

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
68th Corps Support Battalion
Fort Carson, Colorado 80913

AFZC-Y-SPO

4 December 1995

Memorandum for: Chief of Transportation, MG Brown, Fort Eustis, VA 23604

SUBJECT: III CORPS TRUCK ROADEO

1. Sir, enclosed is the AAR, a copy of the OORDER, and photo of the III Corps Truck Rodeo site. Any other information that you may require I will be happy to send.
2. I will be at my present address until 19 December 95, I will be attending CLOAC from 23 January to 18 June 1995. My address is:

WORK

HHD, 68th CSB
ATTN: AFZC-Y-SPO
CPT. Luekenga
Fort Carson, CO 80913

DSN 691-6808

RESIDENCE

7261 Guadal Canal, APT A
Fort Carson, CO 80913

(719) 576-3757

3. Very respectfully.

*TO → CSM
FYI. Do you want to do
anything w/ this? B*

S. Luekenga
SCOTT LUEKENGA
CPT, TC
U.S. ARMY

SPEARHEAD OF LOGISTICS

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
68th Corps Support Battalion
Fort Carson, Colorado 80913

AFZC-Y-SPO

6 November 1995

Memorandum for Chief of Transportation, MG Brown, Fort Eustis, VA 23604

SUBJECT: III Corps Truck Roadeo After Action Review (AAR)

1. The first annual III Corps Truck Roadeo was conducted 23 - 27 October 1995. The Roadeo was conducted in an outstanding and professional manner. All competitors were challenged both mentally and physically. From conception thru planning to execution all soldiers of the 43rd ASG performed admirably. The general consensus of all involved is that the III Corps Truck Roadeo should remain a vital part of the III Corps training program.

2. Listed below are general comments made by both the soldiers who planned, executed and competed in the Roadeo. The comments are arranged in an Issues, Discussion, and Recommendation format.

a. **Issue:** Scheduling of the III Corps Truck Roadeo.

Discussion: This year's Roadeo was in its simplest terms a "non scheduled training event". The Roadeo was planned in less than four months. Although the four months allowed for planning was adequate, the actual competitors were, in some cases notified three weeks prior to the start of the competition. This did not allow the MSU teams adequate time to hold competitions, organize a team and practice for the actual Roadeo.

Recommendation: Place the 2nd annual III Corps Truck Roadeo on the III Corps Master Training Schedule no later than the end of the second quarter FY 96.

b. **Issue:** Awards

Discussion: All competitors were extremely pleased with all awards received. The very quality of these awards has already established the III Corps Truck Roadeo as the premiere logistical competition in the U.S. Army. The one problem that occurred with the awards was the lack of timely action in providing adequate funding to purchase all awards. Although all awards were present for the awards ceremony, the project officer could not identify the awards to the competitors prior to their arrival at Fort Carson.



AFZC-Y-SPO

SUBJECT: III CORPS TRUCK ROADEO AAR

Comments from Team Captains indicate that a much greater response in terms of the number of competitors and enthusiasm would have been expressed if the awards would have been announced prior to the teams arrival at Fort Carson.

Recommendation: Awards and funding need to be identified up to six months prior to the next Roadeo. This will alleviate the possibility of not having sufficient funds and give the project officers the ability to announce awards in a timely manner throughout the Corps.

c. **Issue:** Competition Equipment

Discussion: Competitors from Fort Carson were competing on their own equipment. This gives the appearance of host unit soldiers having an unfair advantage when driving their own equipment.

Recommendation: Ensure that host unit competitors do not use equipment that is assigned to them. Another recommendation is to create a "motor pool" of vehicles from all units participating. The drawback of this option is cost of equipment shipment to Fort Carson and return to home station.

d. **Issue:** Evaluators

Discussion: Fort Carson competitors were being evaluated by soldiers from Fort Carson and in some instances from the competitor's own company.

Recommendation: As long as the hosting unit competes, this will be a problem. One solution is to have each MSU that competes also provide evaluators. This would solve the problem of host unit evaluators evaluating host unit teams, but would not allow the OIC / NCOIC the time needed to fully train MSU evaluators.

e. **Issue:** Timeliness of MOI issue

Discussion: The MOI was received by competing units less than 30 days prior to the Roadeo. Selection, preparation and training for the teams was compressed into a two week period.

Recommendation: Place the III Corps Truck Roadeo on the Corps Master Training Schedule six (6) months prior to the actual execution date.

f. **Issue:** Scheduling

AFZC-Y-SPO

SUBJECT: III CORPS TRUCK ROADEO AAR

Discussion: The schedule of events for each day was handed out the night prior.

Recommendation: Establish the schedule of events prior to the competition and publish this schedule to the competitors upon arrival. This would require the MSUs throughout the Corps to send a **complete** roster (Name, Rank, and Competition Event) to the hosting installation prior to the competition.

g. **Issue:** Protest system

Discussion: Each MSU was tasked in the Corps Order to provide one NCO or Officer to sit on the Protest Committee. Only one MSU fulfilled this requirement. Not having each MSU provide a representative resulted in a Protest Committee comprised mainly of host unit soldiers. The Protest Committee therefore failed to have significant credibility with any of the Team Captains.

Recommendation: Have each MSU supply one representative to act as a committee member. If the MSU fails to provide this person then the MSU will be disqualified from the competition. A second solution to this is to have the host installation provide seven NCO / Officers from units who are not competing and who have no vested interest in the competition.

h. **Issue:** Communication between Operations Cell OIC and Team Captains.

Discussion: Not all Team Captains were aware of requested information as specified in the MOI. The Operation Cell was not made aware of team roster changes until after the changes had been made. A lack of communication caused some teams to be late to events.

Recommendation: Enforce the established time that the Team Captains and Operation Cell OIC were to meet. This time had been established, but not all Team Captains were present for the meetings.

i. **Issue:** Evaluators

Discussion: Some of the evaluators failed to fill out score cards correctly, or bring the score cards to the operation cell at appointed time. Some evaluators failed to arrive at the event site on time. Although a meeting was held to discuss how to evaluate, what to do with score cards, and reporting times some of the evaluators still failed at these tasks.



AFZC-Y-SPO

SUBJECT: III CORPS TRUCK ROADEO AAR

Recommendation: Have multiple meetings with the evaluation teams prior to the competition. Establish an evaluators "school" to explain how to fill out score cards. Have the OIC be held accountable for their evaluation teams actions.

j. **Issue:** Scoring

Discussion: There are numerous points to be made about the scoring system.

(1) Posting of scores. This caused problems between the scoring NCOIC and the Team Captains. Once scores were being posted, Teams Captains began to protest scores. Team Captains would begin to confront the scoring NCO or start going through scoring sheets, mixing them with scoring sheets either already scored or waiting to be scored. This caused great confusion among the scoring NCO and his team.

(2) Location of scoring NCO. The scoring NCO was co-located with the Operation Cell.

(3) Score sheets received from Evaluation OIC. Most of the score sheets received from the OIC were not tabulated to show the competitors raw score. This delayed the scoring process by at least one hour to one day.

(4) At the end of the awards ceremony a copy of each teams final score sheet was given to the Team Captains. Upon receipt of the score sheets numerous arguments began between Team Captains and the OIC / NCOIC of the Roadeo.

(5) Although the scoring team did a first rate job, there were discrepancies in point accumulation after the competition.

(6) No central location to put scorecards within the Operations Cell.

Recommendation:

(1) Scores should not be posted. If scores are to be posted it should be after each category within the competition is completed.

(2) The scoring team should not be co-located with the Operations Cell. The team should be located off the competition site where distractions can be kept to a minimum.



AFZC-Y-SPO

SUBJECT: III CORPS TRUCK ROADEO AAR

(3) All evaluation OICs should go through an in depth scoring class. This class should explain the method of tabulation and scoring both raw and actual competition points.

(4) Score sheets should not be given to Team Captains at the end of the competition. All this did is cause distress between the Team Captains and the Rodeo OIC / NCOIC.

(5) Utilize Fort Carson auditors to validate scoresheets results and to mitigate any controversy that arises over the scoresheets.

(6) Have a system of "In-boxes" built that will be organized by event category. Locate these boxes in the Scoring Cell.

k. **Issue:** Fort Carson using driving course prior to the competition.

Discussion: Fort Carson held the Post run off on Butts AAF two (2) weeks prior to the III Corps Rodeo. Some of the competitors felt this was unfair and gave the Fort Carson units an advantage.

Recommendation: Fort Carson should continue to hold Post run-offs on the competition site. This allows the hosting unit an excellent opportunity to "rockdrill" the competition before hand. Each MSU is given a copy of the MOI before the competition. This MOI explains the exact configuration of all events. MSUs can use this MOI as a means of conducting post run-offs and establishing practice courses at their respective posts.

l. **Issue:** Team Rosters

Discussion: Not all teams submitted team rosters to the hosting unit prior to the competition. This caused numerous complications with Team Captains moving competitors from event to event. This moving of competitors gave the impression of "stacking" teams. Of the six team rosters received prior to the competition, four (4) were incomplete rosters. These incomplete rosters failed to either completely identify competitor's names, ranks or the events the soldier was to compete in. Another example occurred when the Team from Fort Sill failed to notify the Rodeo OIC/NCOIC that their HET team was competing with an M916, Light Equipment Transporter (LET). The M916 was not programmed into the competition, therefore causing the Rodeo OIC/NCOIC to request the use of an unplanned M916.

Recommendation: MSUs submit team roster two (2) weeks prior to the competition. If an MSU fails to submit a complete roster, they do not compete.

m. **Issue:** MSU Scoring



AFZC-Y-SPO

SUBJECT: III CORPS TRUCK ROADEO AAR

Discussion: The MOI stated that MSU scoring would be based on an average of points scored in each event. This was found to be impractical due to some of the MSUs not fielding a complete team (28 Large MSU / 22 Small MSU). This would give those MSUs an unfair advantage over the teams that did field the correct amount of competitors. Therefore scoring was based on the total number of raw points scored in each event, then added together. This allowed the teams with the highest total of raw points to become the overall winners.

Recommendation: Have the MSU scoring be based on total raw points available.

n. **Issue:** Storage of Rodeo Material

Discussion: Over \$10,000 was spent on building or purchasing material needed to execute the Rodeo. Now that Rodeo is a recurring event, these materials will require adequate storage to ensure quality material is available for future Rodeos.

Recommendation: A designated facility needs to be established to permanently store Rodeo materials. This facility will need to be covered to adequately protect the materials from the environment. The facility will need to be large enough to store 300 ea. 10' x 3' x 5' barricades, 300 ea. road cones, and 50 ea. softballs.

o. **Issue:** "Soft" balls vs. Softballs

Discussion: The Straight Line Obstacles on the Driving Course requires the use 10 softballs to aid the evaluators in scoring the Obstacle. During the Rodeo it was determined that the use of softballs is a safety concern. The danger occurs when a softball is struck by a vehicle negotiating the course. The softballs, when struck are propelled at high speeds throughout the course, providing the opportunity of striking a soldier that is located on the course. Another issue is the cost of the softball. The 68th CSB purchased 100 softballs at a cost of 6.95 per ball for a total cost of \$695.00.

Recommendation: Due to safety concerns and cost it is recommended that "Nerf balls" be purchased for this obstacle. Nerf balls would not be a safety concern for obvious reasons. Purchasing Nerfballs would run about \$2.50 ea (Toys-R-Us). This would save approximately \$445.00 in operating costs.

p. **Issue:** Metal "Ts" vs. PVC

Discussion: The Straight Line Obstacle on the Driving Course requires the use of "Ts" to support the softballs [Reference Para (2), (o)]. Initially the obstacle was established with metal "Ts". It was found out that the metal "Ts" were cutting into the



AFZC-Y-SPO

SUBJECT: III CORPS TRUCK ROADEO AAR

tires of the vehicle negotiating the course. A decision to convert to PVC "Ts" was made thus eliminating the possible damage to the vehicle tires.

Recommendation: The Roadeo should use strictly PVC "Ts".

3. The POC for this AAR is the undersigned, ext 6-6808.


SCOTT LUEKENGA
CPT, TC
Project Officer

