

wa

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20301

10 MAR 1976

15 Mar 1976

INTERNATIONAL
SECURITY AFFAIRS

In Reply Refer to:
I-2055/76

MEMORANDUM FOR THE SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

SUBJECT: Stationing of US Brigade in NORTHAG - INFORMATION MEMORANDUM

(U) This memorandum provides a brief status report on our efforts to station a US Army brigade in NORTHAG, using personnel spaces converted from support to combat under the provisions of the Nunn Amendment.

~~(C)~~ You will recall that, in examining options for the possible deployment of US augmentation forces, SHAPE conducted a study last summer and determined that with timely decisions and adequate funding support, it is feasible and desirable to station a US brigade in the NORTHAG area (Bremerhaven/Garl'stedt) as an advance element of a three division US corps. In September 1975 General Haig made a most persuasive case for this proposal in discussions with DoD. Also, the NATO Flexibility Study, submitted by SHAPE last fall and subsequently endorsed in principle by both the NATO Military Committee and the Defense Planning Committee at Ministerial level, recommended the designation of a three division corps as CINCENT regional reserve with priority for employment in the NORTHAG area.

Nato 320.2

(U) We have made clear in NATO our desire to station a brigade in NORTHAG, and the December DPC Ministerial Communique notes that the US is now implementing its decision announced in December 1974 to form two new brigades in Europe and that one of these brigades would be deployed alongside other Allied forces in northern Germany.

~~(C)~~ Following high level discussions with the FRG, the CJCS was asked in November 1975 to proceed with planning for the relocation of a US brigade to the Bremerhaven area in NORTHAG. If the deployment proves feasible, this brigade would be the lead element for a strategic reserve corps to be used by CINCENT as required in the NORTHAG sector. The Corps would remain in CONUS and be deployed after mobilization as would other strategic reserve forces earmarked for NATO.

15 Mar 76

~~(C)~~ The JCS had reported earlier, in October 1975, that it would cost \$122M to implement the relocation of the brigade from CENTAG to the NORTHAG area. In a message from SecDef to MOD Leber in late November 1975, the US requested that the FRG finance the construction of facilities for the brigade. The matter is being considered at the highest levels in Germany, but we have no official answer from them at this time.

meh



Classified by Director, European Region
SUBJECT TO GENERAL DECLASSIFICATION SCHEDULE OF
EXECUTIVE ORDER 11652. AUTOMATICALLY DECLASSIFIED
AT TWO YEAR INTERVALS. DECLASSIFIED ON 12/31/82

~~CONFIDENTIAL~~



OPD DEW COVER Vol. 1-

03/9
0805

(C) Initially, MOD Leber recommended that we temporarily divert offset funds being used in USAREUR for mess hall and barracks rehabilitation until FRG funding could be arranged. When MOD Leber made the proposal, there was about \$110M of the required \$122M. However, in the interim some of the funds were spent for rehabilitation projects; thus, we now have only about \$95M of the required \$122M. The US Special Program included in the 1975-1979 Infrastructure Program would provide about \$7.2M for this project.

(C) Ambassador Hillenbrand recently reported that MOD Leber now proposes we work out a NATO/US/FRG funding formula for this construction. One possibility is the US pays for community facilities (e.g. gymnasiums, bowling alleys, chapels, etc.) up to a total of some \$20-25M--latest estimate from General Blanchard (4 Mar) is \$23.6M. Another option would involve a US contribution of approximately \$30-40M wherein the US might pay for community support facilities and perhaps some portion of the other construction.

(U) We have asked the JCS to provide cost estimates on these options for a list of facilities which the US might fund. If we decide to help finance the construction, three alternatives or combinations of them--all requiring Congressional approval--are under consideration: (1) try to draw from the SecDef Contingency Fund, which presently contains about \$22.9M (DoD is seeking \$30M for FY 77 but House Armed Services Committee approved only \$10M and we doubt Senate will increase that sum); (2) use authorization (up to \$10M under the "Emergency Construction" Section of the FY 77 Military Construction Bi 11 ; or (3) add the contribution to the regular FY 1978 Military Construction Bi 11 next January. Although it is likely that Congress would oppose the first two because of the nature of the projects, we will further investigate these routes. We probably would have a reasonable chance for Congressional approval of funds as a part of the military construction program given the recent decision to provide \$8.1M for the other brigade going to the FRG.

(C) The FRG recently also proposed that all NORTHAG costs, less those covered by the US and US Special Program, be covered by NATO Infrastructure to test NATO's willingness to participate. We do not believe the FRG expects its efforts will be successful, given that they recognize most NORTHAG projects would not qualify for Infrastructure. However, the FRG may be seeking to lay the groundwork for parliamentary support for either complete FRG financing or US-FRG financing of the NORTHAG project.

(U) We will continue to study alternatives for funding the brigade construction in order to prepare for further discussions with the FRG.

Coordination: ASD/I&L 


AMOS A. JORDAN
ACTING ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF DEFENSE

Prepared by:
Mr. Arthur Chapa
X-71386, OASD/ISA/ED/NATO



(ACTING ASD/ISA MEETING WITH SECDEF, MARCH 1976)

SUBJECT: NORTHAG Brigade Stationing

- (C) - It will cost approximately \$122M for the construction associated with relocation of the Brigade from CENTAG to NORTHAG.
- (C) - FRG originally proposed temporary diversion of offset funds (approximately \$110M) until FRG funding could be arranged.
- (C) - FRG now proposes a US/NATO/FRG funding formula. One possibility could be for the US to pay for community facilities (gymnasiums, chapels, bowling alleys) up to a total of \$20-25M. A second possibility is that the US contribute \$30-40M for community facilities plus some portion of the other construction.
- (C) - We have asked the JCS to provide a detailed cost estimate on these options for a list of facilities which the US might fund.
- (C) - FRG has also proposed that all NORTHAG costs, less those covered by US and the US Special Program (\$7.2M), be covered by NATO Infrastructure.
 - Most NORTHAG projects would not qualify under Infrastructure.
 - We believe FRG does not expect this suggestion to work, but may be laying groundwork for parliamentary support for either straight forward FRG financing or US-FRG sharing of construction costs.
- (C) - If we decide to help finance the construction, three alternatives or combinations of them--all requiring Congressional approval--are under consideration:
 - (1) Try to draw from the SecDef Contingency Fund, which presently contains about \$22.9M (DoD is seeking \$30M for FY77 but House Armed Services approved only \$10M and doubtful Senate will increase that sum).
 - (2) Use authorization (up to \$10M) under the "Emergency Construction" Section of the FY77 Military Construction Bill.
 - (3) Add the contribution to the regular FY 1978 Military Construction Bi 11 next January.
 - Although it is likely, that Congress would oppose the first two because of the nature of the projects, we will further investigate these routes.
 - We probably would have a reasonable chance for Congressional approval of funds as a part of the military construction program given the recent willingness to provide \$8.1M for the other brigade going to the FRG.
- (C) - We will continue to study alternatives for funding the brigade construction in order to prepare for further discussions with the FRG.

Prepared by: Mr. A. Chapa

OASD/ISA/ED/NATO

