



UNDER SECRETARY OF THE AIR FORCE
WASHINGTON

SEP 19 2016

The Honorable Mac Thornberry
Chairman
Committee on Armed Services
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6035

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I am pleased to forward the enclosed report as directed on page 130 of House Report 114-537 to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for 2017 concerning the United States Army's Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) program.

A similar letter has been sent to each of the congressional defense committees.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lisa S. Disbrow", is positioned above the printed name.

Lisa S. Disbrow

Attachment:
Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report



United States Air Force

Report to Congressional Committees

Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report

August 2016

The estimated cost of this report or study for the Department of Defense is approximately \$4,160 for the 2016 Fiscal Year. This includes \$10 in expenses and \$4,150 in DoD labor.

Generated on 2016Jun07 RefID: 9-23463C1

Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report



Introduction

This report is provided to the congressional defense committees as directed on page 130 of House Report 114-537 to accompany the National Defense Authorization Act for 2017.

Adoption of Tactical Explosive Detection Military Working Dogs

The committee notes the Tactical Explosive Detection Dog (TEDD) program was established in January 2011 as a temporary, Army-funded contract program supporting Army Brigade Combat Teams by providing maneuver units with canine assets to mitigate casualties associated with improvised explosive devices. In 2013, U.S. Army Central Command curtailed the requirement for TEDDs, and the TEDD program was terminated in February 2014. The Department of the Air Force, the executive agent for all military working dogs, delegated development of a disposition plan for the 229 Army-procured TEDDs to the Department of the Army, through the Office of the Provost Marshal General (OPMG). The committee recognizes the challenge OPMG had in the disposition of TEDDs due to a limited transition window.

However, the committee is aware of persistent concerns raised by former TEDD handlers regarding their opportunity to adopt the TEDDs. The committee notes that the Department of the Army has, on multiple occasions, examined this issue in a singular fashion, examining a specific handler or TEDD. Despite these reviews, the committee believes the Army has not been sufficiently responsive in addressing generally known challenges in the TEDD adoption process. The committee believes that the Army's reluctance to review the adoption application process holistically to ensure that military working dog handlers were provided the first opportunity to adopt TEDDs failed to meet the intent of military working dog adoption processes in law, instruction, and regulation.

Therefore, the committee directs the Secretary of the Air Force to provide a report to the Senate Committee on Armed Services and the House Committee on Armed Services by August 31, 2016, that should address the following issues:

- (1) How TEDD handlers were identified and contacted to verify intent to adopt TEDD military working dogs, including a listing of all TEDD handlers, the method by which they were contacted, the handlers' stated intentions regarding TEDD adoption, and instances of handlers reporting errors in the adoption process;*
- (2) What steps the Secretary has taken to ensure that all military working dog handlers have visibility into the adoption process of all military working dogs, including TEDDs;*
- (3) The factors that led to instances in the adoption process of TEDDs where handlers did not have the first opportunity to adopt the TEDD, and how the Secretary intends to prevent future process errors in military working dog adoptions;*
- (4) Any resource, legislative, or departmental policy changes needed to correct deficiencies in the adoption process; and*
- (5) The process for selection of a handler for military working dog adoption when more than one handler requests to adopt the military working dog.*

Executive Summary

The Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) program was initiated in January 2011 as a temporary, Army-funded contract supporting Army Brigade Combat Teams by providing maneuver units with canine assets to mitigate casualties associated with improvised explosive devices. The TEDD program was a non-standard military working dog program utilizing contracted trainers and “non-traditional”¹ military handlers. When the requirement surfaced in 2010, the 341st Training Squadron, DoD Military Working Dog Training Center was surging to produce traditional MWDs and had neither the kennel space, training areas, manpower resources, nor sufficient time to meet the emergent requirement. These on/off leash explosive search dogs were used in route and area clearance and enabled the Brigade Combat Teams to operate with their assigned infantry soldiers utilizing these critical assets.

In 2013, U.S. Central Command (USCENTCOM) curtailed the requirement for TEDDs, and the TEDD program contract was terminated in February 2014. The Army was challenged in the disposition of TEDDs due to the short time remaining on the contract after USCENTCOM’s decision. However, the problems with the disposition could have been avoided if the Army extended the contract through the option year at a cost of \$3.5M, allowing sufficient time to complete the disposition process. Coupled with this challenge, the U.S. Army did not adequately brief the TEDD handlers during their training at Yuma Proving Grounds (YPG). The U.S. Army relayed that they advised the handlers verbally to provide their contact information to Office of Provost Marshal General representatives if they desired to adopt their dog. Further, the Army admits that TEDD handlers did not receive anything in writing to clearly explain the TEDD adoption application process or the current MWD adoption law, which would have avoided confusion.

In February 2014, when the TEDD contract was terminated, the adoption process was executed in accordance with the law in place at the time (10 USC § 2583, subsection C) which stated military animals may be adopted under this section by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these animals, and other persons capable of humanely caring for these animals. Former TEDD handlers have raised persistent concerns regarding their opportunity to adopt the TEDDs. The Department of the Army has, on multiple occasions, examined this issue, based upon several congressional inquiries. Despite these reviews, the HASC-Readiness committee believed the Army was not sufficiently responsive in addressing generally known challenges in the TEDD adoption process. This report reviews the adoption application process holistically to determine if the known TEDD military working dog handlers were provided an opportunity to adopt TEDDs according to MWD adoption law in 2014. This report makes recommendations for future special canine program contracts to ensure adherence to current military working dog adoption processes in law, instruction and regulation.

¹ TEDD handlers are not considered traditional as they did not attend the Joint Service formal course conducted by the 341st Training Squadron. Instead, they received contractor-provided training lasting 9 weeks at the contractor site and Yuma, AZ, which consisted of teaming, detecting change of behaviors, search patterns and basic care and feeding of the dog. Additionally, handlers had multiple Military Occupational Specialties rather than core law enforcement or security backgrounds.

Report

1) How TEDD handlers were identified and contacted to verify intent to adopt TEDD military working dogs, including a listing of all TEDD handlers, the method by which they were contacted, the handlers' stated intentions regarding TEDD adoption, and instances of handlers reporting errors in the adoption process;

The Army Office of the Provost Marshal General (OPMG) military working dog (MWD) program management staff reported that during training courses, which took place from late 2012 to late 2013, TEDD handlers were advised verbally while at Yuma Proving Grounds (YPG) to provide contact information to OPMG if they desired to adopt their dog². Furthermore, the OPMG representative informed TEDD handlers they could express interest later through their chain of command, or by emailing OPMG directly. OPMG maintained a document containing the names and contact information for handlers that notified them of their desire to adopt a TEDD. Upon notification by USCENTCOM of the program curtailment and OPMG's assessment of the TEDD disposition process, OPMG representatives personally contacted the handlers via telephone and/or email.

| U.S. Army Disposal of Tactical Explosive Detection Dogs | | |
|--|-----------|------------|
| Adopted by current handler | 25 | 40 |
| Adopted by former handlers | 15 | |
| Private Adoptions | 47 | 180 |
| Federal Agencies | 17 | |
| Law Enforcement Agencies | 46 | |
| Army Installations | 70 | |
| Deceased | 9 | 9 |
| TOTAL | | 229 |

According to the OPMG staff members, there were only 25 dogs remaining in theater upon the decision to end the contract. OPMG reached out to USCENTCOM and asked whether these handlers desired to adopt their TEDD. As a result, all 25 handlers adopted their dog upon redeployment. For the remaining dogs, OPMG reported that they contacted 33 soldiers from their roster who expressed a desire to adopt their former TEDD.³ All re-expressed their desire to adopt their dog. OPMG then started to review whether the TEDDs could continue to be utilized by the military, or a law enforcement agency, as a patrol explosive detection

² To answer these questions, the Air Force interviewed members of the U.S. Army OPMG staff and reviewed associated documents and contracts of the TEDD program.

³ OPMG relayed that they did not keep records of completing this notification. During an April 2016 Congressional inquiry, it was discovered that one person on the list, SGT Norton, was not notified.

dog (PEDD). From this review, it was determined that 18 dogs could perform PEDD duties and the remaining 15 were adopted by their handler. The handlers contacted indicated they only wanted to adopt the dog they handled and not another dog. OPMG stated they did not have a complete roster of Soldiers who attended the training. For this reason, the Air Force is unable to provide a list of TEDD handlers for this report.

It is important to note that OPMG did not think any of the remaining handlers wanted to adopt their dogs because they previously communicated to the handlers that it was their responsibility to advise the OPMG office if they desired to adopt a dog.

Of the 229 TEDDs, 9 of them were reported deceased by OPMG. OPMG selected 70 TEDDs for retention and retraining to fill other MWD requirements. Due to time constraints at contract termination, OPMG conducted two Law Enforcement Weeks in February 2014 to allow law enforcement agencies to come to the contractor in North Carolina to assess the remaining 150 TEDDs and process for transfer to their departments.

In the two years since the termination of the TEDD contract, OPMG was made aware of three congressional inquiries by former handlers claiming errors in the adoption process. From an analysis of those inquiries, and other social media observations, it was determined that the TEDD handlers were misinformed by the contractors on the process to adopt a TEDD. In particular, some TEDD handlers submitted adoption packets directly to contractors, and failed to notify OPMG. OPMG staff stated the contractor did not provide any adoption applications to them.

In the first complaint, Specialist Grommett claimed authority to adopt TEDD Matty under 10 United States Code (USC) § 2583, "Robby's Law" due to combat injuries, when according to OPMG staff neither Specialist Grommett nor his TEDD Matty were injured in combat. OPMG never received an adoption application from Specialist Grommett, but the civilian adopter did give Matty to Specialist Grommett in November 2014 when the story gained national attention. The second and third cases involved two handlers, Sergeant Norton and the former Sergeant Henderson, who both worked with and desired to adopt TEDD Satan. At the time of disposition, OPMG had no record of intent to adopt and released TEDD Satan to a civilian adopter. After the disposition, both handlers contacted OPMG and learned that TEDD Satan had already been adopted and then, in turn, notified their respective congressman. During the inquiry, it was discovered that Sergeant Norton actually was on the list maintained by OPMG and Sergeant Henderson was not. In the end, OPMG has no record of contacting either handler prior to disposition and the dog remains with the civilian adopter.

2) What steps the Secretary has taken to ensure that all military working dog handlers have visibility into the adoption process of all military working dogs, including TEDDs;

The TEDD program was a non-standard military working dog program utilizing contracted trainers and non-traditional handlers. In conventional kennels across all services, the dog handlers are a close knit team of military police, security forces or master of arms, depending

on the representative service. TEDD handlers were not considered traditional as they did not attend the Joint Service formal course conducted by the 341st Training Squadron. Instead, they received training lasting 9 weeks at the contractor site and Yuma, AZ, which consisted mainly of teaming, detecting change of behaviors, search patterns and basic care and feeding of the dog. All traditional handlers have attended the basic dog handler course at the 341st Training Squadron and are capable of handling any dog assigned in their kennel. When an MWD is approaching the disposition phase, all handlers at the kennel are aware of the status and have relayed to the kennel master their desire or intent to adopt a retiring MWD. Any past handler that has relocated is aware they must keep in contact with the kennel master to ensure they may have an opportunity to adopt the dog they handled in the past. It remains the current and former dog handler's responsibility to make their adoption desires known and update personal information for the kennel master that prepares a disposition package for approval at the 341st Training Squadron.

In the case of the TEDDs, as well as a like contract the United States Marine Corps (USMC) used for the Improvised Explosive Device Detector Dog (IDD), the service MWD program manager conducted their dispositions and maintained a list of known handlers that wanted to adopt their dogs at the end of that dog's useful service to the Department of Defense. The difference between the programs was proper handler notification of the disposition process and affording the proper amount of time for disposition of dogs no longer required in the program. The MWD adoption process is codified in Air Force Instruction 31-126, *DoD Military Working Dog Program*, last updated 1 June 2015. At the time of the TEDD adoptions, that instruction was AFI 23-126 and contained most of the same language for adoptions. Further, even though handlers were not identified in 10 USC § 2583 as being the first option for MWD adoption in 2014, it was a common practice in all DoD kennels.

To preclude these issues reoccurring, the Joint Service Military Working Dog Committee will thoroughly review future contract considerations, such as the TEDD, that are processed outside of the traditional DoD Military Working Dog Training center, to ensure a proper disposition plan is part of the contract requirements, in accordance with current law. This is included in the current draft DoD policy that is in coordination. Further, the DoD will continue to utilize and transfer MWDs with useful working life when requirements exist in other services, except in the case of a severely wounded handler or handler that was killed in action and next of kin wants to adopt the dog.

3) The factors that led to instances in the adoption process of TEDDs where handlers did not have the first opportunity to adopt the TEDD, and how the Secretary intends to prevent future process errors in military working dog adoptions;

The Army was not prepared, nor did they have a sound process in place to dispose of the TEDDs upon termination of the contract. Upon initiation of the contract, OPMG should have begun the planning for disposition since they were aware it was a short-term requirement. The Army was provided recommended disposition instructions outlined in existing policy, however, they did not allow themselves enough time through contract extension with the care provider to properly review any shortfalls in their disposition process. Further, the TEDD

handlers did not receive any written instructions detailing the TEDD adoption application process or the current MWD adoption law.

In February 2014 when the TEDD contract was terminated, the adoption process was executed in accordance with the law in place at the time (10 USC § 2583, subsection C) which stated military animals may be adopted under this section by law enforcement agencies, former handlers of these animals, and other persons capable of humanely caring for these animals. The 2016 National Defense Authorization Act clearly mandates the handler be the first option for adoption when in the best interest of the dog. Further, the draft AFI 31-126, which has been updated and is out for coordination, ensures that the Joint Service Military Working Dog Committee reviews future contracts processed outside the traditional DoD Military Working Dog Training center and that a proper disposition plan is part of the contract requirements in accordance with current law.

4) Any resource, legislative, or departmental policy changes needed to correct deficiencies in the adoption process

Air Force Instruction 31-126, DoD Military Working Dog Program is an inter-service coordinated instruction into which language was added to ensure all DoD owned dogs are dispositioned in accordance with current law and policies of the DoD. If special program dogs are necessary under an urgent needs contract, those dogs will be evaluated for other DoD MWD requirements within the services and dispositioned in the same manner as all other traditional MWDs.

5) The process for selection of a handler for military working dog adoption when more than one handler requests to adopt the military working dog.

The unit kennel master and current dog handler are the most knowledgeable individuals of any specific MWD during the process of disposition of that dog. The kennel master is the individual point of contact for a handler/handlers to make their desires known in the event of an adoption disposition for a retiring MWD. Using the recommendation of the kennel master and attending veterinarian, the unit command authority will decide in the best interest of the dog, which handler is awarded the adoption. That commander will consider the dog's temperament, adoption living conditions, location, age of children if applicable, and handler rapport with the dog. In most instances, the dog's current handler is given the first consideration for adoption. The kennel master will also inform all handlers of the commander's decision.

Conclusion

The Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) program was established in January 2011 as a temporary, Army-funded contract supporting Army Brigade Combat Teams by providing maneuver units with canine assets to mitigate casualties associated with improvised explosive devices. This program was established under contract with private industry because at that time 341st Training Squadron was surging to produce traditional MWDs and had neither the kennel space, training areas, manpower resources, nor time to meet the emergent requirement.

The Army was challenged in the disposition of TEDDs due to an avoidable limited transition window. Knowing the contract was pending renewal, the disposition process should have been planned in advance or the contract renewed for an option year at a cost of \$3.5M until the TEDDs were properly dispositioned. Three former TEDD handlers submitted a privacy act release form regarding their opportunity to adopt the TEDDs; these resulted in separate Congressional inquiries being conducted in each case. The TEDD handlers did not receive a clear TEDD adoption application process and explanation of current MWD adoption law in writing to avoid confusion. This written hand-out could have presented an ample defense of handler notification for OPMG. During training at YPG, TEDD handlers were advised verbally to provide their contact information to OPMG representatives stating their intentions/desire to adopt a TEDD they were handling. OPMG selected 70 TEDDs for retention and retraining to fill other MWD requirements and then, due to time constraints at contract termination, conducted two Law Enforcement Weeks in February 2014 to allow law enforcement agencies to come to the contractor in North Carolina to assess the remaining 150 TEDDs and process for transfer to their departments. In the end, 40/220 TEDDs were adopted by their former handlers and 1 dog was transferred from the civilian adopter to the previous TEDD handler. An additional 9 TEDDs were reported as deceased during the period of the contract.

To preclude future issues with adoption, the appropriate legislation has now been enacted. In 2014, handlers were not required to be identified in accordance with 10 USC § 2583 as being the first option for MWD adoption, but it was the common practice in all DoD kennels. This is now mandated, when in the best interest of the dog, by the 2016 National Defense Authorization Act. Further, the DoD will continue to utilize and transfer MWDs with useful working life when requirements exist in other services, except in the case of a severely wounded handler or handler that was killed in action and next of kin wants to adopt the dog. DoD policy is now being updated and will require the Joint Service Military Working Dog Committee, composed of program managers from all services and the Director of the MWD hospital, to review future contract considerations such as TEDD. Problems encountered with hasty termination of the TEDD contract highlights the need to ensure a proper disposition plan is part of the contract requirements, in accordance with current adoption law. Lastly, any conflicts between handlers concerning an MWD adoption will be decided by the accountable unit commander with input from the servicing kennel master.

Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report

| | Name | Breed | Sex | Tattoo | Status at Contract Termination |
|----|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 1 | AGBAR | BM | M | R559 | Adoption |
| 2 | ABBY | LR | F | R558 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 3 | AKIM 1 | GS | M | R846 | Adoption |
| 4 | AKIM 2 | BM | M | T283 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 5 | ALAN | BM | M | R560 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 6 | ALAN 2 | GS | M | R561 | Fort Rucker (FORSCOM) |
| 7 | ALEX | GS | M | R686 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 8 | ALEX 2 | GS | M | R562 | Franklin Co Police |
| 9 | ALEX 3 | GS | M | T365 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 10 | AMIGO 1 | GS | M | T366 | Jones County Sheriff Dept (NC) |
| 11 | AMY | BM | F | R563 | Ft Hood (FORSCOM) |
| 12 | ANOUSKA 1 | BM | F | R564 | USAREUR |
| 13 | ARCO 12 | BM | M | R565 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 14 | ARES 1 | GS | M | R566 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 15 | ARGO 6 | GS | M | R567 | Adoption |
| 16 | ARIES | GR | M | R568 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 17 | ARON | GS | M | T035 | Adoption |
| 18 | ARON 8 | GS | M | R569 | USSS |
| 19 | ASIA | GS | F | V071 | U.S. Dept of Energy |
| 20 | ASTOR 1 | GS | M | R659 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 21 | ATILLA | GS | M | R570 | Adoption |
| 22 | BABY 1 | GS | F | R657 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 23 | BAFFY | GS | M | R571 | Bibb County Sheriff Dept. |
| 24 | BAK | GS | M | R572 | University of Mississippi PD |
| 25 | BAK 1 | GS | M | R691 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 26 | BAKO | GS | M | T277 | Adoption |
| 27 | BARAS | GS | M | R573 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 28 | BARO 2 | GS | M | R574 | Adoption |
| 29 | BARTJE | BM | M | T278 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 30 | BEAR | LR | M | R575 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 31 | BEN | BM | M | R660 | Adoption |
| 32 | BESTAMI | BM | M | T720 | Ft Hood (FORSCOM) |
| 33 | BETY | BM | F | T279 | Virginia State Police |
| 34 | BILL 5 | GS | M | R661 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 35 | BLACKY 3 | GS | M | R576 | Adoption |
| 36 | BLACKY 5 | GS | M | R5777 | Deceased |
| 37 | BODI | GR | M | R578 | Adoption |
| 38 | BOM | BM | M | R579 | Deceased |
| 39 | BONA | GS | F | T469 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 40 | BONO 2 | GS | M | R580 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 41 | BORISZ | GS | M | R581 | Duplin County Sheriff |

Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report

| | Name | Breed | Sex | Tattoo | Status at Contract Termination |
|----|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 42 | BRANCO 1 | BM | M | T056 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 43 | BREK | GS | M | R582 | Virginia State Police |
| 44 | BRITT | WMR | M | R583 | Adopted from JBASA-Lackland |
| 45 | BRONCO 1 | BM | M | R584 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 46 | BRUCE | GS | M | V054 | USAREUR |
| 47 | BRUNO 7 | DS | M | R690 | (Fort Bragg) U.S. Capitol Police |
| 48 | CALLIE | LR | F | T367 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 49 | CASEY | GS | F | R585 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 50 | CASTOR | BM | M | R586 | Fort Bliss (FORSCOM) |
| 51 | CEZAR 1 | GS | M | R587 | NYPD |
| 52 | CHACKY | GS | M | R588 | Adopted from JBASA-Lackland |
| 53 | CHARLIE | LR | M | R589 | Capital Police |
| 54 | CHARLIE | LR | M | R842 | Franklin Co Police |
| 55 | CHATSI | BM | F | R688 | Adoption |
| 56 | CHEYENNE | BM | F | R590 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 57 | CHICA 1 | GS | F | R591 | Adoption |
| 58 | COBA | LR | F | R592 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 59 | CROCK | GS | M | T059 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 60 | CSIK | GS | M | R593 | Adoption |
| 61 | DAG 1 | BM | M | T280 | Capital Police |
| 62 | DAKOTA | SS | F | T721 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 63 | DAN 5 | GS | M | R594 | Franklin Co Police |
| 64 | DARCA | BM | M | R595 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 65 | DAVID | BM | M | T451 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 66 | DENY | GS | M | R568 | Put on Army installation (MDW) |
| 67 | DERICK | DS | M | R596 | Deceased |
| 68 | DIEGO | GS | M | R597 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 69 | DINO 1 | BM | M | R598 | Franklin Co Police |
| 70 | DODO | GS | M | V236 | Adoption |
| 71 | DONNA 1 | BM | F | R599 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 72 | DORI | GS | F | R600 | Fort Jackson, SC |
| 73 | DUMA | BM | F | T458 | NYPD |
| 74 | DURY | BM | M | R655 | Capital Police |
| 75 | DZES | GS | F | V237 | Dept of State |
| 76 | EDY | BM | M | R601 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 77 | ENO | GS | M | R602 | Taylor Town Police |
| 78 | EROSZ | GS | M | R662 | Adoption |
| 79 | EVERETT | LR | M | T284 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 80 | FALCO | GS | M | R695 | Adoption |
| 81 | FAMA | GS | F | R689 | Fort Bragg (FORSCOM) |

Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report

| | Name | Breed | Sex | Tattoo | Status at Contract Termination |
|-----|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 82 | FANTOM | GS | M | R603 | Capital Police |
| 83 | FARA | GS | F | T379 | Put on Army installation (FORSCOM) |
| 84 | FIL | GS | M | R693 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 85 | FILIP | GS | M | R694 | Fort Bragg (FORSCOM) |
| 86 | FISTIK | LR | F | R604 | Adoption |
| 87 | FRED | GS | M | R605 | Georgia State Police |
| 88 | FREDY | GS | M | T285 | Duplin County Sheriff |
| 89 | FREE | GS | M | R606 | Adoption |
| 90 | FREIA | GS | F | R607 | Put on Army Installation (ARNG) |
| 91 | FRODO | GS | M | T452 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 92 | GABY | BM | M | R608 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 93 | GEPARD | BM | M | R609 | Put on Army installation (MDW) |
| 94 | GERI | GS | M | R610 | Adoption |
| 95 | GILEK | GS | F | V072 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 96 | GINA 3 | DS | F | R838 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 97 | GREGOR | GS | M | R611 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 98 | GRIFF | BM | M | R685 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 99 | HANS | GS | M | R612 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 100 | HANZ 1 | GS | M | T093 | Franklin Co Police |
| 101 | HARCO | BM | M | R613 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 102 | HAVOC | DS | F | R614 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 103 | HECTOR | GS | M | R615 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 104 | HEIJN | BM | M | T368 | Capital Police |
| 105 | HERON | BM | F | R616 | Deceased |
| 106 | HINDY | GS | F | T281 | Adoption |
| 107 | HOWARD | PB | M | T453 | Taylor Town Police |
| 108 | HUGO 1 | GS | M | T719 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 109 | IKAR | GS | M | T369 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 110 | IKAR 1 | GS | M | T380 | Fort Bliss (FORSCOM) |
| 111 | ISAM | BM | M | R808 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 112 | ISI 1 | GS | F | R617 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 113 | ITTY 1 | GS | M | R618 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 114 | IZI | BM | M | R619 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 115 | JACK 1 | GS | M | V228 | Put on Army Installation (ARNG) |
| 116 | JAJO | GS | M | R620 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 117 | JASPER | PB | M | T457 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 118 | JERRY | GS | M | T460 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 119 | JESSIE | GS | F | R621 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 120 | KARO 2 | GS | M | T286 | Franklin Co Police |
| 121 | KAY 16 | BM | M | R622 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |

Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report

| | Name | Breed | Sex | Tattoo | Status at Contract Termination |
|-----|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 122 | KAY 19 | BM | M | T282 | Deceased |
| 123 | KAZAN 1 | BM | M | R837 | Fort Bragg (FORSCOM) |
| 124 | KEES | DS | M | R623 | Adoption |
| 125 | KEJSY | GS | F | T055 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 126 | KELLY 3 | DS | F | R892 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 127 | KEVIN | GS | M | R811 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 128 | KIM 3 | GS | F | R893 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 129 | KIM 4 | GS | F | R931 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 130 | KIRA 4 | GS | F | R839 | Georgia State Police |
| 131 | KOMA | GS | M | T287 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 132 | KRYNO | GS | M | T461 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 133 | KUTA | BM | M | R624 | Taylor Town Police |
| 134 | KYRA 5 | GS | F | R625 | Adoption |
| 135 | LAIKA 5 | BM | F | T381 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 136 | LEO | GS | M | R626 | USAREUR |
| 137 | LEVI | BM | M | R627 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 138 | LIAM | BM | M | T288 | Adoption |
| 139 | LION 1 | BM | M | T382 | USAREUR |
| 140 | LIVEE | LR | F | R628 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 141 | LIZZY | DS | F | R629 | Fort Hood (FORSCOM) |
| 142 | LORD | GS | M | T462 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 143 | LUCAS | BM | M | R630 | Adoption |
| 144 | LUCKY 1 | GS | M | T454 | U.S. Dept of Energy |
| 145 | LUCKY 6 | GS | M | R631 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 146 | MACI 1 | GS | M | R632 | Franklinton Police Dept |
| 147 | MARCO 39 | GS | M | R633 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 148 | MARLEY | LR | M | R634 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 149 | MARLEY 1 | LR | M | T455 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 150 | MARSHALL | LR | M | R635 | USASOC |
| 151 | MATTY | GS | M | V053 | Adoption |
| 152 | MAX 17 | GS | M | T456 | Deceased |
| 153 | MAX 19 | BM | M | T470 | Virginia State Police |
| 154 | MEGIN | BM | M | R636 | Put on Army installation (MDW) |
| 155 | MERCI | DS | F | R654 | Fort Polk (FORSCOM) |
| 156 | MIDNIGHT | LR | M | R692 | Adoption |
| 157 | MIMSY | PB | F | R894 | Taylor Town Police |
| 158 | MISA | GS | M | T722 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 159 | MORIS 3 | GS | M | R637 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 160 | MOTO | LR | M | R845 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 161 | MYKA | BM | F | R638 | Adoption |

Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report

| | Name | Breed | Sex | Tattoo | Status at Contract Termination |
|-----|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 162 | NERO 18 | BM | M | R639 | Adopted from JBSA-Lackland |
| 163 | NERO 23 | GS | M | T058 | MDW |
| 164 | NICK | GS | M | R640 | MDW |
| 165 | NICK 2 | BM | M | R641 | Deceased |
| 166 | NINA 1 | GS | F | R642 | MDW |
| 167 | NINA3 | BM | F | T289 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 168 | OOGIE | LR | M | R643 | USASOC |
| 169 | PANTER | GS | M | T037 | Taylor Town Police |
| 170 | PISTA | BM | M | R644 | Capital Police |
| 171 | PONGO / BJ | LR | M | R843 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 172 | PRINZ | DS | M | R645 | Dept of State |
| 173 | QUATRO | BM | M | R646 | Deceased |
| 174 | RANGER | BM | M | R647 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 175 | RAYCO | BM | M | T459 | Capital Police |
| 176 | REMY | BM | M | R648 | Adoption |
| 177 | RENO 1 | GS | M | T370 | MDW |
| 178 | REX 54 | BM | M | R649 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 179 | REXY | BM | M | V238 | Virginia State Police |
| 180 | RICA | GS | F | R518 | Virginia State Police |
| 181 | RICKY | BM | M | R807 | Put on Army installation (IMCOM) |
| 182 | RICO 44 | BM | M | R519 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 183 | RICO 45 | BM | M | R520 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 184 | RIKY 3 | BM | M | R521 | Put on Army installation (IMCOM) |
| 185 | RILEY | LR | M | R844 | Converted to SSD (FORSCOM) |
| 186 | ROBBY | BM | M | T060 | Dept of State |
| 187 | ROCKY 42 | GS | M | R522 | USAREUR |
| 188 | ROCKY 53 | GS | M | T034 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 189 | ROGER | GSP | M | R523 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 190 | ROMEO | BT | M | R665 | Fort Leonard Wood (FORSCOM) |
| 191 | ROSSO | GS | F | T723 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 192 | ROXY | LR | F | R524 | Adoption |
| 193 | ROY | BM | M | R809 | USAREUR |
| 194 | RUDO | BM | M | R525 | Deceased |
| 195 | RUDY 3 | GS | M | R663 | 8th ARMY |
| 196 | SAKI | BM | M | R526 | Capital Police |
| 197 | SANI | BM | M | T724 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 198 | SANTO 1 | GS | M | R527 | ARNG |
| 199 | SARIKA | GS | M | R664 | Capital Police |
| 200 | SASSY | LR | F | T036 | Virginia State Police |
| 201 | SATAN | GS | M | T383 | Adoption |

Tactical Explosive Detector Dog (TEDD) Adoption Report

| | Name | Breed | Sex | Tattoo | Status at Contract Termination |
|-----|-------------|--------------|------------|---------------|---------------------------------------|
| 202 | SEGY | GS | M | T471 | Capital Police |
| 203 | SENNA | BM | F | R895 | 8th ARMY |
| 204 | SENNA 2 | BM | F | R528 | 8th ARMY |
| 205 | SHADOW 3 | BM | F | R835 | Adoption |
| 206 | SHIRA | DS | F | R836 | MDW |
| 207 | SIL | BM | M | R529 | Adopted from JBASA-Lackland |
| 208 | SPIKE 31 | BM | M | R530 | Fort Polk (FORSCOM) |
| 209 | SPYK33 | BT | M | R531 | Put on Army installation (TRADOC) |
| 210 | TANK | PB | M | R532 | Adopted from JBASA-Lackland |
| 211 | TAZ | PB | M | R687 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 212 | TESSA | BM | F | R534 | Taylor Town Police |
| 213 | TESSA 1 | BM | F | R810 | Adoption |
| 214 | THEO | GS | M | T463 | Carrollton PD |
| 215 | TIMBER 1 | LR | M | T057 | USASOC |
| 216 | TOKI | GS | M | R535 | Franklinton Police Dept |
| 217 | TOKI 1 | GS | M | R656 | Put on Army installation (IMCOM) |
| 218 | TOMI 10 | GS | M | V219 | Adoption |
| 219 | TOMO | GS | M | R536 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 220 | TORRES | GS | M | R537 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 221 | TOSCA 2 | BM | F | R538 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 222 | TUCKER | LR | M | V239 | SOLIDEN Technologies |
| 223 | XSARA | BM | F | R539 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 224 | YANKEE | GS | M | R540 | Franklin Co Police |
| 225 | YARIM | BM | F | R541 | Jones County Sheriff Dept (NC) |
| 226 | ZINO | GS | M | R806 | Jones County Sheriff Dept (NC) |
| 227 | ZOEY | DS | F | R542 | Adoption by Former Handler |
| 228 | ZORA | GS | F | R897 | ARNG |
| 229 | ZOZO | GS | M | R543 | Adoption by Former Handler |

List of Acronyms

BT Belgian Tervuren

BM Belgian Malinois

DS Dutch Shepherd

GS German Shepherd

GSP German Shorthair Pointer

GR Golden Retriever

LR Labrador Retriever

PB Pit Bull

ARNG Army National Guard

FORSCOM Forces Command

IMCOM Installation Management Command

MDW Military District of Washington

TRADOC Training & Doctrine Command

USAREUR US Army European Command

USASOC US Army Special Operations Command

SS Springer Spaniel

Distribution

The Honorable Thad Cochran
Chairman
Subcommittee on Defense
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510-6028

The Honorable Richard J. Durbin
Vice Chairman
Subcommittee on Defense
Committee on Appropriations
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510-6028

The Honorable John McCain
Chairman
Committee on Armed Services
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510-6050

The Honorable Jack Reed
Ranking Member
Committee on Armed Services
United States Senate
Washington, DC 20510-6050

The Honorable Rodney P. Frelinghuysen
Chairman
Subcommittee on Defense
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6018

The Honorable Peter J. Visclosky
Ranking Member
Subcommittee on Defense
Committee on Appropriations
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6018

The Honorable Mac Thornberry
Chairman
Committee on Armed Services
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6035

The Honorable Adam Smith
Ranking Member
Committee on Armed Services
U.S. House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-6035

This is a work of the U.S. government and is not subject to copyright protection in the United States. The published product may be reproduced and distributed in its entirety without further permission from the Air Force. However, because this work may contain copyrighted images or other material, permission from the copyright holder may be necessary if you wish to reproduce this material separately.