this commitment, and yet people are still willing to do it.” Vice Chair Gearan feels that if the Commission cannot or will not make an argument like this, no other government body would.

Chairman Heck recommended viewing this recommendation as part of a broader approach rather than through the lens of “either/or.” He believes the Commission could recommend changes to increase both the flexibility of benefits and the overall amount of funding for national service programs.

Mr. Kilgannon noted that he has conflicting thoughts about the various approaches. Referencing his experience, he explained that his organization pays scholarship funding directly to schools, in part, because students either might not be responsible enough or may be vulnerable to family or friends taking advantage of them. He recommended that this lump-sum benefit under consideration be allocated in a similar manner to avoid that issue.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Ms. James noted that in the Commission's various trips, the most common refrain regarding national service benefits was that the living stipend was not a livable wage. She recalled hearing about the education award tax as a secondary comment or a noted aside. She suggested that the focus of the recommendations reflect that order.

Ms. Skelly asked for Commissioners' views on whether the Commission should issue recommendations based on what it hoped to achieve, regardless of constraints, or whether it should frame recommendations based on what it thought was feasible to achieve. Chairman Heck recommended that the Commission "go big," but within reason. Vice Chair Wada felt that the Commission could do both. For example, she explained, the Commission could point to a best-case, utopian objective, but also issue stepping-stone recommendations that account for political realities. Near-term, stepping-stone recommendations could include metrics to measure progress and cultivate a pathway towards the desired end. Ms. James agreed and compared Vice Chair Wada's idea to the "widow tax." As she explained, in this situation, legislators could not achieve their desired end state all at once, so they created discrete steps to get there. The effort began fifteen years ago and continues today. Vice Chair Gearan concurred with the step approach. He recommended proposing a moonshot consisting of desired long-term goals accompanied by a clear pathway for achieving those goals over the course of many years. Ms. Skelly added that one way to pursue this would be to state end goals (such as doubling the CNCS budget) while identifying certain recommendations that Congress should act on now.

Chairman Heck asked whether Commissioners preferred to focus on drawing more people to national service or creating a better experience. Dr. Davidson advocated for bigger, better, and more diverse national service programs, noting that achieving those goals will require more resources. She cautioned that a program in which only privileged white kids can participate does not work. Ms. James commented that the decision intersects with the Commission's discussion about mandating versus expecting service because increasing the volume of service opportunities implicitly suggests that there are enough service opportunities available to meet the new volume.

Mr. Allard wondered if well-off parents who support their child's participation in a national service program could be asked to sponsor another participant. Katie McSheffrey, Government Affairs Officer, and Morgan Levey, External Relations Officer, explained that organizations often don't use independent donations to sponsor opportunities in fear that Congress will see an alternative funding stream and defund the organization.

Dr. Rough thanked the Commissioners for their input. She noted that the conversation seemed helpful to bring Commissioners together in anticipation of upcoming public hearings.

**Work Group Deliberations**

From approximately 1500 to 1630 ET, Commissioners met in Work Groups to deliberate issues concerning the matters within the scope of their respective Work Groups. Accounts of these sessions are set forth in internal MFRs.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

**January 25, 2019**

**Work Group Deliberations**

From approximately 0800 to 1000 ET, Commissioners met in Work Groups to deliberate issues concerning the matters within the scope of their respective Work Groups. Accounts of these sessions are set forth in internal MFRs.

**Civic Education Deliberation**

From approximately 1015 to 1145 ET, Commissioners Allard, Barney, Heck, James, Kilgannon, Skelly, and Wada met to discuss civic education policy alternatives under consideration by the Ends, Ways, and Means Work Group. Dr. Davidson joined the discussion at approximately 1130 ET. An account of this session is set forth in an internal MFR.

**Executive Session**

From approximately 1200 to 1300 ET, Commissioners held an executive session outside the presence of staff.

**National Service Deliberation**

From 1300 to 1400 ET, Commissioners Allard, Barney, Davidson, Gearan, Heck, James, Khazei (by phone), Kilgannon, Skelly, and Wada convened for an internal deliberation on methods to grow national service. Dr. Rough led this discussion, facilitated by a slide deck.

Dr. Rough began with an overview of three growth models for national service: first, a semester of service, in which high school seniors would be placed in local, service-oriented nonprofits for a semester; second, an employer-based model, in which employers would offer a four-month service sabbatical for every six years of an employee's tenure; and third, a certification-fellowship model involving funded fellowships for individuals to serve for a year at any certified nonprofit. Dr. Rough noted that each of these models would require consideration of key questions, including who would fund the program, what role the federal government would have, and so on.

Referencing the employer-based sabbatical model, Ms. James recalled a mentoring program in San Antonio, Texas, that involved service members (including Ms. James) leaving the base to tutor students in public middle and high schools. She suggested this sort of cooperative arrangement could prove fruitful.

Commissioners asked whether staff had developed a specific recommendation or "best practice" for the service sabbatical program. Dr. Rough explained that no specific recommendation had been developed. Dr. Davidson referenced Starbucks' approach, which some Commissioners explored during their visit to Seattle. Dr. Rough noted that the research team is examining a handful of different employer-based models. Vice Chair Wada suggested looking at the NationSwell program in New York that brings together individuals from multiple corporations to work on community improvement projects. Dr. Davidson suggested the federal government could adopt such a program and serve as a model for the private sector to emulate.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Dr. Rough turned to the topic of growing the number of individuals engaged in service. Dr. Rough noted that any growth that the Commission could encourage through its recommendations would occur in the national service space, since the military and public service spaces are controlled by government needs. She noted that currently, the military adds 234,000 new service members each year, government at all levels add 3.9 million civilian employees each year (of this total, the federal government adds 150,000 civilian employees each year, 50,000 of which are veterans). These figures were provided in the accompanying slide deck.

Dr. Rough then addressed how different proposals for growing national service would increase the number of individuals engaged in the national service space. Under the status quo, national service programs add 48,500 individuals each year. Achieving the goals stated by the Peace Corps (increasing the number of participants to 10,000 per year) and under the Kennedy Serve America Act (increasing the number of participants in AmeriCorps to 250,000 per year) would result in a net addition of 156,000 new individuals to national service by 2030. A “semester of service” program in half of all U.S. public high schools would add almost 2 million individuals to national service by 2030; extending such a program to all U.S. public high schools would add just under 4 million individuals.

Vice Chair Gearan noted that the figures provided by Dr. Rough do not reach the numbers that Stanley McChrystal has projected.

Vice Chair Wada found all three proposals appealing but recommended using 2035 and 2040, respectively, as target dates for the two semester of service proposals.

Mr. Allard asked if positions and opportunities exist to place the large number of individuals who could be available to serve under these proposals. Dr. Rough agreed about the importance of this question, noting that taken together, the three proposals approach something akin to a mandatory national service program.

Mr. Khazei recommended adding to the slate of proposals the fellowship model introduced at the beginning of the session. He believes the fellowship model provides another way to encourage individuals to engage in a year of civilian national service that is also scalable. Dr. Rough explained that current estimates suggest that adding a fellowship program would result in an annual increase of new individuals to national service somewhere between the status quo (48,500) and stated government goals (156,000).

Vice Chair Gearan expressed caution about adding a semester of service requirement to a public education system already in crisis.

Chairman Heck requested that Dr. Rough and her team develop a wider chart that that scopes out the lifetime of service opportunities, from cradle to grave, for each cohort of individuals that the Commission intends to target with its recommendations. The chart should start with service opportunities available in high school (if not before) through civic education initiatives, and continue through Senior Corps. He requested that the chart also indicate how each life-stage opportunity could grow the number of Americans engaged in service. Commissioners expressed support for this idea.

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Commissioners returned to the growth objectives set out by the Peace Corps (10,000) and as stated in the Kennedy Serve America Act (250,000). Vice Chair Gearan explained that the 10,000-member figure adopted by the Peace Corps was not based on any rigorous analysis. Mr. Scott explained that the 250,000-member figure for national service was determined by Senator McCain and his staff, also without any rigorous analysis. Dr. Davidson recommended that the Commission develop an analytical framework to support whatever figures it may propose for national service growth. She also recommended that this be tied to the needs that service can address. Dr. Rough noted that the research team's support of the Ends, Ways, and Means work group includes developing annotated bibliographies on needs of the nation, with a particular focus on metrics and ways service can help to address those needs.

Mr. Kilgannon felt this portion of the discussion crystalized a key question facing the Commission: does it intend to solve for existing and future needs or to provide opportunities for people to serve? He viewed the latter would as more nebulous and difficult to justify. Ms. James asked about studies that put a notional number on people required to fix problems. Mr. Khazei recommended speaking with Service Year Alliance which, he noted, has begun to develop information about this issue.

Vice Chair Wada addressed Mr. Kilgannon's point about creating opportunities for people to serve. In her view, the challenge of this approach is to articulate to the American public the purpose and benefit of service and why the Commission should strive for increased service opportunities. The key will be for the Commission to explain the benefit of service to the individuals it intends to reach.

Mr. Scott set out how CNCS and the national service community tend to look at this question, citing social cohesion, civic engagement, civic responsibility, individual career and health benefits, and addressing community needs as primary arguments for national service. Ms. James inquired why existing proposals have not succeeded despite the rationale that Mr. Scott explained. Mr. Scott believes a lack of political will and other political factors have stood in the way of these proposals.

Vice Chair Gearan proposed that the Commission look at service as a way to bring together a divided nation. Several Commissioners expressed support for this approach. Vice Chair Wada added that bringing together the three strands of service—military, public, and national—should be seen as a win-win strategy for all involved, one that could open doors for many individuals that were never before open to them.

**Interim Report Briefing**

From approximately 1400 to 1530 ET, Commissioners held a discussion and listening session with representatives from national service organizations. This session provided an opportunity for Commissioners to discuss the Interim Report and receive feedback from organizational representatives. The session occurred at the Commission's offices with some participants joining by conference call. Commissioners Allard, Barney, Davidson, Gearan, Kilgannon, Skelly, and Wada attended, and Mr. Khazei jointed by phone. Organizations represented at the session include the following: America's Service Commissions, Cities of Service, Conservation

**FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY  
DELIBERATIVE & PRE-DECISIONAL**

Legacy, Food Corps, Habitat for Humanity, Innovations in Civic Participation, National Legal Aid and Defender Association, Peace Corps, Service Year Alliance, Sisters of Notre Dame, The Corps Network, and Voices for National Service. An account of this session is set forth in a separate MFR.

Prepared by Paul Lekas, General Counsel

Adopted by the Commission on February 20, 2019