

CHAPTER 7

Tripartite Management: The Apportionment of Power and Influence

December 1979–March 1980

... to try to build airfields here is like trying to wrestle a tiger while you are wearing a strait jacket.

Brig. Gen. Max W. Noah¹

When all the money is in the project manager's hands, it just cuts the program manager right out of any decision-making process at all.

Brig. Gen. Paul T. Hartung²

Quality also means doing as we request. We know the area, we know the threat, we know best what we need to the smallest seemingly insignificant detail.

Brig. Gen. Moshe Bar-Tov³

In the winter of 1979–1980 the program was close to settling into the form it would take for the duration. Construction at the sites was barely under way, and the three components of Tel Aviv management—the Israeli Air Force's program management office under Bar-Tov, Hartung's American program management office staffed by U.S. Air Force personnel, and Gilkey's Near East Project Office—were all ensconced in the IBM Building. The apportionment of power and influence among the three was still unclear. When the test of their relationship came, the generals joined forces against Gilkey. From the outset Hartung and Bar-Tov had developed a strong friendship. Aside from Hartung's initial impression of Bar-Tov as a "winner," the two shared backgrounds as air force brigadier generals. As program managers they also had a common interest in influencing or even controlling operations. Their daily meetings reinforced this bond. So close were they that some employees called them "Har-Tov and Bartung."⁴ As a colonel

in charge of a construction project that two generals sought to dominate, Gilkey was the odd man out.

Disagreements over program issues sometimes strained the relationship between Bar-Tov and Hartung. Lewis thought their spats benefited the Corps of Engineers because their preoccupation with each other diverted their attention from the Near East Project Office. However, such diversions seldom occurred.⁵ As Hartung put it, "We've become close friends and we understand each other."⁶ While it was Gilkey's misfortune to face two generals united by friendship, the reasons for disagreements among the three transcended personal relationships. The needs of their respective agencies and governments ultimately determined individual positions. As the two air forces and the Corps of Engineers pursued different interests, albeit in the context of their shared goal of successful completion of the bases, their representatives were frequently at odds.

Hartung's long association with military construction for the U.S. Air Force did not prepare him for the program's unusual financial arrangement. As program manager he expected to control and dispense the money when he was satisfied that the construction agent needed it. He never recognized the legitimacy of Corps control of the budget, believing that the arrangement nullified program manager control, cut flexibility, and increased costs. "If you give the man that has to do the work," he said, "too large a budget for a piece of work, if he can accomplish something for three-quarters of a million dollars and he has a million and he does it for \$900,000, he's still a hero."⁷ Although about 20 percent of the money would be provided by the Israeli government, control of the entire amount by the construction agent also meant that the Israelis had no real voice in how that money would be spent. According to Hartung this lack of control caused difficulties. Some were substantive; some were matters of perception, "but the real portion created the perceptions."⁸ He opposed use of this financial arrangement for subsequent projects. "I don't think the Air Force would ever participate like this again," he said. "I wouldn't." Unable to control work through the purse strings as he was accustomed, he was not content to manage site activation and act as go-between for the Corps and the Israelis.⁹

Bar-Tov too sought a dominant role. His position as program manager was not specified in any of the intercountry agreements, and, according to Graves, no Israeli program management organization was envisioned by the negotiators. In fact, the Ministry of Defense's establishment of his office—with its \$20 million budget paid from program funds—constituted an explicit rejection of the portions of the 1979 agreements that stipulated that the United

States would build and turn over to Israel two air bases.¹⁰ Nevertheless, Israel's stake was legitimate. After all, its air force would use the bases. Moreover, after the American grant was spent, Israel would either realize any savings on the job or pay for overruns. As its representative, Bar-Tov used his forceful personality to exert maximum influence. That he would play a major part was evident soon after the Corps office in Tel Aviv was established. The program, Colonel O'Shei complained, was "saddled with a Troika-configured leadership, marred by the inevitable deficiencies that such command structures always involve."¹¹

Control of the program budget certainly put the Near East Project Office in a powerful position vis-a-vis the program managers. In light of the frustration that Hartung and Bar-Tov experienced in trying to assert their influence over construction, it might even appear that the Corps of Engineers dominated the situation. This was not the case. Personality, rank, and numbers also entered into the equation. Gilkey could not deal with the barrage of questions and criticisms from the program managers and devote the proper attention to managing the project.¹²

To a significant extent, this situation originated in Morris' decision to assign a colonel as manager of the project. His choice still troubled some participants, who wanted a more senior officer. While never questioning the decision to place the project under North Atlantic, these people continued to urge the chief's office to send a brigadier general to Tel Aviv. They envisioned a management framework somewhere between the alternatives considered by Morris, one that had a general at the top but remained attached to North Atlantic.

In July 1979 Hewitt had evaluated the situation in Israel and concluded that a general was necessary. Supporting the argument Johnson had made earlier, Hewitt said that Bar-Tov's office pressured Damico for larger roles in management and execution. Only another general officer, Hewitt contended, could "go nose to nose with Bar-Tov."¹³ Damico and the Near East Project Office staff seemed to agree. The organizational structure they recommended for their own office would be led by a brigadier general.¹⁴ Johnson thought the best he might be able to do was obtain a second colonel to serve as deputy, but knew that a general would not be assigned "in the foreseeable future." Gilkey would remain in charge.¹⁵ This prospect seemed to satisfy Gilkey, who had tried earlier to convince Johnson and the staff in New York that a general was unnecessary.¹⁶

After Johnson left for Washington, the issue remained unresolved. Lewis renewed efforts to get a general for the project. He

thought that “the Corps should have assigned a general officer as program manager [*sic*] and put him on the scene from the start of the project.” He repeatedly urged Morris to rectify the situation. Lewis’ analysis of the relationship between Colonel Gilkey and the program managers only confirmed his view. “Too often,” Lewis wrote, “the NEPO PM finds himself in a defensive position opposing two BGs.” Lewis and Hewitt believed Hartung and Bar-Tov took up much of Gilkey’s time with their complaints. As Lewis put it, “Hartung, instead of spending his time helping the Corps and the contractors in the interactions with agencies of the Israeli government, kept trying to manage the Corps.” Consequently, Gilkey lacked the time and energy that should have been devoted to the project.¹⁷

From Lewis’ viewpoint, Gilkey was being pressured from below as well as from above. Lewis described Curl and O’Shei, the area engineers who reported to Gilkey but were of equal rank, as “two very capable, strong-willed officers.” At the time Lewis believed “there was a high probability both would be promoted.” He also thought further advancement for Gilkey was unlikely. Curl and O’Shei “believed they were operating the air base projects as independent districts,” and that Gilkey “had only general oversight and support responsibilities.” Lewis thought that having a general in Tel Aviv would end the ambiguity in the relationship of Gilkey’s headquarters with the area offices and the program managers.¹⁸ Lewis saw the mission as too important to manage in any other way. The complex and sensitive situation required the skill, experience, and prestige of a general. With his usual bluntness, Lewis told Morris he was convinced “that if the Corps of Engineers is to meet its responsibility as DOD’s ‘construction agent,’ you should assign a general officer (GO) to devote 100 percent of his time to the project.”¹⁹

Lewis knew who he wanted for the job. He nominated Brig. Gen. Max W. Noah, a self-assured and very tall officer known as “the gentle giant.” Lewis thought Noah, who later became comptroller of the Army as a lieutenant general, had “both the personal and professional qualifications,” among them “considerable experience with resource management, his personality and his physical presence.”²⁰ Morris wanted to keep Noah as commander of the Huntsville Division, an anomalous element of the Corps whose organization-wide responsibilities included training and various special projects, but he finally agreed that “there was no question [that] we had to get Gilkey some help.”²¹ At the same time, he emphasized the need for increased cooperation with Hartung: he wanted to know Hartung’s needs as well as a plan to meet them. “We are,” he wrote, “far from where we must be vis-a-vis the GOI and the two PMs if we are ever to have a smooth operation.” So

Morris agreed to send Noah to Tel Aviv for three months.²² Lewis “accepted him on a temporary basis if that was the only way to secure his services.”²³

Once Morris decided to send Noah to Tel Aviv, he began to shift his overall view of the role of project management. By compromising with Lewis and temporarily assigning a general, he created a managerial situation that was midway between his original alternatives. His basic view remained unchanged: the two organizational possibilities were either an independent headquarters under a general officer or an office managed by a colonel and attached to a division. He now had an engineer general on the scene, and he began to see Noah as the prime manager. He thought the project’s center of gravity should shift toward Tel Aviv, with more control of the work exercised there instead of from New York. By the same token, he wanted Lewis to cut his involvement with daily operations.²⁴ “If I had intended to put a brigadier out there in the first place,” he told Lewis, “I probably wouldn’t have had the North Atlantic Division Engineer involved.”²⁵

Noah went to Israel on temporary duty early in January 1980. He had followed development of the program and at one time thought he might be assigned as project manager. He knew Lewis had wanted to send him there and that Morris had overruled the choice.²⁶ Morris considered Noah “an outstanding organizer and manager,” and wanted him to “review and strengthen the field management procedures.” Specifically, Morris sought a system to control and report on progress, after which Noah was to devise ways to control the budget and the quality of construction. All three areas were important—delivering a quality product on time and under budget were standard project goals—but Morris stressed management of the schedule. His primary concern was completion of operational bases as promised by 25 April 1982.²⁷

Through the winter the fact that an engineer general would be assigned permanently became evident. Lewis kept up the pressure. At the same time, Morris told Gilkey that he was considering replacing him by the summer.²⁸ Noah reported to Lewis on this conversation, concluding that the “Chief is convinced Jack [Gilkey] cannot handle it from here on in although [Morris] recognizes as should you that he has done [a] commendable job.”²⁹ Morris went to Tel Aviv in January 1980 and asked Noah for his views on the future of project management. Noah considered three possibilities. The first involved replacing Gilkey with a “strong competitive 0–6 [colonel].” The other two centered on putting a general in Tel Aviv, either Noah or someone else. The longer Noah remained in Israel, the more he inclined to recommending a general. “As I

shoulder more of the burden," he told Lewis, "Jack [Gilkey] is getting happier again—he needed it. I'm about to the stage that I would recommend a BG here no matter what."³⁰

The situation Noah found in Tel Aviv seemed to call for the best available leadership. There was a set of common assumptions with which to work. While others wondered how firm was the Israeli commitment to withdraw from the Sinai and to finish the job on time, Noah found no reason to doubt their intentions.³¹ "There was," he said, "never a feeling . . . that they . . . wanted anything more than to have two very complete combat airfields built in the time allowed, and they wanted them to be the best."³² Nevertheless, he remained troubled by the possibility that the Corps might miss the deadline, which could result in Israeli refusal to finish the withdrawal: "That's the first thing I think about when I wake up."³³ Despite the common goals of all three managers, he believed the two generals tended "to be rather impatient," and that "the interface was sometimes very abrasive." Noah thought that Hartung sometimes seemed "so interested in pleasing the Israelis that he joins them in jumping on the Corps." He saw that the Corps operation was far from perfect, but thought Hartung and Bar-Tov complained too much. Lewis agreed.³⁴

Neither of the program managers appreciated the logistical and managerial complexities of the job. Moreover, they complained "ad nauseum, night and day continually." Too incessant and too significant to ignore, the dissatisfaction had to be faced.³⁵ Because, as O'Shei said, Hartung and Bar-Tov were "able men with the time to tinker," they "tended to get, quite frankly, in the way of operations."³⁶ Noah had to negotiate with them and found that he spent most of the time doing just that. Noah's objective in serving as a buffer between Gilkey and the program managers was to protect those who actually did the work. He wanted to "separate the contractors in their effort to get things moving . . . from the political [and] financial inter-office concerns that went on in Tel Aviv." He understood that failure to do so would unnecessarily burden the people at the sites. As it was, the program managers "were down there enough, right in the middle of the contractor's business."³⁷

Hartung and Bar-Tov saw the situation very differently. In the first place, they considered their own involvement in construction at the sites to be necessary and legitimate. In addition, Hartung thought the area engineers, both of whom had commanded civil works districts in the United States, lacked experience with military construction and fast-track operations. So he was particularly watchful of their operations.³⁸

Given the divergent views and purposes of the three management offices, it is hardly surprising that even the routine aspects of Noah's relations with Hartung and Bar-Tov took much of his time. Each weekly meeting actually consumed three days. On Tuesdays, Noah accompanied Hartung and Bar-Tov to the bases and answered their questions, an experience he likened to escorting congressional survey and investigation committees. Wednesdays were spent organizing for the meetings on the next day. Then came Thursday and the discussions themselves. The sessions reminded him "a little bit" of "the Panmunjom table," without the flags but nevertheless not without conflict, with the Corps facing the program managers across the table. The meetings considered every problem, "from the most miniscule to the biggest." Noah recognized that both program managers had legitimate concerns. Hartung was bent on ensuring the quality of the product through control of construction, and the Israelis were protecting their interest in the bases.³⁹ However, the confrontational style of the program managers set the tone for Noah's weekly meetings with his chain-smoking colleagues.

Not all of Noah's efforts created distance between Gilkey and the generals. By approving the creation of a configuration control board to be administered by the project office's construction division, he also took a major step toward creating permanent roles in decision-making for program management. The program managers chaired the board, which included the project manager as a member. The group evaluated the operational need for changes in design, master plans, and schedules. The board also considered the technical requirements for implementation of proposals and their effect on completion dates and construction costs. Changes required unanimous acceptance by the board. In the event of dissenting votes, the program managers resolved the impasse. Cochairmanship of the board firmly placed Bar-Tov in the management process.⁴⁰

Noah also became involved in attempts to improve the troublesome procurement process. By the winter it had become clear that the system so ardently defended by Gilkey's staff a few months earlier was not working. Lewis, who had seen the problem during his visit in December, decried the lack of teamwork. He complained that the contractors' design and construction elements did not cooperate in putting together procurement packages and that the Near East Project Office offered little help because its procurement staff lacked the experience to do so. Noah, who had been instructed by Lewis to concentrate on the procurement system, was proud of the Huntsville Division procurement organization and considered purchasing to be one of his division's special

strengths. He took reinforcement with him in the person of Raymond Aldridge, his chief of procurement and supply at Huntsville Division. Within a week Aldridge was at Ovda, offering help with the contractor's procurement plan.⁴¹

Joseph Perini of Negev Airbase Constructors' parent company also visited Ovda in January. He told Noah he was shocked at the amount of time involved in the procurement process. Noah promised to focus on what he acknowledged as a problem area.⁴²

Procurement help came from the Defense Contract Audit Agency, which sent a team to Ovda to evaluate the procurement system used by Negev Airbase Constructors. Members of the audit team underscored the need for training contractor procurement personnel. Their formal report listed a host of problems with documentation of purchases. The team also cited the failure to consider properly the time required to fill orders and the need to place more orders to ensure adequate competition. The team that examined the situation at Ramon also urged establishment of a program to indoctrinate purchasing employees in the requirements imposed by government regulations.⁴³

To Aldridge the message was obvious: "The one thing that came out loud and clear is the need for training in the [design and construction contractors'] purchasing departments." With the audit report as a guide, he wanted procurement analyst Roy E. Edwards from Huntsville Division to teach procedures to the contractors, both of whom welcomed the help. Noah approved the proposal, and a third Huntsvillian came to Tel Aviv.⁴⁴ As had Noah when he first arrived, Aldridge and Edwards stepped into a situation that lacked structure and form. Only one standard procedure, designating which classes of materials could be purchased in Israel, had been written.⁴⁵ While Edwards worked with the contractors developing check sheets, forms, and procedures, Aldridge began the effort to systematize the process at the other end, in Gilkey's headquarters. The results began to appear in April in a procurement guidance series issued by the procurement and supply division. Each issue spelled out procedures and consolidated information on one subject. The documents went to the Tel Aviv staff, the program managers, the area offices, and the New York office. The first explained the series itself.⁴⁶ The next twelve covered subjects ranging from procurement staff visits at the area offices to assistance by the Ministry of Defense in local purchases.⁴⁷

Theoretically, Noah did not replace Gilkey as manager. Instead, they discussed issues, and Noah recommended courses of action. According to Noah, Gilkey still had final authority and was free to decide whether to follow his advice. However, in addition to outrank-

ing Gilkey, Noah had agreed to follow courses of action determined by Lewis, with whom he talked frequently by telephone. So the lack of any notable independent action by Gilkey is far from surprising.⁴⁸

Lewis did not content himself with interposing Noah between Gilkey and the generals. His assessment of the relationship between the three offices convinced him of the need for other measures. Lewis thought that the program managers unnecessarily complicated the project by attempts to control construction. He understood Gilkey's mission as construction of the two air bases, while program management's primary responsibility was making the bases operational. He also believed that the American program manager did not provide Gilkey with proper support. For example, after the program manager's office failed to respond to the request for help in establishing a communications network, the project's signal officer had to establish his own direct contacts with the Ministry of Communications.⁴⁹

To rectify this situation, Lewis told Gilkey to take the offensive. Lewis wanted "to start the flow of requests moving in the other direction, that is, from him to Hartung." He had come to Gilkey with a problem regarding a subpoena issued by the Israelis to an American contractor, and Lewis thought Hartung should have handled the matter with the Israelis. But these specific complaints were secondary and merely symptoms of his primary concern: alleviation of the pressure on Gilkey.⁵⁰

Lewis also saw the proximity of Gilkey's office to those of Hartung and Bar-Tov as part of the problem. O'Shei had told him that the close location of the three offices exacerbated the tendency of the program managers to intervene in construction decisions: "Program personnel attend our staff and technical meetings, are on distribution for our reading files, and even receive copies of the correspondence and reports between the Area Engineer and his staff." Given this arrangement, O'Shei continued, "intervention in our process is as casual and easy as this proximity would indicate."⁵¹ Lewis finally concluded that, with the two generals demanding so much of Gilkey's time, the IBM Building was not big enough for all three of them. If Gilkey moved across town into the Palace Hotel, the situation might improve. So, after clearing his decision with Johnson in Washington, Lewis told Gilkey to move his office.⁵²

Bar-Tov saw the relocation coming months before it took place. He alerted Hartung to a rumor of a move in October 1979. He acknowledged the dubious utility of such stories but cautioned his American counterpart that "our mutual short experience in this project has indicated that many rumors in the past turned into reality and accomplished facts." He thought such a move would signifi-

cantly shift the program's center of gravity. "I would appreciate your advising the COE," he wrote Hartung, "to bring any such plans to us for our mutual approval before reaching a point of no return."⁵³

Hartung assured Bar-Tov that the story lacked validity. He too had heard the rumors, which he thought originated with uninformed employees. Hartung believed that expansion of the program would eventually necessitate placing more support offices in the Palace but did not "envision Project Management or design interface activities being a part of this thinking." These were the "'Center of Gravity' functions," and they would remain where they were. He expected that "any planning to shift activities closely aligned to Program management will be discussed with us before any action." Neither he nor Bar-Tov asked why the Near East Project Office might be considering such a move.⁵⁴

In December Gilkey told Hartung that he had been directed to take his office to the Palace. When office space became available there after the first of the year, he transferred the executive office and the construction division from the IBM Building to the hotel. The moves continued over the winter as more staff sections and some contractor offices also left the IBM Building.⁵⁵

Bar-Tov complained that the moves complicated liaison activities and delayed work. The hiring freeze in his ministry made it impossible to compensate for the separation with additional Israeli employees. He asked Hartung to "direct NEPO not to make any independent decisions that according to good management practices should be discussed and approved on the PM's level."⁵⁶

Hartung appeared to have been particularly stung by the move, carried out so soon after he had denied the rumors. He complained to Noah that the transfer was not in the best interest of the program. He also contended that the refurbishment of the offices in the Palace prior to the move constituted an extravagance that "was perceived as an example of total disregard for Program cost control, right at the project manager level." An inclination to profligacy, he concluded, "permeates throughout the organization." Hartung also took the opportunity to lecture Noah on cost control. "[I] would appreciate it," he wrote, "if all NEPO folks better understood that in addition to this program having CPFF contracts, the Construction Agency is not on the normal fixed fee basis for its operation, but is financed directly from program funds on an actual cost basis." He told Noah that "a dollar saved by NEPO is a dollar saved for the program," rather than for the Corps through a nonexistent account he dubbed "the COE industrial fund."⁵⁷

Noah listened but changed nothing. He explained only that the shortage of space in the IBM Building had made the action



Palace Hotel

necessary. Thereafter, the Near East Project Office kept its distance from the program managers. After Brig. Gen. John Wall took over as project manager in the spring, he returned the construction division to its former location, but he kept his headquarters and his own office in the Palace.⁵⁸

The move provided some breathing room but did not alleviate tension between the Corps and the program managers. Morris visited Israel in late January 1980 and recognized that this was the key problem. He called the establishment of proper working relationships among the three managers "by far my biggest concern."⁵⁹ The feelings of mutual frustration that had brought about the transfer of the office persisted, perhaps even grew, and spilled over into other areas of their relationship.

Extensive negotiations over the proper method for construction of family housing at the bases reflected this hostility. All of the participants worked in Tel Aviv, yet they conducted their discussions through formal memorandums. The question involved responsibility for that part of the job. Either it would be removed from the contractors' scope of work and assigned to Israeli pro-

gram management or built for the Americans by Israeli subcontractors. Both of these options reflected a willingness to accommodate the changing economic situation in Israel. All told, the housing matter involved a relatively small \$20 million slice of a billion-dollar pie.

The notes went back and forth through the late winter and early spring. Hartung wanted the Corps to stop its procurement and design activities and consider alternatives for management of housing construction that would take into account the Israeli interest in carrying it out. The Corps was responsible for completing usable bases on time, so Gilkey, backed by Noah and Lewis, refused to yield control over construction of any of the facilities required for initial operating capability. Finally, Bar-Tov withdrew his ministry's request for consideration of Israeli management of the housing project.⁶⁰

Participants understood the issue to involve much more than a small piece of a big job. Lewis and Bar-Tov rarely agreed on questions of substance, but they did concur on the significance of the dispute over housing. Lewis recalled that "the most basic issue was who was in charge of managing the construction project itself: the Israelis, BG Hartung, or the Corps."⁶¹ Bar-Tov, on the other hand, concluded that "without the ability to direct NEPO directly from the PM's office, the PMs will be left with the responsibility without any authority—a situation that is unacceptable to me." He too saw the fundamental question as one of control. He also saw that he was losing it.⁶²

Notes

1. Memo, Brig Gen Max W. Noah for Lewis, 1 Feb 80, IABPC, 1/2.
2. Hartung interview, Aug 80.
3. Bar-Tov, Open Letter "To My American Friends in the Negev Air Base Program," Jul 81, IABPC, 75/4.
4. Cheverie interview.
5. Lewis interview, Jan–Feb 82.
6. Hartung interview, Aug 80.
7. Ibid., Aug 80 and Apr 81.
8. Hartung interview, Aug 80.
9. Ibid.
10. Interv, author with Lt Gen Ernest Graves, Jr., Ret., Apr 85, part 8, Arlington, Va.; MFR, Gilkey, 21 May 81, sub: Secretary West and LTG Graves Visit, 18–19 May 1981, IABPC, 63/5.
11. Memo, O'Shei for Lewis, n.d. [Nov 79], sub: Project Manager Grade Level, Lewis Papers, Office of History, HQ USACE.
12. Lewis interview, Jan–Feb 82, part 3; Interv, author with Max W. Noah, Apr 83, Washington, D.C.
13. DF, Hewitt to Johnson, 5 Jul 79, sub: Briefing for General Johnson on 5 Jul 79, IABPC, 8/2.
14. Memo, Damico for Johnson, 4 Jun 79, File 228–01, IABPC, 8/4.
15. Telex, Johnson to NEPO [c. 3] Jul 79, IABPC, 65/2.
16. Telecon transcript 9, 11 May 79, IABPC, 10/3.
17. Ltr, Lewis to Morris, 21 Nov 79, IABPC, 8/2; Lewis interview, Jan–Feb 82, part 3; Hewitt, Marginal Comments on Ltr, Morris to Lewis, 31 Jan 80, IABPC, 9/7.
18. Lewis interview, Jan–Feb 82, part 3.
19. Ltr, Lewis to Morris, 21 Nov 79.
20. Ibid.; Noah interview.
21. MFR, Lewis, Telecon with Chief of Engineers, 13 Dec 79, IABPC, 9/7; Morris interview. For information on the evolution of the Huntsville Engineer Division, see James H. Kitchens III, *A History of the Huntsville Division, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1967–1976* (Huntsville, Ala.: U.S. Army Engineer Division, Huntsville, 1978).
22. Ltr, Morris to Lewis, 31 Jan 80, IABPC, 9/7.
23. Lewis interview, Jan–Feb 82, part 1.
24. MFR, Lewis, Telecon with Chief of Engineers, 13 Dec 79; Morris interview.
25. Morris interview.
26. Noah interview.
27. Morris interview; NEPO Sitrep No. 25, 13 Jan 80, IABPC, 13/10.
28. Ltr, Lewis to Morris, 22 Feb 80, Lewis Papers; Memo, Noah for Lewis, 28 Jan 80, IABPC, 1/2.
29. Memo, Noah for Lewis, 28 Jan 80.
30. Memo, Noah for Lewis, 1 Feb 80, IABPC, 1/2.
31. Ze'ev Schiff and Ehud Ya'ari, *Israel's Lebanon War*, trans. Ina Friedman (New York: Simon and Schuster, 1984), p. 68; Interv, author with Fred Butler, Aug 80, Ramon, Israel.
32. Noah interview.
33. *U.S. News and World Report*, 26 May 80, p. 49.
34. Noah interview; Memo, Noah for Morris, 26 Jan 80, sub: Relationship with PM/DOD and NEPO-Corps, IABPC, 9/7.

35. Noah interview.
36. Memo, O'Shei for Lewis, sub: Project Manager Grade Level.
37. Noah interview.
38. Hartung interview, Apr 81.
39. Noah interview.
40. SOP 14, Configuration Management, 15 Feb 80, IABPC, 15/14.
41. Ltr, Lewis to Morris, 26 Dec 79, IABPC, 1/7; OAO, Master Diary, 13 Jan 80, IABPC, 84/4; Noah interview.
42. MFR, Noah, 14 Jan 80, sub: Meeting with NAC Executive, IABPC, 31/2.
43. DCASR New York, CPSR: Initial Review, NAC, 26 Mar 80, pp. I-4—I-5, II-1, IABPC, 8/3; Ltr, Gilkey to GM, ABC, 12 Feb 80, sub: CPSR, IABPC, 32/2.
44. Memo, Raymond Aldridge for Noah and Gilkey, 15 Feb 80, sub: Use of Roy Edwards, IABPC, 32/2; Memo, Noah for Area Engineers, 19 Feb 80, sub: Purpose and Scope of TDY Effort of Roy Edwards, IABPC, 32/2.
45. SOP 10, Procurement Procedures for Purchase of Materials, Equipment, and Services, 9 Nov 79, IABPC, 15/10.
46. Procurement Guidance 1, 18 Apr 80, sub: Procurement Guidance, IABPC, 8/7.
47. The rest of the series are in IABPC, 8/7. They are the following: (2) MOD Assistance to Prime Contractors; (3) Policy on Contracting for Transportation Services; (4) Subcontract Consent Reviews for Actions of \$100,000 or More; (5) Monitoring of Contractor Procurement Activities; (6) Procurement Staff Visits to Area Offices; (7) Evaluation Factors; (8) Emergency Procurements; (9) Not Used; (10) Flow Down of Prime Contract General and Special Provisions into Subcontracts; (11) Small Purchases (Purchases Not in Excess of \$10,000); (12) Technical Compliance with Purchase Order Requirements; (13) Not Used; (14) Procurement from Bonded Warehouse; and (15) Shipment of Food from Foreign Sources.
48. NEPO Sitrep 29, 11 Feb 80, IABPC, 13/14; Noah interview; Lewis interview, Jan–Feb 82, part 1.
49. Lewis interview, Jan–Feb 82, part 3.
50. Ibid.
51. Memo, O'Shei for Lewis, sub: Project Manager Grade Level.
52. Lewis interview, Jan–Feb 82, part 1.
53. Ltr, Bar-Tov to Hartung, 11 Oct 79, sub: Shifting Center of Gravity from IBM Building to Forum Palace, Encl to Ltr, Hartung to Noah, 2 Mar 80, sub: Shifting Center of Gravity-IBM Building to the Palace, IABPC, 9/7.
54. Ltr, Hartung to Bar-Tov, 23 Oct 79, sub: Shifting Center of Gravity from IBM Building to Forum Palace, Encl to Ltr, Hartung to Noah, 2 Mar 80; NEPO Sitreps No. 24, 6 Jan 80, and No. 25, 13 Jan 80, both in IABPC, 13/9.
55. Ltr, Hartung to Noah, 2 Mar 80; DF, Chief, Construction Division to Chief, Engineering Division, 8 Jan 80, sub: SOP #9—Design, Development, Review, and Approval, IABPC, 23/4.
56. Ltr, Bar-Tov to Hartung, 24 Feb 80, sub: Shifting Center of Gravity from IBM Building to the Palace, Encl to Ltr, Hartung to Noah, 2 Mar 80.
57. Ltr, Hartung to Noah, 2 Mar 80.
58. MFR, Bar-Tov and Hartung, 28 Feb 80, sub: DOD/MOD Program Managers Meeting of 21 Feb. 1980, IABPC, 45/4; Ltr, Wall, through Lewis, to Morris, 25 Jun 80, sub: Management Issues, Israeli Air Base Program, IABPC, 9/7; Noah interview.
59. Ltr, Morris to Lewis, 31 Jan 80.
60. Ltr, Hartung to Damico, 11 Feb 80, sub: Family Housing and Dormitories; Ltr, Noah to Hartung, 12 Feb 80, sub: Family Housing and Dormitories; Ltr, Har-

tung to Noah, 14 Feb 80, sub: Family Housing and Dormitories; Ltr, Gilkey to Hartung, 13 Mar 80, sub: Family Housing and Dormitories; MFR, Noah, 14 Mar 80, sub: Family Housing & Dormitories, Ovda and Ramon Air Bases; Ltr, Bar-Tov to Hartung, 10 Apr 80, sub: Family Housing and Dormitories; Ltr, Hartung to Noah, 11 Apr 80, sub: Family Housing and Dormitories. All in IABPC, 1/2.

61. Lewis interview, Jan-Feb 82, part 3.

62. Ltr, Bar-Tov to Hartung, 10 Apr 80.