The Unified Regiment—A Progress Report

By Brigadier General Phillip R. Anderson and Brigadier General Anders B. Aadland

The *One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight* concept is about one year old. Introduced at ENFORCE XXI-96, the concept of a unified regiment electrified the Army engineer community. As participants listened, the light slowly dawned that we have a great opportunity to touch the future. The concept described the vision of our regiment as a cohesive force, part of a shrinking Army in transition, and compelled to change some "old ways" that are no longer relevant. However, the implied issue, the one that hit the center of our collective souls, was commitment among the components of the Engineer Regiment to mend the schisms that have crept into our relationships and to work as a team, transcending the "warrior" and "civil" associations that have so deeply branded each camp. We rearticulated our bonds and pledged to set our house in order collectively. It was a great week!

The enormity of coming to resolution with the concept became apparent quickly. There was far too much at stake to let the expectations wither and die. One manifestation of those expectations was that the term *One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight* was cropping up everywhere (sometimes cited as *One Corps, One Regiment, One Team*). Words are nothing without actions and the concept was a call to action. We engineers quickly identified the key axes:

- Delineate "ownership" of functional responsibilities.
- Expand participation in the doctrine-development process.
- Develop a self-sustaining mechanism to keep our training relevant and effective.
- Inspire the regiment by promoting common values and understandings.
- Demonstrate to the Army and the nation that the Corps of Engineers can speak, work, and develop as a single team.

Working on the future is tough when you are fully committed with problems in the present. We realized that we had to maintain a high level of progress toward meeting the expectations created at ENFORCE XXI-96. It's now obvious that achieving full closure will take more than a year. So, it's time for an in-progress review!

The first step of our action plan was to establish a senior oversight committee—a Unified Engineer Regiment General Officer Steering Committee (GOSC). Figure 1 shows the GOSC charter and members. The committee first met at Fort Belvoir in July 1996, then again in November 1996 and in March 1997. The GOSC decided to appoint Process Action Teams (PATs) with appropriate subject matter experts to address specific issues and develop solution sets. Major General Albert J. Genetti Jr. noted that the Engineer Regiment has the perfect tool in this GOSC process to resolve several key responsibilities in preparation for the Quadrennial Defense Review (QDR). Both a QDR process briefing and a unified regiment update briefing will be presented during ENFORCE XXI-97.

General Officer Steering Committee	
Charter: to take optimum advantage of the synergistic and complementary relationships among all parts of the unified Engineer Regiment	
Members	
■ Director of Military Programs, USACE	■ Deputy Chief of Staff for Engineers, USAREUR
■ Assistant Commandant, USAES	■ Chief, Research and Development, USACE
■ Assistant Deputy Chief of Staff for Combat Developments, TRADOC	■ Chief, Public Works, USACE
■ Assistant Chief of Engineers, Reserve Affairs	■ Honorary Colonel of the Regiment

Figure 1

Functional Responsibilities Process Action Team	
Charter: to make significant improvements in the manner in which the unified Engineer Regiment develops organizations and doctrine	
Members	
■ Deputy Commander, 412th Engineer Command	■ Commander, Waterways Experiment Station
■ Director of Combat Developments, USAES	■ Director, Office of the Chief of Engineers (Pentagon)
■ Director of Training, USAES	■ Director, Engineer Strategic Studies Center
■ FORSCOM Engineer	■ Chief of Staff, USAES

Figure 2

By the third meeting of the GOSC (on 24 March 1997), the requirements for background information had been established, and the members moved directly into substantive debate on major issues. Much of the discussion concerned preparation for the update presentation during ENFORCE-97. The GOSC made major changes to the draft script. It wanted more emphasis on future initiatives to strengthen cooperation among constituent parts of the regiment. The title "Topographer of the Army" was among the "bump-up" issues that received lively debate. The GOSC was concerned about the "looseness" of the boundaries of duties associated with the title as well as the somewhat anachronistic-sounding name itself. The GOSC also wanted more specifics concerning potential DOD-level disagreements over Engineer School humanitarian demining initiatives.

Communicating the *One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight* story is critical to achieving our goal of a truly unified regiment. Toward that end, action officers at the U.S. Army Engineer School's Directorate of Combat Developments and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' Engineer Strategic Studies Center created a Unified Regiment home page on the Internet. This home page includes a summary of the original *One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight* briefing. About 300 "guests" view the page monthly. You can locate it on the Fort Leonard Wood home page at http://www.wood.army.mil/DCD/Regiment/regiment.htm.

Figure 2 shows the first and most challenging PAT chartered by the GOSC. The Functional Responsibilities PAT recognized that no other branch of the Army has such a dual mission as does the Engineer Regiment. The regiment keeps itself trained and equipped to respond to worldwide military challenges during Army, joint, and combined operations. Engineers are also responsible to the president and Congress for many civil engineering functions that directly contribute to our national well-being and that of our friends.

The actual work of the PAT was to—

- Collect, rate, and synthesize positions and policies on functions and issues across the Engineer Regiment.
- Develop an action plan for assigning or migrating functional responsibilities.
- Recommend actions to the Unified Engineer Regiment GOSC.

Specific tasks of the Functional Responsibilities PAT were to—

- Set up common frames of reference for those engineering functional responsibilities that are subtasks for military contingency and stability and support operations. Determine which elements have the lead and which have support responsibilities for specific functional areas.
- Identify specific responsibilities for the functional areas in order to coordinate subject matter expertise from various elements within the regiment.
- Recommend, as appropriate, shifts of responsibilities for specific functions and/or force structures across the regiment.
- Develop a draft Unified Regimental Strategy for the Total Army Analysis process.

The Functional Responsibilities PAT used the Internet and a September 1996 meeting at Fort Leonard Wood to accomplish its mission. It described the various functions of Army engineers and determined which component of the regiment is the responsible advocate for each function. Figure 3 is a condensed version of the matrix developed by the PAT. The full version with 59 tasks is shown on the Unified Regiment home page. The matrix and a suggested implementation plan will be presented at the ENFORCE XXI-97 Conference.

The GOSC reviewed the results of the Functional Responsibilities PAT at its November meeting and acknowledged this work as the "dynamic baseline to portray functions within the regiment." The Functional Responsibilities PAT also identified several additional issues and recommended that the GOSC form PATs to examine them. These issues and the steering committee's decisions on which PATs to form are summarized below.

Tele-Engineering

To meet future demands for engineer support, we must find innovative ways to leverage the regiment's capabilities. Tele-engineering will provide some of

Engineer Functions Matrix—*One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight*
(predominant responsibilities)

Function/ Number of tasks	Element						
	Active	*USAR*	*ARNG*	*USACE*	*DPW*	*HNS*	*Other*
Project the Force (15)	P1/S2	P2/S2	P2/S2	S1	P1	HNS	ACSIM USAF/USN
Protect the Force (9)	P1	P2	P2	S1			
Gain Information Dominance (6)	P1	P2	P2	S1			NIMA (DMA)
Shape the Battlespace (4)	P1	P2	P2	S1			
Decisive Operations (7)	P1	P2	P2	S1			
Sustain the Force (10)	P2	P1	P1	S1			
Civil Support to the Nation (8)				P1			FEMA/EPA DOE/DOI

Legend:
P1 = primary responsibility for function execution
P2 = increased responsibility for execution as theater matures
S1 = direct support responsibility
S2 = supplemental support responsibility

Figure 3

that leverage. Advanced communications provide unprecedented opportunities to link members of the Engineer Regiment. Operation Joint Endeavor gave us a real-world taste of what is coming. For example, soldiers and airmen in Bosnia measure snow depth, record weather conditions, and take river gage readings every 2 hours. Engineers relay these readings electronically to military and civilian experts at the USACE Cold Regions Research and Engineering Laboratory and the Waterways Experiment Station. These experts combine the data with imagery and hydrologic models to produce daily forecasts on the Sava River level and river basin snow maps. Then they send the unclassified results directly to the field via the Internet. This sort of "split-based operation," where technical products and advice are transmitted from the continental United States to deployed forces, greatly enhances our ability to support contingency operations. However, engineers must continue to provide on-site support to ensure that the expertise of the entire Engineer Regiment is effectively applied during contingency operations. Tele-engineering includes enhancing the deployability of USACE and Directorate of Public Works (DPW) soldiers and civilians and developing timely operational plans that effectively use rapid response teams such as the USACE Contingency Real Estate Teams operating in Bosnia. The GOSC quickly marked this initiative as a "winner" for our future effectiveness and chartered a Tele-Engineering PAT. This PAT will give a status report at ENFORCE XXI-97.

Army Topography/ Terrain Visualization

The GOSC discussed the concept, implications, and identity of the "Topographer of the Army." They noted that topography was a prime candidate for re-engineering. We must articulate the penalties associated with the status quo—which is a confusing dichotomy of responsibilities caught between two elements of the Engineer Regiment and the intelligence contingent under the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence. The GOSC recommended, as a first step, that a PAT composed of Engineer School and USACE representatives develop a matrix of topographic functions and responsibilities. The next step will be a memo to the Deputy Chief of Staff for Intelligence inviting the intelligence community to join the PAT. This expanded regimental effort would help design the future of Army topography. The PAT will report the status of their effort at ENFORCE XXI-97.

Demining and Unexploded Ordnance—Engineers and Explosive Ordnance Disposal (EOD)

The GOSC discussed how to design a synergistic vision of battlefield cooperation between combat engineers and EOD units to deal with explosive devices (such as mines, booby traps, unexploded ordnance, and cluster munitions). Engineers clearly have the lead for breaching operations. Ordnance EOD units clearly have the lead for all "render-safe" procedures. The gray area is in

One Team—Focused!

By Major General Sam Kem (Retired)

Let's stay grounded and focused. That is tough to do these days, with bursting technology, exponentially expanding demands for information, and missions that seemingly change daily. New enthusiasms "dictate" new priorities that press against already strained resources. There are many distractions—aggressively worked by energetic people—that vie to dissipate the Engineer Regiment's focus and the focus of those who care so deeply for our regiment's future.

The value of *One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight* is that it must be a clarion call for all: To be one team, focused to—

- Ensure that we best serve our nation and our Army.
- Provide the engineer soldier and civilian the tools he/she must have to do the job.
- Grow and nurture our leadership to contribute effectively in our changing Army.
- Develop our soldiers and civilians to be all they can be.

In short, that means we must ensure that our Army engineer organization (One Corps, One Regiment) remains relevant to the Army's mission; responsive to both battlefield and national needs; and organized, equipped, and trained for the fight.

Success sometimes is measured by battlefield victory, a project constructed, or a major economic/physical disaster avoided or mitigated. Unseen and unnoticed in such dramatic times are those who fight the other battles—budgets, force structure, doctrine, national priorities, reorganization, material fielding, and personnel training and development—that allowed the big victory to happen.

The joint effort initiated by USACE and the Engineer School under the *One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight* banner can be an exercise in words—or it can provide the focus on what is important. Determining what is important—what is *vital*—is an essential task in today's rapidly changing environment. That and marshaling the resources to bring a solution is the task of our leaders.

It is right that we be *One Corps, One Regiment, One Team.* There is work to be done. Let's do it!

Major General Sam Kem (R) is the Honorary Colonel of the Engineer Regiment. He served as commandant of the Engineer School from 1984 to 1987.

clearing operations and support to civilian demining operations. To resolve this issue, we must clearly delineate the roles and missions based on the type and scope of operations. The GOSC recommended that Colonel Steve Hawkins, Commander of the 1st Armored Division Engineer Brigade, examine the issue from his Bosnian perspective. As part of this issue, the GOSC was briefed on the Engineer School's initiative to establish a resourced national Humanitarian Demining Operations Training Center. They discussed the problems USACE faced in cleaning up formerly used defense sites and the likelihood of some technology and procedural exchanges. The GOSC requested additional information on this initiative.

Engineer Doctrine Improvement

The GOSC concluded that our Engineer Regiment does as well as other proponents in creating doctrine. The problem is the current slow "industrial-age" process of writing, reviewing, editing, and publishing doctrine. They noted that engineers habitually use U.S. Army captains, allied officers, and Department of Army civilians to write doctrine. We now can electronically enlist the help of the broader engineer community, including many outside the Engineer School with a depth of appropriate experience. The Engineer School has noted that conventional doctrine development suffers from a whip-saw effect from changing priorities and resource levels. The GOSC recommended that the Engineer School develop a strategy to use our "distinguished alumni" to expand the base of doctrine expertise.

Inspire the Regiment

An observation from many who have served on the Army Staff is that engineers typically do not promote their interests or "stand together" within the key decision nodes in the national capital area. There is also a perceived sense of "distance from the proponent" expressed by our students at senior service colleges. The school's *Engineer* magazine is a well-established way to get guidance out and discourse started. The Engineer Regiment has about 200 retired general officers; we must ensure that they receive *Engineer* magazine. The same holds true for our retired Senior Executive Service retirees. Other means of distributing information include:

- U.S. Total Army Personnel Command's *Engineer Officer Bulletin*
- Army Engineer Association's *The Army Engineer* magazine
- Engineer School "Staff Notes to the Field"
- USACE Program Analysis and Evaluation "Questions and Answers" sheets

The GOSC approved a PAT to examine this issue and directed it to develop a comprehensive platform for discussing sensitive issues among the regiment.

Training is the glue that holds the Army together. Not an original observation on our part by any account, but it's just as important for our civilian components as for our soldiers. To be able to respond to our nation's needs, from warfighting to coping with natural disasters, the Engineer Regiment must develop a relevant and flexible training strategy. As our doctrine evolves, so must our training strategy change to produce meaningful individual and collective training. It does no good—indeed, it does great harm—for us to devote time and other resources to train on irrelevant processes. Only through a cooperative and collective effort across the regiment can we determine our essential training needs.

The U.S. Army Engineer Regiment has many constituent parts: TOE units in Active Army, Army Reserve (USAR), and Army National Guard (ARNG); and TDA elements, which include the engineer training base (Engineer School), the Directorate of Public Works, and USACE. These elements employ Department of the Army civilians and contractors, who are part of our team. USACE operates divisions, districts, and laboratories throughout the world. Army engineers are assigned to the Department of Defense and commands such as the National Imagery and Mapping Agency (NIMA). Finally, an important part of our team is our alumni—our retired community. It is all too easy to polarize the components of such a diverse organization, especially during a budget war in which each component tries to protect its own turf. We must not let that happen! *One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight!*

The first step toward organizational health is acknowledging the problem. We have taken this step. Now, we must go beyond that and energize the processes that will eventually become self-sustaining. Prior to ENFORCE XXI-96, we created a vision for the Engineer Regiment: *"Trained and ready, a rapidly deployable and versatile member of the strategic force...combining efficiencies of information with physical and technical capabilities, to master terrain in support of decisive victory."* We must press on to achieve this vision. The spirit of *One Corps, One Regiment, One Fight* will ensure success for the engineers, the Army, and our nation!

Brigadier General Anderson is the Assistant Chief of Engineers for Military Programs, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. He previously served as the assistant commandant of the Engineer School.

Brigadier General Aadland is the assistant commandant of the Engineer School. He previously served as the chief of staff of the Engineer School and Commander, 2nd Armored Division, Engineer Brigade, Fort Hood, Texas.

The Commander's Thought

By Major General Clair F. Gill

Is SHE an Engineer?

The engineer branch expanded the opportunities for its female officers back in October 1994. Today, all engineer officer positions, except combat line company commanders and platoon leaders, are open to women. However, many maneuver officers, as well as officers within our own corps, are still unaware that the Corps of Engineers fully supports placing women in units that directly support the front-line commander. The title question—*Is SHE an Engineer?*—is still sometimes asked when maneuver commanders receive support from bridging, construction, and even their own habitually associated combat engineer units.

The versatility of the engineer officer is one of our branch's greatest strengths. All engineer officers receive the same training. The responsibility for providing these trained officers opportunities to develop their diverse skills rests squarely on the shoulders of our field commanders. Female engineer officers have served successfully in all of the major deployments in the last several years—and they will continue to do so. Today's engineer commanders must invest in their junior female officers and expose them to the full range of corps capabilities. This investment will ensure that all of the corps' future leaders have the full range of skills required to meet our branch's diverse mission.

The face of the engineer officer may have changed, but the quality of support provided to the commander has not. How do the maneuver officers that you work with react when a female engineer officer shows up at the tactical operations center ready to meet the challenge of *ESSAYONS*?