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A message from the Director

New Challenges, New Thinking

This report provides you with a detailed annual review of a small, independent federal agency which is a part of a new national security equation driven by a number of factors – a world engaged in combating terrorism, an evolving geopolitical environment, constrained federal resources, and responsibility for vital perennial missions. Addressing this new equation is one of the greatest challenges facing Selective Service.

Selective Service has a 65-year history of rising to challenges and creating opportunities. Today, we are responding to the new national challenges by leveraging our strengths: high-impact adjustments to time-tested operational programs; a small but highly competent workforce; the application of technology to maximize the value of our existing assets; and the creation of partnerships that benefit our organization, our communities, and, of course, our customers around the world.

My vision for the Agency rests on three underpinnings. First, our mission remains fundamental. Selective Service must be capable of providing our primary customer, the Department of Defense, with personnel during an emergency within the necessary time frames. It must accomplish this multi-prong task on time and with policies and procedures that are efficient and fair to all. Second, we have the responsibility in all that we undertake to make certain that our methods of registration for young men are user-friendly and effective. This begins with our endeavors to ensure public awareness of the registration requirement. They include disseminating direct mail reminders to eligible young men; having volunteer high school registrars in schools nationwide dedicated to creating student awareness; providing accurate facts and data to national and local news reporters; implementing a public service media campaign; courting educators and community leaders through our exhibits program; participating in radio, TV, and print media background interviews and “live talk” shows; and speaking directly to eligible young men and their influencers at public forums. Our efforts require constant attention because 6,500 young men turn age 18 daily in the United States. And third, Selective Service is a “service” organization. We do not determine policy; we implement policies determined by our elected representatives in the legislative and executive branches of the federal government.

The nation can take great pride in this Agency. For a very modest investment, America retains a time-proven capability to mobilize manpower in a crisis. It is a system that has been finely tuned with policies and procedures that have been evaluated and refined for more than a half century. Thus, America is able to “provide for the common defense,” as quoted from the U.S. Constitution, during emergencies with a respect for the rights of its citizens that is second to none.

Simply stated, after 65 years, the Selective Service System remains a fundamental national defense asset with a vital contemporary role. For our nation, the Agency remains an organization that is “still serving.”

William A. Chatfield
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The Selective Service System is a small, independent federal agency operating with permanent authorization under the Military Selective Service Act (50 U.S.C. App. 451 et seq.). It is not part of the Department of Defense; however, it exists to serve the emergency manpower needs of the military by conscripting untrained manpower, or personnel with professional health care skills, if directed by Congress and the President in a national crisis. Selective Service is America’s only proven and time-tested hedge against underestimating the number of active duty and reserve component personnel needed in a future conflict. Its statutory mission also includes being ready to administer an alternative service program in lieu of military service for men classified as conscientious objectors opposed to any form of military service.

Currently, the Agency is minimally staffed and heavily dependent upon part-time personnel and volunteers across the country trained to conduct a draft that would be timely, fair, and equitable in the event of a national crisis.

As a part of that readiness, virtually all men in the U.S. are required to register with Selective Service within 30 days of reaching age 18. The current registration program, in effect since July 1980, for men born on or after January 1, 1960, is vital to America. By registering with Selective Service, every young man is reminded of his potential obligation to serve our nation in an emergency. Selective Service is the last link between society-at-large and today’s all-volunteer Armed Forces. Registration is important to a man’s future because Congress, more than half of the nation’s state legislatures, and scores of county and city jurisdictions have conditioned eligibility for several government programs and benefits upon a man being in compliance with the federal registration requirement. These include student loans and grants, government jobs, job training, and U.S. citizenship for registration-aged men who are not yet citizens.

Under the current law, women serve voluntarily in the U.S. Armed Forces, but are not required to register with Selective Service and are not subject to a draft.
**The FY 2005 Budget**

On December 8, 2004, President Bush signed into law H.R. 4818, a consolidated appropriations bill which set the Selective Service System’s FY 2005 funding level at $26.3 million. It was the same funding level as FY 2004, reflecting other national security spending priorities of the federal government.

In its budget submission of February 18, 2004, Selective Service noted its intention to accommodate itself to budget shortfalls by transforming core processes and employing technology to generate greater efficiencies in its mobilization, financial management, and automation security systems while continuing its upward trend in registration compliance.

Chairman James Walsh (R, NY) of the House Appropriations Subcommittee on Veterans Affairs, Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies reported the House version (H.R. 5041) on September 9, 2004. Senator Christopher Bond (R, MO) reported the Senate version (S. 2825) on September 21, 2004. However, the House-Senate Conference Report was not completed by the September 30, 2004, deadline, and the Agency’s budget was incorporated with others into the consolidated bill.

The Selective Service budget for FY 2005 was further reduced to $26.1 million as part of a government-wide, across-the-board rescission of 0.80 percent.

**The FY 2006 Budget**

Under the House reorganization in early 2005, Selective Service was moved to the new Appropriations Subcommittee on Transportation, Treasury, and Housing and Urban Development, Judiciary, District of Columbia, which included many other smaller federal agencies. The Senate soon followed suit with the Transportation, Treasury, the Judiciary, and Housing and Urban Development.

The House subcommittee under Chairman Joe Knollenberg (R, MI) issued its report, H.R. 3058, on June 24, 2005, calling for $24 million for Selective Service – nearly $1.7 million below the President’s request of $25.65 million. The Senate, under Chairman Bond, however, held to the President’s recommended higher funding level and the Conference Committee ended up with $25 million.

Note: The September 30, 2005, fiscal year deadline passed before the House and Senate were able to reconcile their differences. Selective Service operated under a temporary continuing resolution until the House and Senate agreed to a compromise funding level of $25 million. The House passed the conference agreement on November 18, 2005, and the Senate on November 21, 2005. Nine days later, President Bush signed H.R. 3058 into law. An across-the-board rescission of one percent further reduced the funding level to $24.75 million for FY 2006.
The Selective Service System exists to serve the emergency manpower needs of the military by conscripting untrained manpower, or personnel with professional health care skills, if directed by Congress and the President in a national crisis. Its statutory mission also includes being ready to administer an alternative service program in lieu of military service for men classified as conscientious objectors.

While providing the only time-tested mechanism to backup the all-volunteer military when needed, the Selective Service System continues to satisfy its statutory obligations. Selective Service’s Call and Deliver, Reclassify, and Alternative Service Divisions play vital roles in fulfilling its two-part mission.

**Call and Deliver**

Selective Service continued working throughout the year with the U.S. Military Entrance Processing Command (MEPCOM) on software applications enhancing the ability to process and induct registrants. Software is also being migrated to a new platform that will allow a more efficient and secure method of exchanging data between MEPCOM and Selective Service. Joint meetings are held with operational, as well as technical, experts from Selective Service and MEPCOM to make certain that data created by each entity is readable and conforms to established business rules.

Discussions continue on the methods to be used in processing health care personnel and how the credential process would be accomplished.

The Call and Deliver Division oversees the Agency’s Registration and Registration Compliance Program, including the Registration Improvement Program. The division coordinates with the Agency’s Data Management Center and region headquarters to ensure Selective Service’s mission requirements are satisfied.

**Registrant Transportation**

Should Congress authorize and the President of the United States issue an order to reinstate the draft, it will be necessary to transport draftees to and from the U.S. Military Entrance Processing Stations (MEPS). A memorandum of understanding with the Transportation Logistical Service, LLC was approved and signed by the Director of the Selective Service System that will provide nationwide transportation for Selective Service in the event of a draft or national emergency. This memorandum of understanding will allow for the planning, scheduling, and transporting of draftees to and from the various U.S. MEPS for Armed Forces evaluations and induction.
Readiness Plan

A significant amount of work has been accomplished by all Selective Service directorates over the past few months to bring its national headquarters’ Readiness Plan up to date. The plan is specific to each region headquarters, state headquarters, and area/alternative service office. Each component contains the property, personnel, and grade authorized for each office. Once the national headquarters’ Readiness Plan is completed, it will be used as a model to update the region, state, and area/alternative service plans.

Registration

Selective Service must be ready to furnish manpower to the Department of Defense in the event of a national emergency. Thus, registration of young men is a critical element of Selective Service’s mission.

If the draft becomes necessary, it must be widely seen as fair and equitable. No draft would be fair and equitable unless all men were treated equally. For that to happen, all eligible men must be registered. Selective Service strives for a 100-percent compliance rate and continues to develop initiatives to increase registration compliance across the country and its territories.

During calendar year 2004, the Selective Service registration estimated compliance rate was 92 percent for men ages 18 through 25 who were required to register. The primary factors contributing to registration compliance were: (1) the enactment in states and territories of legislation requiring registration with Selective Service to obtain a state driver’s license, permit, or identification card, with an increased focus on mandatory driver’s license legislation linked to Selective Service registration for young men under the age of 26; (2) the use of online registration by way of the Selective Service Web site, www.sss.gov; (3) emphasis on having more volunteer Selective Service high school registrars; (4) additional mailings to states (i.e., California and New York) having the lowest compliance rates and highest registrant population potential, as well as nationwide to those 19-year-old men who had not registered; (5) increased liaison with United States Postal Service offices supplying the only universal source of Selective Service registration cards; and, (6) targeted, cost-effective registration awareness initiatives and outreach efforts to educational and community leaders and groups.

Increasing Registration Compliance – The Driver’s License Legislation

Since the objective of Selective Service’s mission is to have a fair and equitable draft if the need arises, it is necessary to develop initiatives to increase registration compliance. The most important initiative during the past couple of years has been the driver’s license legislation initiative, through which the Agency has worked closely with states and territories in pursuing legislation that supports the Selective Service registration requirement by making it a condition for obtaining a driver’s license. Selective Service provided such assistance as reviewing draft legislation, having a working agreement with the American Association of Motor Vehicle Administrators network, and providing information management related technical expertise. By the end of FY 2005, 34 states
(Alabama, Arizona, Arkansas, Colorado, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, Illinois, Iowa, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maryland, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, New Hampshire, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, Ohio, Oklahoma, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, Utah, Virginia, West Virginia, and Wisconsin), three territories (Guam, Mariana Islands, and Virgin Islands), plus the District of Columbia had enacted driver's license legislation in support of the Selective Service registration requirement. As a result of implemented driver's license legislation, 843,747 men were registered in FY 2005, which represented 37 percent of all registrations, compared to 832,824 men registered by this method in FY 2004. In lieu of driver's license legislation, Alaska enacted legislation requiring registration with Selective Service as a precondition for receiving proceeds from the Alaska Permanent Fund Dividend Program.

Although the states that have enacted this type of legislation comprise nearly 65 percent of the nation's registrant population potential, it is not enough. Therefore, during FY 2005, the primary emphasis on improving the overall registration compliance rate continued to be assisting states in their efforts, especially for enacting legislation making it mandatory for those men under age 26 to register with Selective Service before obtaining a driver's license. As each state/territory goes online with Selective Service, the resulting cost savings will allow Selective Service to reallocate its resources to improve customer service and the overall mobilization readiness of the Agency.

**Electronic Registration**

Cost-effective programs continue to be used and expanded to help young men register more quickly and easily. A larger portion of the registration process has become automated because of driver's license legislation, Internet registration, tape matching programs, and a telephone option. Eighty-one percent of registrations were electronic by the end of FY 2005, compared to 79 percent by the end of FY 2004. In comparison to paper/card registrations filled out by hand and processed manually, electronic registrations are more cost effective and more efficient, and provide immediate customer service.
With the cooperation of the U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services, immigrant men age 18 through 25 who are accepted for permanent U.S. residence also become automatically registered with Selective Service. Men of registration age who complete an application for an immigrant visa with the U.S. Department of State are automatically registered. During FY 2005, nearly 45,000 men were automatically registered through this interagency arrangement.

Registration Reminder Mail-back Program

The Registration Reminder Mail-back Program generated more than 1,377,000 registration reminder postcards to young men ages 18 through 25 who have yet to register with Selective Service. Other than completing and returning the registration reminder mail-back card, the mail-back card suggests other convenient ways to register such as through the Internet or by telephone. Names of those required to register are obtained from state Departments of Motor Vehicles and U.S. Department of Education. Department of Motor Vehicles data are obtained from almost every state and territory of the United States, representing approximately 85 percent of the potential records identified for registration compliance processing. Other sources of data used in the compliance program are the United States Postal Service; U.S. Social Security Administration; the Departments of Defense, Labor, Education, and Transportation; and the Office of Personnel Management.

The Agency continued special direct mailings to improve registration awareness and compliance rates. These mailings were sent to potential registrants in metropolitan areas with large populations and low registration compliance, with emphasis on California and New York.

Early Submission of Registration Information

In an effort to reach young men who are considering dropping out of school, as well as to buttress on-time registration compliance, Selective Service focused on early submission of registration information. This process allows 17-year-old men to submit registration information “early” by means of mail-back registration cards, telephone, the Internet, and driver’s license applications, which is the primary source of early submissions. The information is held until 30 days before the young man’s 18th birthday, at which time his registration record is processed. During FY 2005, nearly 548,900 young men submitted their information early.

Increasing Registration Awareness – Registrar Program

Eighty-six percent of the nation’s 20,977 high schools had volunteer Selective Service registrars authorized to register young men. This effective awareness
program enables registrars to talk with male students about their legal requirement to register with Selective Service. Because registration is a prerequisite for federal job opportunities and student financial aid, the program helps spare many young men the delays and disqualifications they could experience if they failed to register. The program also provides a convenient location for young men to register at their high schools. Increased public awareness and use of online registration has reduced the workload of the volunteer high school registrars.

Selective Service board members and state resource volunteers, all civilians, participated in Selective Service’s “Adopt-a-High School” program to encourage schools to appoint high school registrars and highlight online registration. The program received a boost when the Governor of Puerto Rico proclaimed March 2005 as Registration Awareness Month, and when the Mayor of Washington, DC, proclaimed May 2005 as Selective Service System (Registration) Month, encouraging many high school students to register with Selective Service.

Increased use of the Selective Service Web site’s registrant verification online feature resulted in improved customer service by providing high school registrars, as well as registrants, student financial aid officers, and Workforce Investment Act officials an easy way to verify a man’s Selective Service registration.

Outreach Initiatives

Outreach efforts used to increase registration awareness included Selective Service staff and Reserve Force Officers providing registration information to young men and/or their “influencers” at the Aroostook County Young Men’s Business Association in Presque Isle, ME; District of Columbia Public School Administration Offices in Washington, DC; National Association for the Advancement of Colored People Annual Convention in Milwaukee, WI; Youth Safari 2005, an employment fair in Grayslake, IL; National Convention of the American Association of Community Colleges in Boston, MA; Memorial Day activities in Avella, PA; American Association of Collegiate Registrars and Admissions Officers Annual Meeting in New York, NY; Reserve Officers’ Association Mid-Winter Conference in Washington, DC; Veterans Day activities in Philadelphia, PA; Veterans of Foreign Wars County Post in Center Moriches, NY; the Mid Hudson Claims Association in Newburgh, NY; Military Order of Foreign Wars in Philadelphia, PA; National Urban League Conference in Washington, DC; Broward County (FL) Sheriff’s Department of Detention; American School Counselor Association Annual Conference in Orlando, FL; Annual League of United Latin American Citizens National Convention and Exposition in Little Rock, AR; Boy Scouts of America, which added Selective Service registration requirements to a sidebar in the “Citizenship In The World” Merit Badge pamphlet; Florida’s Annual Yellow Ribbon Festival in Tampa, FL; the American Legion in Fort Worth, TX; Organization of Chinese Americans in Las Vegas, NV; National American Legion Conference in Honolulu, HI;
various Rotary International clubs; various high schools; Association of the United States Army Convention in Fresno, CA; University of Nevada’s Gladiators Organization Conference with 11,000 attendees in Las Vegas, NV; Hispanic Chamber of Commerce in St. Paul, MN; Hmong 18 Council in Minneapolis, MN; National Association of Secondary School Principals Expo in San Francisco, CA; various Big Brothers organizations and YMCAs; Washington Urban League in Seattle, WA; Personnel and Management Association of Aztlan (an Hispanic organization that conducts Aztec work in southwestern U.S.) in Los Angeles, CA; various Cub/Boy Scout clubs; State Commanders of the California Veterans Organizations in Sacramento, CA; UCLA – WA football game in Los Angeles, CA; and, Laotian Veteran Leaders in Fresno, CA.

Selective Service continued taking advantage of every possible opportunity to inform the public. Selective Service board members and state resource volunteers took part in the “Adopt-a-Post Office” program to help ensure U.S. Post Offices had ample supplies of Selective Service registration materials and understand current Selective Service registration procedures.

**Registration is the Goal**

Selective Service’s goal is registration, not prosecution. However, if a man fails to register or provide evidence that he is exempt from the registration requirement after receiving Selective Service reminder and/or compliance mailings, his name is referred to the Department of Justice (DoJ) for investigation and possible prosecution for his failure to register as required by the Military Selective Service Act. During FY 2005, more than 177,000 names and addresses of suspected violators were forwarded to the DoJ.

**Reclassify**

The Reclassify Division is responsible for developing Selective Service plans and policies for settling claims by men seeking postponements, exemptions, or deferments from military service during conscription. This responsibility includes maintaining and updating manuals which delineate the two mobilization scenarios in which the Selective Service System could operate a draft: time-phased response mobilization or health care personnel delivery system. A significant project currently under way is the total rewrite and
consolidation of the mobilization manuals into one user-friendly document that will provide guidance on each of the mobilization scenarios.

This division also develops and maintains the table of distribution and allowances for Reserve and National Guard Officers assigned to the Selective Service System’s detachments. Also, the Reclassify Division is responsible for all military personnel and military issues that pertain to active duty and reserve military training, assignments, promotions, awards, and Service and Agency reorganizations.


Board Member Program

The Agency’s workforce is largely comprised of its local, district, and national appeal board members. The patriotic men and women serving on these boards are uncompensated citizen volunteers who are appointed and trained in their own communities.

Local board members are nominated by state governors or equivalent officials and appointed by the Director of the Selective Service System on behalf of the President of the United States. District appeal board members are nominated by the Agency’s three region directors and also are appointed by the Selective Service Director on behalf of the President. Board member candidates must meet specific Agency requirements, be upstanding citizens in their communities, and agree to serve as uncompensated Selective Service employees before they can be appointed.

Board members receive initial training and yearly continuation training thereafter. The law limits board member terms to 20 years.

In the event of a draft, local and district appeal board members would meet to decide claims by registrants who seek draft postponements, exemptions, and deferments. The district appeal board members also deal with appeals to classifications given to registrants by local boards and claims related to alternative service work assignments.

Military Personnel

The Selective Service System is directed by the Defense Authorization Act for FY 1977 not to exceed 745 military billets for Reserve Force Officers (RFOs) to help augment the Agency’s staffing. These positions are considered prestigious joint assignments for these RFOs.

At the end of FY 2005, 238 of these positions were filled with National Guard members and Reservists from every military service. These officers are assigned throughout the United States and its territories. They serve as Drilling Individual Mobilization Augmentees (DIMAs) or as members of a
National Guard unit, primarily to assist in mobilization planning and readiness training for the Selective Service System to ensure the Agency will be able to activate its field structure in the event of conscription.

RFOs are a critical grass-roots conduit in establishing and maintaining contact with state and local government agencies, providing visibility for the Agency’s registration programs to local high schools, the media, and local communities. These RFOs talk with young men regarding their civic duty and make certain they understand their obligation to register. RFOs also assist in appointing and training local and district appeal board members. Training board members better prepares RFOs to open area and state offices if a draft is reinstated.

**Alternative Service**

In its second year, the Alternative Service Division made solid gains in ensuring the Agency’s ability to operate an alternative service program in the event of a return to conscription. Director William Chatfield captured the essence of the Alternative Service Division’s mission when he wrote the following statement:

“Our goal, in any return to conscription, is to provide a 24-month term of fully supervised alternative civilian service to any man classified as conscientiously opposed to both combatant and noncombatant military training and service. Our pledge to America is that in fulfillment of their citizens’ obligations, the alternative civilian service of conscientious objectors will benefit the nation’s health, safety, and interests. We simultaneously pledge to conscientious objectors that their right to productive, fair, and honorable alternative service will be protected.”

In fulfillment of that pledge, the division initiated a phased plan for more active development of the Alternative Service Employer Network, including profiles for each state and the encouragement of initial employer agreements. In addition, the Agency continued to press for memoranda of understanding with corporations and federal agencies.
who meet the requirements to become alternative service employers. Despite significant roadblocks, Selective Service is still hopeful of its eventual success in these efforts.

Selective Service increased its outreach to the “peace church” community. During the past year, Selective Service officials met with representatives of the Church of the Brethren, various denominations of Mennonites and Amish, and, for the first time, members of the Buddhist faith from Soka Gakkai International – USA on its home court. These pacifists wanted to get a better understanding of the Agency’s current state of readiness and the Agency’s plans for conscientious objectors in the event of a future draft so they may prepare young men in their community for alternative service.

On March 4 and 5, 2005, the manager of the Alternative Service Division and the Associate Director for Public and Intergovernmental Affairs spoke at a national gathering of over 100 historic peace church representatives in Elgin, IL. This event was the first such gathering in over 30 years. Leaders from the Mennonite Church, Mennonite Brethren Church, Brethren in Christ, Church of the Brethren, Conservative Mennonite, Beachy Amish, and other groups convened to discuss the possibility of a military draft, military recruitment, and to highlight the tradition of Christian service. The two Selective Service officials presented the current Administration’s position concerning the draft and provided an explanation of how the Alternative Service Program would work in any return to conscription.

In May, when a contingent of future military leaders from the U.S. Army War College visited national headquarters to be briefed on the Selective Service System and its functions, the Alternative Service Division gave a briefing on its history and mission. Later that month, Selective Service was on hand at the annual Church of the Brethren Youth Conference in Washington, DC. In July, the manager of the Alternative Service Division addressed several panels at a semi-annual gathering of American and Canadian Mennonites in Charlotte, NC.
Finally, the Alternative Service Division manager and the Associate Director of Public and Intergovernmental Affairs traveled to Bosnia-Herzegovina in August to brief a select group of Bosnian military officers on Agency operations, procedures, and policies.

**FY 2005 Readiness – Training**

The Alternative Service Division also manages Selective Service’s Readiness-Training Program. In FY 2005, Selective Service continued to refine its training methods, making better use of interactive and self-study programs to accommodate the needs of field personnel even in the most remote areas of the nation.

Selective Service previously provided training and/or training materials to state directors, Reserve Force Officers (RFOs), and more than 10,000 volunteer local, district, and national appeal board members annually. Beginning in FY 2005, modifications to the training goal began to reflect division manpower shortages. No state director training was offered in FY 2005; however, other activities kept the Agency’s state directors ready and current. Seasoned state directors and RFOs received continuation and refresher training using readiness-based Training Guidance Outlines and Training Guidance Packets. The outlines and packets emphasized mobilization responsibilities under various draft scenarios.

Such standard readiness-training programs as the New Officer/State Director (NO/SD) Program, taught new personnel their duties and responsibilities. Under Phase I of the NO/SD Program, new state directors and RFOs received self-study training packets in an electronic format. This program provides an overview of the Agency’s mission, its readiness requirements for mobilization, and operational responsibilities.

Phase II of the NO/SD Program features a Professional Development Course (PDC) detailing state director and RFO mobilization responsibilities. Using multimedia presentations, the PDC incorporates the most likely mobilization scenarios faced by the Agency: a time-phased response mobilization or a health care personnel draft. RFOs completing the PDC take a certification exam to test their command of the training materials.

New local and district appeal board members were provided Initial Board Member Training (IBMT). Phase I of IBMT consists of a Preliminary Readings booklet to introduce new board members to their duties in the event of a draft. Phase II of IBMT, an eight-hour group-study course, provides hands-on training on these duties through lecture, discussion, videos, and using role-play scenarios.
During FY 2005, Selective Service designed new training materials for RFOs and board members. RFOs received mini-exercises to simulate “hands-on” mobilization activities. These exercises were scenario driven, forcing RFOs to use all available resources to resolve each issue.

Seasoned local and district appeal board members were provided group-study continuation training with audiovisual production provided by the Pentagon’s Army Multimedia Visual Information Directorate. This directorate incorporated script changes, contemporary music, in-house and outsourced talent, and a closed-captioning feature into the local board and district appeal board continuation training videos.

District appeal boards assumed the responsibility of deciding alternative service worker job assignment appeal claims when civilian review boards were disestablished in FY 2005. District appeal board members were given Initial Alternative Service Worker Appeal Training, a self-study package that was accompanied by a fictional case file and audio role-play on cassette.

Despite manpower shortages, Selective Service’s training staff continues to aggressively develop and implement innovative training materials designed to meet the Agency’s readiness objectives.
While performing the spokesperson function for the Agency, the Office of Public and Intergovernmental Affairs handles the preponderance of Selective Service’s communication with the general public, professional associations, government entities, Congress, and news media. This small-sized element advises Selective Service’s leadership on the public relations aspects of all policies; monitors legislation in the U.S. Congress of interest to the Agency; assists individuals searching for Selective Service registration numbers and classification records; responds to all press inquiries; services e-mails, faxes, phone calls, and letters from the general public and its elected representatives; and negotiates Agency positions with state and federal governmental bodies.

Legislative Affairs

During FY 2005, four bills have been introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives which address Selective Service. Each has been referred to the appropriate committees of jurisdiction:

1. H.R. 1495 amends the Military Selective Service Act to terminate the registration requirement and the activities and appointments of all Selective Service boards. Further, it revokes all previous sanctions for non-registration. It was introduced by Rep. Major Owens (D, NY) on April 6, 2005.

2. H.R. 2455 repeals the Military Selective Service Act and terminates the entire Agency and all of its programs. Consequently, nothing remains: no registration, no boards, no planning, and no conscription capability. The institution disappears. This was introduced by Rep. Ron Paul (R, TX) on May 18, 2005.

3. H.R. 2631, the Religious Freedom Peace Tax Fund Act, affirms the religious freedom of taxpayers who are conscientiously opposed to participation in war, to provide that the income, estate, or gift tax payments of such taxpayers be used only for nonmilitary purposes, and to create a fund to receive such tax payments. Under this proposal, monies collected in this fund could not be spent on Selective Service, among others, because it is defined with a military purpose. This proposal was introduced May 25, 2005, by Rep. John Lewis (D, GA).

4. H.R. 2723, the Universal National Service Act of 2005, provides for the common defense by requiring all young men and women to perform a period of military service or a period of civilian service for national defense or homeland security. It was introduced by Rep. Charles Rangel (D, NY) on May 26, 2005. It is the same bill proposed by him in January 2003, except that the period of service is now 15 months rather than 24.
Public Affairs

The Agency in the Public Eye

The Selective Service System has a venerable history of public service which spans two centuries of war, cold war, and peace. However, because there has not been a military draft since 1973, many believe incorrectly that this Agency has been disestablished and its important work terminated. Others believe, innocently but erroneously, that its programs would operate in the future just as they did during the past era of Vietnam.

To foster a greater public reception of the Agency’s new approach to its traditional mission, Director Chatfield approved a new direction. It will harness the power, passion, and patriotism of air shows to his vision of a more service-centered Selective Service. His concept starts with presenting the Agency in open, huge community venues geographically dispersed across the U.S., highlighting authentic American heroes, and promoting patriotic and public-service themes across multiple generations, while attracting a high concentration of registration-age young men. At air shows, rated the second most attended spectator event in America, Director Chatfield is confident that his public service message will be easily accessible, result in substantial registrations, educate the influencers of youth, and tap a specific audience of interest. This initiative will be funded and executed during 2006.

Communicating with the Public

Throughout the reporting period, the Office of Public and Intergovernmental Affairs received and responded to approximately 10,200 pieces of mail from the public. Over 9,900 of those were general public inquiries, ranging from seeking proof of one’s registration through complex historical research of policies and operations. The remainder consisted of congressional inquiries, White House referrals, and
Freedom of Information Act (FOIA) requests. One of the FOIA requests came from the Scottish House of Commons, which was considering military draft legislation and was seeking Selective Service expertise.

Just under 2,000 packages were mailed in response to requests for brochures, posters, and other Selective Service registration awareness literature. During the same fiscal year period, the Office of Public and Intergovernmental Affairs serviced approximately 5,400 e-mails, 3,100 faxed inquiries, and 25,500 phone calls. Most of the communications were requests for Selective Service registration numbers or for Agency responses to non-registrants.

Public and Intergovernmental Affairs designed a user-friendly graphic clip art reminding 18-year-old men to register. This graphic was sent to every press secretary in the U.S. Senate and House of Representatives, encouraging the use of the Selective Service message in constituent newsletters.

Communicating with the News Media

Appointment of board members has been ongoing since 1980. As vacancies occur due to normal attrition, Selective Service fills them with civilian volunteers. This has been the procedure for over 26 years; however, this routine administrative process was misinterpreted as Selective Service’s first step in restarting the draft. The resulting waves of rumors continued throughout FY 2005, exacerbated by press coverage of extended troop deployments and strains upon the U.S. Armed Forces and their Reserve Components due to fighting in Afghanistan and Iraq. While answering the vast majority of press and public inquiries directly, the Office of Public and Intergovernmental Affairs occasionally recruited the nearest board member, state director, or Reserve Force Officer whenever media outlets requested a local spokesperson to provide a local dimension to the story.


PIA personnel talked to reporters from, or appeared live on, such broadcast outlets as WTOP (Washington, DC), Pacifica Radio, Channel I (Los Angeles, CA), Hearst Argyle TV, Fox News, KCPW Radio (Salt Lake City), WCCO (Minneapolis, MN), and “Super Talk Mississippi.” Press inquiries also came from student journalists at such colleges as
Virginia Tech, Texas Tech, Penn State, Bakersfield (CA) Community College, and “Hour 90,” which serves students in North Carolina. Finally, PIA participated in a live-chat session with readers of The Washington Post.

Radio Public Service Messages

During FY 2005, Selective Service continued to provide awareness materials to the general public. Selective Service re-released radio public service announcements and had a limited radio distribution. It did receive $421,554 donated air time with more than 24,016 announcement airings.

Selective Service distributed 14 “Keep America Strong” 30- and 60-second radio public service announcements in English and Spanish. In January, and again in July, radio announcements were sent to 1,000 stations across the country.

No television public service announcements were produced or distributed this year.

High School Publicity Kit

Last fall, Selective Service distributed its FY 2005 High School Publicity Kit to over 31,000 high school Selective Service registrars and principals. The kit had an array of communication items – posters, high school newspaper ads, public address announcements, and other collateral publicity materials that reminded both young men and their influencers about the importance of registration compliance. Educators were encouraged to remind young men about their civic responsibility to register and the importance of complying with the federal law.

Public Awareness Exhibitions and Focus Group Studies

During FY 2005, Selective Service manned exhibit booths at 10 conferences nationwide:

- American Association of Collegiate Registrars & Admissions Officers
- American Association of Community Colleges
- American School Counselor Association
- League of United Latin American Citizens
- National Association for the Advancement of Colored People
- National Association of Secondary School Principals
- National Congress of American Indians
- National Council of La Raza
- National Urban League
- Organization of Chinese Americans

In FY 2005, PIA staff traveled to four major cities to conduct outreach and focus group studies in areas where registration compliance fell short of the national average. Demographic factors and lack of driver’s license laws requiring registration with Selective Service limit compliance in these states. Selective Service’s outreach team members met with those considered influential “educators” or role models of the male population, especially those serving minority or
disadvantaged youths, or having a proven track record to reach a large number of young men. Selective Service state directors frequently joined national headquarters personnel at outreach events, and are encouraged to assist by maintaining the partnerships and developing others in their communities.

The following is the list of metropolitan cities and corresponding organizations:

**Portland, Oregon**
- Boy Scouts Exploring, Cascade Pacific Council
- Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization
- KOIN local CBS-TV affiliate
- Korean Society of Oregon
- Native American Youth Association
- Portland Urban League
- Thomas Edison High School
- United Way of the Columbia-Willamette

**Las Vegas, Nevada**
- Big Brothers/Big Sisters of Las Vegas
- Clark County School District
- Jewish Community Center of Southern Nevada
- Las Vegas-Clark County Urban League
- Las Vegas Gladiators
- Rancho Public High School
- Raphael Rivera Community Center
- Trinity Christian School
- WestCare Nevada, a youth and family service center
- YMCA of Southern Nevada
- Youth With A Mission

**Seattle, Washington**
- Asian Counseling and Referral Service
- Big Brothers/Big Sisters of King & Pierce Counties
- Catholic Community Services of Western Washington Catholic Northwest
- IWISIL Boys and Girls Club
- Organization of Chinese Americans, Greater Seattle Chapter
- Interagency Academy
- YMCA of Greater Seattle

**Boston, Massachusetts**
- Boston Center for Youth and Family
- Boston Minuteman Council, Boy Scouts of America
- Brazilian Times
- Compass, Inc.
- Dorchester Community Network Center
- Jordan Boys and Girls Clubs of Boston
- Log School
- LULAC Youth
- Refugee Assistance
- Urban Youth Program of the American Friends Service
- World Journal Chinese Daily
- YMCA of Greater Boston
- YouthBuild Boston
Throughout FY 2005, the Information Technology (IT) Directorate continued to support the Agency’s overall mission and vision, in relation to the role of technology in the workforce. The directorate expects to advance the Agency’s previous “steady state” by turning the Agency’s IT infrastructure into a more modernized data collection, reporting, and delivery system using the available tools, processes, and development standards while maintaining a secure environment. Over the year, the IT Directorate’s aim had been on improving three elements: tools, processes, and standards. Improvements in these areas will in turn enhance other operations throughout the Agency by strengthening productivity, streamlining capabilities, reducing overall costs, and providing “real time” management reporting. In regard to its ongoing design and development projects, the directorate will be incorporating current stabilized technologies that have been accepted, proven, and successful.

New technologies and procedures are already transforming the way the Agency’s information is captured, disseminated, stored, and accessed. The IT Directorate’s challenge is to ensure that Selective Service can maintain its vitality, relevance, and contribution to what some have coined the ‘post-Vietnam-generation,’ particularly as electronic methods and access to resources increasingly become easier.

In 2005, the IT Directorate oversaw the Agency’s modernization to deliver better and more responsive services. The successful pursuit of IT’s emerging strategic priorities will ensure that Selective Service is ready to mobilize in the event of a future draft.

The Information Technology Security Program (ITSP) was adopted and implemented during 2005. This program establishes IT policies and procedures for the entire Agency, and designates responsibilities and authorities for guaranteeing an adequate level of information security for all sensitive but unclassified information collected, created, processed, stored, or disseminated on all Agency information systems. These policies and procedures were communicated to Selective Service employees through administrative orders (i.e., Information Technology Security Program Handbook and other issuances), and incorporated into the handbook.

Having revised its Information Security Training and Awareness Program, the directorate was more efficient in educating Selective Service employees on information security and the policies and procedures in which they must comply. This revised program includes periodic training classes, as well as an ongoing security awareness campaign to maintain our vigilance. New employees receive information security training as part of the orientation process. All employees receive mandatory training on an annual basis.

The IT Directorate is in the process of updating its Continuity of Support Plan, Disaster Recovery Plans, and procedures for providing access to critical information resources in the event of a disruption (e.g., disaster, power outage, or other emergency).
Network Systems
In FY 2005, the Network Systems Division started a major overhaul of the network’s infrastructure, which includes upgrading its servers and expanding the Agency’s network environment.

Information security continues to be a major concern for the directorate; over 100,000 Internet attacks against the Agency’s network occur weekly. The Network Systems staff has upgraded its firewall and intrusion prevention systems to thwart future attacks. In securing the network, software upgrades and patches are installed upon completion of testing.

The Network Systems Division upgraded its wide-area network to a vBNS (very high-speed Backbone Network Service) maintained by MCI under the FTS2001 contract. This upgrade increased the amount of data the Agency can securely transmit over its private network, connecting national headquarters with its region headquarters and the Data Management Center.

The Network Systems Division established a contract with a local cable service provider to align cable modems with the federal government’s telecommuting initiative. Selective Service employees can now work from home and get a secure VPN (virtual private network) connection from the Internet into the Agency’s network.

The technical staff continually strives to maintain compliance with federal programs governing IT resources by making certain security requirements, system configurations, and purchases comply with regulations set forth by such acts as Federal Information Management Security Act.

The Network Systems Division improved mobile communications this year by establishing a new Verizon cell phone contract for voice, data, and BlackBerry service. Senior management now uses these services on a regular basis to keep in touch and interact with Agency operations while on travel.

In addition to all of the projects mentioned above, the Network Systems Division provides day-to-day network support to maintain Selective Service’s local- and wide-area networks. This includes maintaining the Internet online registration and verification system.

Future projects include migrating from a legacy mainframe system to a less expensive, more capable Intel-based server platform. The Network Systems group is currently evaluating a software package to run legacy database code on the new platform. The division plans to implement voice-over-IP service during FY 2006 to reduce telephony costs and improve capabilities.

The Network Systems Division is also involved with the federal government’s project to implement the next generation of the Internet using an improved communication protocol.

Office Automation Systems
In FY 2005, the IT Directorate modernized a number of the Agency’s legacy software applications and computer systems, including the following:

- Replacing and standardizing Agency’s Corel WordPerfect and Lotus software with Microsoft Office Suite 2003. Since Microsoft Office is the norm across government, this enables the Agency to be better suited to correspond with other government entities and improve customer service.

- Replacing and standardizing desktop computer workstations at national headquarters, Data Management Center, and remote offices.

- Upgrading the Agency’s Web-based Intranet site with security features so it can be accessed from a remote site. This new technology will allow all state directors and detachment commanders access to critical information.

- Upgrading critical Agency legacy forms into PDF format and providing more user-friendliness when accessing the Web.

- Standardizing office printers, to a single platform, thus reducing printer maintenance cost while allowing for increased productivity.
Application Modernization and Standardization

The IT Directorate has been aggressively planning and executing the development of its Central Registrant Processing Portal (CRPP). The CRPP is designed to modernize, standardize, and consolidate all of the disparate and legacy mobilization applications into one central browser-based system. Since a decision was made to develop the CRPP, using Agency staff only, year 2005 commenced with an in-house training course on developing enterprise application with Microsoft.net. The project was planned, applying the Team Software Planning (TSP) process. The team has implemented an Earned Value Management Tracking System and the project is currently about 36 percent complete. Fifty percent of the requirements of the system have been documented and several areas are already in the design phase.

This project has implemented many new standards at Selective Service for software development, including the rollout of a new Software Quality Assurance Plan and Software Configuration Management Plan. This project has also standardized the development and operating environment: Microsoft Visual Studio.net 2003 and Microsoft SQL Server 2000.

The Agency has also initiated planning for the modernization of our registration systems. Selective Service’s registration, compliance, and verification applications and data are currently hosted in a mainframe environment. This modernization effort will involve the complete migration of all Agency’s legacy applications and data off of the mainframe environment and into a Microsoft Windows and SQL server-based environment. The purpose of this migration is to decrease maintenance costs, increase technical capabilities of the applications, and allow easy integration with other systems/

data throughout the Agency’s enterprise architecture. This project will commence through 2006.

Data Management Center

The Agency's Data Management Center in Illinois, processes registrations and maintains computer operations that support the Agency's mission. In addition to over 2.3 million registrations processed in FY 2005, the center processed more than 790,000 updates to registrant files, verified the registration status of over 1.4 million men through the Internet Web site, reviewed over 25,000 pieces of written correspondence, processed nearly 1.4 million telephone inquiries, and produced and mailed over 5.1 million pieces of computer-generated correspondence to acknowledge or promote registration. Most inquiries were from men applying for federal and state entitlement programs that require proof of registration. Eighty-six percent of calls to the Data Management Center were processed by an interactive voice response system. The other calls were more complex, and were handled by a small group of agents.
The number of requests for status information letters continues to be substantial. These letters are sent to men who failed to register with Selective Service and are now past their 26th birthday. These men may be denied federal student financial aid, federal employment opportunities, and job training unless they can show evidence that their failure to register was not willful or knowing. The center prepared and mailed nearly 49,000 status information letters to non-registrants.

Through the end of FY 2005, the Data Management Center had developed programs to process the input from the 38 states and jurisdictions that implemented driver’s license legislation, as well as a system for processing registrations for Alaska’s Permanent Fund applicants.
Selective Service relies on a diverse workforce of full- and part-time civil servants, part-time military reserve component personnel, and civilian volunteers. The Agency has reduced its level of full-time equivalents (FTEs) to 154 over the past year while still accomplishing its overall mission through investments in technology, employee training, and the ongoing development of a Human Capital Management Plan. The Agency’s FTE number includes support of 56 part-time state directors and one deputy state director. State directors are compensated for an average of 12 duty days throughout the year, although most of them devote considerably more time to Selective Service activities.

The Agency is developing its strategic Human Capital Management Plan (HCMP) in fulfillment of the President’s Management Agenda. The purposes of the HCMP are to align the Agency’s human and financial assets with its operational, information technology, and logistical processes for the benefit of those it serves, and to set more ambitious goals for the future. Greater responsibility and accountability will be the key objectives of the HCMP.

During the preliminary stage, Selective Service must develop an HCMP that prepares the Agency for both its current ongoing tasks and the less likely reinstatement of a draft. In either case, the Agency must prepare for a future workforce significantly different from today’s workforce, where the average employee has 20 years of service. The Agency must also be ready to recruit and process a massive influx of employees in case of a general mobilization.

Agency human resources officials are motivated by the goals of improving employee morale and the work environment, enhancing employee training tools, and increasing efficiency and asset management through the optimum use of state-of-the-art technology. In addition to adding flexible and compressed work schedule options, the Agency has expanded its Telework Program to cover nearly 60 percent of all employees and improved online work capabilities. Improvements in the performance appraisal and award systems are being accessed under the HCMP development project.

In conjunction with the Office of Personnel Management, the Agency’s e-Quip process is operational and will improve the security clearance process by automating paperwork, enabling cross-agency checks, and streamlining data management. The addition of the online USA Learning Center has helped the Agency upgrade critical employee skills without the expense and time of formal classroom training. Selective Service also will save time and postage by participating in e-file initiatives to automate the personnel records and contracting proposal processes. Each of these improvements is supportive of the President’s Management Agenda and sound business practices.
While public discussion about restoring a military draft continues to take place, the current Administration has been quite clear that there is no present need for conscription. This position has been consistent with the five previous Administrations. America’s security is protected by a successful volunteer military, and backing up that all-volunteer military is the Selective Service System.

For decades, elected leaders from both sides of the political aisle have recognized the value of Selective Service to serve as a compact, cost-efficient civilian structure capable of rapid expansion in a crisis; to provide people to our Armed Forces as needed; and to do it fairly, equitably, and within the necessary time frames. The Agency was established with the realization that America should never be as unprepared as she was in the years between the two world wars. Although much has changed since 1940, one thing has not changed. The world will never cease being a dangerous place, even if the nature of the danger changes. No one can predict the dangers and crises that may face us in the future. As Plato observed, “Only the dead have seen the end of war.” This nation, to be free, will always have a mandate for the Selective Service System.
As of September 30, 2005

Alabama .................................................................................................................. Sheldon E. Jeames
Alaska ....................................................................................................................... Charles A. Smith
Arizona .................................................................................................................... Victor R. Schwanbeck
Arkansas .................................................................................................................. Richard Gassaway
California ............................................................................................................... Ronald H. Markarian
Colorado ................................................................................................................. Paul S. Baldwin
Connecticut ............................................................................................................. Nathan G. Agostinelli
Delaware ................................................................................................................... Richard C. Cecil
District of Columbia ............................................................................................... Margaret G. Labat
Florida ..................................................................................................................... Douglas R. Maddox, Sr.
Georgia ..................................................................................................................... Roy James Yelton
Guam ....................................................................................................................... Lorenzo C. Aflague
Hawaii ....................................................................................................................... Edward K. Nakano
Idaho ......................................................................................................................... Michael D. Moser
Illinois ...................................................................................................................... Richard E. Northern
Indiana ..................................................................................................................... Stephen C. Hoffman
Iowa .......................................................................................................................... Myron R. Linn
Kansas ...................................................................................................................... Robert C. Schnelle
Kentucky .................................................................................................................. Harold D. Loy
Louisiana ................................................................................................................ Everett J. Bonner
Maine ....................................................................................................................... Averill L. Black
Northern Mariana Islands ...................................................................................... Warrington O. Tyson, Sr.
Maryland .................................................................................................................. Joseph C. Reyes
Massachusetts ........................................................................................................ John M. Bissonnette
Michigan .................................................................................................................. James A. Klynstra
Minnesota ................................................................................................................ John D. Fitzgerald, Jr.
Mississippi ............................................................................................................... Steven L. Melancon
Missouri .................................................................................................................... Donald L. Hiatte
Montana .................................................................................................................... Edward L. Hanson
Nebraska .................................................................................................................. Robert J. Foley
Nevada ...................................................................................................................... Billy G. McCoy
New Hampshire ...................................................................................................... Robert E. Dastin
New Jersey ............................................................................................................. Frederick W. Klepp
New Mexico ............................................................................................................ Mucio Yslas, Jr.
New York City ......................................................................................................... Vincent J. Albanese
New York State ....................................................................................................... Rosetta Y. Burke
North Carolina ....................................................................................................... Lyndon S. Worden
North Dakota ........................................................................................................ Donald L. Shaw
Ohio ......................................................................................................................... Michael A. Reynolds
Oklahoma ................................................................................................................ Owen M. Barnhill
Oregon ...................................................................................................................... Gary E. Lockwood
Pennsylvania .......................................................................................................... John C. Williams
Puerto Rico .............................................................................................................. Walter Perales-Reyes
Rhode Island .......................................................................................................... Vacant
South Carolina ........................................................................................................ Joe P. Johnson III
South Dakota ......................................................................................................... Paul A. Hybertson
Tennessee .................................................................................................................. Chris L. Gingles
Texas ........................................................................................................................ Claude E. Hempel
Utah .......................................................................................................................... Leland D. Ford
Vermont ................................................................................................................... David C. Pinkham
Virgin Islands ........................................................................................................ Warrington O. Tyson, Sr.
Virginia ..................................................................................................................... Manuel R. Flores
Washington .............................................................................................................. Verne M. Pierson
West Virginia ......................................................................................................... Jack E. Yeager
Wisconsin ................................................................................................................ John C. Cumicek
Wyoming .................................................................................................................. Henry W. Buseck
### Registrants by State

#### Draft Eligible Registrants as of September 30, 2005

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alabama</td>
<td>195,945</td>
<td>45,439</td>
<td>241,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>32,843</td>
<td>8,211</td>
<td>41,054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>215,890</td>
<td>59,780</td>
<td>275,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>134,929</td>
<td>31,041</td>
<td>165,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>1,357,158</td>
<td>292,240</td>
<td>1,649,398</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorado</td>
<td>197,739</td>
<td>58,985</td>
<td>256,724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connecticut</td>
<td>122,035</td>
<td>28,525</td>
<td>150,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>36,162</td>
<td>10,198</td>
<td>46,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>730,870</td>
<td>215,999</td>
<td>946,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>364,797</td>
<td>106,712</td>
<td>471,509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaii</td>
<td>50,381</td>
<td>9,734</td>
<td>60,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho</td>
<td>68,137</td>
<td>18,563</td>
<td>86,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Illinois</td>
<td>556,253</td>
<td>127,045</td>
<td>683,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>257,470</td>
<td>59,599</td>
<td>317,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>135,436</td>
<td>34,156</td>
<td>169,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>128,224</td>
<td>34,746</td>
<td>162,970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kentucky</td>
<td>165,910</td>
<td>39,136</td>
<td>205,046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Louisiana</td>
<td>211,086</td>
<td>55,421</td>
<td>266,507</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maine</td>
<td>53,558</td>
<td>13,016</td>
<td>66,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maryland</td>
<td>199,304</td>
<td>47,497</td>
<td>246,801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Massachusetts</td>
<td>222,801</td>
<td>51,713</td>
<td>274,514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michigan</td>
<td>408,432</td>
<td>96,707</td>
<td>505,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minnesota</td>
<td>222,745</td>
<td>55,269</td>
<td>278,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mississippi</td>
<td>122,324</td>
<td>27,581</td>
<td>149,905</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>239,411</td>
<td>59,215</td>
<td>298,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montana</td>
<td>42,882</td>
<td>10,257</td>
<td>53,139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nebraska</td>
<td>79,163</td>
<td>19,146</td>
<td>98,309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nevada</td>
<td>70,247</td>
<td>16,336</td>
<td>86,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>53,200</td>
<td>13,784</td>
<td>66,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Jersey</td>
<td>310,316</td>
<td>73,487</td>
<td>383,803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Mexico</td>
<td>91,121</td>
<td>20,613</td>
<td>111,734</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>750,794</td>
<td>161,127</td>
<td>911,921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Carolina</td>
<td>349,279</td>
<td>91,850</td>
<td>441,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Dakota</td>
<td>31,184</td>
<td>7,548</td>
<td>38,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>508,012</td>
<td>126,355</td>
<td>634,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oklahoma</td>
<td>160,967</td>
<td>37,454</td>
<td>198,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>142,517</td>
<td>31,340</td>
<td>173,857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pennsylvania</td>
<td>456,889</td>
<td>107,621</td>
<td>564,510</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rhode Island</td>
<td>43,829</td>
<td>11,440</td>
<td>55,269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Carolina</td>
<td>159,761</td>
<td>35,918</td>
<td>195,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>39,196</td>
<td>9,430</td>
<td>48,626</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tennessee</td>
<td>244,892</td>
<td>58,841</td>
<td>303,733</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Texas</td>
<td>928,980</td>
<td>218,914</td>
<td>1,147,894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utah</td>
<td>142,721</td>
<td>36,171</td>
<td>178,892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vermont</td>
<td>25,440</td>
<td>6,387</td>
<td>31,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virginia</td>
<td>290,727</td>
<td>81,535</td>
<td>372,262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>249,663</td>
<td>55,452</td>
<td>305,115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>73,977</td>
<td>16,893</td>
<td>90,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>244,967</td>
<td>59,361</td>
<td>304,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyoming</td>
<td>25,066</td>
<td>5,912</td>
<td>30,978</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, D.C.</td>
<td>15,135</td>
<td>2,364</td>
<td>17,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northern Mariana Islands</td>
<td>5,626</td>
<td>1,364</td>
<td>6,990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virgin Islands</td>
<td>4,811</td>
<td>876</td>
<td>5,687</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puerto Rico</td>
<td>159,203</td>
<td>31,850</td>
<td>191,053</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guam</td>
<td>7,225</td>
<td>1,372</td>
<td>8,597</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign</td>
<td>24,930</td>
<td>4,516</td>
<td>29,446</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| TOTALS                         | 12,162,580       | 2,942,042        | 15,104,622       |
The FY 2005 Annual Report was produced by the Office of Public and Intergovernmental Affairs, Selective Service Act, Section 10(g).
