

Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Engineer, USAREUR

Q: Well, let's turn to your next assignment, '78-'79. You were, at the beginning of the period, Chief of the Installations and Construction Division in the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Engineer, at Headquarters, USAREUR. I'll begin the way we've begun these other assignments. How did you get that job? How did it come about that you went to Heidelberg and to the Office of the DCSENGR.

A: I guess in the great scheme of things that people at Headquarters, USAREUR, look around, see what positions are going to be open the next year, and figure out how they're going to fill those positions and with whom. They have available those people coming out of command, as in my case, and then whichever they can't fill from within theater, they get from the replacement stream from the Military Personnel Center. That's how it worked, and I was picked, I suppose, by General Lou Prentiss, the then DCSENGR, and General Dick Groves, who was the Chief of Staff. I'm sure they laid the slate before General Blanchard for final approval of many different positions with me in that position. That's how I got it.

Q: So, the two years down as commander, 7th Engineer Brigade, was a pretty standard two-year command tour at that level?

A: It changed while I was there. When I went over, the command tour was a year and a half. The Army changed that, for longer continuity, to a two-year tour. The day that policy came out, I petitioned General Ott for an extension. He sent a message back to the States asking that I be extended for the full 24-month tour, and it was approved.

Q: That was pretty good timing for your assignment, wasn't it?

A: Good timing.

Q: Got to stay on six more months.

A: That's right.

Q: Well, the Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff, Engineer, had just undergone some changes in staff in '77. I guess the year before you got there, there was a reorganization of the whole USAREUR staff as well as the DCSENGR staff. Maybe you could talk a little bit about how the DCSENGR staff worked and how the Installations and Construction Division fit into the DCSENGR organization.

A: Well, like all organizations, the USAREUR headquarters keeps changing over time. The basic changes from Staff '77 were in place, at least structurally, when I arrived. Now, as part of that, it was felt that policy, programming, budgeting should be in the headquarters at Campbell Barracks—that is, Headquarters, USAREUR. Execution and implementation should be in the field and at the USAREUR level for facilities that would be vested in a new organization called ISAE, the Installation Support Activity, Europe. Colonel Charlie McNeill was assigned as the first ISAE commander.

His organization was up, functional and running but not fully staffed, and there were still a lot of rough edges between what they were to do and what remained at Campbell Barracks. By that I mean some people were reluctant to let some things go out of Campbell Barracks. The people out at ISAE were putting together an organization and picking up the ball and weren't all quite sure they wanted all these various missions and issues because they were trying to manage what they could handle and add to it.

I don't remember any major problem. I just give that rundown as the place where we were in the maturity of the organization transition.

To get the colonel position to command ISAE, two separate divisions of the headquarters were combined. DCSSENGR previously had an Installations Division and a Construction Division. They were combined into one division called Installations and Construction Division. That's the one that I took over. Jim Van Loben Sels was my predecessor.

In addition, there was a Facility Engineering Division, which was responsible for those kinds of activities. There was also a Programming, Budgeting Office. When I said the Facility Engineering Division, I meant the Engineering and Housing Division. Colonel Fred Wegley had that, and he had two hats, one for engineering, one for housing.

There was a Real Estate Division. George Fuentes had been there for years, a civilian and a great person.

When I mentioned the Programming and Budgeting Office, I meant the Management Division, which is what we called it, which had a programming side and a budgeting side. In addition, with that also was a Military Engineering Office. They worked with the DCSOPS [Deputy Chief of Staff for Operations and Plans] on engineering troop matters. All that was under the Management Division, Lieutenant Colonel Bob Vermillion, and then Lieutenant Colonel Bob Lee had it at the time.

In the Deputy Chief of Staff, Engineer's office, besides Major General Vald Heiberg there was the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Ed Keiser. Charley McNeill, who commanded ISAE, also acted as Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff, Engineer. Within the province of the way Headquarters, USAREUR, acted, and acts today, great power is vested in the assistant deputy chiefs of staff, as they're called. There are the deputy chiefs and the assistant deputy chiefs who carry the stick for the boss and usually had sign-off authority the way General Groves ran things then, continuing to today.

So, that's basically the organization.

Q: Now, what were the responsibilities of your Installations and Construction Division?

A: Well, as I related, I brought two different parts together, so let me talk about them. Our construction mission was focused on new construction, not execution. That is, if European Division was designing it and was going to go out and be construction, ISAE, the Installation Support Activity, Europe, would have the interaction with EUD. That was one of those things where staff responsibility was divided. We in Installations and Construction Division

would work the program five or six years out, putting together the MCA [Military Construction, Army] program for USAREUR, and we would ship that to the Department of the Army.

We also had the NATO infrastructure program. We'd work all those details, which was taken care of within NATO locally with Headquarters, EUCOM, a big player but involving the whole NATO organization. There was a separate branch in Installations and Construction Division for NATO infrastructure because it was complex. They had all their own interworkings and a whole different set of rules.

That basically was the construction part of the division, focused on putting construction programs together. We interacted with EUD, EUCOM, Department of the Army, with our own Real Estate Division, and with the entire USAREUR staff, and we went down to the Corps and the Corps' Director of Engineering and Housing, now, to get the Corps program built together. That meant we brought programs together; we had a lot of prioritizing sessions in-house; and we'd come back and participate here in the Pentagon with Department of the Army and the Office of the Assistant Chief of Engineers. There were a lot of faxes going back and forth, trading messages as we tried to work the priorities as the Army went through its annual building the program, building the POM, and building the budgets process.

On the installations side, we really were the keeper of the books on those 800 different installations that I talked about earlier in 39 communities. We were the keeper of policies having to do with installations—whether you can have this, don't have that, how many of them, what the standards would be, and that sort of thing.

We were also the stationer. You know, with stationing there's a big operations component and there's a big engineer facilities component. Over time it has gone back and forth as to who is the stationer, DCSOPS or DCSENGR? Well, obviously it's operations who has the call. I mean, DCSOPS takes it to the commander for approval of which unit should be where, but we were the ones who kept the books and would say, "If you want that unit there, you're going to take up all the facilities and you still will have a shortfall." So, we knew how much and we kept all those kinds of facts. So, if you ever wanted to move a unit or change a force structure, DCSOPS and the Installations Branch of the Installations and Construction Division would have to get together and work all those details.

That was a very big comprehensive kind of thing, not so routine a process as every year putting together a construction program.

Also involved with stationing was something that had come up as a special initiative at that time—the master restationing plan for Europe. General Groves, I think, had been the initiator of the program initiative to try to determine the way of refitting where we were located so that we better fit the mission and installations in Germany—maybe to be able to move out of some of the U.S. installations, which were right in the middle of downtown German communities; move them out to the periphery to avoid some of the interaction problems and to get us out of some of the older, hard-to-keep-up facilities. After all, the kasernes we were living in, for the most part, were those captured during the war.

Once the Bundeswehr was established, they built new kasernes. So, they were living in fairly modern kasernes, and our soldiers were living in older, patched-up kasernes. The idea of the master restationing plan for Europe was to allow us to potentially build new, better facilities. Garlstedt, a newly constructed community that had just been built up in the north when we wanted to move a brigade to the northern area, was heralded as a novel approach. General Groves, as DCSENGR, had gotten German funding and built a facility out and away from a city. It was modern. Our folks were in it. By restationing, we could get away from the downtown Stuttgarts, Frankfurts, and so forth.

In DCSENGR, as Chief of the Installations and Construction Division, I was responsible for USAREUR action on the master restationing plan.

Q: Now, is this also related to the forward stationing idea that had begun to be talked about? I think we talked about it earlier, moving U.S. troops closer to the front?

A: It became that because the DCSENGR is responsible for all infrastructure and facilities. If the command was to do something new or different requiring restationing or building new—part of that would be obtaining the real estate, part would be facilities engineering and housing those other divisions in the DCSENGR—but the kind of focused things, the up-front things, really came to “installations” first to figure out the where and how and the what, and then to the “construction” part of the Installations and Construction Division to program the necessary construction.

President Jimmy Carter had brought to the NATO countries, through his defense staff and the State Department, an American initiative for rapid reinforcement of NATO. His initiative was to get every country to increase its defense budget by 3 percent, so everybody was contributing more to a better NATO defense. His point was that if every country did that, the United States would commit its 3 percent to adding forces for reinforcement of NATO. That is, we would build more POMCUS sites. In other words, if you want a more capable force, we would commit to building sites and storing the equipment forward for three more reinforcing divisions from the United States to come forward to fight in NATO. That would reduce the time to move three divisions to be able to fight because they would just have to fly troops over; the weapons and equipment would be there. That was the initiative.

Like most initiatives, the decision makers wanted it done in a very short time. As I arrived in DCSENGR to be the Chief of the Installations and Construction Division, execution of that initiative was on my desk. Sites had been picked for the first division set of POMCUS in northern Germany at Moenchen–Gladbach, Herongen, and Twistaden—three different sites.

It had been determined that we were not going to use the usual controlled humidity warehouses but adopt something else—individual covers for tanks with separate dehumidifier elements, which had come to be called, in the vernacular, “baggies.”

That was the point where we were when I arrived. EUD was now the design agent, through the Germans, to try to construct the first division set of facilities. That wasn’t going very quickly, certainly not quickly enough for those at the Pentagon who were involved. We still

had not picked sites for the other two division sets. So, very quickly this became a major personal effort for me. I spent the next year in that office, and it was the most intense year of my career. Another major item, of course, was the master restationing plan. Both of these had major Chief of Staff and command interest. A third major one was the collocation of CENTAG [Central Army Group, Central Europe] headquarters and Fourth Allied Tactical Air Force headquarters with USAREUR headquarters in Campbell Barracks.

Both Fourth Allied Tactical Air Force and CENTAG were NATO commands. Of course, General Blanchard then was the CENTAG commander. The two commands were located nearby, but not within Campbell Barracks. His thought was, "If we're going to have this greater cooperation and interaction, we ought to have the three headquarters living together in Campbell Barracks." As part of the USAREUR staff reorganization, discussed earlier, people were moved out of Campbell Barracks, and the new space was to provide for the two headquarters. There was a relocation plan that had been drawn up to relocate different USAREUR staff people from one barracks to another, rehabilitate the buildings, and then at the end of all of that, Headquarters, CENTAG, and Fourth Allied Tactical Air Force would move in. That program was also my responsibility in the Installations and Construction Division.

So, over and above the annual construction program, I found myself with those three major initiatives that I was the point of contact on, or, really, the division chief responsible to deliver the results.

Q: What were the problems with the POMCUS storage program? Was it new technology, new design principles? What had slowed the program?

A: There weren't great new technologies. There were just a mass of things involved and a lot of different people across international boundaries that had to be involved, and they all had to be driven through to conclusion. There were a lot of players; I mean, it got so that I spent most of my time networking. The networking included people in SHAPE headquarters, in the Office of the Secretary of Defense, people in the Army Staff, and people in EUCOM headquarters. There were people contacts and phone calls trying to smooth the way so that papers got addressed in three days, not two weeks. We were dealing across so many lines.

We didn't have, as I mentioned, the sites for the fifth and sixth POMCUS sites. General Groves called me in and said, "Well, what are you going to do about it?"

I asked, "Where are we?"

He said, "Nobody's even decided where they should be. There's been one thought that they should all be in Germany, but the Germans say the impact should be shared, probably."

I asked, "Well, has anybody figured that out? Has somebody made a decision?"

"No, nobody has made a decision."

So, in the first couple of weeks in the job I really found out that my action ramp had to accelerate. I wasn't going to have a nice glide path into understanding what was required in my new job. General Groves wanted answers now—and he was looking down the table at me directly. It was one of those things where it was pretty plain that I had to seize the responsibility and do it and pull it all together. So, I became the focal point for making things happen for the USAREUR implementation of the rapid reinforcement of NATO initiative.

Probably the only way that worked was that I had direct access to General Groves, the Chief of Staff. I could call his secretary, Marian O'Donnell, and say, "I really need to see General Groves." I'd get five minutes, and I'd go in and say, "This is this and this is that," and I'd get it—he'd say, "Drive on," or "Change direction," or "Go." I was involved in the thinking and strategizing, and I had a validator. I had a high-placed somebody that could give the blessing and I didn't have to wait a long time for that blessing.

I should back up here and give you an incident there that happened soon after I first arrived. Major General Lou Prentiss was the DCSENGR and he changed out just six weeks later. Major General Vald Heiberg replaced him. I remember after about the second week, after one of my trips up to see General Groves in one of our private sessions, General Heiberg, who had been out flying around, learning, visiting some of the people like you do when you first arrive at a job, came back and said, "Well, don't you think you could come see me before you go see General Groves?"

In sort of a flip response, but being sincere, I said, "We do need to succeed, and I don't think we have the time to wait on your availability for these things, so, I mean, I'll keep you informed, we'll let you know, but there will be times when, to keep things going, we're going to have to get up there and get the Chief's blessing. I suggest we better have that modus operandi." So, that continued and he didn't object and we had a great working relationship. I believe I kept him informed.

Now, back to the example I was giving—where were division sets five and six to go? As mentioned, I'd been up to General Groves and found out nobody had made a decision. Not only that, no decision was pending. There was nothing operating to get a decision. So, I went back to the office and wrote a message basically to the world, to the Supreme Allied Commander, Secretary of Defense, EUCOM, to all the players, and said, "We've determined that one set ought to be in Belgium and one set ought to be in the Netherlands in addition to the set in Germany for the following reason: basically to share the pain. Need your decision and coordinated positions. If you don't object by so-and-so date, we're going to go with it."

I walked that back up to General Groves. He signed it out, and the message went to the world, and within a week it was the decision. I don't know if we ever got a message back from anybody. It was just understood that that was the right way to do it. That was an example of how we just had to make things happen.

Then the question came, "Well, where in the Netherlands?" I didn't have anybody to turn to. So, we called up the defense staff in The Hague and said, "We want to meet with you and pick sites." In the meantime, once the global site message had gone, we solicited SHAPE and

the Department of Defense to send messages to Belgium and the Netherlands saying we had decided on sites in all three countries.

Once the decision was made, then I called and set up a meeting date and said, "We're coming up. How about nominating 8 or 10 sites." Then we would fly to The Hague or wherever they wanted to meet us; they would send a lieutenant colonel or major, and we'd go walking sites. I'd take two or three people. We'd say, "That one, that one, that one," and would rank-order them in priority. They'd come back and say, "No, there's too many communists in that area; that'll be a major problem," or, "No, not in that place; too environmentally sensitive." We'd maybe say, "Not in that place; the road network or rail network is not good enough."

Through that process we would winnow down the sites, oftentimes not having enough at the end. We'd say, "Go back and get us some more." That's how we picked the sites, back and forth, mostly dialoguing in my office, getting approvals and ratification. That was our modus operandi. We'd try to go wrap it all up, and when people objected, we'd go get some higher-up to break the objection or put pressure on them to make things happen.

Meanwhile, we're back trying to figure out with EUD how we're going to get the Germans to build the division first set more quickly because they were dragging their feet. They were saying, "Well, we'll get to it next year," and so we would then network around for pressure to come down saying, "No, Germany, you've got to do it more quickly." We would call a meeting in Bonn, fly up to Bonn with EUD, and we'd sit there and play the bad guys, saying, "No, that's unsatisfactory, you've got to deliver it more quickly."

The German defense staff would say, "No, we can't. We've got to do this and this and this, and you haven't done it." Then we'd do our part. We played that back and forth just to get construction of the first POMCUS set going.

So, there was a lot of focused activity. Why did it go slowly? It was going slowly because there was a lot of this kind of interaction necessary to make things happen. I mentioned my organization at the start—I established a new Storage Branch. I got approval for eight more positions, put two people in it, and got started right away so I could have somebody just to keep the books on all of this.

I was now involved not only with the POMCUS sites but also with all the theater reserve storage sites. Because we were increasing the number of divisions, we were also going to have to have more theater reserve in the country to back them up with additional days of supply. We were also going to have to have more ammunition, so we had to add ammunition sites. So, I had a theater reserve program, an ammunition program, and the POMCUS program, all having to do with storage—and I found our books floated.

By this, I mean, we would go to briefings and a DCSLOG staffer would brief and there would be this requirement on this day, and two weeks later the requirement changed. I set up the Storage Branch in the Office of the DCSSENGR just to have our own focal point, to become the bible, so to speak, of requirements that you could audit back to. DCSLOG was still responsible for logistics materiel and ammunition procurement, but I kept the books on

facility requirements. If the DCSLOG wanted to change something and it had to do with facilities, the facilities inventory didn't float, but changed only by our Storage Branch inventory.

So, it came that there were several of us at the colonel level who began to network in the USAREUR headquarters considerably. Four of us were almost always at these many different meetings involved with trying to sort out these operational enhancements. One of those was Bob Dacey, an engineer who was then the plans officer in the Office of the DCSOPS. Another, Rod Ferguson, was in the Office of the DCSRM [Deputy Chief of Staff for Resource Management], a money, budget, and program guy. I was in the Office of the DCSENGR, and Colonel Walt Kastenmayer was with the Office of the DCSLOG, the colonel responsible for the supply and maintenance division.

When we went to a decision briefing over in the Keys Building conference room, all four of us would be there. We would have to all basically talk, agree that it was "This amount of things that needed to be stored, this amount of facilities required," and "Yes, it fit the operations stationing plan" and "Yes, we had money in the program to do it." We were always talking, networking. I'll bet I talked to those other three guys twice a day throughout this period as we tried to work the many issues involved.

I should go on to say our work evolved to the point of many trips back to the United States to brief at the Pentagon. There were doubts that we were proceeding fast enough. I guess there's always been some sort of a great understanding and credibility problem between USAREUR and the Department of the Army. Really, there shouldn't be; we're all pulling the same way. Often it's, "Those guys said," or "They don't understand over here in the Pentagon," or "It's the Imperial Seventh Army over there, always got to have it their way."

Actually, many things were different in Europe—quite a number, as a matter of fact, like the NATO construction program. We were using other money, different sets of rules, not Department of the Army's rules. We had to do construction through German agencies. We really had to go by certain other rules, not the same rules we had back here in the Army for military construction. When you're crossing international boundaries, there are other things, conventions, agreements, rules.

General Blanchard, Commander in Chief, wanted to send a team back to brief the Army Staff on how we were proceeding, basically to say, "We really do have our act together over here. We are proceeding on POMCUS sites four, five, and six. We do know what ammunition we want, we do know what theater reserve we want, and this is the whole program."

We were called to the Chief of Staff's office one afternoon. At that meeting were the DCSLOG, DCSRM, DCSOPS, and DCSENGR. General Groves wanted to decide how we were going to address this credibility problem with the Department of the Army. He indicated that General Blanchard had decided to send back this team and asked who should head it. Every Deputy Chief of Staff looked at every other one, and by and by I got picked. I was in the back row and had not said anything.

We put together a good team, but unfortunately it was advertised as “The Truth Squad.” Now, if you tell somebody that we’re sending this team back to bring you the truth, it raises certain hackles on the part of those who are to receive that message. So, we walked back into a veritable lion’s den of growling folks ready for, “What is this truth you’re bringing us?”

Now, the nice thing about it was that General Blanchard did call General Shy Meyer, who was then the DCSOPS, and asked that he sponsor us, so we at least had somebody to be a long-range protector.

In any event, we came back, after putting together a rather long briefing of, I don’t know, 70 to 80 Vu-Graphs, and briefed. At the staff level, the majors and lieutenant colonels from all over the Army Staff just had question after question. We dealt with all kinds of their questions, and then we briefed up the line, the next level. Finally, we had our major briefing to a dozen Army Staff generals, co-chaired by Lieutenant General Meyer, the DCSOPS, and Lieutenant General William R. Johansen, the DCSLOG at the time. They co-chaired the meeting. It was a two-and-a-half-hour briefing. That is, I was on my feet at the end of the table briefing for two and a half hours. There were a lot of questions and answers and challenges and dialogue. This briefing was a major point, I think, in which we moved to a place where everybody understood where everybody else was. We portrayed the difficulty of doing all the things required and the fact we had to have decisions. Somebody needed to be figuring out where they were going to get all the trucks, tanks, and Bradleys to put in the warehouses we were going to build.

We now had the basic mark on the wall for how we would proceed. Henceforth, after that day, the Department of the Army and Headquarters, USAREUR, had a plan that called for so many warehouses, so many theater reserves, so many ammunition storage sites, the number of places we intended to put those warehouses, and that sort of thing. This was the mark that any other change could be measured against. We now, at least, had something on paper we could dialogue against. That was a major point in time.

A second most interesting trip back to Washington came a couple of months later. Brigadier General Drake Wilson was commander of EUD at the time. He came down, sat with me, and said, “I think we’ve got a big problem in constructing the first site in Moenchen–Gladbach using the baggies, the humidity-controlled cover for individual tank storage.” His point was twofold: First, instead of having one big, cleared area where you construct a warehouse, you had to have a bigger area to put all the individual baggies. Second, each one of them had to have a prepared platform, which meant there was a lot more construction required, and therefore it was going to be a lot more costly. Yes, the individual bag may not be too much, but for the construction to have a pad, an entrance, and then the wiring to get electricity to each of the dehumidifiers was going to be more. Additionally, we were in wooded areas, so we were going to have to take out a lot more trees, and EUD was getting adverse reactions from the Germans.

Drake felt we really had a problem, and he ran out some numbers that showed EUD felt they could build controlled-humidity warehouses for about the same price. With that, General Groves, the Chief of Staff, dispatched General Heiberg and me back to brief the Army Staff

on the change; that is, don't use the baggies, and go back to controlled-humidity warehouses. The problem was that General Prentiss had been quite wedded to the baggies, and the British had used some smaller number in their area before and had sold the program to the Department of the Army. General [William] Wray had been the ACE at the time. He had testified to Congress extolling the virtues of this great new idea, the baggie. It was one of those occasions where what had been extolled previously didn't appear to be so virtuous any more, but a lot of people had put their credibility on the line and felt strongly about it.

General Heiberg and I stopped in to brief General Wray to begin with. General Read was now the ACE; General Wray had moved up to be Director of Military Programs. General Wray, was really quite irate that USAREUR was changing its mind, saying, "How come you new guys don't buy what the old guys did?" We had some time trying to lay out the rationale. We were trying to do it, not to harpoon anybody—but because Drake Wilson, the EUD commander, who, of course, worked for General Wray, had brought to us the facts that feasibility and the dollars said that maybe this wasn't the way to go.

With that, we scheduled a meeting with the Army Staff. As a follow-on to our previous briefing before Generals Meyer and Johansen, they had set up a rapid reinforcement of NATO steering committee. Henceforth, when we came back, that was the group we addressed.

That group was called together and we briefed them, and they concurred. Then we went to see General Kroesen, who was the Vice Chief of Staff, in an office meeting of, oh, five or six of us. I remember it included General Heiberg and me; General Read, the Assistant Chief of Engineers; and General Max Thurman, Director of Program Analysis and Evaluation at the time; and maybe one or two others. There was another person from the Army Materiel Command, who were asked to procure the baggies. They had come up with concerns of their own as to how they were going to put those things together and procure them and get a kit and have to maintain airtightness during dehumidified periods. We came down on the fact that the British didn't take their equipment in and out of the individual storage shelters quite as often in the amounts that we were going to do. During REFORGER exercises we were going to be moving whole brigades' worth of stuff out of the shelters. Once your soldiers go in and take the baggie off, they leave the area and are focused on other things. After the FTX they come back and have to put the tank back in the baggie, seal it up, and reestablish the dehumidified state. There had just begun to be a real question as to how viable that was for maintainability over the long run.

So, we made our presentation to General Kroesen. The AMC guy made his presentation from the procurement situation, and we all recommended change. The Vice Chief of Staff made the decision that we would not proceed further with the concept of individual humidity-controlled wraps or baggies, but we would go back to the controlled-humidity warehouse concept. We were back in business.

Q: Can you give me a rough date on when this meeting took place?

A: Late January or February of '79.

Q: So, the baggie concept, then, was sort of an open area and then the tank or piece of equipment would be on the hard stand, wrapped in this plastic or whatever the material was.

A: Yes. It was all in a separate shelter with a separate dehumidifying device that would operate for that bag.

Q: I suppose the idea was, on first blush, that you don't have to build walls and a roof and all that, so it must be cheaper, I mean, until you think about how costly the bag is, I guess.

A: You would have to talk to those who thought it up.

Q: This is really an interesting evolution of an idea here. So, the POMCUS storage sites, then, were probably more elaborate and more expensive than the theater reserves or the ammunition storage sites, is that right?

A: Well, it's hard for me to say because for ammunition you need bunkers with concrete walls, metal doors—you'd really have to run a cost analysis. A theater reserve site often had controlled-humidity warehouses. Some of them had open areas. Even POMCUS sites had some things stored in the open, like trailers. You would have to run out the cost to see, and it would vary by site.

On a POMCUS site you had the complexity of having different things. You had the tank and then you had the radios, which we'd pull off the tank and store in a separate area. The weapons systems were stored in another area secured just for that. Then there was fuel. The vehicles were topped off on the way out. There was a whole bunch of these different kinds of things. In the controlled-humidity warehouses, the vehicles park side by side, bumper to bumper.

I should mention one other thing. We didn't build just the controlled-humidity warehouses. There was another idea that was retained to be tried. This was something called the stress tension structure. The structure was a rather large fabric-over-frame kind of structure for multiple vehicles that had cost benefits. We were going ahead to procure six of them to try out. The 18th Engineer Brigade did a good job of constructing the six stress tension structures.

Q: Do you remember if there were different program terms for POMCUS, theater reserve storage, and ammunition storage? Were they considered different programs or were they sort of folded into the general POMCUS facilities program?

A: No, they were separate programs. There was another panel run by the DCSLOG that was addressing ammunition. Ammunition is a very complex problem because you're always upgrading guns, systems, and ammunition. Ammunition items you don't need any more because you have a modernized kind of gun, are still in tons in ammunition bunkers, taking up space. We also didn't have space necessarily where we wanted it. We wanted so much of it forward, so much of it back, for flexibility. So, the Army had a separate steering committee, run by the DCSLOG's assistant for supply and maintenance, for ammunition. He was involved not just with facilities, but for procurement—how much do you buy of this

round versus that round to meet projections of when various tubes are going to be available and storage is going to be available, and how much shipping are you going to have? Whether you have a facility or don't, which is the chick and which is the egg when you make all those determinations? It becomes very involved and complex.

I also began to be involved with ammunition, with Walt Kastenmayer from the Office of the DCSLOG, USAREUR, being the principal person. He would take me back to the Department of the Army committee meetings to talk the facilities part of ammunition.

I think one of the things we accomplished during this period was to bring discipline to the process by keeping the books in USAREUR, as the person responsible for the facilities. When I arrived, DCSLOG would brief the facilities part and the ammunition and everything else. We wouldn't brief facilities; they would. They had no feeling for how long it would take. They would say, "We need one here in this town, so we'll just start calling it an ammunition supply point."

Next thing you know, it'd start getting used in the conversations like there was one there. There wasn't a program and nobody had done a feasibility check. So, by our taking responsibility, saying, "Look, we own the books on facilities and we will share information with you, but the facilities you're going to use are going to be on our inventory, and our books are it. If you have got something out there, it better be on this set of books." Then we started presenting the facilities part in all the briefings. I think that helped sort things out over time and got us all dialoguing better. Then when General Groves, the Chief of Staff, looked down the table, the logger didn't feel obligated to speak about facilities. He could turn to the engineer to speak for himself. The engineer would have to speak and say, "I have it" or "I don't." "It's not in the program" or "It is." "If we do it, it'll take this long." Or whatever the aspects were.

Q: The funding for the POMCUS program, was it in MCA or NATO funding? Were there funding problems with POMCUS, NATO reserves, ammunition, and storage?

A: All the above. NATO infrastructure was a very complicated thing. One of the other complicators was the requirement to run our programs through all the other countries. All the countries had to agree on various things. There's a formula by which various countries contribute to the NATO infrastructure fund. The United States is the greatest contributor, something like 27 percent back in that time. Germany was second greatest, 26 percent or so.

Everyone wanted to get all they could for their country. This influenced their vote, whether something was or wasn't eligible for NATO funding. Remember the obligation to contribute an additional 3 percent. The United States was going to contribute its 3 percent and do it, in part, through NATO infrastructure. If a country wasn't eager to push forward on its contributions, it could delay the whole process and might help its own national budget. One way to do that was not to proceed too quickly in approving the part that the proponent country, the United States, was pushing for its 3 percent. So, if we couldn't get ours implemented then maybe they would not have to match it. So, it became very complicated if we tried to push through that maze. NATO infrastructure funds funded some aspects of our

rapid reinforcement of NATO program, and some new categories were established to take care of that.

Some other things, though, had to be built with MCA kind of funds because NATO wouldn't cover those items. We had difficulties making our pitch to Congress on things over and above NATO funding. "We are contributing to NATO infrastructure," was the congressional view; "why don't they cover it all?" There was almost a continuous dialogue about whether it should be this way or that way. We would have an opinion on how it should be. Both places where we were addressing them—NATO countries and Congress—would disagree and want to pare down their part. This meant another reason for a lot of the networking of whether we in USAREUR were on top of things. USAREUR was always getting blamed by EUCOM, the Department of the Army, and the Office of the Secretary of Defense that we weren't proceeding fast enough.

I used to say that, "Look, USAREUR is at the bottom end of this noodle. You push a noodle, it collapses. We need a pull from the top and then the noodle will come straight." In effect, we were at the bottom of the NATO infrastructure system. We had to send things to EUCOM, then to AFCENT [Allied Forces, Central], with a German commander, before it went to SHAPE. Then we, if we wanted to do things through MCA, had to go to the Department of the Army. We just had a lot of players, and we really tried to succeed through networking.

So, I would call people—Colonel Bill Keach, Corps of Engineers, worked in the Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy. General Groves had left USAREUR and gone back to that office. I would call Bill Keach and say, "It'd be awfully helpful if the Secretary of Defense would put out a message saying this and this and this." He would work it from there to make it happen. I would call Colonel Vern Ebert, a friend of mine who was one of General Haig's SPACOS—U.S. action type. Vern worked on U.S. problems at SHAPE headquarters, and I'd say, "We're really having trouble getting into The Hague. Can you have somebody call down and tell them to get with it?" He'd have someone call down, and they would be more responsive to us.

We just tried to anticipate obstacles and somehow push the obstacles or go around and had somebody pull it through that obstacle. I might even call Vern Ebert and have him say, "We need General Haig to ask the AFCENT commander to get that stuff on up here. He's interested" because, from the German national perspective, it might well have been advisable to hold the thing down. After all, the Germans wouldn't have to start delivering on the more rapid schedule in Moenchengladbach if we didn't have approvals. We were beating on them to execute, but we didn't yet have all of our approvals through—delay in the approval process took the pressure off of them.

So, within the scope of things, our plans just might get hung up at AFCENT for a few weeks, so I would call up to ask Lieutenant Colonel Ebert to have SHAPE pull them up, pull that "noodle" through AFCENT. I did an awful lot of networking, just trying to make it happen. We in USAREUR were at the bottom of all of the approval totem poles, but we were the ones who were being looked at to produce.

Q: Was there any resistance in Belgium or the Netherlands to building these storage sites in their countries? Was that a sensitive issue?

A: From the governmental and NATO perspective, I saw none at all. There may have been late—I left before all things were wrapped.

There were some community folks who had the old NIMBY—“not in my back yard”—feeling, that local community reaction to some of the planned storage sites. Many of them were at places, though, that had low employment and out-of-the-way areas. I think nationally they recognized the obvious: that if they were going to be for this rapid reinforcement initiative, they each ought to take one division set of storage sites.

Now, at the end of this time frame, about April or so, General Haig asked us to come lay out the whole program for him. He invited senior SHAPE staffers and Air Force types, and we laid out the whole program—that is, theater reserve, ammunition, and rapid reinforcement. We were planning to use some airfields in Belgium that were being given up by SHAPE’s air component. I was the briefer. General Heiberg, Walt Kastenmayer, and I had flown up. It went over pretty well, but I recall one Belgian general from the NATO air component standing up, saying, “I don’t think we should use those airfields. We might want to have them available for standbys, for extra airfields.” General Haig turned and rather pointedly said, “That was my thought a year ago, and I asked you all if there was a reason to keep them. No one had a reason, so we exceded them. Where were you then? Now they’re exceded. We’re going to use them for this.” It was a rather decisive moment.

Q: Was EUD going to be responsible for the construction of the facilities for all of these programs at all of these sites?

A: Yes. I say that, recognizing that we used EUD as our agent either to construct or as our pass through to the German construction agency. Almost all of the construction in Germany was done by German construction agencies, but EUD was our contact and agent.

Q: So, that was a big program for EUD—or at least the prospect for them during the late ’70s, early ’80s. Quite a few storage facilities.

A: Yes.

Q: Maybe we could turn to another program that I’m not sure that your office would have been responsible for—the long-range security program that was going on at this time. Was this in your area of responsibility?

A: Yes and no. What I mean is that, as I described before, certain things were in the policy, programming, budgeting stage, and then there was the execution stage. The long-range security program had passed out of the first part, was now a program being executed. So, ISAE was really monitoring and working with EUD on the construction at the various sites. I did attend some meetings. There was a lot of consternation, some policy issues and everything else, but it was basically ISAE from the standpoint of USAREUR headquarters that was managing the program with EUD.

Q: There were some problems, I think, with the long-range security program at this point. So, you didn't have too much relationship with those problems or knowledge about them?

A: I went to a meeting where there was a lot of hollering and cussing back and forth between EUCOM and EUD. My recollection of that was thinking that people from EUCOM at that time were rather unrealistic in their expectations and demands. They had a responsibility as the user and they were reflecting narrow user views without accommodating practicalities and changes. In other words, if something wasn't going to work, they had a requirement to sit down and interact with EUD as part of the modifications to the concept so that it would be something that would work, as opposed to just staying out of the issue and then criticizing EUD for something that wasn't going to work. That was a very complicated arena with lots of different issues, many of which were site specific. So, there was EUD and EUCOM and ISAE who would go site-by-site and look at the problems and try to work out solutions.

Q: Was that program, the security program, primarily for nuclear weapons, or did it have other components as well?

A: I think the answer is yes, primarily for nuclear weapons. It may have had other components as well, but I'm really not positive.

Q: Of course, this had a lot of visibility because of the German terrorists during that time and the anxieties about storage of U.S. nuclear and conventional weapons too. There's another program I've run into called the Facilities Modernization Program. Are you familiar with that program?

A: That was a program that, I believe, if I have the right label, started with using facilities modernization funds, German funds, and put them into barracks to fix them up. We had talked about a facilities modernization program from the standpoint of rolling all things in just to focus on modernizing everything that needed to be modernized, and we tied that in with the master restationing plan, as well. So, we tried to package everything that had been there before and to call it the Facilities Modernization Program.

With the way you're using the term, I'm not sure if you're really addressing the earliest attempts called Modernization of U.S. Facilities, which was a program of its own, or how modernization programs later were amalgamated and brought together. By the time I had gone back as DCSENGR in '87, facilities modernization had many components—had a maintenance shed component, had a “get the tanks out of the mud” component—that is, pave motor pool areas. So, it was a way of addressing what was a number of programs and deficiencies, trying to allocate funds against them, so much each year, so that we could be working against the backlog.

We could always represent to our higher-ups in the Department of the Army and then to Congress that, “We have so many square meters of motor pool space that need to be paved. Right now, it's on gravel and mud. We are programming this next year for this many at this many million dollars, so we will accomplish 3 percent of it,” or whatever. Then we would be able to show progress against a backlog, whereas before we were just out saying, “We got to

have this, got to have that.” With the Facilities Modernization Program, with all their various components, we could say, “In this component, using the tank motor pool example, this is how much we have as backlog. Here’s how much we’ll accomplish with your money this year. We need this amount of money that will bring us, say, to 6 percent, and it’ll take so many years to finish.”

That is how the Facilities Modernization Program grew over time from the Modernization of U.S. Facilities Program to really having something—it was really a way of articulating need and requirement in terms of kinds of things—amount done and amount remaining—for the decision makers.

Q: I read somewhere the program allowed the use of MCA as well as OMA funds, but it brought more funds to bear on some of the backlog problems. Is that the way you remember it?

A: Well, yes. MCA funds were used on the MCA things; OMA on OMA things. It was a reflection that for many things you could use different kinds of funds to solve a broad-based kind of problem area. You might use maintenance funds to fix up certain motor pools; you might build new ones under MCA, which takes part of the backlog away. Both of them can be used to address a backlog. It’s not that you’re using MCA for OMA kind of things or OMA for MCA kind of things. It’s you’re addressing a backlog in that category, using both kinds of funds.

Q: Okay.

A: You were able, then, to be able to let everybody focus on a category, “Hey, that’s a good idea. Yeah, we can do that. So, let’s do it.”

I’m not sure when—I suppose it happened between when I left and when I arrived back in ’87—somewhere in that time frame, I think, that it fleshed out to be the program given the label, “Facilities Modernization Program.” There was a set of facilities books, much like probably my earlier storage set of books, that was the bible. It was an inventory of facilities and requirements. You could say to VII Corps when they came in for a motor pool, “Is that on your backlog in the Facilities Modernization Program? Yes or no? Yes? Okay, then you can tie it in there.”

Q: Any other particular programs? It sounds like the POMCUS, theater reserve, and ammunition storage programs were the ones that took up most of your time during that time.

A: The rapid reinforcement of NATO program took a considerable amount of it. Then we’d also have the meetings for prioritizing military construction and we’d have the NATO infrastructure meetings. We’d fly off with many of the same players from SHAPE, AFCENT, and people would come over from the Secretary of Defense’s office, and they would all sit and wonder why USAREUR wasn’t spending money fast enough. That was right back to my shop too, and so we had to interact there too. We were actively involved with the master restationing plan because that had passed from where it had been under DCSOPS the year before about, “Where do you want to have your tactical units?” to the point of coming over to

DCSENGR where we had to fit them to facilities, determine where we wanted those facilities, and come up with a game plan to do that.

That year we also put together a strategy for how we wanted to relocate and position Europe in terms of facilities. We derived that in my shop. Steve Rutz put it all together and recommended it to CINCUSAREUR. The strategy concept was to build a new brigade encampment at Vilseck, one at Wildflecken, and one at Giessen. We could then start the master restationing by moving a brigade forward to each of those new areas, thus releasing some space to the rear. We could then move some folks about, thus freeing other space. General Groves was the catalyst for this and all the thought processes that brought this together, based on his experience before as the DCSENGR in Garlstedt, as I mentioned before.

Through the trickle-down we would free up some space, say in the middle of my community in Ludwigsburg when I was at 7th Brigade, where in the middle of town we had old warehouses and old beat-up facilities that weren't very good. We could then turn those back to the Germans, where they had some value because they were downtown. The Germans could put something commercial in that location, some kind of a hotel or something of value. The sites certainly had more value to them than us. The Germans should then be willing to put up funds for that, and we would then get approval through the system back to Congress to use those funds to build yet another new installation. Then we could move some more U.S. troops out—that was why it was called the master restationing plan. It was not conceived as a quick fix. It was conceived as working over time so we would move forward, closer to the border, out in the rural areas away from the towns. Thus, our forces would be in better locations where we wanted to be. We could improve our war-fighting posture at the same time we were improving our location with the Germans posture. We would give up facilities that they would take and use the money back in the loop.

It was a rotating cost concept. That year we fixed locations where we would like to have major brigade areas. We wanted to start the process, and so we picked the first three. Those were, as I mentioned, Vilseck, Wildflecken, and Giessen. That became, then, the USAREUR program.

Jumping ahead to my next year, I went back in the Office of the ACE. There, I'm receiving military construction programs that I sent from USAREUR the year before, and we had the master restationing plan presented by Europe to the Department of the Army for action. We also had General Groves, the architect of the plan, who's graduated up to the Office of the Secretary of Defense, who wants it pulled up to him. During this second year—and I'm really ahead of myself now—General Groves arranged to brief congressional staffers. I was the briefer, now from the ACE's shop, that in the Pentagon briefed staffers from the House and Senate Armed Services and Appropriations Committees, under General Groves' sponsorship from the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Policy.

A lot of effort went into all that, with a lot of interaction, and we engaged in a lot of dialogue with the Germans. Eventually Congress approved Vilseck as a new brigade location without committing to the master restationing plan. So, the new brigade location in Vilseck is that

same brigade location conceived of back then as the first increment of the master restationing plan. Very obviously, the rest will not now follow with the fall of the Berlin Wall. We had initiated the first move under the master restationing plan while I was still there, to get started. We moved an armored battalion of the 8th Infantry Division forward to Wildflecken. So, here's the 8th Division basically behind the Rhine and one battalion up at Wildflecken. The concept had been to build this brigade base whereby you could put a brigade of the 8th Division with its associated battalions and artillery battalion and forward support battalion and engineer company up there to be forward deployed. One battalion was about as far as we got.

Q: I noticed in your bio here it said that you spent some time as assistant DCSENGR, too, during the time you were over there?

A: Yes. Ed Keiser had been the assistant DCSENGR. He had left command of the 18th Brigade shortly before I left 7th Brigade and came down to USAREUR. He was the assistant DCSENGR when in April or May the brigadier generals list came out. He was on it and immediately rotated back for a new position in the States. Once he did that, I moved up to be the assistant DCSENGR. I only had two or three months left to go myself, and I was already on orders back to the ACE's shop.

Neil Saling, who had been my deputy in the Installations and Construction Division, took over as chief when I moved up.

Q: You've talked about ISAE a little bit before, but I've seen references to it in some of my reading. I know that as a result of Staff '77 it did combine a lot of previously separate elements that reported to DCSENGR, but maybe I could get you to talk a little bit more about the variety of functions it actually performed. It seems to have done quite a few different things. You talked about how it had worked more closely with EUD during the actual construction stage, I think, so it did have sort of coordinating responsibility during the actual construction. It seemed to include a lot of activities there.

A: Oh, it did. As you look at the name, the Installation Support Activity, Europe, it brought together those things that supported the installation engineer throughout all the communities. It was supposed to be that point of contact that would support the facility engineer or the housing guy, although there wasn't so much of that. It also brought together other things that were out there in the execution mode. Once again, remember, this was for USAREUR headquarters under Staff '77 to separate policy, programming, and budgeting staff functions from execution. The execution functions were to leave Campbell Barracks and go elsewhere. ISAE did that for engineer execution functions.

If you look at the ISAE organization chart, they were the Power Procurement Office—they procured the power and did all the interactions with the German agencies for that. They procured the coal from all over that went to the various installations.

In the Supply Maintenance Division, those folks were supporting facility engineers with supply and maintenance support and data. The DEH in VII Corps had its own supply and maintenance activity, ordering various kinds of things.

When a community facility engineer had a problem, they could call Charlie McNeill and he'd send somebody out to help them. He was designated to be that kind of person. I wouldn't send anyone from the USAREUR staff, Campbell Barracks, because Charlie McNeill would do that. I would deal primarily with the Corps DEH on programming or policy or funding issues, but not on the execution. Well, you say, it sounds like with TR-1, ammunition and POMCUS, I was doing a lot of execution. We were. That was a special kind of thing. ISAE was involved in that, too, but we were the drivers of that rapid reinforcement of NATO initiative and we were at the early point in a program where driving and pushing and articulating and networking was really the thing getting it off the ground and moving.

Also within ISAE was the U.S. Army Real Estate Agency, Europe, which had been a separate entity before that. They didn't move from Frankfurt. Charlie McNeill was now responsible for it.

So, as an operating activity there was somebody there who could be concerned with helping the facility engineer and a focal point for all of those things that didn't have to be in Campbell Barracks. It was the prototype for the Engineering and Housing Support Center under the Office of the Chief of Engineers. It was determined that we ought to have an organization for the Army to do what ISAE did for Europe. It's the irony that the Engineering and Housing Support Center happened about the time that ISAE went into demise.

Q: During even deeper staff cuts at USAREUR, I guess.

A: Well, that happened before I arrived back at USAREUR in '87. It took place during Major General Scott Smith's time as the DCSENGR. Just as Generals Blanchard and Groves had driven certain approaches in Staff '77 to separate execution from policy planning, General Glen Otis's drive was, "We've become bloated. We need to streamline. We ought to stop doing things." Okay, so earlier we had separated planning, programming, and budgeting from execution, maybe we shouldn't execute anything at USAREUR headquarters. Maybe we don't need an ISAE that sends people down to help facility engineers. Maybe they don't get any help. Maybe we can't afford to have folks that only get around to a facility engineer every 9 to 10 months. Maybe that's not helpful enough. Maybe we better take those 90 people and send 2 out to each community and get 2 more warm bodies down there to work, or do it from Corps. Let's don't necessarily expect that we have to support.

Now, I'm giving you that from what somebody's told me because I didn't go through the experience. Scott Smith would have to tell you that or Major General Chuck Fiala, who was Chief of Staff in USAREUR at the time. Those were the driving notions, I believe, that then made the ISAE demise happen. Some functions and activities, though, still had to exist, like the Real Estate Agency, Europe. So, it returned to the Real Estate Division located in DCSENGR USAREUR. The direct link was to George Fuentes, the Chief of Real Estate. He no longer had to go through Charlie McNeill, an independent arm. Which is better? Probably

a few different views on that, but it evolved back to a more direct link. We had no middle person, no middle line in there, but yes, we now had a headquarters back with some executing responsibilities, at least within the organization box. Now, the Real Estate Agency, Europe, that was part of ISAE did not move back into Campbell Barracks. It's just that it reported to the Chief of the Real Estate Division instead of the commander, ISAE.

We also still had to procure energy, and we still had to have people who were interested in engineering and housing management. So, some of those kinds of things moved back, but mostly spaces were saved that were distributed to the field.

Q: Well, in more general terms, when you got there in the '78-'79 time period, EUD as an organization was just about four or five years old. What was your perspective on how EUD was doing at that time, in general terms, with its mission?

A: I thought EUD was struggling. It had some good people. It also had a lot of people taking shots at it. Just as we felt that everybody blamed us at USAREUR because those high-visibility national programs weren't getting executed as quickly as everyone thought they should be, EUD was at the focus of all of the shots on the long-range security program that you mentioned before. They were understaffed to address things. We had many new rules, like you had to have 35 percent design by 1 January before a project could make the year's MCA program. They worked hard, applied themselves to the program, and worked the issues. I know they had a big program to recruit back in the States to get people to come over. They were sending out teams from EUD to go back and visit our divisions and districts. These efforts were starting to show promise; people were arriving. I remember Joe Higgs arrived that year to take over the Engineering Division. I thought that was really a break because he brought concepts of how to run things and project management into the Engineering Division.

I give that example because I was made aware of the new rule that you had to have 35 percent by 1 January or it didn't make the program. As the Chief of Construction, Headquarters, USAREUR, I called my supporting USACE engineer at EUD and said, "Send me a team to tell me where you are with all our projects because I want to be assured that you are going to make 35 percent. I don't want to lose a single project in our program because they're not at 35 percent by 1 January."

A couple of young folks came down from EUD and we compared lists and we went down 30 projects. I think they were going to make 35 percent on just one or two of them. This was going to be a terrible blow to the program if we couldn't get some relief. So, I started marching down the projects one at a time, saying, "Why can't we do this? You're just going to site adapt, you've got plans, why don't you get it out on the street and do this and that and everything else and by this time you'll be at 35 percent. You've really got to get moving. I mean, you can't wait two more months to do that. On this one you can check it off, you're going to be at 35 percent."

I was really concerned that the understanding of necessity and how to "get it done" wasn't there. I put a phone call in to Drake Wilson and he understood. Joe Higgs came in at that

time. He understood those things and jumped on the problem, and so I saw things getting better even as we watched. So, I'm just trying to frankly answer your question, which was, how did I see them when I arrived. I saw them not yet fully there, a situation recognized by their leadership who had set up these recruiting teams. USACE had agreed to more personnel spaces, and so the build-up was still happening when I arrived. When I left, it wasn't well but I saw things happening that made it look like the fixes were coming and in place. The right people, like Joe, were there to put things together and make it happen. When I returned in '87, eight years later, there was an obvious improvement in capability.

Part of the problem of the long-range security program, too, was the right kind of people. I mean, not just people who could do the technical engineering, but people who could work with the user. I'm speaking of the philosophy of working with the user and getting him to work out solutions. If he doesn't, go back to him and push him into working with you rather than let him say something, you go back and fuss with it a long time and come back with something, and then he beats you over the head because you'd taken so long and he still doesn't like it even though he'd never helped contribute to the solution.

So, that organizational maturity had happened by '87; they were a growing organization in '79. I'm sure that it had happened by some intervening time, probably closer to '79 than '87.

Q: You mentioned Joe Higgs. Had you worked with him before or known him?

A: Never had.

Q: Just the way you said it, it was like maybe you had experience with him. You're saying he came and then afterwards you saw what happened.

A: Yes. He came and I saw what happened. Then when I came back here, I really found out about his reputation and that sort of thing. He was just Joe Higgs to me, senior Corps kind of person, when he came over.

Q: Yes.

A: He's the kind of person who deals straight up. I mean, you sit with him and immediately he conveys to you, "I'm here to solve the problem; let's work it out." And, "Yes, that's my responsibility; I'll take care of it; I need this from you." I mean, you could immediately work with him on a straightaway basis. John Blake's the same kind of person. He might have been there in '79—I don't remember when he came in to be Chief of Construction.

Q: A little later, I think.

A: Again, in '79, execution was in the ISAE part of the organization. I wouldn't deal with the construction side of the house. I was dealing with getting the projects from program into design so we could have something to construct.

Q: The relationships between your office and EUD wouldn't have been as extensive, I guess, as ISAE's, but did you see those developing and maturing while you were there, as well, that everyone was having to learn to work with EUD still as a relatively new player?

A: Well, no, I don't want to leave you with the wrong impression. I think our office maybe had more extensive interrelationships with EUD than ISAE, but I just didn't do it on the actual construction side. I mean, we would be more involved in the programs as the programs continue through congressional approval for construction. We were responsible for the NATO infrastructure program, and we had parts of the execution part of that too. So, we had quite an involvement with EUD. I can't comment on the ISAE side, but remember, ISAE also was just organized at this time.

Q: That's right.

A: So, EUD was maturing and ISAE was probably at a lesser stage than even EUD at that point in time. So, we often had meetings where there was a little finger pointing back and forth and everybody was trying to grapple with just who is the interactor with us. General Heiberg, the DCSENGR, and Drake Wilson, commander, EUD, had a good working relationship and they moved that down through their subordinates—Charlie McNeill and me on Heiberg's side. It was a matter of working it out. The leadership was compelled to the right kind of working relationships. It's just when there is a lot of work and organizations are maturing, there are apt to be some rough edges and maybe even a gap now and then.

I thought during that year we had good relationships with EUD. My comments had to do with the fact they were still growing their capability to produce with that one very specific example.

Q: That's about all I have on the DCSENGR job. Are there any other areas we should cover?

A: Well, I just want to make one comment on Army assignments to a major Army command headquarters. You asked how I got the job. I really went kicking and screaming. I wanted to stay down with Lieutenant General Ott and his VII Corps staff. He had asked for me to be the G-4.

There's always a perspective, I guess, as of the next higher headquarters. I've always told folks who've come for assignment advice since that a MACOM [major Army command] headquarters provides anyone who wants to really understand how things work in the Army a very good experience. You really learn it there. The MACOM headquarters is that place that interacts both upward and downward—downward to the BDU [battle dress uniform] army, upward to the green suit army. The MACOM headquarters is that place that has to translate needs from below and sell them to all the higher decision makers. The MACOM headquarters has to translate the allocation of resources from above downward—recognize they're usually in terms of shortages from that desired—into real terms for those below. So, a MACOM headquarters is a pivotal point in our system of planning, programming, budgeting, and execution.

At Headquarters, USAREUR, we did theater planning and theater programming to try to relate the needs in our 800 installations and for training and all the many other aspects of living and training in Europe. We had to balance, then, the desires of the community commanders and the Corps commanders and all those BDU folks that are the real Army into some kind of terms, package them, and sell the program to the Department of the Army. First of all, so they would understand it, appreciate it, buy it, and second so they'd be prepared to use that kind of justification to carry it to Defense and Congress. So, the success of our efforts would be how well we'd be able to support our folks in the field.

On the other side, once Congress had decided and the budget trickled back down and we got an amount of money, which was always short of what we wanted, then we had to reallocate it, once again balancing so everything could get done. In fact, the doors of the installation open every day, the front gate opens, and people come—you have to have electricity, you have to have water, you have to have motor pools, you need training to keep the troops going and combat-ready so you have to have fuel and track pads. You needed to have logistics flying things over, and you have to take tanks back for maintenance. So, we had to repackage the budget allocations the best possible way we could to do the job of the command.

Then we had to sell it once again back down, saying, "Division commander, I know you don't get what you want, but you can still do your job and here's how we figure it. Do this and do that, and yeah, I know you can't accomplish this, but...." We had a selling job back down to keep them motivated even when under-resourced to get the job in the command done. Headquarters, USAREUR, was a very pivotal point. We would wear our BDUs, go down to the Corps and sit there in the meetings and figure out what they wanted. We would fly back to the United States in our greens, back to walking the Pentagon halls or going over and visiting the staffs on the Hill, to try to justify what we wanted for our BDU folks in the field. Again, a MACOM headquarters is a very pivotal place in the system.

If you serve only at Corps and below, you don't understand. All you understand is that you never get enough. If you're at the Department of the Army level and have not been down to the MACOM level, you don't understand things are different. You may think of the Seventh Imperial Army because it's different. You don't think they understand that we're the boss back here at the Department of the Army and when we say this is the policy, damn it, that's the policy—even though it really can't be implemented in Europe because there's a German law that precludes it. Once you've been at this MACOM level, you really have your sharp edges rubbed off and you recognize you really have to make peace upward and downward, and you have to make the translations. I wanted to cap my discussion of Headquarters, USAREUR, with that.

Q: Where's that intersection in USACE? Is that the division level? I was thinking about some things that you hear inside the Corps in terms of the model you were setting up. The field does what they want; they don't pay any attention to headquarters. Then from the field the question of the standards there.

A: Well, districts don't believe there is any necessity for divisions—I know that. [Laughter]

When I was Deputy Chief, and that idea was being advanced, I argued that districts really do need divisions, they just don't understand that they need them. They need them because their perspective is so narrow that they'll always be in trouble unless there's a division engineer there to help bail them out, do some of the interactions with certain congressional folks, and provide that level of review that keeps them out of trouble. When we get to the Ohio River Division, if you want me to give example after example, I don't know if I'll give it or not, but I mean there are cases where we really do need divisions—and the Corps' one-up review policies are a given.

That's not just reviewing an engineer design, but ideas. I mean, things need to be buffered to get them right. Sometimes you don't get a buffering if one person's the only god. So, the fact that they have to show and tell, other ideas come to play, products usually get better. That's where I think we are in USACE. Divisions come testify to Congress and then with the assistant secretary's policy-making function, which is separate from USACE, and so that sort of clouds a nice clean line of comparison with my MACOM example.

I think basically the fact that the Chief of Engineers wants his regional commanders—the division commander—to take charge of that region is much like the Chief of Staff of the Army looks to his USAREUR commander to be the guy who's calling the shots. That's who I want to tell me, the Chief of Staff, how it's to be in USAREUR. That's the one I want to tell me, the Chief of Engineers, how it should be in the Ohio River Division.

Then you have the executing arms below, the districts. We allow them a little freedom to go out and talk with the locals, and we're talking governors, mayors, and congressmen, so that's where it gets a little confused. Those people don't have any problems with that. Sometimes people do have problems with that. Without doubt, the division is needed to take a very myopic perception of a district and broaden it. So, the Lower Mississippi Valley Division can talk about the whole lower Mississippi, not just the reach up around Memphis.

Q: Well, at this point, after three years in Germany, you're getting ready to head back to the United States. Do you have any reflections about what it was like going back, what you felt like headed back to Washington? Were you reluctant to leave Germany?

A: Well, I have to say that I mentioned that year in USAREUR headquarters was the most intense year of my career. Literally, with all of those things I mentioned, I worked every Saturday and I believe every Sunday but three during that year. It was a most intense period. I think I was approaching burnout and needed a change. I think, in retrospect, the decision to combine Installations and Construction into one single division overloaded one colonel. Later, the Installations and Construction Division was divided and re-established as separate divisions in the Office of the DCSENGR.

At the same time, it was a very satisfying year because I thought things were rolling now in our rapid reinforcement of NATO program. I left with a Storage Branch established. We now knew the facilitization status of where things were and the DCSENGR was fixed as the, quote, "expert" on what should happen, where. Incidentally, over the years that Storage Branch went away.

The master restationing plan was well developed as a concept. We were nearing the end of the relocation of the three headquarters in Campbell Barracks. That was well on the way and most of the arguments had gone by the wayside. So, I had a good feeling of satisfaction, but it had been a long, tiring year.

Also, I really enjoyed my two years in command of the 7th Engineer Brigade. That was just a top-drawer assignment, working with super people. I really liked General Ott and interacting with the division commanders and assistant division commanders and all the colonels and others that over the years I interacted with more and more. I mean, Colonel Butch [Crosbie E.] Saint, later CINCUSAREUR, was commander of the 11th Armored Cav, then on the USAREUR staff at that time. Major General Bob Dacey was on the USAREUR staff as a colonel. Walt Kastenmayer, in DCSLOG, was later to make brigadier. When I first arrived, the Chief of Staff, 3d Mech Division, was Colonel Jack Galvin [later the Supreme Allied Commander, Europe]; Bob Elton was the Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff; and Glenn Otis [later the Commander in Chief, U.S. Army, Europe] came over at that time as a major general to command the 1st Armored Division. Lieutenant Colonel Ed Leland was G-3, 3d Mech Division, and is a three star at EUCOM now. You just go on and on of people who we were involved with. Of course, I worked for Major General Vald Heiberg and Major General Dick Groves, people that I came back and worked with and for later on. It was a superb experience and I really enjoyed it.

My family really enjoyed Europe. I still managed to get away for a skiing vacation here or there and to take advantage of space A travel and the Air Force's C-130s to England and Spain during those three years. So, it was a very enjoyable experience. I've always enjoyed assignment to Europe, and that certainly was a measure of why I sought the assignment leaving Fort Belvoir later to go back as the DCSENGR.

Deputy Assistant Chief of Engineers

Q: You mentioned about finding out about your next assignment while you were still in Europe, and I wondered if you could reflect a little bit on your selection for the Deputy ACE job and the factors that you see in getting the assignment.

A: With every assignment there's some negotiations with the assignment officer. By the time you reach colonel, many people get involved and the assignment officer's working with various folks. I don't quite know how it happened or what came first, really. As I mentioned, it was such an intense year, and years are very short in terms of assignments. I reported to the job in DCSENGR, Europe, in the summer of '78 and knew already in January, February of '79 that they were putting together the slate for the coming year of assignments. So, I'd only been there five or six months and already somebody's thinking about where I was going to be reassigned. I knew I was coming back to the States and was not going to stay in Europe another year.