

1969

outlined in the 18th MP Brigade Regulation 100-12. There were no prepared check lists available for use in conducting the sentry dog survey. The format for the formal written report was prescribed by the 18th MP Brigade, but it did not require an explanation or detailed description of the conditions found in the survey (See Annex B). As a consequence, the conditions were described in generalities, or not at all. Such comments as "an adequate reaction force existed at the time of the survey" were common. Only the criticality and vulnerability of the installation, and existing physical security measures such as fences, perimeter lighting, and guard positions were explained in any detail. These represented only three of the nine factors to be considered. In most cases, there was insufficient information provided for higher headquarters analysis of the survey officer's recommendations.

e. Resurvey of Sentry Dog Posts

The 18th MP Brigade did not schedule or direct periodic resurveys to reassess or confirm the conditions that affected individual sentry dog posts. Rather, resurveys were conducted only when the sentry dog company personnel reported adverse changes in conditions on a post or when the installation commander reported a change in status or mission.

f. Priority List

In September 1969 the 18th MP Brigade initiated a priority list for installations with approved sentry dog surveys. The 16th and 89th MP Groups maintained the priority lists for installations in their respective areas of responsibility. Each MP Group commander recommended assignment of priorities based on an assessment of the installation's criticality and vulnerability. Final approval of priority level was made by the 18th MP Brigade. As additional sentry dog assets became available these assets were redistributed. Sentry dog support was provided to the installation highest on the priority list that met the sentry dog employment and support requirements.

11. (f) ANALYSIS OF SENTRY DOG EMPLOYMENT

a. Analysis of Sentry Dog Surveys

Descriptions of many conditions in sentry dog survey reports were either incomplete, misleading or not current. For example:

(1) The survey of the Delta Exchange Sub Depot, Vung Tau, (See Annex B) noted that "a sufficient reaction force capability is available." In fact, there was no dedicated reaction force for this installation. The only reaction forces that could be made available were mobile military police units assigned to patrol the city of Vung Tau. Additionally, no mention was made of the distracting conditions resulting from a Vietnamese housing area and a heavily traveled street located within 100 meters of the post.

1969

function, which was required to insure adequacy of sentry dog support, resolution of problems, and validation of proper installation environmental conditions for sentry dog employment, was also accomplished by company personnel as an additional duty. The liaison function required continuing attention and considerable time.

(3) The assignment of sentry dog functions, as discussed above, to the companies resulted in heavy reliance on the companies for sentry dog operations and the staff-related functions of the responsible higher headquarters.

c. Organization

The sentry dog companies were organized along the normal organizational structure of a military police company. They were composed of five types of cellular functional teams taken from TOE 10-500E. These teams were organized into a company headquarters and three sentry dog platoons. The sentry dog platoons were further divided into detachments, which were located at the supported installations.

d. Personnel

The number of personnel authorized the sentry dog companies was adequate, with two exceptions:

(1) Unit Operations NCO

The TOE of the sentry dog company did not provide an operations NCO as a part of the company headquarters. Both companies assigned a staff sergeant (E6) from within unit assets to perform this function. The operations NCO was responsible for scheduling and supervising unit training, maintaining unit training records, scheduling and coordinating sentry dog demonstrations, and arranging for the transportation of dogs and handlers in RVN and shipment of dogs to Okinawa or CONUS for retraining. He compiled and forwarded detachment and company biweekly reports concerning unit commitments, dog team status, and operational lessons learned. He coordinated all operational matters with the separate detachments.

(2) Company Headquarters Kennel Master and Dog Trainer

The company headquarters kennel housed dogs that were in shipment from or to Okinawa without handlers, extra dogs maintained as replacements, and dogs whose handlers had rotated from RVN. Each company averaged 20 dogs in this category. As many as 45 unassigned dogs might be housed at one time in a company headquarters kennel before a shipment could be made from RVN. This number did not include the 35-50 working dogs housed in the kennel. The company TOE did not provide any personnel to supervise the care of these dogs. Both companies elected to assign

SECTION V

OBJECTIVE 4: TO DETERMINE THE MAXIMUM EFFECTIVE PERIOD OF DUTY PER DAY, WEEK AND TOUR-FOR THE ELEMENTS OF THE SENTRY DOG TEAM IN RVN.

OBJECTIVE 5: TO IDENTIFY AND QUANTIFY NON-PRODUCTIVE TIME FACTORS WHICH MAY BE USED AS A BASIS FOR MODIFICATION TO THE MANPOWER AUTHORIZATION CRITERIA.

20. (U) MAXIMUM PERIOD OF DUTY

a. A maximum daily period of on-post duty for sentry dog teams in RVN was established, by both AR 190-12 and USARV Regulation 190-12, as 6 hours. The dog teams were used only during the hours of darkness, and two shifts were employed at most installations. The first shift was from 1800 hours to 2400 hours, and the second from 2400 hours to 0600 hours daily. There was no regulatory maximum established for a weekly or total tour of duty utilization. The sentry dog team was available for duty 7 days per week, for a total of 42 hours per week. This maximum weekly utilization was rarely met, however, because, in practice, 2.5 sentry dog teams were applied against each dog post. This procedure normally provided enough dog teams at each installation to allow periodic days off for each dog team.

b. The primary consideration in determining a maximum daily utilization for a sentry dog team was a projection of effectiveness of the sentry dog and handler over a prolonged period of time. The normal tour of duty extended from 5 1/2 to 6 hours, depending on the number of hours of darkness. This period included the time required to post and relieve the dog team. Three installations had shorter duty shifts because work activity or indigenous traffic on or near the sentry dog post dictated postponing the first shift later in the evening. After the sentry dog team was posted, the team performed duty continuously for a 6-hour period. There were no posts that alternated the sentry dog teams for a 2- or 3-hour relief rather than a 6-hour shift. The primary reason given for a continuous tour of duty was the distance between the sentry dog post and the sentry dog detachment. In only two cases were the guard post facilities sufficiently near the sentry dog posts to permit alternating shifts.

c. The most frequent comment made about the length of the daily duty tour concerned the effect of boredom. Approximately 75 percent of the handlers stated they experienced extreme difficulty in maintaining alertness during the 6-hour period. The handlers also stated that their dog was unable to maintain alertness throughout the duty tour. Another significant comment concerned the physical exertion of walking a post for 6 hours. This comment was more commonly made by handlers who walked posts on hilly, sandy, muddy, or broken ground. Handlers stated that adverse weather conditions accelerated the physical deterioration of the dog team. Frequent alerts on posts located close to work activity, passing personnel, or vehicular traffic also fatigued the dog rapidly.

Activity	Daily Time Spent (Hrs)	
	Handlers	Dog
a. Work on post (includes travel time)	5.80	5.80
b. Animal care (includes grooming, veterinary care, and cleaning kennels)	.65	.35
c. Dog training	.55	.55
d. Other unit training	.20	0
e. Unit details	2.70	0
f. Time-off or rest	14.10	17.30

FIGURE V-3. Arithmetic Averages of Responses to Time Spent on Daily Activities.

Activity	Range of Time Spent (Hrs)	
	Handler	Dog
a. Work on post	3.5 - 6.1	3.5 - 6.1
b. Animal care	0.1 - 1.4	0.1 - 1.0
c. Dog training	0.1 - 1.1	0.1 - 1.1
d. Other unit training	0 - 0.9	0
e. Unit details	0.7 - 3.5	0
f. Time off or rest	12.4 - 16.7	16.2 - 20.2

FIGURE V-4. Range of Responses to Time Spent on Daily Activities

22. (U) FINDINGS

a. Sentry dog teams in RVN were employed for a continuous 6-hour daily tour of duty (Paragraph 20a).

b. Two and one-half sentry dog teams were applied against each sentry dog post (Paragraph 20b).

c. Approximately 75 percent of the dog handlers reported difficulty in maintaining team alertness over a continuous 6-hour period (Paragraph 20c).

OBJECTIVE 7: TO DETERMINE ADEQUACY OF THE CURRENT TRAINING OF SENTRY  
DOGS AND HANDLERS

26. (U) PREDEPLOYMENT TRAINING

a. General

The predeployment training of US Army sentry dog handlers was conducted by the US Air Force at Lackland Air Force Base, Texas, or by the US Army at the USARPAC Sentry Dog School on Okinawa. Of the 98 handlers interviewed during the evaluation, 85 percent were trained on Okinawa. It was the opinion of dog handlers and dog supervisory personnel that the basic predeployment training was sound; however, some improvements were recommended. These are discussed in the following paragraphs.

b. Environmental Conditions

Handlers reported that predeployment training was accomplished on sentry dog posts established under ideal or desirable conditions. These conditions were rarely found in RVN. Additional training oriented to the peculiarities of sentry dog personnel to perform their mission. Emphasis should be placed on recognizing undesirable and unacceptable environmental conditions for sentry dog utilization.

c. Dog Alerts

Approximately 75 percent of the handlers stated they could not distinguish between their dog's alert on an animal and an alert on a human until after they had begun walking posts in RVN. Although all sentry dogs alert differently, there was a distinct difference in the way dogs alerted on an animal and on a human. Predeployment training noted there was a difference, but provided no practical instruction in alert on animals. The sentry dog units in RVN recorded frequent alerts on animals near sentry dog posts. As a result, unit training emphasized dog alerts on animals for handlers newly arrived in RVN and continually stressed it during periodic training periods.

d. Communications

Except for limited training on the AN/PRC-25 and AN/PRC-46 radios during MP Advanced Individual Training, it was reported that no predeployment communication training was given sentry dog personnel. In addition, no communication training was included in the sentry dog school program of instruction. Only 10 percent of the handlers interviewed felt qualified upon arrival in RVN to employ communication equipment used by sentry dog personnel in-country. The problem was overcome with minimum difficulty by on-the-job and unit training.

e. Dog Records

Dog handlers reported they received 2 hours of training on dog-related records during their 8-week predeployment training. This training consisted of familiarization instruction on dog training and veterinary records. Handlers and supervisory personnel were unanimous in stating a need for additional predeployment training on sentry dog records.

27. (U) UNIT TRAINING

a. Required Training

USARV Regulation 100-12, Paragraph 7, provided guidance for unit daily training programs. This regulation directed each unit to conduct a minimum of 4 hours on dog and handler training per week. The following subject areas were included in the training program:

- (1) Obedience training
- (2) Obstacle course training
- (3) Agitation training
- (4) Attack training to include attacks under gunfire.
- (5) Guarding and escorting prisoners.
- (6) Detection training, or scouting problems, to include scent and sight alerts.

b. Unit Training Programs

(1) Responses of 98 dog handlers, who filled out daily activity logs totaling 1351 handler days, revealed that sentry dog detachments averaged 3.7 hours of unit training weekly. The weekly training time in various detachments ranged from 1 hour to 7.8 hours. Adverse weather conditions during wet weather periods limited training time in some cases. While weather and training facilities contributed to some extent to the variance in unit training, the single most important factor was the emphasis placed on training by the detachment commander. The wide dispersion of the sentry dog detachments did not permit close command supervision. In addition, several isolated detachments were commanded by E5s (as noted in paragraph 9e), and lacked direct supervision by experienced senior dog handler personnel.

(2) All required types of training were conducted except attack under gunfire, and guarding and escorting prisoners. Additionally, training in scouting took place in only two detachments. Guarding and escorting prisoners was not an assigned mission for sentry dog units in RVN and therefore constituted no problem. However, a training problem existed with