

1-1

Meeting with Charles Bataglia, June 13, 1988.

Meeting was to review the Senate workpapers on the personnel study to see what material will be of use in the NAPA effort. The material had not been reviewed and it would require a couple of days. I indicated that we had a staff meeting scheduled for June 16 and if at all possible would like to have the material by that time.

When I indicated that we were scheduled to begin the INR discussions, Bataglia retrieved the INR workpapers. We reviewed them and he provided the interview notes and the summary papers. I declined material on regulations and staffing levels.

The material can be copied and the originals returned to the SSCI files. [On review, the interview notes will be of little use and were not copied.]

A copy of the proceedings of a 1986 conference on training in the intelligence field beyond the year 2000 was provided.

Bataglia also let me review a classified document on the reasons for INR inability to fill positions to the authorized budget level.

A copy of a Hall memo to Bataglia on possible expansion of the study in the 88 conference report language was provided. The House may add to this. I indicated that this appeared more doable than the expansion discussed at the last meeting.

180/15 June 88

I N T E R O F F I C E M E M O R A N D U M

Date: 6-Jun-1988 15:55 EST
From: KEITH HALL
HALL
Dept:
Tel No: 224-1733

TO: CHARLIE BATTAGLIA

(BATTAGLIA)

Subject: RE: Memorandum to Keith Hall

The language in our classified report relative to NAPA says:

"...the Committee requests the DCI to task the NAPA study group currently reviewing intelligence personnel policies and compensation to review NFIP manpower costs and make whatever recommendations they find appropriate on ways to constrain such costs without adversely impacting intelligence missions."

Our request deals with manpower costs (not personnel growth per se which is only one factor in increasing manpower costs). In my view, this request does not ask for any new major undertaking by the NAPA group. Rather, it asks them to take into account what they have observed or learned in their review of compensation at the various agencies and make whatever recommendations they think appropriate on ways to constrain costs (presumably we are already going to get recommendations that might increase costs in certain areas and that's fine). Anyway, I don't see why this couldn't be included in their January report.

