

CHAPTER IV
ADMINISTRATION

The process by which the Command administered its multifaceted responsibilities remained relatively stable during the ten year period. Staff and support functions comprising this segment of Command activity underwent a period of refinement rather than massive overall revision. Perhaps the most volatility was experienced in refining the Command's management system. Yet despite major improvements in program management, the basic concepts underlying the Command's management philosophy had emerged unscathed.

CHANGE OF COMMAND

In November 1965 Rear Admiral Peter Corradi completed his four-year term as Chief of the Bureau of Yards and Docks. Enduring management innovations marked Admiral Corradi's tenure.¹ In 1965 Admiral Corradi received the Distinguished Service Medal for his achievements in that office.²

¹RADM A. C. Husband, "Annual Message to Naval Facilities Engineering Command Headquarters Personnel" (1 Nov 1967).

²The Navy Civil Engineer (May-Jun 1965), p. 33.

Rear Admiral A. C. Husband, after two years service as Deputy Chief, for which he earned the Legion of Merit,³ succeeded Admiral Corradi. While reaffirming and continuing the management innovations of his predecessor, Admiral Husband, in addition to presiding over the Command's response to the Southeast Asia emergency, gave new impetus and importance to the Command's activities in the field of facilities planning.

Rear Admiral Walter Enger, Commanding Officer of the Command's Chesapeake Division, replaced Admiral Husband as second-in-command. Four years later, in August 1969, he relieved Rear Admiral Husband as Commander. Simultaneously Rear Admiral James Bartlett assumed the post of Vice Commander. During his tenure Admiral Enger skillfully guided the Command from wartime to peacetime operational status.⁴ He subsequently received the Distinguished Service Medal for his accomplishments as Commander.⁵

In October 1972 Rear Admiral Albert Marschall relieved Admiral Bartlett as second-in-command. Less than a year later, in May 1973, he succeeded to the post of Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command and Chief of Civil Engineers. Besides consolidating the work of his predecessor during the transitional period, he led the Command during a period of rapidly changing environment and emphasis which had

³CEC Biweekly Report (16 November 1965).

⁴The Navy Civil Engineer (Spring 1972), p. 3.

⁵"RADM Marschall Assumes Command; RADM Enger Retires," PAC-FACTS (Jun 1973).

resulted from the wind-down and conclusion of Vietnam conflict.

Rear Admiral Donald Iselin has served as Vice Commander beginning in September 1973.

MANAGEMENT

In 1965 the Naval Facilities Engineering Command's managerial system, management by program, was still in its infancy. The system had grown from the Command's own internal needs, but at the same time, rested upon technological changes which had made it feasible and which reflected a general trend in the development of management practice.⁶

The program management approach had been foreshadowed by Rear Admiral Eugene J. Peltier during his years as Chief,⁷ but the concept and its subsequent implementation stemmed directly from Rear Admiral Peter Corradi's term at the helm. Both men had perceived the growing trend toward and need for the development of sophisticated management skills to complement and aid the Command in its

⁶ For general background on program management in the Command, see "Management by Programs," CEC Biweekly Report (21 Oct 1965), pp. 1-2; CAPT R. J. Pratt, "Management by Areas of Responsibility," Chief's Annual Conference (May 1963); CAPT J. G. Dillon, "Management by Programs Fits Budocks Needs and Operations," Navy Management Review (Jun-Jul 1965), pp. 4-7.

⁷ RADM E. J. Peltier, "Long Range Objectives and Policies," CEC Bulletin (Jun 1959), pp. 3-6.

long-standing pursuit of technical excellence.⁸ Put another way, the Command's top management had decided to abandon the "seat of the pants methods" of previous generations in favor of a new, more scientific management approach.⁹ The common observation that government was robbed of private industry's barometer of success - the profit and loss statement - meant that the Command had to forge new paths in order to effect management improvements.¹⁰

The selected concept, program management, began with a complete analysis and formulation of the tasks which constituted the Command's assigned workload. Related tasks were then combined into ten functional programs which together covered the entire range of Command activities. Management of each program became the responsibility of a program manager, who also served as head of the organizational group which dealt, after the reorganization of 1963, with the related functional area. Initially, every program also had a coordinator to pull its efforts together.

Program management with its precise definition of workload elements, permitted correction of previously existing managerial

⁸ Peltier, "Long Range Objectives," p. 3; "Verbatim Transcript of Rear Admiral Peter Corradi's Annual Speech to All Hands in Budocks" (14 Feb 1964).

⁹ CAPT D. E. Carberry, "FEO Management of Bureau Programs," Bureau/Field Maintenance Conference (9-13 Sep 1963).

¹⁰ CAPT J. G. Dillon, "Review of Program Management" (May 1965).

weaknesses as well as greater management control of resources and flexibility in their use. Before, management had lacked the means to focus on clear and definite objectives and to balance the value of the performance of a given task against its actual cost. "This," Captain J. G. Dillon observed, "made us vulnerable to external pressure and resulted in passing an unsupported workload to the field."¹¹ In effect, managers could now substitute their own categories - categories responsive to their needs and based upon the work they actually performed - for the unresponsive categories imposed by the budgetary process. Cost and prospective benefits could now be identified with work to be done and comparisons made to facilitate decisions as to the optimum distribution of resources and effort. By providing a means to highlight problem areas, the system also facilitated the employment of management by exception techniques.¹² In summary, the key objectives of program management were to identify tasks, fix responsibility, provide a work-oriented budget system, permit establishment of goals and targets, and measure performance.¹³

In order to make program management work the Command devised a number of management tools: (1) Beginning in June 1965, an annual

¹¹Dillon, "Management by Program," pp. 4-6.

¹²Dillon, "Management by Programs," pp. 4-6; Pratt, "Management by Areas of Responsibility;" CDR T. F. O'Neill, "A Program Management System for BUDOCKS Field Engineering Offices," The Navy Civil Engineer (Jun 1964), pp. 6-7.

¹³CDR R. E. Dickman, "Integrated Program Management System Provides Information to Top Management," Navy Management Review (Jun-Jul 1965), p. 8.

Operating Plan set forth program goals for the coming five years, with each goal broken down into annual targets contributing to its achievement. The Operating Plan was revised semi-annually beginning in 1966;¹⁴ (2) An integrated Program Management System, first implemented in fiscal year 1964, served as the information system which assisted in making program management workable. It identified the organizational responsibilities for the tasks set forth in the Operating Plan and provided the data feed-back necessary for monitoring and, hence, controlling execution;¹⁵ (3) An Appraisal Office (before the reorganization of Code 01 in 1967) carried out the all-important function of appraising performance against target, and a Management Information Center presented this information in concise visual form. Both the Office and the Center dated from 1963; an Instruction in January 1965 set forth their general principles and established their procedures.¹⁶

While the Command had operated under program management since fiscal

¹⁴ NAVFAC Operating Plans 1-66, 1-67, 2-67, 1-68, 2-68; BUDOCKS Notice 5000 of 3 Jun 1965.

¹⁵ Dickman, "Integrated Program Management System;" NAVFAC Instruction 7300.7D of 29 Jun 1967, enclosure (1); For a more detailed discussion of IPMS refer to Chapter 5 in this history.

¹⁶ C. A. Besser, Jr., "A Working Tool - the Management Information Center," Navy Management Review (Jun-Jul 1965), pp. 13-15; BUDOCKS Instruction 5200.12 of 21 Jan 1965.

year 1964 and the approach had been endorsed by Admiral Corradi and reaffirmed by Admiral Husband,¹⁷ the system remained through the late 1960s in what might be called a developmental stage. Doubtless, concentration of effort in Southeast Asia, with its greatly intensified pressures on day-to-day business, did not offer particularly favorable conditions for far-reaching management innovations. In addition, any major rearrangement of the traditional ways of doing things seems bound to encounter a certain amount of foot-dragging and inertia¹⁸ - not to mention confusion. To some extent, implementation of the system fell to the lot of a management-generation for whom it represented an adopted child rather than one conceived by themselves.¹⁹ On the more positive side, however, these problems stemmed from the Naval Facilities Engineering Command's position as a leader in the field of program management. Following its early exploration and

¹⁷RADM Peter Corradi, "Chief of Bureau of Yards and Docks Speaks of Management," Navy Management Review (Jun-Jul 1965), p. 3; RADM A. C. Husband, "Draft Remarks to All Hands" (Feb 1966).

¹⁸Peltier, "Long Range Objectives..." noted that some of his people regarded this "management stuff" as "the bunk;" Corradi, "Address to Chief's Annual Conference," (1964) expressed pleasure with present responsiveness to new management policies while suggesting that in the past cooperation had not always been so whole-hearted.

¹⁹By 1 May 1966, four of a group of five officers (Corradi, Dillon, Pratt, Dickman, Carberry) most closely associated with the beginnings of program management had retired or been transferred from Headquarters.

implementation of program management concepts, there occurred an explosion of knowledge and experience in this realm. As a result, personnel later inheriting the system not only more thoroughly understood the concept but readily accepted it.²⁰

In practice, several areas of weakness appeared. The system depended upon rapid dissemination of accurate information, especially between the field and headquarters, but in its early operation rapidity and accuracy of communication did not always prevail. On the basis of experience, the need for formulating more useful goals and targets became clear - goals and targets that would meet the criteria of attainability, significance, and expression in terms useful and informative for decision making and in terms of resource estimates as well as functional requirements. At the other end of the management process, the appraisal function showed need of strengthening. Furthermore, the Operating Plan applied only to the Engineering Field Divisions, which meant that only a part of the overall organization was fully integrated into the program management system.

In 1967 the Command undertook a concerted effort to solve some of these problems. Conferences and studies led to steps aimed at strengthening the appraisal function, improving communication within Headquarters and between it and the field, and formulating the Operating Plan in operationally more useful form. At the same time, the question of integrating the entire organization more fully into

²⁰ Memo from RADM R. F. Jortberg, CEC, USN to COMNAVFAC of 10 May 1974.

the program management system came under discussion.²¹

On balance, the new management system, by the end of the decade still appeared to be in an advanced shake-down stage. That it had, in spite of deficiencies, already begun to prove itself is suggested by the comment of Rear Admiral Ralph L. Shifley that the Command was "doing a better job with no increase in personnel but (with) better management."²²

Efforts during the 1960s toward smoothly integrating the Command's management system into the organization were supplanted in the 1970s by an era of reappraisal and refinement. It should be noted, however, that throughout the period under consideration the concept of management by programs was continually reaffirmed as a fundamentally sound basis for managing the Naval Facilities Engineering Command.

New management innovation began in 1970 in response to fiscal retrenchment and far-reaching organizational realignment.²³ The

²¹ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69 is a concrete manifestation of the effort toward improvement in the system. Its forward notes two innovations: "First, it contains planned resources identified to work requirements; second, and most important, it is the product of an enlightening dialogue among the Commanders/Commanding Officers of the EFD's, the NAVFAC Program Managers, and the Command Advisory Board."

²² The remark was made at a NAVMAT meeting on 3 Aug 1966 according to a CNM memo of the same date.

²³ Reference is made to resource restraints associated with the wind-down of the war in Vietnam and the consolidation of the Engineering Field Divisions.

Command's response to these environmentally imposed limitations was an attempt to strengthen its managerial foundation and effectiveness by strengthening its basis, management by programs. To improve its management schema, several actions were identified as necessary:²⁴

- (1) Clarify the Command management concept so that it would be easily understood by all personnel.
- (2) Rearrange the organizational components under the Director of Programs and Comptroller. Establish two new divisions, Programs and Systems, and emphasize the continuity of operations between the Budget Division and the Programs Division. Remove all administrative functions from the Director of Programs and Comptroller to permit total concentration on mission operations.
- (3) Establish a new program for Military Construction Programming, a relatively recent addition to the Command's functional family.
- (4) Extend the program management concept to include "all Command functions, funds, and field activities."²⁵

While the above was not an exhaustive list of future developments, it served as an initial framework and stepping-off point for an intensive effort to improve the Command's management system. As the Command

²⁴ Memo from COMNAVFAC to Commanders and Commanding Officers of EFDs, CBCs, and PWCs of 26 January 1971; Memo from COMNAVFAC to NAVFAC Deputy Commanders, Assistant Commanders and Division Directors of 22 Dec 1970.

²⁵ Ibid.

sought to implement changes, new problems arose which either replaced or supplanted past efforts.

Assisted by new lines of development in the field of management, the Command began a long-term effort to correlate resources with objectives after the fashion of a true management by objectives program.²⁶ Progress in this area was most evident in the Command's Operating Plans and, later, the Command Management Plans. The Operating Plan for 1969 was the first to include resources in conjunction with a listing of the Command's tasks to be accomplished in the forthcoming fiscal year. Lacking, however, was a breakdown of resources by appropriation and the inclusion of organizational components other than the Engineering Field Divisions.²⁷

By 1970 the Command's Operating Plan was recognizable only as a pure resource report. At the same time, the field organizations had become very comfortable with a simple listing of their tasks and the resources allocated to accomplish these tasks.²⁸ The 1970 Operating Plan, however, was the first to divide resources by appropriation, a particularly important addition in view of the different restraints and requirements associated with each. Also added was a section

²⁶ Interview with Mr. Wayne Grupe, NAVFAC Programs Division, Code 12A, 1 Aug 1975.

²⁷ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-69.

²⁸ Grupe interview.

entitled "Objectives for Special Command Attention" which gave a listing of tasks with high priority for the coming fiscal year.²⁹

While the Operating Plan for 1971 followed much the same format as that of the previous year, behind the scenes activity was culminating in a radical new departure for this Command management instrument. Much time had been spent redefining concepts to make them more readily understandable and educating personnel in the Command's management philosophy. Programs were asked to prepare a list of goals as distinguished from tasks.³⁰ The result was the Command Management Plan which, for the first time, set forth in one comprehensive document the Command's mission, policies, objectives, goals, and resources. The document was divided into three segments - the Precepts, the Objectives Plan, and the Operating Plan. The Precepts established the basic framework in which the Command operated; it included charter authority, management philosophy, and policy. The Objectives Plan was composed of long-range and mid-range Command goals. The Operating Plan identified achievements expected in the coming fiscal year along with resources, by appropriation, allocated to attain these achievements.³¹

²⁹ NAVFAC Operating Plan 1-70.

³⁰ Grupe interview.

³¹ Blueprint (29 Nov 1971); FY 1972 Command Management Plan, NAVFAC P-441 (Jun 1971).

Illustrative of the refined Command management concept was a pyramid diagram showing Command objectives at the very peak followed in descending order by long-range program objectives, intermediate or mid-range objectives, and then annual goals.³²

Yet another management innovation was wrought during the year of the first Command Management Plan. In the budgeting process the Command had, for the most part, forsaken the practice of budgeting from historical data. Previously, resources had been distributed in proportions similar to that of the prior funding year. The new Command Management Plan sought to use historical data as only one factor in resource allocation. The guiding force in the budgeting process was to be the objectives set forth in Command's new, comprehensive management document.³³

The Command Management Plans prepared between 1972 and 1974 remained essentially the same in format.³⁴ A searching reappraisal in 1974, however, was to conclude that the Command had failed to fully relate resources to goals - the major thrust of the refined management concept. The Command Management Plans had become too detailed and had

³² RADM J. V. Bartlett, "Command Management Plan (NAVFAC P-441)." Chief's Progress Report (1972).

³³ Ibid.

³⁴ Command Management Plans, NAVFAC P-441 of FY 1973 (Jun 1972), FY 1974 (Jun 1973), and FY 1975 (June 1974).

placed an overabundance of emphasis on resources. Beyond this, many programs had merely reworded their traditional tasks in an attempt to develop goals.³⁵

In 1974 a special study group, chaired by Rear Admiral R. F. Jortberg, was assigned the task of reviewing the current Command Management Plan and its implementation.³⁶ The two-phased study once again reaffirmed the viability of the Command's management concept. A forthcoming report, however, suggested several areas of improvement and was to serve as the framework for still further improvements. After soliciting views from many components of the Command, it appeared that problems were centered in several key areas.³⁷ Firstly, the language used within the plan was unclear and, consequently, the Command's management philosophy was both misunderstood, and, worse yet, lacked credibility. In addition, the plan emphasized the management of resources while understating the importance of the management of products or outputs. It was also deemed necessary to simplify the management process in order to make it more readily

³⁵ Grupe interview.

³⁶ Memo from COMNAVFAC to CAPT R. F. Jortberg, CEC, USN of 8 Jan 1974.

³⁷ NAVFAC message 101741Z of Jan 1974 requested comments on the strengths and weaknesses of the Command Management Plan. It was suggested that the greatest potential for improvement probably existed in (1) goal and program structure and orientation, (2) the appraisal concept, (3) resource allocation effectiveness, (4) IPMS, and/or (5) the format of the plan.

understandable. Perhaps one of the most important issues raised was in the realm of appraisal. Despite several efforts to incorporate a systematic appraisal process since the inception of management by programs, one had yet to be introduced that would serve as an effective management tool. Hence, the study group felt it was essential to devise and implement a simple and practical appraisal process. Furthermore, it was believed that certain extensive format changes to the Command Management Plan would greatly enhance its clarity and usefulness. Finally, since effectiveness of the system rested on understanding and participation by all personnel, a continuing, comprehensive training program was considered essential.³⁸

Two sets of recommendations, designed to alleviate the above noted problems, were presented. Phase I recommendations were aimed at making immediate (fiscal year 1975) improvements in the system. Noteworthy among them were the following:³⁹

- (a) Increase Command emphasis on the management of output or results through the establishment of complementary output and input plans.
- (b) Simplify the output and input plans by eliminating detailed annual increments.
- (c) Conduct an appraisal of the concept of management by exception.

³⁸ Ltr from RADM R. F. Jortberg, CEC, USN to COMNAVFAC of 10 May 1974.

³⁹ Ibid., enclosure (3).

- (d) Improve the format of the Command Management Plan to make it a more meaningful and useful document.
- (e) Initiate a limited training program to provide instruction on the Command's management process.
- (f) Refine the present system of resource allocation.
- (g) Clearly define areas of emphasis and de-emphasis.

Phase II recommendations included actions that would require extensive study before implementation. Areas of consideration included (a) clarification of the Command's management process (i.e. distinguishing between program and functional management, describing a priority system, and discussing the appraisal process), (b) establishment of a workable appraisal and priority system, (c) reestablishment of the old Real Estate Program to be renamed the Land Management Program, (d) revision of the Command Management Plan's format, (e) development of a continuous, comprehensive training program on the management process, (f) improvement of communication between the Command and its field organizations, and (g) inclusion of both the Construction Battalion Centers and the Public Works Centers in the Command Management Plan.⁴⁰

While the foregoing became a current guideline for future development, other previously mentioned issues were to remain in

⁴⁰ Ltr from RADM R. F. Jortberg, CEC, USN to COMNAVFAC of 10 May 1974, enclosure (4).

the limelight. For instance, as an outcome of further study on an effective priority system, the Command discovered that its method of delineating goals was out of line. Thus, work on furthering some of the studies recommendations would be postponed until the Command's goals had been redefined. Effort would be directed toward categorizing the many different types of goals inherent in the Command's mission.⁴¹

Throughout the period under consideration, the Command's management concept had continued to develop in a forward-looking, evolutionary manner. While detailed discussion of the Command's constant struggle for improvement may give the appearance that this was an area of endeavor riddled with problems, the contrary was closer to the truth. The management process can never be a static function and constant refinement of the system was an essential part of keeping it current and useful. In fact, a Naval Material Command inspection report on the Command's management system noted that "while the system is still being perfected it appears to come closer to a true demonstration of Management by Objectives than others reviewed to date."⁴²

⁴¹Grupe interview.

⁴²Memo from C. K. Hall, MAT 0424, to Team Leader of 27 Sep 1973, enclosure (1).

POLICY PLANNING

Policy planning, according to an authoritative definition, is an effort to shape the future by exerting influence on trends that flow from the past into the present. Within the Command this effort was embodied in a staff office. In more practical terms, the Policy Planning Office "studied events and trends effecting the Command's policies, evaluated current policies, studied internal and pertinent external problems and developments, studied the plans of others which might affect Command policies, and formulated long-range policy that would serve as a framework for program planning and as a guide for decision making on current operational issues."⁴³ Ancillary functions included serving as the control point for staff studies and as the secretary for the Command Advisory Board.⁴⁴

Policies arose out of the objectives and needs of the organization as well as from forces imposed by the external environment. Since a large and complex organization such as the Command operated with a wide range of purposes and programs, it was important to disseminate policy guidance. In an organization where policy formulation was accomplished by top management, such a procedure ensured consistency of action by those persons tasked with execution of the Command's programs.⁴⁵

⁴³ Memo from NAVFAC 09P to NAVFAC 01 of 27 Dec 1972.

⁴⁴ Headquarters Organization Manual, NAVFAC P-313.

⁴⁵ RADM E. J. Peltier, CEC, USN, Forward to BUDOCKS Policy Reference Book, NAVDOCKS P-329 (Nov 1960).

To this end, the Command published a Policy Reference Book which was updated periodically to provide a convenient digest for policy reference. The document was not intended to be all-inclusive; it highlighted major policies with the ultimate objective of fostering uniformity of purpose.⁴⁶

Also, beginning in 1961, a booklet known as Precepts was periodically published. It served as a compendium of the Command's broad objectives; a statement of the fundamentals guiding the Command toward achievement of its goals.⁴⁷ In later years, of course, policy statements and long-range objectives were included in the new, comprehensive Command Management Plan.⁴⁸ Nevertheless, for ease of widespread distribution, the Command continued to publish Precepts separately as well.

Organizationally the Policy Planning Office was removed from the cognizance of the Director of Programs and Comptroller and situated as a special staff office in 1970.⁴⁹ When this reorganization was assessed at a later date, the soundness and wisdom of the decision

⁴⁶ Policy Reference Book, NAVFAC P-329 (Aug 1969); Policy Reference Book, NAVFAC P-329 (Jan 1972).

⁴⁷ Civil Engineer Corps and Bureau of Yards and Docks Precepts, BUDOCKS (1961); Civil Engineer Corps and Bureau of Yards and Docks Precepts, BUDOCKS (Oct 1963); Civil Engineer Corps and Naval Facilities Engineering Command Precepts, NAVFAC (Jul 1971).

⁴⁸ See Command Management Plans.

⁴⁹ Key to Routing Slips of 1970.

was affirmed. One matter, however, which continued to trouble the Command was the differentiation of functions between the Policy Planning Office and the Programs Division. This was later resolved with recognition of the two different meanings of "planning" as applied to these organizational components. As such, the Policy Planning Office was to concern itself with policy formulation and adherence while the Programs Division was to concern itself with program planning and current operations.⁵⁰

FINANCIAL MANAGEMENT

The Naval Facilities Engineering Command operated within the tenants of the Department of Defense's Planning, Programming and Budgeting System (PPBS). The PPBS was the normal process through which the Secretary of the Navy and the Secretary of Defense determined future force levels, weapon systems, and support programs.⁵¹ Within the programming subsystem concepts and objectives were transformed into resource requirements. This was accomplished through systematic approval procedures which projected costs five years into the future and forces for an additional three years.⁵² Consequently, the impact of current decisions on the future were readily apparent.

⁵⁰ Memo from NAVFAC 09P to NAVFAC 01.

⁵¹ Department of the Navy Programming Manual (5 June 1971).

⁵² Ibid.

Budgets were derived annually on the basis of the forces and programs set forth in the first program year of the Five Year Defense Plan (FYDP). Actual budgets, however, were expressed in greater detail than in the FYDP because they resulted from a culmination of separate budgets submitted by various defense components.⁵³

Within the Command, budget formulation and review were performed under the auspices of the Director of Programs and Comptroller. Exceptions, however, included Military Construction and Facilities Management financial responsibilities for which the Command acted as agent for the Chief of Naval Operations. In military construction matters, the Command developed program requirements with major claimants and performed the function of formulation and justification to higher authority. In facilities management matters, the Command provided the major claimant and the Chief of Naval Operations with financial advice in deriving funding requirements. In all other areas, however, the process began with requests to the program managers, noting any fiscal constraints, for individual program requirements. Any program requirements in excess of funds authorized were either forwarded to higher authority in an attempt to attain additional monies or closely examined in order to develop a workable alternative.

Budget execution and review was also a joint effort of the Director of Programs and Comptroller and the other program managers. Following

⁵³ Department of the Navy Programming Manual (5 Jun 1971).

a presentation to the Command Advisory Board concerning funds available from the various appropriations, the program managers submitted detailed plans to obtain the necessary funding documents.

Official accounting for Command funds, with the exception of Family Housing and Military Construction, was accomplished by the Naval Material Command Support Activity (NMCSA).

Key Command appropriations, essential for carrying out its assigned mission, were as follows:⁵⁴

- (a) Operations and Maintenance, Navy (OMN)
- (b) Operations and Maintenance, Navy Reserve (OMNR)
- (c) Other Procurement, Navy (OPN)
- (d) Research, Development, Test and Evaluation, Navy (RD TEN)
- (e) Military Construction, Navy (MCON)
- (f) Military Construction, Navy Reserve (MCNR)
- (g) Family Housing Management Account, Defense (FHMAD)
- (h) Wildlife Conservation, Military Reservations, Navy (WCMRN)

In addition, the Command's Public Works Centers operated under the Navy Industrial Fund. The budget was prepared separately for each appropriation source utilized. The Command's budget must, in the end, interface with that of the entire Navy.⁵⁵

⁵⁴ Interview with Mr. M.C. DeLacy, NAVFAC Budget Division, Code 0132, 4 Aug 1975.

⁵⁵ Interview with Ms. F. Morgan, NAVFAC Budget Division, Code 013, 4 Aug 1975.

Adding to the complexity of the Command's financial process was its intimate relationship to the program management concept. Relating resources to Command objectives was no easy chore and required that program management and fiscal management be closely aligned.

While the above only provides an overview of the Command's financial management process, a more detailed discussion of funding levels and constraints is found throughout the remainder of the history.

SPECIAL STAFF

Counsel

Construction and the procurement of associated architectural-engineering services as well as specialized equipment were the backbone of the Command's responsibilities and, as such, generated the most legal problems. Dominating the period, of course, was the conflict in Southeast Asia. Legal problems associated with the huge construction program there began cropping up in 1966 and continued into 1974. Another particularly traumatic event was the suspension and later reinstatement of the Davis-Bacon Act which resulted in protested determinations of which contracts to award and which to readvertise. Individual actions needing extensive legal assistance included the construction of VLF Pacific, Projects AUTEK and Sanguine, support facilities for the Trident missile and submarine system, and the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences.⁵⁶

⁵⁶ Annual Reports, NAVFAC Office of Counsel (Fiscal Years 1965-1974).

The Command's responsibility for the acquisition, management, and disposal of the Navy's huge real estate holdings also presented a host of legal problems. While relatively few real estate actions transpired during the period, those that did required painstaking negotiation and preparation. Noteworthy legal involvement in real estate transactions included the acquisition of the town of Port Chicago, California for a safety buffer zone around an ammunition depot and the acquisition of land on Sewells Point in Virginia. Land management problems requiring the most legal action involved encroachment by nearby civilian communities on Navy property.⁵⁷

Counsel also furnished legal assistance in the procurement of public utility services. Legal action pertaining to utility services posed special problems, primarily because of the role of local government and regulatory bodies. Emphasis in the 1960s was on stemming pollution and, hence, many legal dilemmas arose over sewage service. Of central concern in the 1970s were rising public utility costs associated with pollution abatement measures and the energy crisis. Counsel represented the Navy and sometimes other federal agencies as well in legal action aimed at halting or reversing rate increases.⁵⁸

Counsel also concerned itself with the legal aspects of the Navy

⁵⁷ Annual Reports, NAVFAC Office of Counsel (Fiscal Years 1965-1974).

⁵⁸ Ibid.

Family Housing Program. In the latter half of the 1960s it was deeply involved in the Wherry and Capehart acquisition programs. Its responsibilities for management of Navy Capehart Quarters, Incorporated were also quite weighty. As more unusual forms of housing acquisition surfaced during the ten year period, Counsel provided advice and conducted negotiations. The advent of the new turn key contractual method for family housing construction required additional legal expertise.⁵⁹

Counsel busied itself reviewing and commenting upon yearly legislation which had some impact on the Command's responsibilities. Of continuing interest was legislation relating to the Military Construction Program. A new and continually expanding role for Counsel was that of the liaison with the Government Accounting Office. Throughout the ten year period Counsel commented upon and responded to Government Accounting Office inquiries and reports.⁶⁰

Eventually, of course, some legal problems became claims and the Command was faced with litigation. In such instances, Counsel represented the government both within the Command and before the Armed Forces Board of Contract Appeals, and assisted the Department of Justice in dealing with litigation resulting from the Command's business transactions.

⁵⁹ Annual Reports, NAVFAC Office of Counsel (Fiscal Years 1965-1974).

⁶⁰ Ibid.

Small Business

In compliance with the Small Business Act of 1953 the Command has long sought to award a fair share of its contracts to small business firms. In doing so it has encouraged and enhanced business competition and, at the same time, fostered the continued survival of small business as a viable economic force. During the ten year period the Command's small business program has been constantly emphasized.

Goals for the small business program were set at a proportion of the total dollar value of all contracts awarded. The Command's goals ranged from 43 percent to 72 percent throughout the period 1965 to 1974. On only three occasions did the Command fail to meet its goals and then by very small margins. In the majority of years goals were not only met, but often greatly exceeded.⁶¹

The scope of the program was expanded during the period to include economic utilization. Also known as the Labor Surplus Area Set-Aside Program, its aim was to place government contracts in areas of high unemployment and, as a consequence, provide the nation's hardcore unemployed with both jobs and training.⁶²

Increasing emphasis was placed over the years on assisting economically disadvantaged firms through the contract award process.⁶³

⁶¹Interview with Mr. B. Barston, NAVFAC Small Business/Economic Utilization and Contractor Liaison Office, Code 09J, 3 Aug 1975.

⁶²NAVFAC Programming and Problems Relating to Industry/Government Pilot Program for Hardcore Unemployed (Compendium of documents).

⁶³Section B (a) of Small Business Act.

Wholehearted participation by the Command accounted for the placement of over half of the Navy's contracts and 30 percent of the Navy's resources devoted to this program during 1974.⁶⁴

To assist prospective firms in submitting bids for contracts, the Small Business/Economic Utilization Office published a pamphlet entitled How to be Considered for NAVFAC Contracts.⁶⁵

Public Affairs

The Public Affairs Office was tasked with the responsibility of informing the public about the accomplishments of the Command, the Civil Engineer Corps, and the Seabees. Through the dissemination of information and other appropriate materials to the press, radio, television and other mass communication media, the Public Affairs Office carried out its mission. The period 1965 through 1974 was a particularly active one for the Command's public affairs effort. From the 25th Anniversary of the Seabees, to the war in Vietnam, to preparation for the nation's bicentennial celebration, the Command's accomplishments were continually presented to the public.

In 1967 the Silver Anniversary of the Seabees provided the Command with an opportunity to renew the nation's image of these "CAN DO!" constructionmen. Particular emphasis was given to their role in

⁶⁴Barston interview.

⁶⁵How to be Considered for NAVFAC Contracts, NAVFAC P-303 (Sep 1971).

Vietnam and the continuing recruitment effort for additional Seabees.⁶⁶ Besides nationwide media coverage, a Seabee float adorned the Rose Bowl Parade and a special postal cancellation was issued by the Postmaster General. Seabees were even represented in such favorite comic strips as Steve Canyon and Gasoline Alley. For their exemplary public affairs effort during the anniversary year, the Public Relations Society of America presented the Command with one of its highest honors, the Silver Anvil Award.⁶⁷

In 1969 the Command was represented on a Joint Information Team covering the famous TEKTITE I Project. Not only did a group of top Seabee divers emplace the underwater habitat, but a Seabee detachment from Amphibious Construction Battalion 2 had earlier built the base camp for scientists and other personnel participating in the experiment.⁶⁸ That same year publicity was provided for the launching of a destroyer escort named for Seabee Medal of Honor recipient, Marvin Shields.⁶⁹ The story of Marvin Shields was also included in a book entitled 37 Greatest Navy Heroes.⁷⁰

⁶⁶Blueprint (12 Jul 1968).

⁶⁷Ibid.

⁶⁸"Navy Seabees Start Final Phase of Underwater Construction for Project TEKTITE I," NAVFAC News Release 1-10 (1).

⁶⁹"USS MARVIN SHIELDS (DE-1066) Commissioning," 13th ND News Release 24-71.

⁷⁰Arthur S. Curtis, 37 Greatest Navy Heroes (Washington, DC, 1969).

In 1970 work commenced on a history of the Command's massive construction effort in Southeast Asia. Hired to write the treatise was the renowned author Richard Tregaskis. The collection of documentation, known as Project Search, and the subsequent preparation and publication of the manuscript was a five year project.⁷¹

In 1972 the President signed a bill authorizing the construction of a Seabee Memorial in Arlington, Virginia.⁷² The bronze, bas relief Memorial was sculptured by Felix de Weldon, best known for his Iwo Jima Memorial. The Seabee Memorial was dedicated two years later in May 1974 amid massive publicity.⁷³

Although the Command eliminated its Public Affairs Production Division in 1974 due to budgetary constraints, numerous motion pictures had been conceived and filmed in previous years. The films covered a myriad of topics from Seabee civic action to pollution abatement.⁷⁴ Each had helped publicize the important work of the Command throughout the ten year period.

To conclude this period of heightened public affairs activity a history of Navy public works was written for the American Public Works Association. The project was designed to commemorate the

⁷¹Richard Tregaskis, Southeast Asia: Building the Bases (U.S. Government Printing Office, 1975).

⁷²"President Nixon Signs Bill to Authorize Construction of Memorial to Navy Seabees," NAVFAC News Release 36-72 (9-21)

⁷³"Memorial to the Navy's 'Fighting Seabees' Dedicated at Arlington National Cemetery," NAVFAC News Release 17-74.

⁷⁴Documentary Motion Picture Films, NAVFAC Brochure (Jul 1972).

nation's bicentennial and, in particular, the Command's own special contribution to our country's heritage.

Safety

Since safety is an important aspect of organizational life, the Command provided for a comprehensive, effective and continuous Safety Program which encompassed all of its operations and activities. The Safety Program was a composite of those actions intended to prevent accidental injury to personnel or material damage to property. In the words of one safety official, the Command sought to "fight people's apathy about doing things casually rather than carefully."⁷⁵

Particular emphasis was given to component safety, noise reduction, and systems safety engineering.⁷⁶ Component safety included such efforts as guarding moving parts, locking out live electrical components, protecting eyesight, and teaching proper driving skills. Measuring noise levels at work sites and, when necessary, recommending environmental controls comprised the noise reduction program. Systems safety engineering techniques were leveled at introducing safety mechanisms into a system before it became operative.

While previously safety directives had been issued to the field piecemeal, in 1971 a central directive was published which for the

⁷⁵ Interview with Mr. J. Crawford, NAVFAC Safety Office, Code 09K, 5 Aug 1975.

⁷⁶ Ibid.

first time described the program within the context of one, complete package.⁷⁷

Inspector General

The Inspector General's Office conducted special investigations as directed by the Commander and reported on the compliance of field activities with stated policies and procedures. Its purpose was to ensure that the Command was operating in an efficient manner. To this end, the Inspector General carried out periodic inspections of field activities and responded to charges and complaints leveled at Command decisions and actions. Another important aspect of this function was to maintain liaison with the Navy Inspector General and the Inspector Generals of other commands, bureaus, and offices. The result was often free interchange of ideas and, where appropriate, participation in the actions of these different offices.

A special Resource Application Suggestion Program (RASP) was initiated during the period under study. The program offered an opportunity for individual employees to directly approach an inspection team and make suggestions on methods of better utilizing Command resources.⁷⁸

⁷⁷ NAVFAC Instruction 5100.11A of 15 Jun 1971.

⁷⁸ Memo to Vice Chief of Naval Material (MAT 09G:OLD) of 8 Sep 1972.

A special study of note was conducted for the Bureau of Medicine and Surgery which entailed the performance of post-occupancy inspections at newly constructed hospitals. After the completion of construction and the commencement of operations, a Command inspection team visited hospitals to ensure that their facilities were suitable and adequate. Other special studies during the period examined the up-keep of heavy equipment and evaluated the performance of operations and maintenance.

PERSONNEL

Organizational Changes

As a result of decisions made by higher authority, organizational arrangements for handling personnel matters in the Command underwent a marked change at the end of 1966. The centralization of Navy civilian personnel matters at the policy level in the fall of 1966 entailed transfer of twenty-one employees from the Command to the Office of Civilian Manpower Management on 2 October 1966. Centralization of remaining personnel functions for the Naval Material Command in the newly created Naval Material Command Support Activity involved a transfer of twenty more persons on 1 January 1967.⁸⁰

⁷⁹ Interview with Mr. R. A. Genders, NAVFAC Inspector General, Code 09E, 4 Aug 1975.

⁸⁰ Background on the two reorganizations can be found in a memo from NAVFAC 01 to NAVFAC 00 of 21 Jun 1966 and Command History of the Headquarters, Naval Material Command, 1 July 1966 - 30 June 1967 (OP-Nav. Report Symbol 5750 - 1), pp. 83-88. Data on personnel transfers from Code 013A2 in a memo from NAVFAC 017 to Distribution List of 24 Oct 1966.

The two consolidations resulted from considerable study and both involved conscious efforts to make the respective centralized operations responsive to the individual commands and agencies they served.⁸¹ However, on the basis of the first year of operation under the new arrangement, the Commander of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command expressed sharp dissatisfaction with the way the consolidation of personnel functions in the Naval Material Command Support Activity worked in practice. He noted a reduction in support and responsiveness which led him to suggest that policies and procedures be centralized under the Chief of Naval Material with personnel operations being returned to his command.⁸²

Other systems commands expressed similar concerns and, as a result, the concept of a totally consolidated personnel function was eventually abandoned. A personnel division was reinstated within the Command but remained, in part, under the direction of the central personnel office at the Naval Material Command Support Activity.

While the situation was greatly improved, the role of the newly reestablished personnel division remained a source of conflict. Problems were generated by virtue of the fact that the personnel staff was now serving two masters, the Naval Material Command Support

⁸¹ Memo from 017 to Distribution List of 21 Jun 1966; CNM Draft Memorandum on meeting of VCNM with Systems Commanders of 22 Dec 1966; NMC Headquarters History, pp. 85-86.

⁸² Ltr from COMNAVFAC to CNM of 10 Apr 1968.

Activity and the Command itself.⁸³ A particularly unusual situation was created in the realm of requirements versus resources. Personnel requirements were determined by the Command while the resources necessary to fill those requirements were controlled by the Naval Material Command Support Activity. In some instances even the policies of both organizations were in direct conflict. By the end of the period under consideration there was movement afoot to eliminate this dichotomy and return greater control of personnel operations to the Command.⁸⁴

Workforce

During the second half of the 1960s the Command's workforce responded to wartime demands by expanding from 18,750 employees in 1965 to 23,897 employees in 1967. Subsequent years saw a gradual downward trend in the total number of people employed by the Command.⁸⁵

Headquarters employment underwent the least change during the Vietnam buildup and experienced the greatest reductions during the first half of the 1970s. This disproportion in the rate of growth between Headquarters and the field can be taken in part as an indication that some reality lay behind the Command's stated policy of

⁸³Interview with Mr. H. Wicklund, NAVFAC Civilian Personnel, Code 09M3, 3 Aug 1975.

⁸⁴Wicklund interview.

⁸⁵Refer to Chart 4-1 for yearly employment figures.

maximum possible decentralization of its functions. The peak for on-board personnel at Headquarters was 961 in 1966. While remaining relatively stable during the Vietnam build-up, personnel employed at Headquarters began to steadily decline in subsequent years. By 1974 their number had dropped to 631 with further reductions anticipated in the future.

CHART 4-1 PERSONNEL EMPLOYED BY THE 86
 NAVAL FACILITIES ENGINEERING COMMAND, 1965-1974

<u>Fiscal Year</u>	<u>Headquarters</u>	<u>Field</u>	<u>Total</u>
1965	929	17,821	18,750
1966	961	21,039	22,000
1967	928	22,969	23,897
1968	923	21,027	21,950
1969	959	21,157	22,116
1970	810	18,467	19,277
1971	706	19,049	19,755
1972	702	18,830	19,532
1973	666	17,977	18,643
1974	631	19,123	19,754

⁸⁶Information provided by Mr. B. V. Omodt, NAVFAC Administration, Code 09M2.

In the field the number of employees swelled from 17,821 in 1965 to a high point of 22,969 in 1967. With the consolidation of the Engineering Field Divisions in 1970, personnel figures took their most drastic drop falling from 21,157 in 1969 to 18,467 in 1970.⁸⁷ Employment remained stable for the next three years with only small fluctuations. Then, in 1974, the number of personnel employed increased by over 1,000, most probably as a result of the establishment of a new Public Works Center in San Francisco, California, the Officer in Charge of Construction for the new armed forces medical school to be built in Bethesda, Maryland,⁸⁸ and the Officer in Charge of Construction for the Trident Support Site.

Personnel Development

On the whole, the last half of the 1960s constituted a period of stringency in obtaining personnel, particularly in the crucial upper-grade levels, to handle a growing workload. As of mid-1965 needs had largely been met, but difficulties loomed on the horizon.⁸⁹ As part of its response to the exigent demands of Southeast Asia, the Command had recourse to a special program for recruiting professional and managerial talent from within its own organization for temporary duty in that area.⁹⁰

⁸⁷SECNAV Notice 5450 of 13 Jun 1966; OPNAV Notice 5450 of 20 May 1970.

⁸⁸OPNAV Notice 5450 of 8 May 1974; OPNAV Notice 5450 of 14 Jun 1974.

⁸⁹Memo from NAVFAC Code 30 to NAVFAC Code 10 of 2 Aug 1965.

⁹⁰CEC Bulletin (1 Mar and 5 Apr 1966).

The Command could point with pride to its wartime achievement of handling a huge increase in workload with only limited increases in personnel.⁹¹ The Chief of Naval Material had earlier complimented the Command on its "forthright approach" to handling the upper-grade problem.⁹² Nevertheless, difficulties occasioned by civilian ceiling austerity continued into and throughout the ten year period.⁹³

The Command's long-range approach to securing and developing quality professional talent must be seen against this background, and in the light of the Chief of Naval Material's remark that "our single most critical problem is how to get the skilled people we need."⁹⁴ A Career Plan for civilian professional personnel with a related Professional Development Program represented the Command's answer to this most critical problem.

Implementation of the Career Plan dated from 1963.⁹⁵ It provided for systematic action that would ensure planned and optimum development

⁹¹ NAVFAC Progress Report (FY 1966).

⁹² At a CNM staffing meeting of 2 Feb 1966 as reported in a CNM memorandum of the same date.

⁹³ Ltr from COMNAVFAC TO CO SOEASTDIV of 15 May 1967; Memo from NAVFAC Code 09 to COMPACDIV of 8 Jun 1967; Memo from NAVFAC Code 01 to Distribution List of 17 Nov 1967.

⁹⁴ At the NAVMAT MIC meeting of 12 Oct 1966 as reported in a CNM memo of that date.

⁹⁵ BUDOCKS Instruction 12400.2 of 4 Sep 1963.

and utilization of managerial and technical talent. A Professional Personnel Inventory served as the basis for informed utilization of managerial and technical talent. A Professional Personnel Inventory served as the basis for informed utilization of upper-grade professional skills within the organization.⁹⁶ The plan also provided for planned intake of new professional personnel who for the next two and a half to three years would undergo a vigorous and carefully contrived series of training stages under the auspices of the Professional Development Center.⁹⁷ It was this latter facet of the program, the Professional Development Center, which flourished in the forthcoming years.

To give some idea of the center in operation, during the first eleven years of its existence 579 trainees advanced to journeyman positions within the Command. More importantly, however, 74 percent of these trainees were still holding positions throughout the organization in mid-1974.⁹⁸ The success of the Professional Development Center became increasingly evident throughout the period under study as keen

⁹⁶ Career Plan for Civilian Professional Personnel (unpublished paper); Millard F. Billings, "BUDOCKS Plans for Both Professional and Blue Collar Careers," Navy Management Review (Jun/Jul 1965), pp. 27-28.

⁹⁷ Earl Nikkel, "Naval Facilities Engineering Command Develops the Young Professional," The Navy Civil Engineer (May/June 1967).

⁹⁸ L. J. DiFilippo, "The Personnel Development Center," The Navy Civil Engineer (Summer 1974).

competition for young professionals failed to deplete the Command's reservoir of talent.

Throughout the years the Command aggressively pursued a course of action directed at developing and enhancing professionalism among its technical personnel. This was accomplished by emphasizing and encouraging professional registration for engineers and architects, active membership in professional societies and contributions to technical publications.⁹⁹ The professionalism campaign applied equally to civilian and military personnel. In 1965 the Civil Engineer Corps Directory even included data on professional registration of Civil Engineer Corps officers.¹⁰⁰ At the same time, an automatic data processing file of the registration status of these officers was established at Command Headquarters.¹⁰¹

Although accelerated promotion of unregistered officers led to a decline in the percentage of senior officers registered,¹⁰² the campaign had, by mid-1967, progressed to the point where registration became a major factor in selection for certain important assignments within the Command.¹⁰³ It was also a key consideration in selection

⁹⁹RADM A. C. Husband, "Speaking from Topside," The Navy Civil Engineer (Sep 1967).

¹⁰⁰CEC Directory (Oct 1965).

¹⁰¹Memorandum from NAVFAC Code 06212 to NAVFAC Codes 00 and 09.

¹⁰²Ibid.

¹⁰³Husband, "Speaking from Topside;" Ltr from COMNAVFAC to field activities of 22 Jun 1967; CEC Bulletin (24 Oct 1967).

of civilian employees for promotion to GS-13 and above. At the same time, a sample poll indicated satisfying progress in the area of membership in professional societies.¹⁰⁴ The Dillon Board on Civil Engineer Corps Career Development, Education and Training reaffirmed the Command's emphasis on professionalism which continued to be stressed through 1974.¹⁰⁵

Special developments in the realm of training included the establishment of a Learning Center at Command Headquarters. In the Learning Center numerous courses were offered on a self-paced basis. Individual instruction was provided through the medium of programmed instruction, audio-cassette, and audio-tutor facilities.¹⁰⁶

The Command's Upward Mobility Program afforded lower level employees with underutilized skills or potential to begin a new career in a particular occupational field through a planned, intensive development and training program.¹⁰⁷ To supplement its Upward Mobility Program, the Command later instituted a unique Training Opportunity Program (TOP).¹⁰⁸ A significant difference between the two programs was their

¹⁰⁴ Husband, "Speaking from Topside."

¹⁰⁵ "The Dillon Report Revisited," The Navy Civil Engineer (Apr 1969).

¹⁰⁶ Employee Development and Training, NAVFAC (Compendium of Information).

¹⁰⁷ NAVFAC Instruction 12410.54 of 21 Dec 1972.

¹⁰⁸ NAVFAC Instruction 12410.56 of 6 Feb 1974.

developmental time frame; the Upward Mobility Program was designed to meet immediate job needs whereas the Training Opportunity Program developed employees with an eye toward future career opportunities.

The Command's Equal Employment Opportunity efforts were given a boost during the ten year period with the establishment of a position for a full-time administrator of the program. This was accomplished even prior to a new Naval Material Command requirement for such a position. The program's greatest achievements occurred after 1972 with a significant increase in the number of minorities and women employed in professional positions.¹⁰⁹

Civil Engineer Corps Personnel

The Commander of the Naval Facilities Engineering Command is also the Chief of Civil Engineers for the Navy. In the latter role he acted as technical advisor to the Chief of Naval Operations, Naval Material and Naval Personnel "on all matters pertaining to planning, recruitment, training and utilization of . . . Civil Engineer Corps Officers." ¹¹⁰

¹⁰⁹ Interview with Ms. L. S. Lewis, NAVFAC DEEO, Code 00H, 1 Aug 1975.

¹¹⁰ NAVFAC Charter in A Study of Civil Engineer Corps Career Development, Education and Training, Phase One of the Board Report (29 Aug 1968).

The Commander during the last half of the 1960s exercised these duties chiefly through the Assistant Commander for Military Readiness and the Director of the Military Personnel Division.¹¹¹ Following the second phase of the Civil Engineer Corps Career Development, Education and Training Board, commonly referred to as the Iselin Board, an important new development in military manpower management took place. The Board concluded that "from the standpoint of overall operation of the military personnel function, both for the Civil Engineer Corps and the Group VIII community, that it would be desirable to have this function separated from Military Readiness."¹¹² The underlying reason for this recommendation was the differing management orientation of these two functions; the whole thrust of the military readiness function was operationally oriented while military personnel management was personnel oriented. Thus, the personnel function was henceforth vested in a new Deputy Commander for Manpower and Organization, a senior officer reporting directly to the Commander or Vice Commander.¹¹³ When implementing the Iselin Board's

¹¹¹CEC Biweekly Report (24 Oct 1967).

¹¹²CDR J. E. McNeill, CEC, USN, "The Reorganization of Manpower Management and Why It Was Done," The Navy Civil Engineer (Spring 1972).

¹¹³Headquarters Organization Manual, NAVFAC P-313.

recommendation, it was decided to expand the scope of this new office to encompass civilian manpower management as well. The result was greater integration, coordination, and visibility for the Command's manpower management responsibilities.¹¹⁴

Only about one-third of the members of the Corps were under the immediate command of the Commander, Naval Facilities Engineering Command.¹¹⁵ Their ranks included those serving at Headquarters or in the Command's field activities. The remaining two-thirds served in staff positions with other commands, activity public works departments, or the Naval Construction Force under line command.

From 1 January 1965 to 1 January 1968 the Corps grew in number from 1,699 officers to 2,051. The great bulk of this growth occurred in calendar year 1966 (253 of the total increase of 352).¹¹⁶ Expansion of this magnitude entailed numerous special actions, including a greatly expanded educational effort at the Civil Engineer Corps Officers School, Port Hueneme, California and a limited program of direct procurement of officers in the Lieutenant and Lieutenant Commander ranks. Voluntary returns to active duty, extensions of

¹¹⁴ CDR J. E. McNeill, "The Reorganization of Manpower Management."

¹¹⁵ CEC Biweekly Report (24 Oct 1967).

¹¹⁶ Figures from CEC Biweekly Report (12 Jan 1965, 18 Jan 1966, 31 Jan 1967 and 16 Jan 1968).

service, and a general slowdown in retirements and resignations also contributed to meeting the increased manpower needs.¹¹⁷

Total growth figures tell only part of the story of the impact of the Vietnamese war on the Corps. Wartime demands resulted in disruption in the distribution and training of personnel and distortions in the Corps' structure, often reinforcing previous trends in that direction. The chronic problem lay in a shortage of middle-level officers, Lieutenants and Lieutenant Commanders. This problem had existed well before 1965 and was attributable to the small input of new officers in the post-World War II period, increased responsibilities assigned to the Corps, and greater emphasis on post-graduate education.¹¹⁸ By the spring of 1965, before the full impact of Vietnam, junior officers were "fleeting up" in order to alleviate the acute shortage of Lieutenants and Lieutenant Commanders.¹¹⁹

By June of 1965 needs in Southeast Asia had approached a total of 100 officers. Over a year later, the overriding need for experienced officers in Vietnam had increasingly serious effects upon normal assignment practices and involved shortened tours, short-notice moves, delays in filling vacated billets and undermanning at various ports.¹²⁰ In

¹¹⁷ CEC Biweekly Report (19 Apr 1966 and 17 Jan 1967).

¹¹⁸ CEC Biweekly Report (2 Mar 1961).

¹¹⁹ CEC Biweekly Report (6 Apr 1965).

¹²⁰ CEC Biweekly Report (9 Jun 1965 and 4 Oct 1966).

spite of accelerated promotion of junior officers¹²¹ and the direct procurement program, a status report of 1 January 1968 still showed serious defects in the Lieutenants and Lieutenant Commander ranks and a moderate deficit in Commanders.¹²² Moreover, losses of junior officer billets as a result of the civilian substitution program added to the difficulty of overcoming the deficit in the future by decreasing the pool from which the middle-ranks would some day be filled and by eliminating vital training billets.¹²³

As the supply of Civil Engineer Corps personnel began to meet demand in the early 1970s, the outlook was much more promising. The current and anticipated number of officer's on-board was below the number of anticipated base billets and promotional opportunities were expected to remain high. The Corps was depending heavily on the augmentation of reserve officers to fill their requirement for regular officers.¹²⁴

Unfortunately, with the wind-down and conclusion of the Vietnam War the promising outlook of earlier years was shattered. In keeping with legislation which restricted the Corps to 3 percent of the number

¹²¹CEC Biweekly Report (19 Sep 1966 and 12 Sep 1967).

¹²²CEC Biweekly Report (16 Jan 1968).

¹²³A Study of Civil Engineer Corp Career Development, pp. 41ff.

¹²⁴CDR C. A. Merica, CEC, USN, "Status of the Civil Engineer Corps in the Summer of 1971," The Navy Civil Engineer (Special Edition, 1971).

of unrestricted regular line naval officers, their strength was severely curtailed when Navy-wide officer cut-backs transpired. The Chief of Naval Operations implemented a redistribution of Civil Engineer Corps officer manpower on 12 June 1973. Augmentation of reserve officers, which had at one time been expected to proceed at a rate of about thirty-five officers per year, was limited to only a token number in 1973 and 1974.¹²⁵

¹²⁵ The Officer Personnel Newsletter (Mar 1974).