UNCLASSIFIED

AD NUMBER

AD878269

NEW LIMITATION CHANGE

TO

Approved for public release, distribution unlimited

FROM

Distribution authorized to U.S. Gov't. agencies and their contractors; Administrative Operational use; 22 Dec 1970 Other requests shall be referred to Assistant Chief Of Staff For Force Development [Army] Attn: For OT, Washington, DC 20310-0000

AUTHORITY

AGO, d/a ltr, 29 Apr 1980

THIS PAGE IS UNCLASSIFIED

DDC
RECEIVED
JAN 6 1971
B

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
OFFICE OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20310

IN REPLY REFER TO
AGDA (M) (17 Dec 70) FOR OT UT 703201 22 December 1970

SUBJECT: Special Operational Report - Lessons Learned, Headquarters, 18th Military Police Brigade

SEE DISTRIBUTION

AD878269

1. Reference, AR 525-15, Operational Reports - Lessons Learned, 25 September 1969.

2. Subject report is forwarded for your information and review in accordance with paragraph 4b of above reference. This report contains a summary of lessons learned relative to the utilization of sentry dogs by US Army units stationed in the Republic of Vietnam. Lessons Learned, contained in subject report, were initially reported by military police units in previous Operational Reports - Lessons Learned.

BY ORDER OF THE SECRETARY OF THE ARMY:

Kenneth G. Wickham

KENNETH G. WICKHAM
Major General, USA
The Adjutant General

1 Incl
as

DISTRIBUTION:
Commanding Generals
US Continental Army Command
US Army Combat Developments Command
Commandants
US Army War College
US Army Command and General Staff College
US Army Combat Surveillance School
US Army Infantry School
US Army Medical Field Service School
US Army Military Police School

AD No. ____
DDC COPY

Copies furnished:
Office, Chief of Staff, US Army
Deputy Chiefs of Staff
Chief of Research and Development
Assistant Chiefs of Staff
Chief of Engineers
The Surgeon General

STATEMENT #2 UNCLASSIFIED
This document is subject to special export controls and each transmittal to foreign governments or foreign nationals may be made only with prior approval of

UNCLASSIFIED REPORT
~~DISTRIBUTION, NO FOREIGN WITHOUT APPROVAL OF~~
ASSISTANT CHIEF OF STAFF FOR FORCE DEVELOPMENT
(ARMY) ATTN: FOR OT UT, WASHINGTON, D.C. 20310

Protective marking cancelled when separated from inclosure.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

45

DISTRIBUTION (Cont'd)
The Provost Marshal General
Commanding General, Deseret Test Center
Commandant of the Marine Corps
Defense Documentation Center
USAF Project RAND
Commanding Officers
US Army Limited War Laboratory
US Army Logistics, Doctrine Systems & Readiness Agency
US Army Mobility Equipment Research & Development Center

ACCESSION for
CFSTI WHITE SECTION
DDC BUFF SECTION
UNANNOUNCED
JUSTIFICATION
BY
DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY CODES
DIST. AVAIL. and/or SPECIAL
2

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, 18TH MILITARY POLICE BRIGADE
APO San Francisco 96491

AVBGC-P 10 July 1970

SUBJECT: Special Operational Report - Lessons Learned, Headquarters, 18th Military Police Brigade, RCS CSFOR-65 (R2)

Commander in Chief, United States Army Pacific, ATTN: GPOP-DT, APO 96558
Commanding General, United States Army Vietnam, ATTN: AVHGC-DST, APO 96375

1. Operations: Significant Activities. This special Operational Report Lessons Learned (ORLL) has been prepared to summarize the lessons learned relative to the utilization of sentry dogs by the 18th Military Police Brigade in the Republic of Vietnam (RVN).

a. Mission. The mission of the three sentry dog companies assigned to the 18th MP Brigade is to supplement physical security at critical installations and facilities throughout the Republic of Vietnam.

b. Organization. The 18th Military Police Brigade currently has three sentry dog companies assigned:

(1) 212th MP Co (SD) was activated at Tilden Park, Berkeley, California by GO 148, HQ USA Air Defense Command, dated 23 June 1965. It arrived in Vietnam on 6 Sep 65. The unit is currently under MTOE 19-500E which authorizes 5 officers, 188 EM and 140 sentry dogs. The 212th MP Co is assigned to the 720th MP Battalion, with operational control retained by the 89th MP Group.

(2) 595th MP Co (SD) was activated on 2 Jan 70 in RVN by GO 820, HQ USARPAC, dated 11 December 1969. It was assigned to 18th MP Bde by USARV GO 33, dated 6 Jan 70, and further assigned to 16th MP Gp by 18th MP Bde GO 4, dated 10 Jan 70. Until recently it was assigned to 16th MP Gp and attached to the 504th MP Bn for administration and logistics. In June 1970, the company was assigned to the 504th MP Battalion for all purposes. The unit is currently under MTOE 19-500E19 which authorizes 5 officers, 188 EM and 132 sentry dogs.

(3) 981st MP Co (SD) was activated on 1 April 1967 at Ft Carson, Colorado by GO 68, HQ 5th US Army, dated 13 Feb 67. It arrived in RVN on 5 Dec 67 and until recently was assigned to the 16th MP Gp and attached

FOR OT UT
703201
Inclosure

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

to the 97th MP Bn for administration and logistics. In June 1970 the company (-) was assigned to the 97th MP Battalion for all purposes. Two platoons are attached to the 93rd MP Battalion for all purposes. The unit is currently under MTOE 19-500E19 which authorizes 5 officers, 188 EM and 132 dogs.

c. Current deployment of the three sentry dog companies.

(1) 595th MP Co (SD) furnishes sentry dog support to installations located in Military Region I (MRI). It was added to 18th MP Brigade resources in anticipation of increased Army missions in I MR as a result of Navy and Marine turnover of tasks and facilities. It is presently operational at only two facilities which employ a total of 30 sentry dog teams. Further employment has been restricted due to a lack of kennels. A 36 run kennel was completed in Da Nang in mid June 1970. Five other locations in the I MR, outside of Da Nang, have been approved for sentry dog employment pending kennel construction at the sites. Sentry dog resources of the 595th MP Co (SD) are employed as follows:

Location	Instl/Facility	No of Posts	SD Teams
Da Nang	156 HEM Company	7	18
	Covered Storage Yard	5	12

(2) 981st MP Co (SD) furnishes sentry dog support to installations in the II MR. 175 sentry dog teams are currently utilized at 15 facilities in 9 cities as follows:

Location	Instl/Facility	No of Posts	SD Teams
Phan Rang	Outport & POL Pumping Facility	3	8
Cam Ranh Bay	Ammunition Supply Point	8	20
	6th Convalescent Center	1	3
Phu Tai	Ammunition Base Depot	14	25
An Khe	Class I Yard	1	3
	Class II & IV Yards	1	3
	ASP	4	10

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

An Khe	POL Tank Farm	2	
Pleiku	ASP	20	47
Ban Me Thuot	Army Airfield	5	13
Nha Trang	Class I Yard	2	5
	Class II & IV Yards	1	3
	Class III (Tank Farm)	3	8
An Son	Army Airfield	6	17
Qui Nhon	POL Tank Farm	2	5
	TOTAL	73	175

(3) 212th MP Co (SD) furnishes sentry dog support to installations in the III and IV MR's. 114 sentry dog teams are currently employed at 10 facilities in 6 cities as follows.

Location	Instl/Facility	No of Posts	SD Teams
Long Binh	Ammunition Base Depot	15	38
	Class I Yard	2	5
	483rd Field Svc Yd (Clothing Reclamation Point)	1	3
Tay Ninh	ASP 277th Bn	4	10
	PX Storage Yd	2	5
Long Than	Army Airfield	10	26
Saigon	Newport Docks	1	3
Vinh Long	Army Airfield	5	13
	Ammunition Supply Point	1	3
Soc Trang	Army Airfield	3	8
	TOTAL	44	114

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(4) Facilities guarded include airfields, ammunition supply points, port facilities, PX areas, POL tank farms and other logistical activities.

d. On 9 February 1970, a request for Modification Table of Organization and Equipment (MTOE) change was forwarded to Headquarters, USARV for the 212th, 595th, and 981st Military Police Companies (Sentry Dog). Twenty (20) immersion heaters were requested for each unit for the proper health and sanitation care of sentry dogs and kennel facilities at isolated locations. Additionally, six (6) 3/4 ton trucks and twenty-one (21) ¼ ton trucks were requested for both the 595th and 981st MP Companies (SD). The transportation requested for these units is not authorized by current MTOE documents. Authorization of the additional transportation will bring the units in line with the vehicle authorization for the 212th MP Company (SD), and will enable the unit commanders and supervisory personnel to more easily perform necessary inspections of widely dispersed sentry dog teams, in addition to transporting dismounted dog teams to their posts. The document has been approved by Headquarters, USARV, with several minor changes, and was forwarded to CINCUSARPAC on 26 February 1970.

e. Sentry Dog Working Conference. The 18th Military Police Brigade conducted a two day Sentry Dog Working Conference on 21 and 22 April 1970. Representatives from the USARPAC Sentry Dog School (Okinawa); 7th Air Force; 1st Military Police Group (Okinawa); 1st Aviation Brigade; 1st Logistical Command; 522nd Medical Detachment - Veterinary Service; USARV G3, USARV Provost Marshal; Army Concept Team, Vietnam (ACTIV); and representatives from throughout the 18th Military Police Brigade involved in sentry dog operations were in attendance. As a result of the information obtained during the conference, many of the 18th Military Police Brigade sentry dog operational policies have been revised. (Agenda at Incl 1; Conference minutes at Incl 2).

f. Dog handler training programs were established by the 212th MP Co (SD) for Army of the Republic of Vietnam (ARVN) cadre of country-wide Vietnamese dog platoons. The training was designed to teach Vietnamese officers, noncommissioned officers and veterinary technicians the fundamentals of dog care, grooming and training. Sixteen classes were conducted in as many weeks. On 3 April 1970, the training program was successfully completed. In addition, during the month of May a total of thirty (30) sentry dogs were shipped by the 212th MP Company to MACV for transfer to ARVN sentry dog units.

g. The 981st MP Company (SD) completed the rebuilding of the sentry dog kennels at Phan Rang in early 1970. Also at Phan Rang the interior

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

of the veterinary support building was panelled, a bulletin board was constructed at the kennel, and a kitchen facility for the kennels was constructed using salvaged materials. At the company headquarters in Cam Ranh Bay the orderly room, day room, kennel facility and kennel support building were repainted. Lights were installed in the training area at the kennel to provide a capability for training during periods of reduced visibility. A sump was installed for the enlisted shower room, lights were installed around the outdoor basketball court, and the court was repainted. The sand bag revetment around the unit ammunition storage bunker was reinforced and three new perimeter bunkers were constructed. At the Ban Me Thuot detachment, 981st MP Co (SD), a fence was constructed around the sentry dog training area, and obstacles were constructed for use in obstacle course training. The individual rooms in the barracks were panelled using salvaged plywood, and a water tank was installed on top of an existing tower. All sentry dog units find it necessary to engage in self-help projects such as the above to make their kennels and billets acceptable. Engineer support is difficult to obtain and will become increasingly so during drawdown. Anticipated closures and consolidations of logistical bases/facilities will require abandonment of some kennels and billets and construction or modification of others.

h. 18th MP Brigade Supplement 1 to AR 190-12 was published on 15 May 1970 (Inclosure 3). This supplemented the new AR 190-12 dated 17 April 1970. Major changes to former Brigade policy were the revision of the bi-weekly status report to more adequately reflect availability of sentry dog resources; granting greater flexibility to the MP group commanders in temporarily adjusting or augmenting sentry dog posts based on local, tactical, and police intelligence information, clarifying information required in the sentry dog utilization survey and establishing a priority list for sentry dog employment.

i. TCP. A disease known as Tropical Canine Pancytopenia (TCP) has infected 51% of the sentry dogs assigned to the 18th MP Brigade. Symptoms are a rise in temperature and a drop in blood count. TCP suspects cannot be returned to the USARPAC Sentry Dog School in Okinawa for retraining. As a result, a program has been initiated whereby handlers are trained at the school, sent to RVN without dogs and are assigned a dog (TCP suspect) in country. As of 6 June 1970, 215 or 51% of the 418 sentry dogs in country were TCP suspects. There is no known cure for the disease and its cause is also unknown. Most dogs appear to recover and continue to perform duty. Once they become a suspect, however, they can never leave the country.

2. Lessons Learned - Commanders' Observations, Evaluations, and Recommendations.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

AVBGC-P
SUBJECT: Special Operational Report - Lessons Learned, Headquarters, 18th Military Police Brigade, RCS CSFOR - 65 (R2)

a. Personnel: None

b. Intelligence: None

c. Operations.

(1) On-Post protection for sentry dogs and handlers against mortar/rocket attacks.

(a) OBSERVATION: Sentry dog posts in RVN average between 200 and 400 meters in length, and up to 600 square meters for area posts. Currently there are no doctrinal provisions made for on-post protection for sentry dogs and handlers against stand-off fire attacks.

(b) EVALUATION: Because of the isolation and criticality of supported installations, those installations are particularly vulnerable to stand-off fire attacks. Sentry dog posts are characteristically located on exposed terrain and this constitutes a hazard to the sentry dog and handler during a stand-off fire attack. The construction of shallow trench or fox hole positions, covered with either PSP or culvert sections and adequately sand bagged, would provide a degree of protection not presently afforded. These positions should be spaced not more than 150 meters apart on the sentry dog posts. While action has been taken to provide protection, the requirement is not stated in present doctrine or policy.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That the construction of on-post bunkers as described above, be made a part of doctrinal material pertaining to the employment of sentry dogs in areas where stand off mortar/rocket attacks are common.

(2) Employment Ratio.

(a) OBSERVATION: Once a sentry dog utilization survey has been completed and the number of sentry dog posts determined, there exists a need for a ratio factor to determine the number of sentry dog teams to man these posts.

(b) EVALUATION: Based upon experience this command has settled upon the ratio 2.5 sentry dog teams per sentry dog post. This ratio permits manning each post with 2 sentry dog teams per night (2 six hour shifts) in compliance with accepted policy that sentry dog teams not be employed longer than 6 hours. It also allows for continuous coverage of the post during periods of sickness by dog or man, R&R, leave, training and an occasional night off. This ratio, of course, is a guide only for planning purposes, but has proven very satisfactory for this command.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That 2.5 sentry dog teams per sentry dog post be established as the accepted ratio for employment of sentry dogs in a combat environment such as Vietnam. It is recognized that this ratio would probably not be adequate for CONUS or other "peacetime" environments.

(3) Priority of Employment List.

(a) OBSERVATION: Sentry dog availability has always exceeded kennel support availability in that if kennel support is available, sentry dogs are employed at any reasonably critical, vulnerable and effective location.

(b) EVALUATION: In the future, it is likely that our requirements will increase to the point where sentry dog teams will be more scarce than kennel support. This situation is particularly possible if the Brigade is significantly affected by drawdowns. Therefore, lists establishing priority of sentry dog employment have been established to determine which facilities will receive sentry dogs first, or, in the case of drawdowns, which facilities will lose this support first. The priority lists are established based upon four factors, in the following order:

1. Criticality of the facility - to be determined in coordination with the appropriate Corp/Field Force Commander.

2. Vulnerability of the facility - to include physical security measures already in effect and available reaction forces - also to be determined in coordination with the Corps/Field Force Commander.

3. Effectiveness of the sentry dog post - determined by the survey officer.

4. Support - includes kennels, billets for handlers and training areas. Determined by the survey officer.

In fact, the actual employment of sentry dogs in Vietnam has been primarily dependent on support rather than upon the other criteria listed. Realistically, the determination as to where to employ dogs should be made based upon the factors above in the priority stated. The availability of portable kennels would permit employment of sentry dogs on a more realistic priority basis. (See para 2f(1)).

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That sentry dog employment doctrine include the above factors as the basis for establishing employment priorities.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(4) Shift Changes.

(a) OBSERVATION: Sentry dogs and handlers should be billeted inside the perimeter of the installation they guard and the time of shift changes should be varied to avoid setting a definite pattern.

(b) EVALUATION: Sentry dogs and handlers, in many cases, are employed at installations other than that on which they are billeted. Recently, an enemy sapper team attacked the main gate of a tank farm just as the handlers who had been relieved at midnight were exiting to return to their own installation nearby. Brigade policy now requires that both shifts be transported to the guarded installation during daylight, remain throughout the night and return to their own installation the following morning. Exceptions have been made:

1. Where the facilities guarded are located within a well established secure area and the distance between installations is only a few hundred yards.

2. Where regulations prohibit billeting of troops on the premises, e.g., an Ammunition Base Depot. In this case additional security measures have been initiated to support the movement between installations and during the time the gates are open to allow entry/exit of the sentry dog handlers. The time of shift changes are also being varied to avoid establishment of a pattern.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That sentry dog employment doctrine in a counter-insurgency environment encourage billeting of sentry dogs and handlers on the installation they are guarding. In instances where this procedure is impossible or impractical it is recommended that both shifts be taken to the installation during daylight, remain overnight and return to their own installation the following morning. Time for shift changes should also be varied.

(5) Patrol Dogs.

(a) OBSERVATION: It appears that the patrol dog concept now being used by the Air Force may have distinct advantages over the sentry dog concept currently being used by the Army.

(b) EVALUATION: The Sentry Dog Working Conference sponsored by this headquarters in April 1970 (para 1e and Inclosures 1 and 2) included a presentation on the patrol dog by a representative of the 7th U.S. Air

Force. As explained by this representative the Air Force has found the patrol dog to be very effective, primarily because of its great versatility. The capabilities of the sentry dog are basically to detect unauthorized penetrators, alert, and if necessary, pursue and attack the intruder. He is trained to attack savagely and to be distrustful of all persons other than his handler. As a result, he cannot be used with any degree of safety for any function other than patrolling isolated areas of an installation. On the other hand, the patrol dog has the same capabilities as the sentry dog to detect and alarm plus numerous other abilities. He is capable of being used in the same manner as the sentry dog because he has the ingrained ability to detect and can be trained to alarm and attack on command, therefore, none of the present capabilities of the sentry dog are lost. The patrol dog, however, can also be trained to perform a myriad of other tasks. He can be trained to mingle with the public at large with safety, yet be capable of detaining or detecting a criminal. The basic objective of the patrol dog program is to train a composed and observant animal capable of performing any task associated with the protection of personnel or government property. Among the specific tasks envisioned for these dogs are:

1. Law enforcement and riot control. The patrol dog will detect and alert his handler to an intruder over any type of terrain and will attack and hold on command. He presents a psychological deterrent during demonstrations or riots.

2. Tracking.

3. Searches. Patrol dogs are taught to enter and scout buildings and open storage areas, checking every object within the building or area where a person might be hiding. If he locates an individual he will alert his handler by barking and prevent the individual's escape until arrival of his handler.

4. Psychological deterrent. The use of the patrol dogs as a psychological deterrent is unlimited. Some possible uses are as follows:

a. Mobile patrols.

b. Housing areas.

c. Money escorts.

d. Parking areas.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

e. Checkpoints.

5. Security of critical installations in a combat zone. The patrol dog appears to possess all of the attributes of a sentry dog plus many others. Primarily, he can be used in areas where sentry dog employment would be marginal because of noise, activity, odors, or lights.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That an Army agency examine results of the Air Force's experience with patrol dogs and seriously explore the feasibility of their use by the Army. This headquarters is willing to conduct evaluation tests on patrol dogs.

(6) Sentry Dog Surveys.

(a) OBSERVATION: There is a need for establishing firm guidelines and standardizing the preparation of sentry dog utilization surveys in order to better provide higher headquarters with adequate information on which to base approval or disapproval of the post.

(b) EVALUATION: In an attempt to standardize sentry dog surveys, and provide this headquarters better information on which to base approval or disapproval, guidelines for survey officers were established and incorporated in the 18th Military Police Brigade Supplement 1 to AR 190-12. (Inclosure 3). Paragraph 2 - 4 of this Supplement lists several factors to be considered in conducting sentry dog surveys. Sentry dog surveys must be complete and thoroughly descriptive of the facility and its security measures. Survey officers have been instructed to review the latest physical security survey/inspection of the installation/facility prior to conducting the sentry dog survey. In order to preclude frequent resurveys, the survey officer must survey the entire installation/facility for sentry dog employment, those areas considered marginal for sentry dog posts, and those areas which are suitable for sentry dog posts; and recommend the establishment of specific permanent posts, if appropriate.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That criteria as established in Inclosure 3 (para 2 - 4 and Annex B) be incorporated into ARMY doctrine for the employment of sentry dogs.

(7) Coordination with Supported Commanders.

(a) OBSERVATION: Establishing and maintaining effective, cordial and personal coordination with the unit commander/installation coordinator being supported is essential to effective sentry dog employment.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(b) EVALUATION: Generally speaking, commanders and security officers at supported installations/facilities lack an appreciation and understanding of the capabilities and limitations of sentry dogs. They tend to rely too heavily on the psychological value of the dog teams and lack an understanding of the conditions needed for effective sentry dog employment such as a proper post environment, reliable communications and a responsive reaction force. They sometimes fail to include the sentry dog teams in the installation physical security plan. Sentry dog company commanders or staff officers with sentry dog responsibilities must visit commanders and explain how sentry dogs can or cannot help them in the security of their installation. Close and continuous coordination becomes even more important during the preparation of facilities for the sentry dogs, and, of course, after sentry dogs are employed. The sentry dog detachment commander must be in continuous contact with the installation security officer and a unit officer should conduct regular liaison visits with the supported commander. This constant coordination is necessary to insure that the commander is kept fully informed of the sentry dog capabilities and limitations and that necessary adjustments are made in the employment of the dogs or the regular guard force to meet changing conditions. By working closely with the supported unit, the detachment commander will also find it easier to obtain the logistical support he needs for the dogs and handlers.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That sentry dog employment doctrine emphasize the need for close, personal coordination between the sentry dog unit and the supported commander. This coordination begins with the initial inquiry by the commander concerning possible use of sentry dogs and continues throughout the periods of kennel construction and actual employment of the dogs.

d. Organization.

(1) Sentry Dog Company Supervisory Personnel (TOE).

(a) OBSERVATION: Sentry Dog Companies, organized under TOE 19-500E, lack many of the elements necessary to insure efficiency of operations.

(b) EVALUATION: Sentry dog companies in a counterinsurgency environment are normally fragmented into a number of small detachments of platoon and squad size. There are frequently great distances between detachments, and subordinate units have to operate on a semi-autonomous basis. Company headquarters is responsible for the processing of incoming and outgoing dogs and handlers and the operation of limited training programs. As a

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

result, the unit headquarters generally requires a large kennel facility. The sentry dog units are not correctly manned by grade and MOS to face either requirement discussed. Since there is no provision in company headquarters for training or kennel support personnel, the platoon supervisory structure offers platoon leaders and platoon sergeants. The latter, in grade E6, are in MOS 95B4D and should be military police NCOs who have gone to sentry dog supervisor school. Below them, there are the supervisory team E5 Sergeants, MOS 95B4D, who are usually two year men who have been promoted from dog handler status. Because of the requirement to establish many subordinate detachments, these E5s serve as squad leaders and frequently are detachment commanders. Platoon Sergeants are now E7s and squad leaders are now E6s in other MP units and should be E7s and E6s in the sentry dog units. These NCOs have the same leadership responsibilities found in other MP units.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That necessary action be taken to amend TOE 19-500, (thereby precluding multiple MTOE submissions), to provide the following:

1. Supervisory team NCOs (E6) and (E5) in MOS 95B4D to replace the present E5s and E4s currently authorized in that MOS.

2. Platoon Sergeants in grade E7 instead of the present E6.

3. An additional E7 in MOS COC4D to function as Training NCO and Kennel Master in Company Headquarters.

(2) Sentry Dog Company Support Personnel (TOE).

(a) OBSERVATION: Sentry dog companies, organized under TOE 19-500E are not staffed with sufficient support personnel.

(b) EVALUATION. Sentry dog companies, as indicated above, are normally fragmented into a number of detachments of platoon and squad size and are usually attached for logistical support to the unit they are supporting. Frequently, especially at company headquarters which usually will be co-located with a large user of sentry dogs, a sizeable segment of the company will be satellited onto another unit. The present MTOE provides no maintenance or mess personnel for the sentry dog company to offer the supporting unit as its "share of the load". This situation sometimes results in a reluctance by other units to provide mess and maintenance support to the sentry dog company. The sentry dog company has a sizeable maintenance responsibility with 30 vehicles assigned.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That necessary action be taken to insure that the following positions are incorporated into the TOEs of the sentry dog companies.

1. First Cook E5 (2).

2. Motor Sgt E5 (1).

3. Mechanic E4 (3).

4. Equip Reports Clerk E4 (1).

5. Repair Parts Clerk E4 (1).

6. Personnel Records SP E4 (1).

(3) Control of Operations.

(a) OBSERVATION: Authority to establish, adjust, or augment sentry dog posts, based upon local, tactical or police information must be delegated to the lowest level possible without relinquishing control of resources by higher command.

(b) EVALUATION:

1. In order to provide a more flexible response to emergency situations and encourage maximum use of resources, military police group commanders or officers designated by MP group commanders have been authorized to temporarily establish, adjust or augment sentry dog posts. Such action is based upon tactical or police intelligence, does not degrade support provided to formally approved installations, and is closely coordinated with the supported commanders. Changes are reported to brigade headquarters by message before, or immediately upon, occurrence or termination. It is felt that this procedure greatly improves the support rendered by the sentry dog units by increasing their flexibility and capability to respond more rapidly to the needs of the supported commander.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That sentry dog employment doctrine include delegation of authority to the lowest possible level to establish, adjust or augment sentry dog posts, with immediate notification of such action to higher headquarters.

e. Training.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(1) Field Manual (FM) on Sentry Dog Employment.

(a) OBSERVATION: FM 20-20 deals primarily with the training of military dogs. There is a definite need for the establishment of documentation on employment doctrine in a field manual. FM 20-20 is completely inadequate in providing guidance for the employment of sentry dogs.

(b) EVALUATION: There is very little established doctrine for the employment of sentry dogs. What little does exist is not documented but is passed verbally from one dog handler to another. A great deal of valuable experience in the techniques of employing sentry dogs has been gained in Europe and CONUS under peacetime conditions, and particularly in Vietnam under combat conditions. This experience and these lessons learned need to be documented and from them, doctrine established.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That a field manual be written giving ARMY doctrine for the employment of sentry dogs based upon the information in this ORLL and experience gained in other parts of the world. Air Force Manual 125-5 has a section (Chapter 3, Section c) devoted to utilization which can be included as a part of the Army manual.

(2) In-Country Training.

(a) OBSERVATION: Experience has shown that an "in-country" orientation is helpful to prepare sentry dog teams for their duties.

(b) EVALUATION: All sentry dog handlers undergo the normal 4 day "In-Country" training program required of all new arrivals. Following this training, basic skills learned in sentry dog school are related to the specific mission performed at the installation to which the handler is assigned. Each handler is given an orientation on his specific mission which includes:

1. Emergency and alert procedures.

2. Types of communications he will be using.

3. An explanation of the duties of the reaction force and what actions the handler must take to summon the reaction force.

4. An orientation on health problems encountered in Vietnam. Early diagnosis of health problems is stressed.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

5. A tour of all posts during daylight hours so that he can familiarize himself with the area before he patrols the area at night.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That sentry dog employment doctrine include a requirement for an orientation based on the above factors for all handlers prior to their actually walking a sentry dog post at night.

f. Logistics.

(1) Prefabricated sentry dog kennels and kennel support buildings.

(a) OBSERVATION Most of the existing doctrine concerns the employment of sentry dog teams in a fixed, static, peacetime environment. In Vietnam the requirements for sentry dog support of critical logistical activities and combat aviation resources varies with the tactical situation. The sentry dog team can provide a valuable supplement to the physical security scheme of any installation. However, inherent in the use of sentry dogs is the requirement to provide facilities for their support. These facilities include, as a minimum, sheltered kennel facilities for the dogs and a food preparation area, while a veterinary work area is also desirable. Present regulations require the construction of permanent kennel facilities before sentry dogs are deployed to support a given installation or activity. This requirement is impractical in view of the flexible support necessary in Vietnam, and would be completely impossible in a more mobile tactical situation. The problem of expensive kennels and time consuming construction has seriously impeded the deployment of sentry dogs in a constantly changing tactical environment.

(b) EVALUATION: It presently costs $2,660 to construct one kennel run and a proportionate share of the kennel support facility for each sentry dog. Assuming that the average sized installation requires at least ten sentry dogs to provide a continuing and viable security supplement, the initial cost of the physical facilities for sentry dog support to the average installation exceeds $26,600. Considering that sentry dog support at a given installation may be temporary in nature, especially in a changing tactical situation or the era of redeployments from Vietnam, this cost becomes progressively more difficult to bear. In Vietnam, the sentry dog program has become a prisoner of existing physical facilities for lack of funds to construct additional kennel and support facilities. The non-tactical ARADCOM standards for kennel construction have been transferred to tactical employment, and the resultant loss of effect of the sentry dog program is readily apparent. To counter this trend the Army must develop transportable, prefabricated kennel and support facilities which can be

readily redeployed. Sentry dogs can be adequately housed for short periods in transport cages. However, the adequacy of these accommodations becomes questionable as employment approaches semi-permanence. No temporary housing facilities for sentry dogs, other than the transporter cages, are presently available in the inventory. Adequate, low cost, semi-permanent kennel facilities could be constructed in sections from iron pipe and chain link fencing material. Overhead cover, flooring and a kitchen facility/veterinary support facility could be readily constructed from tin plating. If properly designed, these sections could be arranged to be interlocking and transportable in a CONEX or similar container. The semi-permanent nature of the kennels would provide the needed flexibility to satisfy changing support requirements. Further, the number of runs at a particular facility could be adjusted to operational requirements.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That a standard design be developed for prefabricated kennels and kennel support facilities capable of supporting sentry dog teams in a semi-permanent physical security role. (NOTE: 18th MP Brigade has made arrangements for conducting evaluation tests on a type of prefabricated, movable kennel. These kennels are being furnished by the Land Warfare Laboratory, Aberdeen Proving Ground, MD 21005, ATTN: Chief, Mobility Branch. The kennels are expected to arrive in-country o/a 30 July 1970).

(2) Sentry Dog Leather Equipment.

(a) OBSERVATION: Leather equipment deteriorates quickly in a tropical climate.

(b) EVALUATION: Leather equipment used in the sentry dog program is suitable and acceptable in a temperate climate. In the tropical environment of Vietnam this equipment deteriorates very rapidly unless it is treated daily with leather conditioner, neats foot oil or saddle soap. A substitute material requiring a minimum of maintenance is needed and should meet the following criteria:

1. Strong enough to control the dog.

2. Require a minimum of maintenance.

3. Economical to produce and replace.

4. Light in weight.

The 180th MP Detachment (SD) (Okinawa) is understood to have experimented, with favorable results, with locally developed equipment made from web material. Further examination by Army Research agencies is appropriate. A problem has also developed with the muzzles, in that the standard ¼ inch rivet used on these muzzles is not adequate. The strain put on the muzzle frequently causes the rivet to break and has resulted in some injuries.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That research be conducted to:

1. Develop a substitute material (such as web) for leather equipment now being used in the sentry dog program which, with minimum maintenance, will not deteriorate rapidly in a tropical environment.

2. Correct the obvious flaw in currently available muzzles.

(3) Minimum Standards for Kennel Facilities.

(a) OBSERVATION: The problem of expensive kennels and time consuming construction has seriously impeded the deployment of sentry dogs in a constantly changing tactical environment.

(b) EVALUATION: The construction of dog kennels as prescribed by AR 190-12 is expensive, time consuming, and in many cases impractical in a tactical area. Design, construction and distribution of movable kennels as proposed in paragraph 2f(1), above, would contribute significantly to an improved sentry dog program. There is also a definite need to establish acceptable minimum standards for the construction of permanent kennel facilities. Those currently prescribed by AR 190-12 are desirable and should be demanded in stabilized areas. In areas such as Vietnam, however, it is impractical to spend thousands of dollars on dog kennels which may be vacated within a few months after construction due to the changing tactical situation, or may be vacated due to consolidation of facilities due to drawdowns. The length of time required to complete kennel construction after submission of a work request is often a year or more. This discourages commanders from using sentry dogs where they could provide increased security, reduce property loss, and reduce manpower requirements. A need exists to develop a set of minimum standards, keeping in mind cost, health of the dogs, ease of construction and the temporary nature, (up to a year), of their intended use.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That a set of minimum standards for sentry dog kennels be designed in coordination with the Engineer and Veterinarian which will provide for:

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

1. Rapid construction with readily available materials.

2. Relatively low cost, since they may be abandoned after several months or at best within a few years.

3. Sanitation and health safeguards for the dogs.

g. Communications.

(1) OBSERVATION: The commercial Series 220 Motorola radio (Handi-Talki FM Radio), with rubberized flexible antenna, has greatly improved communications within sentry dog units.

(2) EVALUATION: Replacement of the AN/PRC 88 radio with commercial Motorola radios (Handie-Talkie FM Radios) has greatly improved communication capabilities. The Motorola radio is better, and much easier for the handler to carry and operate. Thus far, it has proven highly effective. Initially, problems were encountered with the metal antennas breaking. These have now been replaced by rubberized, flexible antennas which are more durable.

(3) RECOMMENDATION: That commercial (or military adaptation) of the Series 220 Motorola Handi-Talki FM Radio be incorporated into the sentry dog company TOE in sufficient quantity to provide 1 radio for each sentry dog post, 1 for each supervisory post, and a minimum of 10 base stations per company.

h. Material: None.

i. Other.

(1) Administering of Capsule/Tablets to a Sentry Dog.

(a) OBSERVATION: An effective method is needed to insure a capsule/tablet is taken by the dog.

(b) EVALUATION: The present method of administering capsules or tablets to dogs may result in the dog regurgitating or coughing out the capsule from the back of his throat. A method utilized by this command is the following: the handler places the capsule/tablet into the dog's mouth. He then closes the dog's mouth with his left hand and cups his right hand over the dog's nose. The handler then blows through the dog's nostrils. This air forces the capsule down the esophagus of the animal without any harmful effects.

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(c) RECOMMENDATIONS: That the method described above be considered as an additional way to administer capsule/tablets to sentry dogs.

(2) Method for loading sentry dogs on vehicular transportation:

(a) OBSERVATION: In many areas of Vietnam, as in many areas of the world, the posts manned by sentry dog teams are located at such great distances from kennel facilities that it is impractical to expect the dogs and handlers to walk from the kennels to the posts. To require walking would expose the man and dog to an unneeded level of fatigue, or would be totally unacceptable because of the distance involved. Although vehicular transportation is normally available at sentry dog companies and detachments, ancillary problems can be created by the use of vehicular transportation, such as how to safely and efficiently load sentry dogs on transport vehicles. In many locations enough dog teams are transported at one time to justify the use of a 2½ ton truck as a transport vehicle. The height of the truck cargo compartment above ground level compounds the problem of loading the sentry dogs.

(b) EVALUATION: The formal prescribed method of loading a dog into the cargo compartment of a 2½ ton truck involves lifting the dog and placing it on the bed of the vehicle. In actual physical accomplishment this requires the handler to grasp the dog forward of the hindquarters and forward of the front shoulders and lift the animal more than four feet to the bed of the truck. This is the method that is presently taught at the Scout Dog Training Detachment, Fort Benning, Georgia, the USAF Sentry Dog School, Lackland AFB, Texas, and at the USARPAC Sentry Dog School, Okinawa. While this method has been found to be marginally workable in the absence of refinements, experience has pointed out a number of disadvantages to its continued use:

1. Many of the sentry dogs weigh in excess of 100 lbs and at that weight are too heavy to be safely and conveniently lifted.

2. Some of the dog handlers, because of their physical stature and their physical development, are not capable of lifting even the average sized dog to a height approximating that of a 2½ ton truck bed.

3. Minor injuries have often been sustained by dogs that have been dropped or inadvertently mishandled during loading operations of this type. A simple and yet effective solution to this problem can be constructed from materials available at most military installations employing sentry dogs. Using ammunition boxes or other scrap lumber, a simple stairway or

similar loading ramp can be constructed that will permit the animal to walk or climb aboard the vehicle. This obviates lifting. While it is recognized that permanent or semi-permanent items of equipment such as loading stairways or loading ramps may prove impractical in a mobile field environment, they can be of great use where the loading of dogs takes place frequently in the same area.

(c) RECOMMENDATION: That a loading stairway or loading ramp of a standardized construction, and fabricated of universally available materials be designed for use at all kennel facilities where sentry dogs are commonly loaded aboard cargo vehicles. The ramp should be easily affixed to the tail gate of 3/4 and 2½ ton trucks to allow easy boarding of dogs at any location. As a field expedient, a board of sufficient width and height can be used.

W. K. WITTWER
Colonel, MPC
Commanding

3 Incl
~~1. Agenda, Sentry Dog Working Conference~~
2. Minutes, Sentry Dog Working Conference
3. 18th MP Bde Suppl 1 to AR 190-12
Incl 1 w/d HQ DA

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

AVHGC-DST (10 July 70) 1st Ind
SUBJECT: Special Operational Report - Lessons Learned, Headquarters, 18th Military Police Brigade, RCS CSFOR-65 (R2)

Headquarters, United States Army Vietnam, APO San Francisco 96375 1 SEP 1970

TO: Commander in Chief, United States Army Pacific, ATTN: GPOP-DT, APO 96558

Assistance Chief of Staff for Force Development, Department of the Army, Washington D.C. 20310

This Headquarters has reviewed the Special Operational Report-Lessons Learned from Headquarters, 18th Military Police Brigade and concurs.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

R. E. THOMPSON
CPT, AGC
Assistant Adjutant General

Cy furn:
18th MP Bde

GPOP-DT (10 Jul 70) 2d Ind
SUBJECT: Special Operational Report-Lessons Learned, HQ, 18th Military Police Brigade, RCS CSFOR-65 (R2)

HQ, US Army, Pacific, APO San Francisco 96558 30 SEP 70

TO: Assistant Chief of Staff for Force Development, Department of the Army, Washington, D. C. 20310

This headquarters concurs in subject report as indorsed.

FOR THE COMMANDER IN CHIEF:

D.D. CLINE
2LT, AGC
Asst AG

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS 18TH MILITARY POLICE BRIGADE
APO San Francisco 96491

AVBGC-P 1 May 1970

SENTRY DOG WORKING CONFERENCE

1. The 18th Military Police Brigade conducted a two day Sentry Dog Working Conference during 20 - 21 April 1970. Representatives from the Okinawa Sentry Dog School, 1st Military Police Group, 1st Logistical Command, 1st Aviation Brigade, 7th Air Force, 522d Medical Detachment, USARV PMO, USARV G3, ACTIV, and personnel involved with sentry dog operations within the 18th Military Police Brigade were in attendance.

2. Forwarded for your information is a copy of the minutes recorded during the Sentry Dog Working Conference.

FOR THE COMMANDER:

DONALD B. JACKSON
MAJ, MPC
Adjutant

DISTRIBUTION:
10 - 18th MP Bde
10 - 16th MP Gp
10 - 89th MP Gp
5 - 1st MP Gp, APO 96331
5 - 1st Log Comd, ATTN: PMO
5 - 1st Avn Bde, ATTN: G3
5 - USARV, ATTN: PMO
5 - USARV, ATTN: ACTIV
2 - USARPAC, ATTN: PM, APO 96558
2 - CDC, MP Branch, Ft Gordon, GA 30905
2 - USAMPS, Ft Gordon, GA 30905
2 - OTPMG, Wash DC 20314

~~Inc 2~~

SENTRY DOG CONFERENCE

20 - 21 April 1970

1. Survey Criteria and Survey Report Format — CPT GOLPHENEE

Purpose - To develop criteria for determining the necessity of sentry dogs at different locations. To formulate firm guidelines for describing area being surveyed and standardizing overall evaluations to tie in with physical security surveys.

The survey report format was passed out to the class and explained. Comments from company commanders and others experienced in surveying, emphasized the concentration in surveying on distractions which would cause the dogs to falsely alert. Rotation of posts was mentioned as a good way to keep the dogs effective in remaining alert and not becoming sedate. Also kennel support is essential to maintain posts, and must be received.

Since personnel making the survey may not be knowledgeable of the overall criticality of the installation being surveyed, it was suggested that USARV, Brigade or Group might indicate on the survey, on a 1 to 10 scale, the criticality of the installation. The vulnerability of the installation was also considered. The four areas to consider in determining sentry dog utilization are - criticality, vulnerability, effectiveness, and support. A total consideration of these parameters is necessary to determine the need for a dog post. The sentry dog company commanders are not in a good position to determine overall vulnerability, since they are not familiar with the surrounding allied forces and enemy ease in infiltrating. MAJ's Gibbons and Lockwood stated, however, that when support is there, resources are delegated out to any reasonably critical and vulnerable position where dogs can perform effective service, and only if resources are scarce would such overall utilization factors become heavily scrutinized. [illegible]C Smith suggested studying Physical Security Surveys in greater depth prior to conducting Sentry Dog Utilization Surveys, to assist in determining vulnerability. [illegible] added that dogs can't replace people. Since dog teams can't [illegible] withstand sapper attacks alone, personnel are still just as scarce needed to man bunkers when Sentry Dogs are used as when they are not. He also added that Physical Security School graduates should accompany the sentry dog survey personnel to help them ascertain the vulnerability of the area. In conducting the survey, the entire installation should be sufficiently described so that resurveys are not necessary when minor changes occur, and so that a survey can be tentatively approved, pending improvements in certain mentioned areas.

It was suggested that Physical Security Surveys and Sentry Dog Utilization Surveys might feasibly be conducted together. However, it was decided that this was not always possible. It was felt that if personnel trained in conducting physical security surveys accompanied the sentry dog survey personnel, the overall sentry dog survey would be more meaningful.

2. Utilization Parameters and Guidelines — CPT STRINGHAM

The SD company often has to go to the people at the installation to suggest to them that they request a Sentry Dog Utilization Survey since they may not be aware that one should be made. Also personnel trained in sentry dog utilization can aid commanders requesting sentry dog support in determining the feasibility of sentry dog use. Advice to local commanders can preclude

nonproductive surveys

heavy traffic det[illegible]y dog use due to noise and vehicle lights. Size and reaction time of the reaction force is very important. Villages close to sentry dog posts will distract effective utilization; also strong odors, billets, and generators. The area should be dark and isolated for maximum sentry dog utilization. Rotation of posts aids in negating effect of strong odors and to a lesser extent noise. The handler must know his dog; without a good handler, the sentry dog team is ineffective. A problem is in objectively determining extent of distractions, such as odors and noise, for different locations. There is a meter for measuring odors, but how a dog will react to an odor is not easily translatable. Estimates are that continuous noise and strong smells will limit the dog's particular sense effectiveness [illegible] about 50%, while limiting the handler nearly 100%, because the sentry dog handler would probably be unable to effectively interpet any alert.

Lack of uniformity in conducting surveys is a problem. MAJ Lockwood feels that standardization of procedures is a better goal than centralization of survey making. He thinks responsibility for the survey should in some cases be moved down from present Group level to Battalion level.

3. Forms - SD Survey, Checklist CPT GOLPHENEE

The possibility of utilizing a checklist when conducting sentry dog utilization surveys, to promote standardization in reporting, was proposed. A checklist would include items which would be considered on each survey and would need to be complimented by items peculiar to the particular survey. MAJ Valladares stated that to standardize surveys, one officer is in charge of all Air Force sentry dog surveys within his area of responsibility. CPT Golphenee and MAJ Lockwood pointed out that this would be impossible for the Army due to the much greater number of surveys required. MAJ Lockwood says that 16th MP Gp does have someone from their S3 office check the site of all approved surveys but does not check those surveys which recommand that sentry dog utilization be disapproved. This checking aids in standardization of surveying to some extent.

4. Priority List Criteria MAJ LOCKWOOD

Availability of support is the most important criteria; without proper support, sentry dogs cannot be employed. Previously, sentry dog availability has exceeded the kennel support availability so if kennel support was available, sentry dogs were used at any reasonably critical, vulnerable, and effective location. In the near future, our requirements may increase to the point where a priority for use of sentry dogs will have to be used since sentry dog teams will be more scarce than kennel support. Determination of the four criteria factors was discussed. MAJ Lockwood believes that the criticality can not be effectively determined at Group level and should be at a higher command; like USAFRV. Vulnerability can be determined at Group level, and effective employment should continue to be determined by the surveying officer. LTC Smith indicated that even if USAFRV were to determine the criticality of each surveyed area, this process would materially slow down the approving procedure and would be impractical. He also indicated

group commanders could confer with the local Corps/Field Force Commanders who have access to information concerning criticality and deployments. MAJ Collins mentioned that in the 1st Avn Bde, availability of support is often less emphasized than the tactical need for the aviation required. MAJ Lockwood answered that mechanical support, as in the case of aviation, is not analogous to sentry dog support since sentry dogs are living beings and cannot function well unless properly supported to some minimum extent. Also, AR 190-12 prohibits use of sentry dogs without proper support. LTC Smith says that portable kennels are soon going to be tested here. Sentry dogs, unlike scout dogs, can't sleep with the troops because of their vicious nature. CPT Gorman said he had investigated portable kennels and said there were problems with them concerning sanitation. LTC Smith added that since we make it to the moon, our technology ought to also be able to build a portable kennel which would meet minimum specifications. MAJ Lockwood emphasized that portable kennels would eliminate building expensive kennels and then abandoning them when the installation closes down.

SUMMARY: Priorities are currently established by Group Commanders, although perhaps criticality should be determined at a higher level in the future. There is an urgent need to experiment with mobile kennel facilities.

5. Changes to AR 190-12, FM 20-20, 18th MP Bde Reg 190-12 CPT GOLPHENEE

CPT Shea thought present regulations are too stringent, being based on stateside standards, e. g. kennels being built in a certain way, lights in training area, training specifications required. If the mission is being accomplished, we have been overlooking unsatisfactory kennels, although some minimum standards are needed. MAJ Lockwood mentioned that when Brigade re-writes its regulation, it should state that the regulation will not have to be followed explicitly, but should be worded to allow for flexibility. CPT Gorman suggested that coordination between the sentry dog company, veterinarians and those constructing the kennel should be made before the construction begins. Problem has been that 1st Log has built kennels and then they were disapproved by the veterinarians due to unsatisfactory construction. LTC Smith said that the disapproval was based mainly on the inability to get improvements made on the kennels by engineers after the dogs have moved into them. He agreed that coordination would be valuable at such an early stage, and this would be included in the new regulation.

Concerning the number of dogs per post, it was commented that the present recommended figure of 2.5 dogs per post be continued but that it is not a mandatory ratio but just a guideline. MAJ Lockwood mentioned that the present 16th MP Gp overall working figure is about 2.2 dogs per post. Flexibility of posts is a problem since any adjustment or alterations to operating sentry dog posts must be approved at Brigade level. It might be better to make this decision at a lower level to promote flexibility. A sudden need for a sentry dog position to be adjusted, such as one arising from intelligence reports of imminent attack, could not be approved quickly enough under present procedure.

The problem of a dog becoming tired after too many distractions and also through too much time on the job was mentioned. A possible improvement concerning time on the job would be to decrease the dog watches from the present six hour tours to a two-hour-on and four-hour-off operational rotation.

6. Kennel/Training Area Construction and Layout CPT HELD

Regulations concerning proper kennel construction, sentry dog training area and layout are specific, however, no present kennel support area fully meets all requirements. Many specifications are required and no kennel support area fully meets all requirements. Therefore it was proposed that the minimum standards for kennel construction, training area, and layout be lowered. MAJ Gibbons defended the USARV standards in that even though the standards cannot always be met, they should still be used as a goal. Many areas that could be bettered aren't being bettered. Wooden kennels, for instance, even though the only thing available often, provide a home for ticks and other bugs, as well as the dogs.

Sanitation can be coped with even without meeting AR criteria although more work on the part of the handlers is required. CPT Stringham told of kennels built with metal walls to decrease the cost; they didn't meet AR standards but were adequate. SFC Cooper said that most training is in alert and attack, so a fenced in training area is not required, but a 200 yard square field is needed.

MAJ Lockwood added that he though USARV Training and Utilization Inspection ratings should be based upon what is possible to be done, and the detachment should not be graded [illegible] even though conditions do not meet standards. CPT Shea pointed out that the units being supported with sentry dog resources often don't care about the deficiencies although the Sentry Dog Companies do. CPT Held said that a list of minimum standards should be forwarded to the supported units with the survey, so they know what standards should be met.

7. Packet for Supported Commanders CPT SHEA

PURPOSE: To familiarize a supporting commander with Sentry Dog attributes and support necessities.

MAJ Cullins felt the packet handed out by CPT Shea to the class should be in more detail to more fully answer questions of supported commanders. CPT Stringham felt the packet was sufficient for presentation to the supported commander at the time of the first visit (the survey), but a verbal orientation should be presented at a later time or in conjunction with the packet issuance. CPT Corman added that showing him what the regulations require might scare the supporting commanders away. CPT Shea countered that the commander would at least be learning what he was getting into. MAJ Cullins indicated that showing commanders standards that cannot be met and may not be expected to be met would be detrimental, e. g. potable water being required for dogs when there often isn't enough potable water for the troops. MAJ Lockwood felt that a more detailed, carefully though out fact sheet than that submitted by CPT Shea should be presented to the supporting commander, alerting the commander as to areas which would not have to be strictly followed. MAJ Cullins stated that the fact sheet should be hand carried and explained to the supporting commander. CPT Stringham added that examples of sniper attacks prevented, as well as other effective utilization of sentry dogs, would be good propaganda to include in any fact sheet presented to commanders requesting sentry dog resources.

8. Liaison with Supported Elements. CPT STRINGHAM

Personal contact with supporting commander is essential. Getting a hold of the right personnel is often a problem. Keeping the supporting commander informed is also a problem. Liaison with Navy, Air Force, and Marines has usually been good, also with ARVN's. Courtesy calls to commanders utilizing sentry dog resources by representatives of the sentry dog company being supported should be made frequently.

9. Training Problems and Procedures 1LT LINDSEY
SFC COOPER

There is a problem concerning what to do with over aggressive sentry dogs in Okinawa. They might be used in warehouses in Vietnam (Brigade will look into this). A well qualified handler is necessary, though, to react when the warehouse sentry dog encounters an intruder and to clean and feed the dog. A handler is needed to keep people from poisoning the dog and also to keep the dog from killing an intruder. SFC Cooper said they were used in Korea in PX's and they cut stealing down to zero when used properly. LTC Smith wondered if when the handler was not present, if the attacks on intruders by the dogs would lead to unfavorable congressional investigations. SFC Cooper answered that in Korea, the area was posted as "Off Limits" and "Sentry Dog Being Utilized". Incidents involving intruders attacked by warehouse sentry dogs were backed up by the Provost Marshal when they occured. SFC Cooper stated that sometimes the dogs become so aggressive that they had to be killed, since they will even turn on their handlers. LTC Smith said that we would have to go to higher headquarters, namely MACV, to have the decision made as to whether the savings in goods not stolen is greater than the risk of danger to life due to the dog.

MAJ Valladares said that the AF patrol dog would be better in that the dog attacks anything that moves but if it gets a person pinned down it won't attack the still person but will just hold its ground unless the person attempts to escape. They are being trained right now in Tan Son Nhut and have been operational in the States. Patrol dogs require a handler, but they can also be used as sentry dogs.

LTC Smith asked if dogs could remain in Vietnam and handlers be trained in Okinawa. SFC Cooper said that a matching in Vietnam of the old dog and new handler would require about two weeks. In MP AIT, five days are being devoted to sentry dog handler volunteers. LTC Smith suggested that we find out what they're teaching in those five days. SFC Cooper said that sending handlers to Vietnam from Okinawa without dogs would facilitate recycling green dogs that need more training in Okinawa in addition to other advantages such as decrease in shipping costs, inability to send dogs back to Okinawa due to TCP/IHS, and elimination of quarantine period after a dog arrived in Okinawa. A possible date to start this procedure would be the next starting class, namely the one starting during the first of June. (Also the Sentry Dog Supervisor's Course will start at the beginning of June). An E6 or better would be needed to lead the training for the two week period in Vietnam. CPT Held mentioned that a problem with Vietnam training is equipment. Shipped dogs are required to be fully equipped and if no dogs are shipped, Sentry Dog Companies over here will have a problem of equipment resupply. We will

attempt to get the approval of USARPAC through USARV on a four week Okinawa and two week Vietnam training program for dog handlers. Brigade will take the action.

10. AF Patrol Dogs — MAJ VALLADARES

MAJ Valladares indicated that through intelligence information, we have learned that the two greatest deterrents to sappers are perimeter lighting and sentry dogs. Security Police are the ground forces of the Air Force. The Air Force employs three rings of defense - an outer ring of bunkers, a middle ring of sentry dogs and an inner ring of resources. Not all forces are employed on the outer perimeter. AF sentry dogs work an average of 8 hours on post, since they are not harassed by people checking on them more than twice a night. Also since lights shine outward from the perimeter, the dogs are constantly in the dark.

Military sentry dogs cannot be used where distractions are present, whereas the patrol dog can function as a sentry dog and also be told to attack upon command. It can be used for law enforcement and riot control. Pinning a person down and tracking him are attributes. In a couple of years, every AF dog will be a patrol dog. A patrol dog can be used either as a sentry dog or patrol dog and can be switched from job to job with a minimum of training. The patrol dogs have been operational in the States and were converted sentry dogs. Training patrol dogs from sentry dogs takes about three weeks and LT Lindsey said that training green dogs would probably be about 8 - 12 weeks. The U. S. Air Force, in training dogs and handlers for Vietnamization to be given over to Vietnamese, train patrol dogs. Patrol dogs are also trained as marijuana detector dogs. LT Lindsey said he thought that the training necessary to train a dog in sentry, patrol, and marijuana detection would make the dog ineffective in specializing in any one area. MAJ Valladares said that dogs are just basically trained in the three areas and specialize in the field in one area, always ready to be transferred to use in another area if the need arises, after a short period of retraining.

11. Communications — CPT STREELMAN, MR. KELLY

There are three types of radios used by handlers. One type is a "hands free" receiver with the receiving station switching the conversation from sending to receiving. A new antenna is coming out that is less easily breakable. A head band arrangement is also available. CPT Held and LT Sudnik from the 212th MP Co (SD) said that their troops use the microphone clipped to their collars which does not utilize the "hands free" capability, because they feel that there is enough time and ability to take the microphone off the collar and hold it for speaking while controlling the dog. They felt that the hands free types were not necessary and the head phones were too uncomfortable to wear. It was suggested by CPT Held that training on use of radios be included in Okinawa school training.

12. USARV Training Inspection — MAJ GIBBONS

MAJ Lockwood suggested that [illegible] should be revised so as to be more mission oriented, especially in [illegible] training and observation of handling. Quarterly inspections are [illegible] by USARV. LTC Smith said that he thought USARV's inspections were too frequent, thus rendering any Brigade inspections

too burdensome on the installations, so the Brigade is presently not performing inspections. The Groups are performing quarterly inspections, however, in much more detail than USARV. Possibly USARV could render annual inspections with Brigade having semi-annual inspections. MAJ Gibbons is in favor of semi-annual USARV inspections and will coordinate with USARPAC on this.

13. Veterinarian; Diseases, Vet Tech Support, Tick Control IHS-TCP, Statistics CPT ELWELL

A veterinarian makes weekly visits to the sentry dog facilities. At present there is a shortage of Vet Techs within the SD companies. SD Co TOE's call for eight Vet Techs (91T) per company. OJT's may be one answer to the scarcity problem. CPT Stringham said the 175th Med Det Vet Techs are helping out the 595th MP Co (SD) with vet supply since the 595th MP Co (SD) are short on vets. CPT Elwell briefly discussed the evacuation procedures for military dogs. Dogs have just about the same priority as humans for emergencies, but the AF has regulations which require that dogs may only travel on cargo plans, which hinders their Medivac. Diagrams and charts were used to depict causes resulting in military dogs being non-operational. Heartworm is not high among dogs over here and is rarely treated. Hookworms and screwworms may be treated but so far hasn't been a real threat. Tropical Canine Pancytopenia (TCP), formerly referred to as Idiopathic Hemmorrhagic Syndrome (IHS), affects approximately 50 dogs per each 1200 dogs in country per month. Much research is being conducted, primarily at Walter Reed Hospital, to combat the disease. However, to date, there is no cure nor true diagnosis. Because other non-battle injuries are causing military dogs to become non-operational at the rate of about 47 per month per 1200, other dangers are nearly as great a problem in causing dogs to become non-operational as TCP. Battle injuries are about 7 dogs per month per each 1200 dogs. Deaths are about 26 dogs per month per each 1200 dogs. TCP first was seen here in June 68 as a fatal nose bleed. There is no sure way of telling if a dog has TCP, so we are taking a risk by shipping any dog out of the country. TCP dogs have a temperature increase, may or may not have bleeding noses and hemorages, and will have a drop in blood count. Each of these things, if they do appear, will appear during the increased temperature period. Many dogs will live through the two week period of treatment and will come back to normal condition, but often their disease will reoccur. A purple inclusion body is seen in infected dogs (an erlikia) in their blood and is believed to be transmitted by a tick. Tetracycline is now used for treatment. Disease is now on the downsing in RVN; at one time it was up to about 150 dogs each 1200 dogs in country per month. SFC Cooper indicated that Okinawa has had very few cases of TCP. It appeared at about the same time as in Vietnam, but they haven't had a case since August 1969. TCP probably came from Malasia, where the British came up with the same problem. Other tropical areas have been similarly affected. The disease Red Tongue was discussed. In this disease the dog has a red tongue and excessive saliva. We don't know the cure, but the dogs usually get better "in 7 days if treated, and a week if not treated". It is chronic (reoccuring) but will not prevent shipment of the dogs out of country after being cured. Military Stress Diet (MSD) is a new dog diet, low bulk, high energy and protein dog food. The Air Force has been testing it extensively and is probably going to use it. The Army is awaiting final Air Force results before deciding on the use/non-use of MSD. Whether the dogs like it or not is a question that hasn't been answered yet.

14. SD Company TOE's CPT STRACENSKY

19-500C - All three companies are under this TOE. Later companies have been modeled after the 212th MP Co (SD) without consideration of changes needed due to such things as mission and deployment. TOE's don't take into consideration special needs of each company. Bde requested in February to DA through USARV that TOE's be standardized for the three sentry dog companies. Some of the shortcomings in the present TOE's are that clerks are inadequate in number, mess and maintenance personnel are not part of the company TOE's and are supposed to come from supporting units, there is no kennel master nor operations sergeant slots and no kennel support personnel. Moratorium by USARV on TOE changes makes only emergency changes possible. A standard form for submitting changes is being designed. MAJ Lockwood recommended that DA be asked to upgrade detachments sergeants from E5 to E6. Military Dog Trainers (00C) are not authorized, but are needed. CPT Held suggested that the TOE was too strict since the 981st MP Co (SD) is way overstrength and is held back by lack of equipment which is not flexible under a TOE. He suggested a TDA would better fit the situation. These areas will be further researched by Brigade.

15. Summary MAJ BILLINGS

It was determined that greater standardization was needed in conducting surveys and in establishing sentry dog utilization parameters. Brigade will rewrite the Bde sentry dog regulations based on these considerations. The checklist to give to supporting commanders (a factsheet) will be completed in more detail by CPT Shea.

A Brigade priority list has been established. Priorities within each Group area will be established and forwarded to Brigade based on criticality, vulnerability and effective sentry dog utilization. These priority lists will be evaluated at Brigade and an over all priority list will be established. LTC Smith noted a general need for flexibility for the sentry dog companies. He also felt CRLL's concerning portable kennels (the Brigade will be receiving approximately ten portable kennels, for testing purposes, during the month of June) should be submitted to Brigade, stating the need and advantage/disadvantages of a moveable/portable type kennel. COL Wittwer added that the redeployment of troops adds to the urgency of establishing kennel capabilities. Also the patrol dog concept will be monitored as well as the possibility of utilizing sentry dogs in a 2nd line of defense concept. SFC Cooper stated that shorter watches of dogs might be better than the longer watches in maintaining their efficiency. Based on experience, TDA authorizations are among the first to be deleted in any massive troop withdrawal. Therefore, it was determined that changes to sentry dog company TOE's would be best affected by means of MTOE submissions. Brigade will take these factors into consideration when changes to the TOE's are submitted.

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HEADQUARTERS, 18TH MILITARY POLICE BRIGADE
APO San Francisco 96491

SUPPLEMENT 1
TO AR 190-12

15 May 1970

MILITARY POLICE

MILITARY POLICE WORKING DOGS

AR 190-12, 17 April 1970, is supplemented as follows:

Page 1-1. Paragraph 1-2, Responsibilities.

(Added) h. CO, 16th and 89th Military Police Groups will:

(1) Conduct sentry dog surveys as requested.

(a) Forward completed surveys to this headquarters, ATTN: AVBGC-P, for final approval.

(b) Conduct surveys as expeditiously as possible. Normally, the survey should be completed and returned to this headquarters within three (3) weeks.

(2) Establish, maintain and forward to this headquarters for approval, priority lists for the employment of sentry dogs utilizing format at Annex A.

(a) This list will include in a single list, and in order of priority, facilities where sentry dogs are employed and facilities approved for employment.

(b) All surveys which are conducted after this priority list has been submitted, and which are recommended for approval, will be forwarded to this headquarters with recommendations as to placement on the standing priority list.

(c) Priority lists will be reviewed continuously. Recommended adjustments in priority will be forwarded to this headquarters for approval.

(3) Be responsible for compliance with provisions of para 2h(1) through (9), USARV supplement 1 to AR 190-12.

* This supplement supersedes 18th MP Bde Reg 190-12, 6 September 1969.

(4) Coordinate with the appropriate Corps/Field Force Commanders to determine criticality of areas being surveyed for sentry dog employment.

(5) Conduct continuous coordination with supported commanders to insure proper utilization of sentry dogs, that maximum support possible is rendered to the commander, and that adequate support is received from the commander for the sentry dog detachment.

Page 2-1. Paragraph 2-3. Restrictions.

(Added) c. Requests for permanent changes in posts at approved installations will be forwarded by letter to this headquarters; ATTN AVBGC-P; with a drawing of the installation showing proposed posts, and supporting rationale.

(Added) d. In order to provide flexible response to emergency situations and encourage maximum use of resources, military police group commanders or officers designated by military police group commanders are authorized to temporarily establish, adjust or augment sentry dog posts. Such actions will be based upon tactical or police intelligence, will not degrade support provided to formally approved installations, and will be closely coordinated with the supported commander.

(1) Temporary changes will be reported to this headquarters, ATTN AVBGC-P by message before or immediately upon occurrence and upon termination.

(2) Temporarily established, adjusted, or augmented sentry dog posts that remain in effect and become permanent in operation must be based upon a survey or re-survey approved by this headquarters. Such surveys or re-surveys will be submitted to this headquarters; ATTN AVBGC-P NLT twenty-one (21) days following the changes.

Page 2-1. Paragraph 2-4. Sentry Dog Surveys.

(Added) a. The following factors will be considered in conducting sentry dog surveys:

(1) Criticality of the installation to the accomplishment of US forces' missions in RVN as stated in current campaign plans. Criticality will be determined in coordination with appropriate Corps/Field Force Commanders and will be discussed in the MP group commander's indorsement of the sentry dog survey. Remaining factors will be addressed in the survey.

(2) Vulnerability of the installation, to include physical security measures already in effect and the available reaction force.

(3) Potential effectiveness of sentry dog teams

(a) Presence of strong odors.

(b) Night time noises.

(c) Wind conditions and direction.

(d) Presence of personnel, vehicle traffic or other distractions.

(e) Terrain conditions.

(f) Communications available.

(Added) b. Surveys will be performed by commissioned officers assigned to sentry dog companies or commissioned officers who are graduates of an approved Sentry Dog Supervisors Course and whose principal staff duty is the supervision of sentry dog activities.

(Added) c. The standard format for sentry dog surveys is outlined in Annex B.

(Added) d. In order to preclude frequent resurveys, survey officers will survey the entire installation/facility for sentry dog employment. He will indicate those areas not suitable for sentry dog employment, those areas considered marginal for sentry dog posts, and those areas which are suitable for sentry dog posts; and recommended establishment of specific permanent posts, if appropriate.

(Added) e. Surveys will be complete and thoroughly descriptive of the installation/facility and its security measures. The surveying officer will review the latest installation physical security survey prior to conducting the sentry dog survey. General comments such as "a satisfactory reaction force is present" and "acceptable communications are available" are not acceptable. Specific information to include size of reaction force, response time, and type of communications available is required.

(Added) f. Surveys will be processed as follows:

(1) Surveys will be forwarded to this headquarters, ATTN: AVBGC-P with recommendations as to approval and priority list standing in three (3) copies (one (1) original and two (2) carbons). One copy will be indorsed back to the Group Commander with comments for action and file, and one copy will be forwarded to the commander of the surveyed unit.

(2) All sentry dog surveys will be numbered consecutively by calendar year as follows:

(a) 212th MP Co (SD): SDS (18th MP Bde) 212-70-1, 212-70-2, etc.

(b) 981st MP Co (SD): SDS (18th MP Bde) 981-70-1, 981-70-2, etc.

(c) 595th MP Co (SD): SDS (18th MP Bde) 595-70-1, 595-70-2, etc.

Page 5-1, Paragraph 5-3, Reports.

(Added) d. The quarterly report of Sentry Dog Handlers and Sentry Dogs as of the last day of each quarter will be forwarded to reach this headquarters NLT the 1st day of each new quarter utilizing format at Annex C.

(Added) e. A bi-weekly status report as of 2400 hours the 1st and 15th of each month will be forwarded to reach this headquarters NLT the [illegible] and 20th of each month, utilizing 18th MP Bde Form # 53.

(Added) f. After action reports on infiltrations, actual or attempted, occurring on an installation which utilizes sentry dogs as part of its physical security will be submitted in accordance with 18th MP Brigade Regulation 335-13.

This supplement may be further supplemented by subordinate commands if required. One copy of each major subordinate command supplement will be furnished this headquarters ATTN: AVBGC-P.

Annexes A through C are added.

(AVBGC-P)

FOR THE COMMANDER:

OFFICIAL:

W. E. HAWKINS
Colonel, MPC
Chief of Staff

DONALD B. JACKSON
MAJ, MPC
Adjutant

3 Annexes
A - Priority List Format
B - Sentry Dog Survey Format (w/1 Inclosure)
C - Report of Sentry Dog Handlers and Sentry Dogs

DISTRIBUTION:
C+

ANNEX A

PRIORITY LIST FORMAT

(SAMPLE)

Priorities for Employment of Sentry Dog Teams: _____ Military Police Group.

Priority	Location	Facility	Status	Remarks
1	An Khe	POL Tank Farm	Operational	
2	Phuc Vinh	Army Airfield	Approved Survey	Kennel const begun 1 Mar 70. Estimated completed 30 Apr 70.
3	Pleiku	ASP	Approved Survey	Billets not available.
4	Vinh Long	ASP	Operational	

ANNEX B

SENTRY DOG SURVEY FORMAT

Subject: Sentry Dog Survey of (Installation/Facility)

TO: (Commanding Officer of 16th or 89th MP Group)

1. GENERAL

a. Survey requested by (Name), Commanding Officer of (Unit), on (Date).

b. Survey conducted by (Name), (Unit), on (Date).

c. Coordination: (Indicate coordination by the surveying officer with the installation coordinator, installation commander, security officer, unit commander or others as appropriate).

d. Installation/Facility Surveyed:

(1) Location: (If a facility is a part of a large installation, explain where the facility is located on the installation. If surveying an isolated facility, describe location by road net and road distances to towns and other installations).

(2) Size: The installation has a perimeter of (number) KM. Total troop population is approximately (number).

(3) Major Units and Activities: (Identify major units on the installation and major activities of these units or of civil agencies).

(4) Mission of Unit(s) Requesting Support: (Briefly describe the mission of the unit or units which sentry dog teams will support, if employed).

(5) Physical Security Measures in Effect: (Describe measures for the whole installation. If surveyed area is in a large installation, describe overall installation measures in general terms and the surveyed area in specific terms).

(a) Perimeter Barriers: (Describe the barrier system).

(b) Ground force:

1. Number of guards.

2. Employment of guard force.

3. Number, location and reaction time of reaction force.

(6) Surrounding Area: (A general description of the terrain, adjacent installations or civilian areas, etc).

2. EVALUATION

a. Vulnerability

(1) The surveyed installation has (high, average, or low) vulnerability to enemy attack. (In subparagraphs, explain the rating).

(2) The installation has (high, average, or low) vulnerability to criminal activity. (In subparagraphs, explain the rating. Criminal activity pertains to loss of supplies and equipment by theft).

b. Effectiveness of Sentry Dog Teams.

(1) Teams should not be employed at (indicate areas completely infeasible) because (cite factors which definitely rule out team employment).

(2) (Number) teams could be employed in emergencies on (number) marginal posts at (indicate marginal areas). These areas are marginal because: (give reasons).

(3) (Number) teams, manning (number) posts, can be effectively employed as indicated on the diagram, (Inclosure 1). Estimated effectiveness of sentry dog senses on these posts:

(a) Post # 1: Smell, _____%; Hearing, _____%; Sight, _____%; Overall, _____%.

(b) Post # 2: (Indicate evaluation for each proposed post).

c. Support for Sentry Dog Teams.

(1) Personnel: (Comment on availability of quarters, mess, maintenance and other support to be provided to the sentry dog detachment by supporting units).

(2) Sentry Dogs: (Comment on availability of kennels. Describe available kennels in detail to include location, type of construction, size, training area, water supply, isolation and security. If kennels are not available, describe plans and actions taken to construct kennels).

3. RECOMMENDATION: That sentry dog teams not be employed at (installation/facility; or, that (number) sentry dog teams be employed at (installation/facility) upon accomplishment of the following. (specify actions required before deployment of teams).

4. (Name, position) of (unit requesting the survey) was briefed on the survey evaluation and recommendation on (date) by the undersigned. This briefing included measures necessary to support the sentry dog detachment which must be accomplished prior to sentry dog employment.

1 Inclosure
Diagram of Area

S: _____

(Name) _____

(Rank) (Branch) _____

Survey Officer

INCLOSURE 1: Diagram of Area.

1. Diagram submitted should be to scale and include:

a. Immediate surrounding area.

b. Perimeter barriers.

c. Towers and/or bunkers.

d. Buildings/structures.

e. Natural barriers/prominent terrains features.

f. Proposed sentry dog posts.

(1) Show distances

(2) Show prevailing wind direction over posts if accurate information is available.

2. Marginal notes which will assist in understanding the diagram are encouraged.

ANNEX C

REPORT OF SENTRY DOG HANDLERS AND SENTRY DOGS (RCS PMG-61)

1. Command:

2. Period:

3. Sentry Dog Handlers (include all personnel with D suffix):

Unit	Authorized	MOS	Actual	MOS
TOTAL:	___		___	

4. Sentry Dogs:

Unit	Authorized	Actual

5. Projected six-month losses - Sentry Dog Handlers (include all personnel with D suffix):

Unit	(Month & Year) Number	MOS	(Month & Year) Number	MOS	(Month & Year) Number	MOS
TOTAL:	___		___		___	

6. Number of Sentry Dogs 7 years old/older at end of reported Quarter:

Unit	Number	Age
		*
Total:	___	

7. Current and anticipated loss of Sentry Dogs due to TCP:

Unit	Current Loss	Anticipated Loss	TCP Suspects

8. Remarks: **

JOHN J. JONES
CPT, MPC
Commanding

* In total years, but not fractions thereof. If unit has sentry dogs of different ages (in years), make separate line entries to depict age grouping. Only dogs seven (7) years old/older should be reported.

** Any remarks to explain future special sentry dog/handler requirements which would be of interest to this headquarters for planning purposes. A fact sheet in lieu of remarks is acceptable.

UNCLASSIFIED
Security Classification

DOCUMENT CONTROL DATA - R & D

(Security classification of title, body of abstract and indexing annotation must be entered when the overall report is classified)

1. ORIGINATING ACTIVITY (Corporate author)

HQ, OACSFOR, DA, Washington, D.C. 20310

2a. REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION

FOR OFFICIAL USE ONLY

2b. GROUP

3. REPORT TITLE

Special Operational Report - Lessons Learned, HQ, 18th Military Police Brigade

4. DESCRIPTIVE NOTES (Type of report and inclusive dates)

Experiences of unit engaged in counterinsurgency operations,

5. AUTHOR(S) (First name, middle initial, last name)

CO, 18th Military Police Brigade

6. REPORT DATE

10 July 1970

7a. TOTAL NO. OF PAGES

45

7b. NO. OF REFS

8a. CONTRACT OR GRANT NO.

b. PROJECT NO.

N/A

c.

d.

9a. ORIGINATOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

703201

9b. OTHER REPORT NO(S) (Any other numbers that may be assigned this report)

10. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT

11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

N/A

12. SPONSORING MILITARY ACTIVITY

OACSFOR, D.A., Washington, D.C.

13. ABSTRACT

DD FORM 1 NOV 65 1473

UNCLASSIFIED
Security Classification