



THE NATIONAL GUARD

# On Guard

VOLUME XXI, NO. 7

APRIL 1992

## Our Environmental Mission



**By Deborah Fields**  
National Guard Bureau  
Environmental Public  
Affairs

"What if our own worst enemy is the same institution that is charged with defending us?" asked a report issued by the National Toxics Campaign Fund.

"Complying with environmental laws has never been the first priority of the American military," charged Tom Turner, a staff writer for the Sierra Club Legal Defense Fund, in an article entitled "The American Military vs. the American Land."

"No longer true," says Lt. Gen. John B. Conaway, chief of the National Guard Bureau. In fact, Conaway has made environmental compliance one of the top goals for the National Guard in the 1990s. He has said the Guard will lead the way for the Department of Defense (DoD) in environmental issues.

Chilling statements like those above are commonplace in environmental organizations, and in the media, nowadays. Such powerful and frightening rhetoric forces us to take stock of our actions, to examine just how we're conducting the business of being citizen soldiers and airmen.

The National Guard deals with environmental concerns in three major areas:

cleanup of past contamination; environmental compliance current operations, including the management of natural and cultural resources; and consideration of the environment in planning future activities. There are systems and programs in place to deal with these past, present and future environmental issues.

The clean-up of past contamination takes place under the Installation Restoration Program (IRP), a DoD program which identifies and remediates hazardous waste sites on military installations. This program, which parallels the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Superfund program, focuses on past operations, generally prior to 1980.

The IRP process consists of several steps. First, there is the preliminary assessment and a site inspection, which identify areas possibly contaminated by hazardous waste. Next, is the remedial investigation, feasibility study, and record of decision,

which involve a more detailed study of contaminated areas, and an assessment of any risks to the environment and human health.

Environmental compliance in current operations includes the many, federal, and state environmental regulations dealing with areas such as air and noise pollution, drinking-water and waste-water management, hazardous wastes, asbestos, fish and wildlife management, land and forest management, and underground storage tanks.

To assist commanders in their environmental compliance efforts, the Air National Guard uses the Environmental Compliance Assessment and Management Program, (ECAMP) and the Army National Guard uses the Environmental Compliance Assessment System (ECAS). Both programs identify deficiencies, and address steps required to achieve and maintain compliance and to implement fixes. The ECAS also includes programming budgetary requirements for compliance.

Natural and cultural resources management plans help to achieve the best use and enjoyment of resources, while maintaining the sometimes fragile environmental qualities, ecological relationships and good qualities of life. Specific programs include forest management, fish and wildlife management, historic and archaeological resource management, land management and pest management.

Environmental consideration in planning future activities is required under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). It mandates that anytime federal money is to be spent on a project or activity, the environmental impacts of the action must be considered and documented.

The public must be involved in the consideration and documentation process. While the extent of public involvement is determined by the scope of the action, public involvement is an important aspect in all environmental actions, whether they be past (IRP), present (compliance), or future (NEPA).

We are all citizens of the earth; some of us are citizen airmen and soldiers. It is only fitting that we lead the fight in protecting the environment for generations yet to come. So that you might better understand the environmental activities underway in the National Guard, we present this special Earth Day issue of "On Guard".





## On Guard

The National Guard

April 1, 1992

*Soldiers and Airmen of the National Guard,*

*Protection of our environment has become a basic American value and one which will continue to dominate the public agenda for years to come. As leaders and neighbors in the community, we Guard members bear a unique commitment to preserving and protecting the environment for future generations of Americans. Our strong community ties are what bind us to ensuring that commitment is carried out each day at every armory, base, facility and community where the National Guard operates.*

*Environmental compliance is among the National Guard's top goals for the nineties. And as citizen-soldiers, we have a moral, ethical and legal commitment to comply with our nation's environmental laws. As America pauses this month to recognize "Earth Day '92," we should begin moving beyond the mind-set of merely complying with environmental laws and go on to build an environmental ethic into everything we do in the National Guard.*

*As we continue to find new and better ways to tackle the tough environmental issues of the future, I am pleased to report that over the past year, the Guard has made tremendous strides in strengthening its environmental initiatives. The momentum continues in 1992 as we refine existing programs and create new ones to help resolve environmental problems which may have resulted from past practices.*

*In addition, we are now taking a more proactive stand toward dealing with the environment by bringing a more holistic view to operational planning. Meeting our long-range institutional goals will require a careful balancing between mission requirements and environmental responsibility. It will also require making the environment a command priority at all levels.*

*Whether performing state or federal missions, Guard members must always consider how the actions they take today will impact the future. From operations and training, to construction, to land acquisition, the environment must always be considered to ensure the Guard's and the nation's long term interest.*

*The 1990's is the decade of the environment. I hold out to each of you a challenge to make the National Guard the recognized leader in environmental compliance, to make stewardship our watchword, and to set an unparalleled national standard for environmental excellence.*

*John B. Conaway  
Lieutenant General, USAF  
Chief, National Guard Bureau*

"On Guard" is published monthly using federal funds under provisions of AR360-81 and is intended for the use of units and members of the Army and Air National Guard. It is printed in 55,000 copies and is distributed to each unit of the Army and Air National Guard as well as major commands by the Command Information Team, National Guard Bureau NGB-PAC, Skyline #6, Suite 401C, 5109 Leesburg Pike, Falls Church, VA 22041.

The views and opinions expressed herein are not necessarily those of the Department of

Defense, Army, Air Force, or the National Guard Bureau.

"On Guard" is the registered trademark of this publication and may not be used without specific, written permission. Questions or comments concerning "On Guard" should be referred to the Editor at the above address or by calling Defense Systems Network number 289-1923 or commercial (703) 756-1923 or FAX (703) 756-0726.

Chief, National Guard Bureau  
Lt. Gen. John B. Conaway

Chief, Command Information  
Lt. Col. Lester R. Stadig

Editor  
Capt. Phillip C. Blahut

Special Assistant  
Tech. Sgt. Rudolph J. Andersen







## Reductions, new capabilities helped reshape global strategy

by The Honorable Donald B. Rice  
Secretary of the Air Force  
Adapted from remarks to the  
National Guard Adjutants General  
Executive Briefing  
Washington, D.C.

For most of its 45 years, the Air Force's shape, size and gameplan focused on the cold war. With the Iron curtain gone, the superpower struggle has been replaced by a global strategy that is regionally oriented. The first test of combat of the now ago was Operation Desert Storm: a joint operation, a coalition operation, and, importantly, a total force operation.

The war confirmed the nation needs a mix of forces to respond to hot spots worldwide. It also confirmed we're on the right track with the defense drawdown. We have to make reductions, and can, while retaining core capabilities that preserve collective security in a splintering world.

The ultimate size of the Guard and Reserves will depend on national security needs and the types of missions that fit with the nature and capabilities of the citizen-soldier. Focusing on the air side, as the size of the active duty shrinks, Air Guard members will face new demands, with units continuing to absorb new missions and equipment.

Although active manpower has been reduced by more than 25% since the mid-1980s, Guard and Reserve personnel strengths will maintain their current levels even as the active component contracts. In our fighter force, Guard and Reserve units will grow from one-third to over 42% of the total force by 1995. If you include the air defense interceptors of the National Guard, fully 48% of Air Force fighter cockpits will be filled by Guardsmen and Reservists. Current plans push our reliance on the Air Reserve Component (ARC) to the maximum in relation to the size of the total force.

In some cases, as force structure decisions affect Guard and Reserve units, alternate missions will be considered—as is the case with some units converting from fighters to tankers. More mission-swapping lies ahead as we define the right mix of Active and Air Reserve Component forces and refine the ability to react quickly to contingencies. When alternate missions are not available, the Air Force will seek the involvement of Guard leadership to figure out the best ways to reduce over time and take care of our people.



Rice

Adjustments to the Air Guard force form a piece of a bigger picture. The Air Force is reshaping according to a strategic vision called Global Reach-Global Power. Though we started moving out on the Global Reach-Global Power game plan before Desert Storm, the war validated a renaissance in airpower thinking. It reinforced the fact that air assets can be used interchangeably for strategic or tactical effects. In the past, airpower and airmen have been divided into three Air Force commands: Strategic Air Command, Tactical Air Command, and Military Airlift Command. The reasons for separating them no longer exist.

So over the next few months the Air Force will be taking down those three commands and forming two new ones—Air Mobility Command and Air Combat Command. The first is for global reach. The other for deterrence and air campaign operations—global power. Air Guard units are affected since they will be gained by the new major commands. In fact, the Air National Guard is in the process of reorganizing to ensure compatibility with the new commands.

The new major command structure is part of a sweeping restructure from the Pentagon to the squadron and everything between. This is an exciting, productive time for the total force as it adapts to global and fiscal realities. By staying on a glide path as we reshape, and avoiding a free-fall, we can keep the muscle in defense.

Smaller does not mean less capable. It means adjusting and implementing wisely as we, in the words of Robert Brookings, "consider how to unscramble the eggs."



Each year Lt. Gen. John B. Conaway, Chief, National Guard Bureau, testifies on a number of occasions before Congress. On Mar. 19, he testified at Defense Subcommittees of both Senate and House Appropriation Committees. His written posture statement highlighted the success of the Total Force Policy as tested in Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm. It indicated that the National Guard must be prepared to adjust to new challenges, and that last year, 38,000 soldiers and airmen had trained in 32 countries throughout Europe, Asia, Central and South America, the Caribbean, the Middle East, and Africa. "When given the resources and opportunity to serve, the Guard can accomplish the mission," said Conaway. More detailed coverage of the posture statement will be published later. (Photo by Master Sgt. John Thornton, National Guard Bureau Executive Support)





## On Guard

The National Guard

# Clean up of contaminated sites a must for

By Barry F. Dillon  
National Guard Bureau  
Environmental Public Affairs

During America's industrial evolution, the National Guard handled its waste like the rest of the country. Workers, like bureaucrats in the industrial blur, swept their waste under America's rug, and said, "What we don't know, won't hurt us."

In the 1970s, however, what we didn't know, began hurting us. Chemicals from dumping, spills and leaks came out from under the "rug" and America began to grapple with contaminated drinking water and toxic fumes at places like Love Canal, near Niagara Falls, N.Y.

Hazardous waste — chemicals from such things as fuel products, cleaning agents and pesticides — became a national concern. The main problem was the extent to which contaminants had spread from these old waste sites into aquifers, underground drinking-water supplies.

Initially, the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the military conducted studies at places where health threats were suspected, such as landfills near contaminated drinking water wells. The number of contaminated sites grew. Other concerns arose about the affects on land, wetlands, and sediment in rivers and lakes. By the late 1970s, the federal government realized that problems were widespread and a national program was needed to assess industrial properties and military installations.

In 1980, the U.S. Congress set rules and provided a few billion dollars to cure the country's old hazardous ills through a law called the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA). This law and the program initiated at EPA became known as Superfund. The military also got money for its program, the Installation Restoration Program (IRP).

Little did anyone know at the time that an environmental monster had been created. The number of hazardous waste sites discovered in the nation has grown into the tens of thousands. The cost of investigating and cleaning up military installations, alone, will be in the tens of billions of dollars.

In the early 1980s, military departments experimented with assorted efforts to meet the requirements of CERCLA. With varying degrees of success, military commands took different approaches toward the IRP until Congress enacted amendments to CERCLA in 1986. Those amendments demanded two things: First, Federal facilities must conduct all CERCLA activities in accordance with EPA's procedures, processes and regulations,

and second, extensive public notification and public involvement programs must be initiated.

As it's been about six years, why hasn't the National Guard simply found its old hazardous sites and cleaned them up? "We all wish it was that simple," said Mr. Scott Hilyard, Chief, IRP Branch, ARNG, Environmental Resources Office. "Unfortunately, for all of us, there's a lot more to it." What he was referring to was the steps and the unique technical problems the program faces.

"There's a lot of pressure on the entire system," said Mr. Gary Hinkle, chief of the Air National Guard IRP program. "People say, all the time, 'All you do is study, study, study, and don't clean anything up.' There's a reason for that perception," Hinkle continued, "and there's a ton of reasons why the process takes so long."

"We're trying to take some shortcuts, but we often have to conduct many years of testing to determine if something needs to be fixed, if it can be fixed, and how to go about fixing it."

The first step in the IRP is to locate any potentially contaminated sites at National Guard installations. This is accomplished by interviewing current and former employees, searching available written records, and visually inspecting the installation. This process — a Preliminary Assessment — deals with information that often goes back several decades. So, understandably, the information gathered is often sketchy. However, from this effort, a report is written that identifies sites that need investigating.

Typically, areas receiving additional scrutiny include sites where spills or dumping



occurred, landfills, abandoned underground storage tanks, and maintenance areas. Often,

these sites have been abandoned for years and they cannot be identified by sight. So, the time-consuming process of examining written records is an integral part of the preliminary assessment.

Once this phase is completed and the written report is provided to government regulators and the general public, the next step is to physically investigate the identified sites. Environmental contractors are then hired to develop work plans, government regulatory agencies scrutinize the plans, and actual field work begins.

"The investigation sounds like a simple process, but it's not," said Hinkle. "The work plans, alone, can cost \$80,000 or more, and take a year to develop and be approved."

Once the investigation begins, the contract team takes a variety of samples for analysis. Soil from the surface, and from borings, is collected, as well as sediment and groundwater samples. This process requires the installation of several test wells, and the utilization of sophisticated ground-penetrating radar and vapor detection equipment.

At the end of this phase, the contractor provides the National Guard with a written report on whether contamination does or does not exist at the site. Government regulators are consulted, again, and a decision is made about which sites should receive further study.

"If we find an immediate health threat at any time during the investigation, we can take emergency action," said Hinkle. "Usually, though, the site investigation will only tell us if we have a problem near the site





# restoration

itself."

The key concern, Hinkle emphasized, is the spread of the contaminants. The most likely public health problem results from the spread of contaminants into groundwater. For example, hazardous chemicals used at a fire training area often can migrate, with rain water, through the soil and into groundwater. It then can be carried away from the site and, potentially, contaminate drinking water supplies in nearby towns.

In this example, to track the contaminants, extensive long-term investigation of the groundwater system would be required—a process that can cost millions of dollars and take several years to complete, according to officials. On the other hand, soil contamination is studied through the analyses of many soil samples from various depths.

Regardless of what contamination problem is found, the National Guard is required to evaluate various cleanup techniques that might be available. This step is called a feasibility study. Following this study, government regulators and the general public participate in deciding what corrective actions should be taken to alleviate the contamination problem.

What does this mean for the average National Guard facility? "I wish there was an average," said Hinkle. "Each installation is unique because of geology, regional conditions, and other complicating factors."

Hinkle cited two examples to highlight the diversity of past and present projects. An installation in Kansas endured a \$2 million, six-year investigation that determined a cleanup wasn't necessary. The study concluded that contaminants were locked in a thick clay soil, which was preventing movement of the chemicals. So, without any worry of migration into groundwater supplies, it was determined that the contaminants posed no further threat.

However, at the Massachusetts Military Reservation, on historic Cape Cod, an entirely different situation developed. More than 70 contaminated sites have been identified and contaminants from many of these sites have quickly migrated into area drinking-water supplies.

Over the past decade, more than \$20 million has been expended on studies at this installation, and the National Guard estimates more than \$100 million will be required over the next 8 years.

"The National Guard Bureau considers the IRP as one of its primary responsibilities, and we're very serious about correcting environmental hazards so future generations can enjoy a healthy environment," Hinkle concluded.

## Camp Ashland hosts environmental training

When members of the Nebraska Army National Guard met in Lincoln last fall for a two day environmental conference, most probably didn't realize the precedence they were setting. The conference was not only the first of its kind in the Midwest, but it was also a unique cooperative effort between Nebraska's military department and the state's environmental regulatory agency.

About 100 Nebraska Guardsmen attended the Environmental Protection and Enhancement Awareness Training conference. The program included discussion on environmental laws and regulations, hazardous waste, health and safety issues, and environmental compliance in the military.

"We need to establish environmental awareness for our people," said Jay Ringenberg, a state employee and Guard member, who served as the link between the military and the state environmental regulatory agency. "The military cannot continue to do business as usual. We must be more environmentally conscientious."

The success of the Nebraska program may lead to an environmental training program at Camp Ashland for units from around the country.

## New Jersey restores contaminated athletic area

The 104th Engineering Battalion, New Jersey Army National Guard, recently restored an environmentally sensitive tract of land on a municipal athletic field in Hope Township, N.J. During a five-day exercise in February, the 50th Armored Division engineering unit unearthed more than 1,200 yards of fill that had mistakenly been placed on the property which had been declared as wetlands.

Under the Wetlands Protection Act, the municipality could have been fined \$100,000 for violations. In addition to cleaning up that property and saving the municipality a hefty fine, the Guardsmen also removed tainted soil from a fuel oil spill at a nearby township garage.

## Pennsylvania engineers cleanse tainted waters

Mill Creek in north central Pennsylvania flows through some of the most scenic and remote wilderness in the state. However, the stream flows in dark contrast to its pristine surroundings—running a lifeless orange, painting its banks with poisonous iron and acid, killing nearby trees and vegetation. The creek is a victim of decades of poor strip mining practices which were all too common place in the past.

Thanks to the Pennsylvania Army National Guard's Company B, 876th Combat Engineer Battalion and the Mill Creek Coalition, several bioremediation ponds are cleansing the tainted waters and reclaiming several miles of the creek. Bioremediation is a revolutionary process which naturally rids contaminants and impurities from the water which flows through a series of ponds containing limestone, compost, a sediment-controlling lining, and aquatic vegetation.

## Fish appear again in Camp Murray Creek

Fish weren't appearing in the numbers they used to, so Mother Nature got plenty of help in the recent efforts to put a newer, cleaner face on Murray Creek. The creek winds its way through Camp Murray, Wash. and eventually spills into American Lake.

According to Staff Sgt. Brad Elken, program manager from the 3rd Battalion, 161st Infantry (Mech.), Washington Army National Guard, the success of the Murray Creek Restoration Project is the result of a unique blend of state agencies, volunteers and National Guardsmen.

"It's been a very gratifying experience to see such a high level of cooperation between all the state agencies and volunteers," said Elken.

When a decline in fish population was noted in 1989, a campaign was started to improve the quality of the creek as a spawning site for salmon and trout. The three-phase project consisted of first assessing needs and obtaining permits and manpower, then cleaning and clearing the stream, and finally, providing an environment for fish hatchlings. Elken estimates that more than 1,000 man-hours have been expended in sprucing up the stream and making it a more habitable place for fish.

## Kit fox population rises at Camp Roberts

For more than a century, the San Joaquin kit fox, once found throughout the valleys of central California, has been fighting and slowly losing its battle for survival.

At the turn of the century farmers moved in cultivating this fertile area. They failed to recognize the big-eared little fox's value in controlling rodents. Instead, they saw it as a threat to their poultry; a varmint to be shot or poisoned.

Despite this, a sizeable kit fox population survived until urbanization spread, in recent years, placing the little critter on the endangered species list. But, in one fair-size area, thanks to the California Army National Guard, the kit fox is making a comeback.

At Camp Roberts, the Guard's largest training facility in the Golden State, little has changed in the past century. Even there, the fox population was dwindling in recent years. But, though no one is quite sure why, there has been a reversal of fortunes. The kit fox population is now on the rise at the installation and some believe that may be due to a change in the camp's rodent control program.

For environmental reasons, the use of some poisons was discontinued and, as a result, the rodent population has increased. That hotdogs and MREs, may have attracted the small foxes to the camp.

Whatever the reason, guard officials have taken steps to assure the survival of the foxes that roam the base. All projects are reviewed in an effort to avoid disturbing the animals, which, at about five pounds when fully grown, are the smallest species of fox in North America. When dens are discovered they're flagged, and soldiers are instructed to give them a wide berth.





## On Guard

The National Guard

# Red carpet, show of stars to be seen by five

by Capt. Phil Blahut  
Editor

A Pentagon "red carpet" award ceremony is set for May 14th to honor five Army Guard captains selected for the prestigious General Douglas MacArthur Leadership Award.

As a tribute, "On Guard" features their unique stories which range from serving in Desert Storm to developing a winning unit training program.

This award is presented annually to a lieutenant or captain who demonstrates the MacArthur ideals of "Duty, Honor, and Country".

Guardsmen to be honored are: Capt. William R. Phillips, II, commander of a 3rd Battalion, 116th Infantry, 29th Infantry Division (Light), Virginia National Guard; and Capt. Terry W. Saltsman, commander, 212th Engineer Company, Tennessee National Guard; Capt. Steven A. Wieneke, commander, 134th Medical Company, Iowa National Guard; Capt. Michael J. Borrel, commander, Company B, 199th Forward Support Battalion, Louisiana National Guard; and Capt. Debra A. Clark, commander, 222nd Transportation Company (PETRL), Arizona National Guard.

### Capt. Terry W. Saltsman

"It was near sunset the day before G-Day. You could see thousands of vehicles parked everywhere and more joining us to the south," recalls Capt. Terry Saltsman, a Tennessee Army National Guard.

Saltsman and his company, the 212th Engineer Company are believed to be among the first United States ground troops to have crossed the Saudi Arabian-Iraqi border.

According to Saltsman, two of his platoons were cutting out a main supply route two kilometers into Iraq, six days before the ground offensive began.

On the day before the offensive, U.S. personnel and equipment appeared all around, and after nightfall, everyone advanced north.

"Everybody dispersed out into the desert in their own train," says Saltsman. "It was amazing to see such an operation."

"We didn't even know that we were among the first ones to cross the border until we got back to Tennessee."

In the desert the 138 Volunteer State Guardsmen came under the command of Lt. Col. Stephen Massey of the 62nd Engineer Battalion, 20th Engineer Brigade.

"Col. Massey told me he understood our troops were older and more mature than his, and that they had more construction and combat experience, so he said we would be first to cross," says Saltsman.

Indeed, some 40 percent of the Tennessee engineers served in Vietnam. Massey's choice to use Saltsman's unit was validated when the 212th won the 20th

Engineer Brigade "best company" contest.

For their contributions in the war effort, 12 NCOs and four officers were awarded bronze stars, while 12 others in the

company received Army Commendation Medals with valor devices for seizing the Iraqi observation posts, and their commander received the MacArthur award.

### Capt. Debra A. Clark

An Arizona Army National Guard commander and her transportation unit directly contributed to the demise of the Republican Guard forces during Operation Desert Storm.

During the ground offensive against Republican Guard forces, Capt. Debra A. Clark, commander, 222nd Transportation Company led her unit into Iraq supporting the 1st and 3rd Armored Divisions. Driving 5-ton tractor trailer trucks 27 grueling hours through desert terrain they delivered in excess of 200,000 gallons of fuel. The on-time delivery came before the advancing U.S. tanks ran out of fuel, allowing them to continue their offensive.

"We were at the right place, at the right time," said Clark. "Our orders were to remain approximately 50 miles behind the advancing 1st Armored Division. But they were advancing faster than planned. We were stopped in the desert with 44 trucks loaded with fuel. I knew what I had to do. I was convinced that we needed to drive fuel to the front lines."

"We had no communication, maps or coordination from the active components," said Clark. "We were ordered not to use our non-secure radios. We had to take the initiative to get rid of our fuel."

The 222nd "triple duece" company moved their trucks through the uncertain terrain, with only minor maintenance problems in relation to other fuel support units. Clark attributes this to experienced drivers and her maintenance support unit.

"We had no break downs from the 44 trucks. But the decision to bring our maintenance support unit with us proved valuable when we passed other active Army and Reserve fuel transport vehicles. My maintenance teams were able to repair their vehicles to get them going again."

During the 27-hour trek, the 222nd passed through the famous "Highway of Death". "We were the second unit to pass



through this horrifying area. We could see some vehicles burning. Some were exploding as we passed through. We were loaded with fuel and this concerned me," said Clark.

"I would drive by the side of the 5-ton tractors and I would throw cans or MRE's (meals-ready-to-eat) at the drivers to make sure they stayed awake," recalls Clark.

Clark tells of another close incident while they were deployed to the Gulf.

"We left the U.S. with no bullets or chemical protective gear. We were told that we would be issued these items when we arrived in the Persian Gulf. Just after we landed there, I and unit baggage handlers got off the aircraft. Just then a Scud attack took place. An Air Force officer ran up and shut the aircraft door and the aircraft took off. It was a scary feeling watching my unit depart the area while I stood on the tarmac with no protective gear," said Clark.

"I looked up to see a patriot missile engage the Scud. This was probably the scariest time of my life."

"My First Sergeant, a Vietnam veteran, was instrumental in training the unit for the worst possible situation. When the missions got difficult we held together and worked like a team. I owe this award to my unit and especially my strong NCO corps. Their confidence, expertise and leadership made me look good," concluded Clark.



### Capt. Michael J. Borrel

Although his Louisiana Army National Guard unit did not fight in the desert sands during Operation Desert Storm, a 5th U.S. Army evaluation labeled them "fully capable to accomplish their wartime mission" had the Gulf War lasted longer.

An open communications policy and teamwork style leadership were the successful ingredients used by Capt. Michael J. Borrel, commander of Company B, 199th Support Battalion while his unit was deployed to Ft. Hood, Texas which "rounded out" the 256th Brigade.

While there, Borrel's soldiers successfully provided direct support maintenance for the brigade in the areas of automotive repair, communications, electronic repair, track vehicle, artillery, small arms, TOW missile repair and provided parts supply during warfare training.





## Guard captains

"Training and maintenance at Fort Hood was a challenge for my unit. What made our mission a success was the programs we implemented back in 1990," said Borrel. "Before we were mobilized, my troops were familiar to sharing ideas, talking problems out and doing a lot of work during a drill weekend."

Achievement is nothing new to Borrel's unit. Prior to the Desert Storm activation, the unit was awarded the Superior Unit Award and the Fifth Army Award for Maintenance Excellence, twice and in 1990, the Chief of Staff of the Army for Maintenance Excellence Award.

"We were fortunate to have a lot of citizen-soldiers with technical backgrounds. Many young soldiers were able to gain experience from the activation period which will help their career, the National Guard and the U.S. Army," said Borrel.



"My NCO's established a lot of trust in the young soldiers. They did a superior job under heavy stress. They were proud to do the mission with no outside assistance from other units."

"We were ready to go to war if needed. We were trained and qualified to do our mission," concluded the MacArthur Award winner.

### Capt. Steven A. Wieneke

During a 24-day period the 134th Medical Company, Iowa Army National Guard treated 24,000 patients at sick call and completed 407 ambulance missions during Operation Desert Storm.

Commanded by Capt. Steven A. Wieneke, the 134th Medical Company (ambulance) arrived in Saudi Arabia January 8th, 1991. Their mission was to provide medical treatment and evacuation for U.S. and coalition forces and care for over 900 enemy prisoners of war in a 275 mile radius around Riyadh, the Saudi Arabia capital.

Working 24-hours a day, the 134th provided emergency ambulance service in the Eskan Village housing area and the



By  
**Capt. Dan Gardner**  
120th Public Affairs  
Detachment  
Indiana National Guard

Photo by  
**Tech. Sgt Ed Andros (1945)**

## WWII photo captures MacArthur



During the crucial fighting for the Philippines, in World War II, Army Public Information photographers recorded Gen. Douglas MacArthur's historic return. One of those photographers, Tech. Sgt. Ed Andros with the 38th Infantry Division recalls the battle for the Philippines and the fulfillment of Gen. MacArthur's promise.

"After the battle we knew MacArthur was coming. He had promised he would return to the Philippines, and he did.

"Of all things, MacArthur wanted to go inside Malinta tunnel, the command post he had been ordered to leave when the Japanese first invaded the islands. One of our guys told him not to do it. There were snipers inside and the place was full of dead bodies. But he walked in anyway.

"Of all the reporters and cameramen there, I was the only one with a flash gun. So I was asked to go along.

We passed by a bunch of charred bodies near the entrance. It was dark in there. I crammed a bulb in the flash gun, and thought, 'Oh hell, here's my chance.' I was real nervous, more afraid of the General than the snipers. I snapped a shot... but the bulb was a ..... no flash. Boy! I felt stupid. I popped another one in.

"This time there was a flash. But I forgot to change the plate of film.

"Well, there was no time for another shot. Turned out all right anyway. There on the film, off to one side, was a ghost image of the first exposure. MacArthur looked like an apparition, head hung down solemnly... And then, next to it on the same plate, was the flash shot of the General, hands on his hips in the familiar MacArthur pose, head aloof.

That double exposure said it all. He had lost the place, and now he had won it back."

entire Riyadh city. In addition, Wieneke's unit provided sickcall/tailgate medical care and ground ambulance evacuation to medical treatment facilities for U.S. and Coalition Forces traveling through the theater of operations.

After successfully completing this large mission, Wieneke was awarded the Bronze Star.

Receiving the MacArthur Award will be the second national level recognition award for the Iowa commander. At the Annual Association of Military Surgeons of the United States conference, he received the "1991, Chief, Medical Service Corps Award for Excellence" and was recognized as the "Most Outstanding Medical Service Corps Officer in the Army National Guard."

Wieneke a vocational agriculture high school instructor is an active participant in agriculture and education associations at local and national levels.

### Capt. William R. Phillips

Unlike many activated personnel which deployed for Operation's Desert Shield and Desert Storm, Capt. William R. Phillips, II, a Virginia Army National

Guard commander, stayed home. But his unit's dedication toward developing and executing battalion projects and training

accomplishments were just as credible.

As commander, Phillips' unit developed and implemented a Small Boat Operation Training Program for the 3rd Battalion, 116th Infantry which

received high praise from the battalion.

Phillips unit set some notable milestones. They achieved 100 percent assigned unit strength, 96 percent in individual weapons qualification, 100 percent at crew-served weapons qualification, average drill and annual training attendance reached 96 percent.

"I owe this award to my dynamic unit First Sergeant and NCO corps. They focus on communications with unit members, training standards and achievements. Unit junior leaders create an environment that retains and attracts soldiers. They make me look good," said Phillips.







## On Guard

The National Guard

# Compliance: New laws create responsive action, earth stewardship



environmental area.

These laws regulate such things as:

- *permitting air emissions and waste water discharges,*
- *protection of wetlands and sensitive habitats,*
- *development of spill-response plans,*
- *sampling and analyses to determine environmental quality at installations,*
- *leak-testing and replacement of underground storage tanks, and*
- *the handling, storage and disposal of hazardous substances.*

by Barry F. Dillon  
National Guard Bureau  
Environmental Public Affairs

About two years ago, the chief of the Air National Guard's Environmental Planning Branch, Doug Anderson, got a "wake-up call," of sorts. An employee had called to report a problem at a base: violation of many state and federal laws, potential fines in the hundreds of thousands of dollars, and possible criminal prosecution.

The problem was years of indiscriminate dumping of hazardous waste into a 25,000-gallon underground storage tank. Anderson worked with the state adjutant general's department to report the problem to state environmental officials, to issue a news release, and to arrange for emergency cleanup. These actions help thwart enforcement of the penalties.

Since its discovery, the problem has been used as an alarm to "wake up" the National Guard to environmental compliance issues.

What are compliance issues? Taking a simplistic look at the environmental picture as programs for past, present and future issues, the present-day issues are grouped into "compliance." This refers to how facilities comply with environmental laws that affect Guard operations and industrial "housekeeping."

Although laws covering past and future environmental concerns do have stringent legal requirements, the big teeth in the environmental jaw are found in compliance legislation. Nationally, jailings and fines are common in this

National Guard operations most impacted by these requirements include armories, aviation support facilities, heating plants, training areas, engine test cells, motor pools, painting operations, maintenance facilities, storage areas and other light-industrial shops.

Four significant compliance laws are the Clean Air Act, the Clean Water Act, the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

The clean-air and clean-water laws are named for the media they regulate. RCRA primarily covers the handling, storage and disposal of hazardous and nonhazardous waste. TSCA targets specific chemicals, such as PCBs and asbestos.

These are the major compliance laws, but National Guard facilities must comply with a myriad of other federal, state and local laws.

"People in the National Guard should know that the EPA (Environmental Protection Agency) has the authority to go onto any of our facilities and inspect them," said Mr. Anderson. "When they do, they often find three or four violations." "In extreme instances," he pointed out, "they can hold an employee criminally liable."

The U.S. EPA has delegated this inspection role in many states, according to Mr. Anderson, and this gives the states the same authority.

"About 70 to 80 percent of the violations at Guard facilities are administrative in nature and easy to fix," said Maj. Carmen Anderson, program manager with the Army National Guard's Environmental Resources Management Office, Arlington Hall, Va.

The typical problems the assessment

teams have found include the lack of, or incomplete, air emissions inventories, no wastewater discharge permits, the lack of written hazardous wastes programs, improper storage of hazardous wastes, and the lack of properly trained personnel.

Maj. Anderson, no relation to the Air Guard's Doug Anderson, knows about these things because she and her assistant, Ed Dlugosz, have been charged with assessing each federal and federally-supported Army Guard facility, ranging from small armories to major training areas covering more than 100,000 acres. To assist with the effort, environmental consultants, under contract to the Guard, execute the Environmental Compliance Assessment System (ECAS), which started in August 1991.

Although most findings concern administrative issues, Maj. Anderson said significant problems have been documented, such as contaminated discharges reaching surface and ground water, uncontrolled erosion as a result of Guard activities.

"We help commanders learn to do it right," she said. "People in the field welcome us to visit their facilities. Before ECAS, they didn't know what the rules were. Now, we show them the problems, as well as teach them how to fix them."

When problems require expensive remedies, the findings help commanders determine budget priorities, program requirements, and assist in the development of corrective-action plans, she said.

"Our legal people have said many times, 'There's no law that says you have to fly planes, but there are laws that say you have to protect the environment,'" said Doug Anderson, who heads the Environmental Compliance Assessment and Management Program (ECAMP), the Air Guard's version of ECAS.

"This program gave us a chance to inspect our operations and clean up our act," Doug Anderson said. "This program is key to reaching the National Guard's goal of 100 percent compliance with environmental laws."

He was referring to the top 10 goals established by Lt. Gen. John B. Conaway, chief of the National Guard Bureau.

"It's better if we find our problems and fix them," Doug Anderson continued, "rather than waiting for the regulators to knock on the door."

Maj. Anderson indicated she explains to commanders that mission related training can be jeopardized if certain environmental procedures aren't followed.





# Guard adopts land management program

**By Kathleen Jewell**  
**National Guard Bureau**  
**Environmental Public Affairs**

It's been about six years since the Idaho National Guard was thrown into a swirl of controversy. Back in the mid 1980s, military planners at Idaho's Orchard Training Area (OTA) had no idea that a seemingly routine proposal to upgrade an existing multipurpose range complex would ignite such intense public debate.

Critics of the proposal said the Guard was preparing to wage a terrible and destructive war; not with sleek fighters, tanks or targets, but a war without an enemy. They alleged the Guard was about to wage war on the environment, sending a clear signal to Guard leaders, nationwide, that the environmental movement in America had just landed in the National Guard's own backyard.

Thanks to the work of OTA's environmental staff, a program, initially developed by the Army's Construction Engineering Research Lab (CERL), was adopted to help allay critics' concerns, defuse the controversy, and help secure completion of the OTA project.

The program, the Integrated Training Area Management (ITAM) system, is now being adopted at 14 Guard training sites, nationwide. ITAM will allow the Guard to take a more holistic approach toward balancing mission requirements with environmental responsibilities, according to Dr. Marc Imlay, natural resources manager for the Army Guard. In turn, ITAM will help Guardsmen "peacefully coexist" with the fragile environments within which they must train.

"The adoption of ITAM is, in many ways, an outgrowth of the Guard's ongoing effort to go beyond merely complying with environmental laws, and to start thinking smarter about what affect training has on the fragile ecosystems in which Guard units must operate," said Imlay.

ITAM is an umbrella title for a number of land management initiatives the Guard is undertaking. The program's thrust is to apply sound land management practices at the conceptual stages of any proposed actions or training programs. Early integration of ITAM enables the Guard to determine the presence or absence of such vital natural resources as wildlife, wetlands, and endangered plant and animal species. That information can then be used to manage training in a manner that will lessen any long-term environmental impacts.

"What we're getting with ITAM is a

win-win situation," said Imlay. "By adapting ITAM at all of its major training installations, the Guard is taking a giant step toward the sometimes difficult task of balancing mission requirements with environmental accountability.

Data collected through the use of ITAM also can expedite future Guard actions, such as major training exercises, which are subject to the environmental assessment requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). ITAM, according to Imlay, can be used as a valuable tool to speed up the NEPA process, which is a series of laws requiring federal agencies to study the environmental consequences of proposed actions before any decisions are made.

As it now stands, on average, the Guard has to wait two to three years to complete an environmental impact study. Without readily accessible data, that process can take even longer. During this lengthy process, the mission must be put on hold and can even change before the study is completed. Ultimately, this time-consuming process can detract from readiness.

By using different data-collection tools, such as Land Condition Trend Analysis (LCTA), installations can monitor changes in the land which can result from military training. For example, computer generated schematics, satellite mapping, and ground data from LCTA plots allow Guard leaders to monitor tank maneuver damage and its affect on biodiversity, vegetation, and soil erosion.

Information obtained through cultural and natural resources surveys and terrain analyses offer commanders essential information that can help minimize the impact of Guard training on surrounding land and wildlife. That data then can be compared over a period of several years, helping to determine any long-term impact military operations could be having on the land and surrounding ecosystems.

Idaho's OTA has led the National Guard in successfully fielding ITAM. OTA is unique among most military installations, in that it is collocated with the Snake River Birds of Prey Area, one of

the densest nesting populations of raptors (birds of prey) known to exist in North America. Because most of the birds of prey hunt for food in nearby desert lands, which include OTA, it is an important installation goal to preserve the natural habitat that plays host to prairie falcons, golden eagles, owls and other raptors.

"Before ITAM, environmental records kept at OTA were limited," said Marjorie Blew, environmental coordinator for the state of Idaho. "At the time we announced we were planning to upgrade the facilities at Orchard, back in 1985, the public demanded to know what the ongoing impacts of our training were. And, we had no way of telling them," she said. Intense controversy almost stopped the project. "With ITAM, we're getting the tools to help solve the problem. ITAM will give us measurable data, rather than 'I think' or 'I guess' data," she said.

To help evaluate and monitor the habitat, Blew and other environmental specialists at OTA implemented the initial LCTA portion of ITAM in 1989.

Environmental awareness training for troops is another key component of the ITAM program at OTA. Educational tools, like posters, videos and handbooks, have made troops more sensitive to the affects of their actions on the fragile ecosystems at the installation. For example, soldiers are trained to immediately report wildfires on the range. This training, according to Blew, will help prevent further loss of habitat for jack rabbits and ground squirrels, the firstline prey for the raptors.

**Future**







## On Guard

The National Guard

# Environmental airspace study involves many states

F-16 fighter jets are fast and can sneak up on their targets at low altitudes. Furthermore, they require miles and miles of air space just to turn around.

It's no wonder the Air National Guard found citizens in the Northeastern United States uneasy about proposed F-16 training areas in the region. Citizens and special interest groups have expressed concern that low-flying, needle-nosed F-16s could potentially affect property values, tourism, and recreation.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) prohibits the National Guard or any other governmental agency, from spending public funds on anything which could potentially impact on the environment without first conducting detailed environmental studies.

That's why an unprecedented environmental impact statement (EIS) is underway in the Northeast to determine just how disruptive F-16s might be. Air National Guard interests from several states are involved with the study because two units are scheduled to convert to the F 16, and additional airspace must be identified. No single northeastern state has enough airspace to accommodate F-16 training completely within its borders.

Although the study will not be complete until July, the Northeast EIS is expected to serve as a model for the Air National Guard in proposing future training locations, according to Jack Kier, chief of the Air National Guard Readiness Center's Airspace Management Branch, Andrews AFB, Md.

The study is a direct result of a proposed conversion of Connecticut's 103rd Tactical Fighter Group and Massachusetts' 104th Tactical Fighter Group from A-10 Thunderbolts to F-16 Falcons.

Historically, airspace utilization studies have had a different focus. In 1988, the Federal Aviation Administration was criticized for its practice of approving nationwide training airspace without

first conducting thorough environmental impact studies.

In the Northeast the Air National Guard has taken the initiative in sponsoring public meetings to brief and solicit concerns of the citizens.

Even before citizens were asked into the process, Guard teams were formed at unit, state, and national levels that would eventually work with the public, elected officials, environmental organizations, and special interest groups.

Col. Joseph B. Riley, Jr., public affairs officer for the New Hampshire National Guard, is one of the key players in the study process. He has traveled throughout the Northeast along with airspace managers, representing interests of the National Guard Bureau and the affected states.

No matter how thorough the environmental impact study is, officials anticipate some opposition and dissatisfaction. Every attempt will be made to address and resolve all the issues.

"The central concern is that most people want a strong National defense," said Riley. "Yet, the people rightfully expect the military to train responsibly, and follow the rules as any good neighbor should do."

The Secretary of the Air Force will ultimately balance environmental and political concerns with national defense requirements.

The Northeast study is the first of many regional planning studies expected as the Air Guard conducts long-range training plans. Presently there are 27 airspace actions that must be addressed by the Air National Guard.

"The bottom line," concluded Riley, "is that we live in the communities, we fly in the communities, and we want to show that the neighborhood environmental concerns are ours too." (Information for this story was provided by Steven Wolf, National Guard Bureau, Office of Environmental Public Affairs)



## After many years Cape Cod will get soil, water cleanup

**By Douglas C. Karson**  
Public Affairs Officer  
Otis Air National Guard Base

In 1978, it was discovered that a municipal well in Falmouth, Mass., was tainted by contaminants later traced to the Wastewater Treatment Plant on the grounds of the Massachusetts Military Reservation (MMR). That set off a chain of events still unfolding today.

Since 1982, the Air National Guard, under the Department of Defense Installation Restoration Program (IRP), has spearheaded environmental cleanup activities on the 22,000 acres at MMR, including the Army National Guard's Camp Edwards, and the U.S. Coast Guard's Cape Cod Air Station.

In 1986, 73 sites on the reservation were identified as being potentially contaminated, and in 1989 the facility was placed on the National Priorities List under

the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (U.S. EPA) Superfund program. At present, over 40 sites are being actively investigated and eight areas of groundwater contamination also have been identified.

In July 1991, an agreement outlining the cleanup effort was signed by the National Guard Bureau (NGB), U.S. EPA, and the U.S. Coast Guard, including a joint community relations plan.

The plan outlined community participation in the cleanup process, in keeping with the requirements of NGB, U.S. EPA, and the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection.

Over the past 10 years, in an effort to identify contamination problems at the installation, extensive testing and research have been accomplished and severe criticism has been lodged by local activist groups regarding the National Guard's environmental responsibilities.

Several hundred residences in the area

that were using private wells have been converted, at NGB expense, to town water.

Local Guard officials are currently working with more than a dozen environmentally-related community organizations. To help keep communications channels open with the public, bimonthly informational meetings are held, and environmental news releases are routinely mailed to over 750 individuals.

A 24-hour environmental "hotline" also is operational, and news conferences are routinely held to discuss the ongoing cleanup efforts.

This is a milestone year for the IRP at MMR, with contaminated groundwater from one area scheduled to be pumped out, treated, and returned to the earth. In addition, a proposal has been made to treat 20,000 cubic yards of contaminated soil through a thermal desorption process, which, essentially, roasts the contaminants out of the soil and traps them in filters.





## On Guard

The National Guard

April 1992 Page 11

# I was so there!



Master Sgt. Sharon B. Page served in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia as the Maintenance NCOIC of Voice & Data Communications Systems at Central Command Headquarters. She sends this convincing photo in response to our omission of her unit, the 224th Joint Communication Support Squadron, Georgia Air National Guard, from the list of participants in December's Desert Storm special edition of "On Guard". (Photo property of Master Sgt. Sharon B. Page)

## Check your entitlement

**Fact:** Guard members and their families often suffer separation and reunion difficulties during times of call up.

**Fact:** The American Red Cross has money to help minimize the suffering resulting from Operation Desert Shield/Storm.

Money is available to reimburse families and individuals for budget counseling, child care, employment skills, and counseling.

According to Michael Guerriere, a licensed clinical social worker, and director of the Red Cross assistance project, 87 percent of the cases received by early March were for child care reimbursement, and the average grant was \$225.

**Do you qualify?**

If you served, or continue to serve in Operation Desert Shield/Storm, you and your family may qualify, and are certainly eligible to apply.

What symptoms might you expect from separation or reunion difficulties that would cause you to seek assistance?

The American Red Cross has found that symptoms like inability to cope,

abrasiveness, ineffective communication, emotional extremes, or unusual conduct may indicate the family member is suffering from reunion or separation difficulties. The behavior changes may occur at home, at school, or at work.

Funding for the assistance program comes from the U.S. Congress in a September 1991 grant, and the Department of Defense selected Red Cross as one of the agencies to administer assistance. The grant is intended to bring parity between Guard/Reserve and active duty.

The January issue of "On Guard" contained an article about another agency selected to provide similar assistance, Boys and Girls Clubs of America.

Your next step should be to call or visit your local Red Cross chapter for details.

Chief of the National Guard Bureau, Lt. Gen. John B. Conaway is a member of the project's oversight committee, and he of course, encourages eligible Guard men and women and their families to take advantage of the assistance.

## Help for Gulf vets

Six private organizations will receive \$18.3 million in grants to assist families of reserve component troops called up for Operation Desert Storm.

The agencies are the American Legion, American Red Cross, Armed Services YMCA, Boys & Girls Clubs of America, Salvation Army, and United Service Organization.

"On Guard" carried an article about the Boys and Girls Clubs of America in the January 1992 issue. An article about the American Red Cross appears elsewhere in this issue.

Working closely with the Department of Defense, these organizations are reaching out with youth programs, crisis intervention and temporary child care, budget and employment counseling, and educational and family support group assistance.

Private organizations were chosen to distribute the grants because they have a proven record of service to military families, and they have offices around the nation, making them easily accessible to National Guard and Reserve families.

The Persian Gulf war caused a serious disruption in the lives of children and military families. Children of active-duty soldiers are perhaps better able to cope with the absence of one or both parents. In addition, they usually have access to on-post services and facilities.

On the other hand, Children of Guard and Reserve families are often removed from military post facilities, and they are usually less accustomed to having parents absent for extended periods, thus the Gulf experience was especially traumatic for them.

Family members may obtain assistance by presenting military identification and the soldier's deployment orders.

The grants, which are part of the Persian Gulf Supplemental Authorization and Personnel Benefits Act of 1991, are designed to relieve the strain experienced by families of activated reservists.

## Commissary cards

Commissary privilege cards for 1992 have not been issued yet. Therefore, last year's cards are still valid until new cards are issued.

According to Lt. Col. Ron Becker with the Army Office of the Deputy Chief of Staff of Personnel, the Defense Finance and Accounting Service at Indianapolis did not obtain the cards, DD Form 2529, in time for normal distribution with the December leave and earning statements (LES). He said Guard members should have their 1992 cards by 1 May.

Individuals who already discarded their 1991 cards, thinking they were invalid, may have replacements issued by their unit.





## On Guard

The National Guard

# Fort McCoy given "operation Desert Fix" mission



A birds-eye view of one of three Desert Fix holding lots at Fort McCoy, Wis. The lots were used to store vehicles and equipment being inspected, inventoried and repaired during the post's unique equipment repair mission. (U.S. Army photo by Rob Schuette)

**FORT MC COY, Wisc.-** The war is not over at Fort McCoy, Wisc.

With the same spirit and conviction demonstrated by U.S. military forces in the Gulf, a small but dedicated Total Army team works at a unique equipment-repair mission here.

The mission, called "Operation Desert Fix," gave Fort McCoy responsibility for the inventory, inspection, repair and return of more than 5,700 pieces of equipment, 4,800 pieces of rolling stock, 900 miscellaneous items and 400 containers of field equipment. After enduring thousands of miles in a harsh environment, all of the vehicles were in need of basic service, and fully 93 percent of the vehicles needed repairs.

Ironically, the post owns none of the equipment. When the repair effort is completed, equipment will be returned to unit control. The equipment, the equivalent of a division-and-a-half's worth, is owned by 121 reserve component units located throughout nine states. The post is responsible for equipment belonging to each of 74 units it processed, trained and deployed to the war zone, as well as for units deployed through Fort Benjamin Harrison, Ind.

In June 1991, Fort McCoy faced what is considered to be one of the largest reserve-component demobilization/repair missions in the Army, "Operation Desert Fix". The post, however, lacked the necessary personnel, equipment for the demobilization and repair mission.

A task force was formed to evaluate, plan and acquire assets, tools and TOE maintenance units for the project.

At the peak of operation, 465 reserve-component soldiers had volunteered to serve active duty for special work tours toward the mission. Of these soldiers, 62 percent were Reservists, while 38 percent were Army National Guardsmen. Additionally, 100 civilians and approximately 50 active duty troops assisted in the effort.

Operation Desert Fix was 90 percent complete by the end of March. Once repaired, the majority of the equipment will be returned to units prior to their summer annual training periods.

A crew of about 165 civilian personnel will complete the residual equipment repairs due to back orders and more difficult, time consuming projects.

Fort McCoy provides a full spectrum of year-round individual and collective training opportunities for combat and combat service support personnel. On an annual basis, more than 130,000 active and reserve component personnel make use of the post's 60,000 acres of prime training land.



A soldier of the Desert Fix Task Force Consolidated Maintenance Company directs rail unloading of a truck used in the Persian Gulf War. (U.S. Army photo by Rob Schuette)

**DRUG USE  
IS  
LIFE ABUSE**